

Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project  
Strategic Science Review Panel Report  
Program Response Worksheet

Report Section	Comment	Agree: We're Already Doing	Agree: How to Address?	Can't/Shouldn't Address	Additional Comments
<b>Problem Identification</b>					
<b>Recommendations</b>	R1. Articulate the problem with the PS nearshore - as indicated by identified symptoms that people not familiar with the science of local ecosystems can understand - clearly and relate these problems directly to VECs or other socially important functions, services, or goods.		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Who: NST to find examples &amp; expand cross-pgm involvement</li> <li>- Internal, all-hands workshop? involve stakeholders in creation</li> <li>- are still developing use of VECs and other pgm components</li> <li>- stakeholder communication hard without this!</li> </ul>
	R2. Utilize information from other ecosystems to support scientific justification of the problems and to identify local data gaps	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- may be more useful strategy later in development of the GI</li> </ul>
	R3. Include future human population pressures (projected settlement and land use patterns) and institutional and management challenges explicitly in the problem definition.	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- High priority</li> <li>- need implementation detail for this high priority</li> </ul>
<b>Additional Suggestions</b>	AS1. Extend the change analysis to include more than two time points, at least in selected areas, to better demonstrate patterns of change over time.			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- incorporate into scientific demonstrations (case study approach)</li> <li>- particularly useful re: tiers 3 and 4 change and to explain/justify our approach to others</li> <li>- rather than 3rd point, incorporate add'l timeframes into text of final report</li> </ul>
	AS2. Provide a more balanced presentation in the change analysis by acknowledging that losses in ecological goods and services were accompanied by gains in economic and social services.		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Who depends on the answer to R8</li> <li>- addressed to some degree in change analysis</li> <li>- more appropriate in narrative, not as revision to change analysis</li> </ul>
	AS3. Utilize a simple report card approach to communicate problems with the nearshore ecosystem.			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Who: Stakeholder involvement team</li> <li>- more appropriate after GI: during implementation</li> <li>- connection to PSP here?</li> </ul>
<b>Program Vision</b>					
<b>Recommendations</b>	R4. Engage stakeholders early in developing a common vision, possibly including activities similar to the <i>Multi Vision Integration to Action</i> exercise.		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Who: Margen, Simon, Andrea T., and others form joint NST, IT, and StC stakeholder involvement team</li> </ul>

Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project  
Strategic Science Review Panel Report  
Program Response Worksheet

Report Section	Comment	Agree: We're Already Doing	Agree: How to Address?	Can't/Shouldn't Address	Additional Comments
<b>Additional Suggestions</b>	AS4. Develop program vision with stakeholders using change analysis to illustrate nearshore change over time.	X			
	AS5. Redesign the Level 2 and Level 3 conceptual model graphics to be more accessible to the public and inform the visioning process.		X		- Who: NST and stakeholder involvement team
<b>Soundness of Scientific Foundation</b>					
<b>Recommendations</b>	R5. Incorporate socio-economic factors into conceptual models to illustrate ways that changes in the system will impact people as well as EFG&S.		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Who: Curtis and NST chair to check w/ PSP regarding existing conceptual models</li> <li>- can we connect to PSP work on conceptual models?</li> <li>- may be captured in separate document that shows connections to existing models</li> <li>- connect science to stakeholder concerns!</li> </ul>
	R6. Integrate the current conceptual modeling approaches and include other non-nearshore limiting or confounding factors to show how the elements of the system work together now and in the future.		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Who: NST</li> <li>- make connections to DPSP (sp?) models</li> <li>- change analysis (tiers 3&amp;4) do this to some degree but need better explanation in final report</li> </ul>
	R7. Conduct local case studies on rates of shoreform change, possibly involving graduate student researchers, to better understand how quickly the system is expected to change and why.		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Who: NST</li> <li>- maybe scientific demo site ~ useful later</li> <li>- Maybe NST develops approach, but doing it comes later (with add'l \$\$)</li> </ul>
<b>Additional Suggestions</b>	AS6. Better articulate the link between process-based restoration and VECs where direct links exist.		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Who: NST</li> <li>- incorporate into "plain talk" materials</li> </ul>
	AS7. Expand the Conceptual Model to include regulatory, institutional, and other socio-economic factors.		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Who: Curtis and NST chair to check w/ PSP regarding existing conceptual models</li> <li>- see also R5</li> </ul>

Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project  
Strategic Science Review Panel Report  
Program Response Worksheet

Report Section	Comment	Agree: We're Already Doing	Agree: How to Address?	Can't/Shouldn't Address	Additional Comments
	AS8. Include additional time periods in the change analysis, (e.g., 1980s) to better identify current trajectories of change.			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- see also AS1</li> <li>- consider explaining why change analysis is more powerful to describe the past than future change</li> </ul>
<b>Incorporation of Best Available Science</b>					
<b>Recommendations</b>	R8. Expand social science expertise on PSNERP teams. Specifically, include an expert in decision analysis to support application of program tools to the restoration strategy, in recognition of the need to systematically analyze tradeoffs amongst competing objectives.		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Who: Tom Leschine, Si, Project Mgrs</li> <li>- there are many ways to integrate soc. sci. into our program ~ are add'l staff resources nec. the answer?</li> <li>- add to contractors or to IT?</li> <li>- beyond staff and into analysis</li> </ul>
	R9. Develop and implement as soon as possible a structured process of stakeholder involvement led by experts in public engagement on technical issues. A pilot project with select stakeholders would provide guidance on how to reach intended outcomes.	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- High priority</li> </ul>
	R10. Explore critical uncertainties through pilot restoration experiments and incorporate results into project planning, using replication when possible.	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- reflected in ESRP adaptive mgmt objectives and PMP</li> <li>- could try to get other grant pgms to incorporate</li> </ul>
<b>Additional Suggestions</b>	AS9. Improve understanding of variability with intensively monitored shoreline reaches tied to management experiments.		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Who: NST</li> <li>- candidate for Science &amp; Technology actions/sites</li> </ul>
<b>Gaps in Logic or Process</b>					
<b>Recommendations</b>	R11. Address uncertainties associated with the likelihood of implementing restoration actions regarding not only scientific factors, but also societal factors (laws, regulations, <b>institutional (added)</b> , attitudes, beliefs, values).		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Who: IT and Rachel Lipsky</li> <li>- This analysis plugs into our prgm at several levels (programmatic and site)</li> <li>- laws and regs may get addressed in more detail than social factors</li> <li>- social factors must be addressed at programmatic and site scales</li> </ul>
	R12. Conduct a complete example of the envisioned PSNERP process in a pilot area once the Vision has been developed to convincingly demonstrate the logic and feasibility of the programmatic approach.	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- change analysis and SNAR do this ~ related to development of initial portfolio</li> <li>- we are implementing a progressively more rigorous pilot process</li> </ul>

Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project  
 Strategic Science Review Panel Report  
**Program Response Worksheet**

Report Section	Comment	Agree: We're Already Doing	Agree: How to Address?	Can't/Shouldn't Address	Additional Comments
	R13. Address potential uncertainty associated with climate change impacts to social and nearshore systems in both conceptual models and restoration strategy options.  <i>R13. Continued</i>		X		- Who: Doug M., Hugh, Tom M. (wrap in state folks as necessary) - reflected to some degree in FRAP ~ could inform restoration strategy options? - adaptive mgmt strategy may help address this - at least need to address effects of increased stormwater, flows, and sea levels - specific task order related to this re: initial portfolio?
	R14. Consider developing a simplified shoreline scorecard (based on multivariate modeling approach) that has no more than 5 grades.				- <b><i>Need add'l explanation from Denise Reed</i></b> - <b><i>Brie to elaborate and/or follow up</i></b>
<b>Additional Suggestions</b>	AS10. Improve formal connections between the NST and the Implementation Team.		X		- Who: PMT - need NST input during the development of SNAR (not just on draft) ~ NST to attend meetings of SNAT?

**Some General Stakeholder Comments:**

- track legal requirements of stakeholder involvement
- check with Nisqually re: their EIS. Would This be a good model for stakeholder involvement in NEPA/SEPA, etc.?

Greetings All,

Attached for your review is a draft stakeholder involvement strategy. We will discuss the context and general approach of the document at next Wednesday's Steering Committee meeting. Although we will have a general discussion about the document at that time, you need not complete your in-depth review by that time. Rather, **please review the document and provide feedback and "track changes" edits to Andrea Takash (andrea.m.takash@usace.army.mil) by the close of business on Wednesday, November 12th.**

Please consider the following things as you review the document:

- Don't gasp at the length of the document (just over 20 pages). It is in an outline format, and there are page breaks between each stakeholder involvement activity. The most important pieces of each section are the program need, objective, and methods. Focus on these sections if you want to expedite your review of the content.
- The timelines are not specific yet. The order of the first six chapters reflects the priorities and sequencing of the Project Management Plan, but the exact dates should be included once the dates in the PMP are finalized.
- We need feedback and commitments regarding the roles and contributions of program participants for each stakeholder involvement activity! Please think seriously about how you or your organization can make a contribution, get specific, and record this in the "program participants" area.
- Remember that a key audience for this strategy document will be the communications and outreach specialists who will help us implement some of these activities. Although we're interested in your feedback to make the explanations accurate and complete, non-technical staff must be able to understand what we're saying in order to help us accomplish this stuff. (Translation: watch the jargon and overly technical explanations and detail in your feedback.)

Finally, tremendous thanks in advance for spending some time looking at this document. It needs your eyes to improve it! I am happy to answer questions via phone or voicemail ~ at least for the next week or so (after which I will be on maternity leave!). Andrea Takash and I have been working closely on the development of this document, and I am confident that she will do an excellent job shepherding this strategy to completion. We look forward to your feedback!

Best,  
\*Margen

# **Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership: Stakeholder Involvement Strategy**

## **Executive Summary**

*Once content is stable, include a brief summary of the stakeholder involvement activity titles and the associated objective of each. Include also an overarching statement regarding the purpose of stakeholder involvement for the Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership.*

# Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership: Stakeholder Involvement Strategy

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Developing “Plain-Talk” Program Materials .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Involving Stakeholders in NEPA .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Visioning: Developing and Reviewing Restoration and Protection Goals and Objectives.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Valuing Ecosystem Functions, Goods, and Services.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Populating the Nearshore Project Database.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Developing and Advancing a PSNERP GI Project/Site List .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Establishing/Improving Relationships with Other Restoration Programs and Partners .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Earning Institutional Support for Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership and the PSNERP GI .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Fostering Broad Program Understanding and Support .....</b>	<b>22</b>

## Introduction

This stakeholder involvement strategy is intended to provide guidance to the members of the Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership who will be implementing the various stakeholder involvement activities between now and the completion of the Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project (PSNERP) General Investigation (GI). Although the Army Corps of Engineers Seattle District (Corps) and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) are the co-sponsors of the Nearshore Partnership and the associated PSNERP GI, other partners may take the lead in implementing one or more of the activities contained in this strategy, including developing implementation plans. While it may not provide a “work plan” level of detail for each activity, this strategy captures the best thinking and agreement of the Nearshore Partnership regarding program needs and stakeholder involvement objectives, which is vital given such a cooperative implementation approach.

The relationships among the Nearshore Partnership and its many member organizations are another important facet of a cooperative implementation approach to stakeholder involvement. Although the Nearshore Partnership and PSNERP will continue to have independent products, process, and even stakeholder needs, there are many opportunities for coordination and collaboration in the context of outreach to the restoration and protection community and the broader public. Taking advantage of these opportunities will be critical in order to avoid confusion and even frustration among our common stakeholders. Such collaboration may even result in more efficient use of financial and staff resources. Indeed, insofar as the Nearshore Partnership and its many members will be engaged in various outreach and involvement efforts in the near term, it will be important to spend time coordinating timelines and activities for stakeholder involvement and product “roll-out”. Coordination with the Puget Sound Partnership is especially important given the high profile of the important initiative, and the public’s increasing association of Puget Sound issues with this new agency.

The program may need to exercise some flexibility in implementing this strategy as a result of this collaborative approach to stakeholder involvement, valuable insights from outside the Nearshore Partnership (e.g., recommendations from the Strategic Science Peer Review Panel), and the evolving

nature of Nearshore Partnership's efforts in general. Although the program needs and objectives captured here are unlikely to change, the particular methods may change. WDFW and the Corps will maintain this stakeholder involvement strategy and keep copies of the implementation plans for particular stakeholder involvement activities.

Each chapter of this document articulates a one-time and/or ongoing stakeholder involvement activity. In general, the first six chapters appear in order of priority and timing in order to support the completion of the PSNERP GI. The final three chapters represent ongoing program needs and should, therefore, occur at all stages of the PSNERP GI and broader Nearshore Partnership efforts.

## Developing “Plain-Talk” Program Materials

### Program Need

One of the most pressing and immediate needs of the Nearshore Partnership is to develop materials that enable the program to communicate its analyses and findings to stakeholders in a consistent and easily understood way. We refer to these as “plain-talk” program materials. The success of each of the stakeholder involvement activities presented in other chapters of the Stakeholder Involvement Strategy is dependent on successfully communicating to stakeholders:

- how the physical features of the nearshore have changed;
- how these changes have affected ecosystem functions, goods, and services (EFG&S);
- how these changes impacts valued ecosystem components;
- how the physical features of the nearshore and the associated EFG&S are likely to change in the future if we do not act; and
- what we can do about these changes.

These materials are likely to include materials such as PowerPoint presentations, fact sheets, brochures, maps, and/or display posters/boards. It will be *critical* to engage a communications and/or outreach specialist in the development of these materials so that they are easy to understand. These materials can be used through the visioning workshops, restoration objectives focus group meetings, and other outreach efforts.

### Objective

To develop and maintain a collection of plain-talk materials (including, but not limited to PowerPoint presentations, talking points, fact sheets, brochures, maps, and/or display posters/boards) that convey the program’s analysis and results in a consistent and easily understood way.

### Timeline

Activity	Begin	Duration
Iterative development of plain-talk materials	Immediately	Approximately 3 months
Testing the Effectiveness of Plain-Talk Materials	Following	

### Audience(s)

*Not an exhaustive list; please add as necessary.*

State and federal agencies	Local government representatives (state, county, and city)
Tribes	General public
Non-governmental organizations	Media
Restoration and protection community	

## Methods

### *Activities*

- *Iterative Development of Plain-Talk Materials*

A communications, public affairs, or outreach specialist should develop plain-talk materials that convey the program's analyses and findings *in conjunction with* the various individuals and committees that produced the underlying technical materials. This iterative method of interaction between a communication and outreach specialist and the various parts of the program is essential to striking the proper balance of technical accuracy and easy comprehension. It may be helpful (and expeditious) to hire a communications consultant to manage the final production of this set of materials. It will also be important to have a point person inside of the program who can participate in this development, and perhaps work with the various parts of the program to produce the draft text or messages that would become the basis for the final set of materials. This work could begin immediately, regardless of the time required to undertake a contracting process.

- *Testing the Effectiveness of Plain-Talk Materials*

Prior to the production of a final set of plain-talk materials, the program should test the effectiveness of these materials in conveying nearshore concepts and messages. This could be done quite easily by creating a focus group consisting of existing, non-technical stakeholders, such as members of the citizen committees of Marine Resources Committees or salmon recovery Lead Entities. Such an effort could be fairly informal, and would give the program valuable feedback about the degree to which the materials will, in fact, communicate effectively with non-technical audiences,

### *Products*

- Plain-talk materials are likely to include (but not be limited to) PowerPoint presentations, talking points, fact sheets, brochures, maps, and/or display posters/boards

### *Media Strategies*

- 

## Program Participants

**Participant**

**Role**

## Valuing Ecosystem Functions, Goods, and Services

### Program Need

The Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project (PSNERP) Change Analysis documents how the physical features of the nearshore have changed over time. The program describes how these changes affect the nearshore's ability to provide ecosystem functions, goods, and services (EFG&S). This translation enables stakeholders to understand how physical changes in the nearshore environment have, and may continue to affect the things they care about. Stakeholder input is needed in defining which of the many EFG&S provided by Puget Sound nearshore ecosystems are of higher relative importance. This helps us focus our restoration actions and describe the project benefits in socially relevant terms.

### Objective

To understand the relative importance to stakeholders of the many EFG&S provided by Puget Sound nearshore ecosystems.

### Timeline

Activity	Begin	Duration
Values survey and/or meetings (see alternatives below)		Depends on alternative chosen

### Audience(s)

*Not an exhaustive list; please add as necessary.*

General public

Shoreline property owners

### Methods

#### *Activities*

There are a variety of ways to accomplish the objective of understanding the relative importance to stakeholders of the many EFG&S provided by Puget Sound nearshore ecosystems. The alternatives vary greatly in cost and level of effort, and so the program should choose the alternative (or combination thereof) that best reflects the evolving budget, schedule, and priorities for completion of the PSNERP General Investigation. Regardless of the alternative chosen, the degree to which the responses reflect an understanding of the problems and opportunities facing the nearshore ecosystem depends on what materials are included to provide contextual information, as well as the success of the general outreach and education efforts of this program and partner organizations. An initial step in this task should include coordination with the Puget Sound Partnership, which has conducted some previous survey work, including exploration of stakeholder preferences for EFG&S associated with Puget Sound.

- *Alternative 1: Professionally conducted EFG&S values survey*

The most comprehensive way to accomplish this objective is to conduct a survey to assess the relative value to stakeholders of the various EFG&S of the nearshore. It would be most effective to hire a specialist to design and conduct the survey. Although this can be relatively expensive, there is a science and an art to designing survey questions, choosing survey distribution method (e.g., phone, mail, or web-based), and ensuring that enough responses are received to draw statistically significant conclusions. It would be possible, for instance, to conduct the survey and monitor the responses so that one could conclude with confidence

that, “Puget Sound residents value...” or “Thurston and Pierce County residents value...” This requires careful consideration of the contact information from which a random sample of respondents will be chosen, and a professional survey designer can help the program understand the consequences of this choice.

- *Alternative 2: Limited distribution EFG&S values survey*

It may also be possible to enlist professional assistance in designing the survey, but utilize existing resources (staff and distribution methods) to solicit responses. While this results in the same quality of survey questions, it is likely to limit the sample of responses to email, address, or telephone distribution lists that the program has ready access to. This will make it more difficult (if not impossible) to extrapolate and draw conclusions about broader groups or populations of people.

- *Alternative 3: PSNERP-designed, limited distribution EFG&S values survey*

In this scenario, the program designs and conducts the survey using the knowledge, experience, and resources of existing staff and partner organizations. This approach is likely to result in a lower degree of confidence in the conclusions the program can make based on responses, as well as a limited ability to extrapolate beyond the responses received. It may, however, provide enough guidance to enable the program to develop a general understanding of the relative importance of nearshore EFG&S, and to develop and describe restoration and protection alternatives that will be supported by the public.

- *Alternative 4: EFG&S values meetings*

It is also possible to gather information from stakeholders in person about the degree to which they value the various nearshore EFG&S. The program should be cautious of conducting separate meetings to achieve this objective, however, as there is tremendous danger of overwhelming our stakeholders with too many meeting requests. It may be possible to gather this information as an addendum to existing meetings that have been scheduled for another purpose. To do so presents the risk of diluting the original meeting’s purpose, and may further limit the breadth of responses and the resulting conclusions.

### *Products*

The specific products will depend, to some degree, on the method chosen for gathering this stakeholder feedback. Any survey will likely require some brief, easily understood contextual information that can be conveyed in print, as talking points, and/or in presentation format. A professional survey developer could help the program understand the degree to which providing contextual information can influence the responses.

### *Media Strategies*

As mentioned above, and regardless of the alternative chosen, the degree to which the stakeholder responses reflect an understanding of the problems and opportunities facing the nearshore ecosystem depends on what materials are included to provide contextual information, as well as the success of the general outreach and education efforts of this program and partner organizations. Please see the “Fostering Broad Program Understanding and Support” section of this document.

## **Program Participants**

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Role</b>
WDFW	Lead, will coordinate hold any contracts with meeting support service providers and will coordinate meetings and other activities as necessary

## Involving Stakeholders in NEPA

### Program Need

The Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project (PSNERP) General Investigation is required to undergo environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Complying with NEPA requirements is an integral part of the critical path forward for the PSNERP GI Final Feasibility Report. NEPA outlines specific requirements, including public involvement and review at various points. The intent of NEPA is to insure that the environmental consequences, both positive and negative, of major federal actions are fully evaluated. *Check on state SEPA compliance requirements.* These environmental review processes provide the program with an important opportunity to seek stakeholder input. The PSNERP team needs to communicate to all stakeholders that we want to hear their comments and will utilize this input to shape our restoration plans and subsequent implementation.

### Objective

To comply in letter and in spirit with the public involvement requirements outlined by NEPA, *and SEPA, if required.*

### Timeline

Activity	Begin	Duration
Public review of SNAR	Spring 2009	
Public review of draft feasibility report	Summer 2010	45 days
Notice in Federal Register	Fall 2010 (approximate)	
Public Comment Period	Fall 2010	45 days

### Audience(s)

*Not an exhaustive list; please add as necessary.*

State and federal agencies	Local government representatives (state, county, and city)
Tribes	General public
Non-governmental organizations	Media
Restoration and protection community	

### Methods

#### *Activities*

The program will implement an early round of NEPA review and comment following the development of the Strategic Needs Assessment Report (SNAR). A subsequent, more in-depth round of NEPA review and comment will be undertaken upon completion of the draft feasibility report, prior to submission to Congress.

- *Public review of the Strategic Needs Assessment Report (SNAR)*
- *Public review of draft feasibility report prior to the formal NEPA process*

Plan to hold public workshops across the basin to scope the range of issues to be considered in our NEPA/SEPA analyses, and to seek public input on the sufficiency of this analysis. These workshops will start mid-June, and the comment period will last 45 days.

- *Public meetings for review of the draft final feasibility report and Environmental Impact Statement*

For the formal NEPA process, the program will hold meetings across the basin to solicit comments on the feasibility report and EIS. These meetings will take place around Oct. 21, and the comment period will last 45 days.

*Products*

- Plain-talk fact sheets, brochures, maps, and/or display posters/boards that convey the major analyses and findings that constitute the final feasibility report and/or the determinations of the EIS
- PowerPoint presentation to convey major analyses, findings, recommendations, and/or major process points
- Ads for local papers to announce formal comment period.
- Text for news releases
- Comment forms for collecting public comment at meetings
- Use the Web site to post event dates and updated information, including the feasibility report and EIS

*Media Strategies*

- Proactive media strategy
- Plan for articles in targeted technical publications and environmental magazines to generate interest in upcoming feasibility report
- Engage local media through phone contact in advance of June public meetings. Consider having federal and local project managers meet with interested reporters prior to the public meetings. Look into possible tours of demonstration projects before the meetings. Each of these activities will generate interest in the meetings and feasibility report.
- News releases prior to June and October meetings.

**Program Participants**

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Role</b>
Army Corps of Engineers	Lead on NEPA. Will coordinate outreach with WDFW.
EPA	Co-lead on NEPA process. May be able to provide staff support.
WDFW	Lead activities necessary to meet SEPA requirements.

## Visioning: Developing and Reviewing Restoration and Protection Goals and Objectives

### Program Need

The Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership must develop and adopt restoration and protection goals and objectives to guide the identification of preferred portfolios of restoration and protection measures. Restoration and protection goals can be thought of as the “vision” for the future of the Puget Sound nearshore. Objectives, on the other hand, are specific, measurable statements about nearshore restoration needs that are to be addressed by the PSNERP. These specific planning objectives will be developed using the results of the Change Analysis and Strategic Needs Assessment, which will provide a clear and concise summary of the problems and ecological needs in the nearshore. Both goals and objectives can be established at the sub-basin scale, or other scales as necessary, and will reflect the local condition of the nearshore, locally desired level of ecosystem improvement, socio-political support for various restoration methods, and any local constraints. Together, these goals and objectives describe how much restoration and protection is desirable to achieve the vision expressed by Puget Sound communities.

The program needs to engage stakeholders in an iterative process so that the resulting goals and objectives reflect the broader economic, Puget Sound recovery, and public funding goals. This iterative process must be supported by plain-talk materials that help stakeholders understand:

- how the physical features of the nearshore have changed;
- how these changes have affected ecosystem functions, goods, and services (EFG&S);
- how these changes impacts valued ecosystem components;
- how the physical features of the nearshore and the associated EFG&S are likely to change in the future if we do not act; and
- what we can do about these changes.

With this information, stakeholders will be prepared to make informed choices about the amount and kind of restoration and protection actions are preferred, and the trade-offs associated with making these choices.

### Objective

To engage stakeholders throughout the Puget Sound in the development of restoration and protection goals and objectives at the sub-basin scale.

### Timeline

Activity	Begin	Duration
Visioning workshops around Sound	<i>As soon as associated CA and SNAR materials are available. Possibly spring 2009.</i>	One – two months
Objectives focus group	<i>Following visioning workshops, which provide raw material for more specific discussions</i>	One – two months

### Audience(s)

*Not an exhaustive list; please add as necessary.*

Tribes

Local government representatives (state,

county, and city)

Non-governmental organizations

General public

Restoration and protection community

Shoreline property owners

## Methods

### *Activities*

In general, the stakeholder involvement activities included in this “visioning” chapter build on each other to provide the program with every-more specific feedback. It may be useful to think of the activities discussed below as a “funnel” for stakeholder feedback: the visioning workshops are at the wide part of the funnel and result in a sense of community desires, broad goals, and a physical vision for the nearshore. Subsequently, meetings of the objectives focus groups will result in increasingly specific, measurable restoration and protection objectives at the subbasin scale – the “narrow” part of the funnel of information.

- *Sound-wide Nearshore Visioning Workshops*

The program should hold 3-4 visioning workshops around the Sound (in one or more sub-basins) to collect public feedback about their physical vision for the nearshore environment. The public feedback portion of these meetings should be preceded by a **brief**, “plain-talk” presentation about the PSNERP’s Change Analysis, Strategic Needs Assessment, Future Risk Assessment, and effects of these changes on ecosystem functions, goods, and services (EFG&S). This will provide past, present, and future context within which people can evaluate the consequences of their choices about future vision.

A promising methodology for conducting these meetings is the “Vision to Action” methodology developed by the Army Corps of Engineers and used especially to guide brown field redevelopment. This method works well for large groups and generates rich information about the physical reality people would like to see in a particular place. *Insert contact information for Vision to Action’s Jim Waddell here.*

- *Nearshore Restoration Objectives Focus Groups*

Plan to hold at least 1 meeting in each of the 7 Puget Sound subbasins of a targeted group of stakeholders with whom the program can delve into more detail to create nearshore restoration objectives. These stakeholders need not be a “representative sample” of people from around the Sound, but should include a representative cross-section of organizations around the Sound (e.g., general business, industry, environmental organizations, etc.), as well as members of the general public. Participants should be identified through targeted solicitations of organizations *and* from broad, public solicitations in the newspaper, on the radio, and using any email distribution lists of potentially interested parties. It is important that participants commit to attending all meetings, as each meeting’s content will build on the work done before. Work with a professional facilitator to design these meetings, and consider setting a cap on the number of participants. It could be difficult to get to specific outcomes with a large group (more than ~25?). Different facilitators will have varying opinions about such a cap depending on their experience and the methods they plan to use to achieve the meeting objectives.

As above, the work of this group should be supported by **brief**, “plain-talk” presentation about the PSNERP’s Change Analysis, Strategic Needs Assessment, Future Risk Assessment, and effects of these changes on ecosystem functions, goods, and services. PSNERP scientists/technical staff need to be on-hand to help participants understand the consequences (positive and negative) of the choices they are exploring. It may be useful for

the PSNERP to prepare several alternative restoration objectives and associated EFG&S trade-offs that meeting participants can discuss, choose among, and/or refine. These example objectives should be informed by the vision and goal feedback that was gathered in the Visioning Workshops.

### *Products*

As discussed above, this iterative process to develop a vision for the nearshore and related restoration and protection objectives must be supported by “plain-talk” materials that help stakeholders understand:

- how the physical features of the nearshore have changed;
- how these changes have affected ecosystem functions, goods, and services (EFG&S);
- how these changes impact valued ecosystem components;
- how the physical features of the nearshore and the associated EFG&S are likely to change in the future if we do not act; and
- what we can do about these changes.

These materials are likely to include PowerPoint presentations, fact sheets, brochures, maps, and/or display posters/boards. These materials can be used through the visioning workshops, restoration objectives focus group meetings, and other outreach efforts.

### *Media Strategies*

- Radio, newspaper, blog, and/or email distribution list solicitations for participants in both the visioning workshops and the objectives focus groups
- News releases to highlight the visioning effort as a whole in order to generate understanding of, and interest in the process

## **Program Participants**

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Role</b>
WDFW	Lead, will coordinate the various meetings and hold any contracts with meeting support service providers

## Populating the Nearshore Project Database

### Program Need

The program requires an understanding of the broad range of locally identified restoration and protection opportunities. In the near term, these locally identified opportunities can be implemented through the Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program (ESRP) and other funding sources, contributing to our understanding of the effects of restoration and protection methods and how these contribute to nearshore recovery. Over the longer term, and in support of the final Feasibility Report, the locally identified restoration and protection opportunities represent actions that can be evaluated for inclusion as “early actions”. Strategic Needs Assessment provides a tool for evaluating these opportunities and developing a portfolio of actions that most efficiently meets identified restoration needs. Locally identified restoration and protection opportunities must come from the Puget Sound restoration community.

### Objective

To establish and maintain a database of locally identified nearshore restoration and protection opportunities, and update it at least once a year.

### Timeline

Activity	Begin	Duration
ESRP Request for Proposals	September 2008 September 2009	
Solicit Project Updates for Existing Entries		

### Audience(s)

*Not an exhaustive list; please add as necessary.*

Marine Resources Committees

Conservation Districts

Lead Entities

Local governments

Tribes

Regional Fishery Enhancement Groups

### Methods

#### *Activities*

- *ESRP Request for Proposals*  
Paraphrase from ESRP guidance document
- *Solicit Project Updates for Existing Database Entries*

The WDFW ESRP assistant (i.e., Jenna Norman, WDFW Nearshore Coordinator) sends an update request form to proponents of existing database entries. The exact content of the update request form should be derived from the content being tracked in the current version of the database. At minimum, the update request form should inquire about the current project contact(s), project phase and description, and remaining funding needs. Effort should be taken to minimize the number and complexity of data requests from project proponents. It will be helpful for stakeholders to be aware of the relationship between the nearshore project database and the eventual list of restoration and protection projects that will be forwarded to Congress as part of the final feasibility report.

*Products*

- ESRP Request for Proposals
- ESRP guidance document
- Fact sheet or flyer highlighting connection between nearshore project database and the eventual list of restoration and protection projects that will be included in the final feasibility report. This may provide additional incentive for local project sponsors to contribute to the database.

*Media Strategies*

- Provide news releases to draw attention to ESRP RFP and process
- Highlight existing, successful ESRP projects through news releases, interviews with newspapers and/or local television, and site tours

**Program Participants**

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Role</b>
WDFW ESRP staff	Manage the ESRP RFP process and solicit updates for existing database entries

## Developing and Advancing a PSNERP GI Project/Site List

### Program Need

To complete the Final Feasibility Report, the Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project (PSNERP) will identify an initial list of candidate restoration and protection sites. Most of these sites will come from the nearshore project database (see the “Populating the Nearshore Project Database” section of this document). This initial list will be selected and further screened considering criteria developed from the Strategic Needs Assessment, feasibility of implementation, and stakeholder values and feedback. The final list of actions is proposed to Congress for authorization, and so broad stakeholder support of the list is critical. Several stakeholder involvement activities lay a positive foundation for this final step, including developing restoration and protection goals and objectives; valuing ecosystem functions, goods, and services (EFG&S); and maintaining the nearshore project database. Subsequently, however, stakeholder feedback is needed to evaluate and advance the specific list of restoration and protection projects. Much of the work necessary to achieve this objective will occur in preceding stakeholder involvement activities.

### Objective

To develop and evaluate a restoration and protection project list that receives broad support when it is advanced to Congress for authorization.

### Timeline

Activity	Begin	Duration
Populating the nearshore project database		Ongoing
Reflecting stakeholder values in evaluation criteria	Winter 2009	
Stakeholder evaluation of projects	Spring 2009	
Involving the public in NEPA	Summer 2010	~ 6 months

### Audience(s)

*Not an exhaustive list; please add as necessary.*

Restoration and protection community

Tribes

General public

Shoreline property owners

Local governments

### Methods

#### *Activities*

- *Populating the nearshore project database*

As mentioned above, the nearshore project database will be the major source of candidate restoration and protection sites. Because of its strong connection to final feasibility report, it is critical to give long thought to the process by which the nearshore project database is populated, and the degree to which it represents the best, locally developed and supported restoration and protection actions. Please see the “Populating the Nearshore Project Database” section of this document.

- *Reflecting stakeholder values in evaluation criteria*

Also as mentioned above, the various activities the program undertakes to understand stakeholder values and priorities will support this final step of building and advancing a restoration and protection site list. The initial criteria for screening sites for further consideration should reflect the program’s understanding of stakeholders’ vision for the nearshore environment, restoration and protection objectives, and valuation of EFG&S.

- *Stakeholder evaluation of sites*

Although the stakeholders are involved in other parts of the PSNERP process (see above), and the broader public will be involved during NEPA review (see below), it will be important to have a few stakeholders involved in the evaluation of the candidate sites. This could be as simple as inviting several members of the restoration and protection community and/or other stakeholders to participate as reviewers in the evaluation process. Be sure that no reviewers have a vested interest in a specific candidate site.

- *Involving the public in NEPA*

It will be critical to demonstrate how the initial list of sites that is forwarded to Congress is the result of PSNERP attention to the stakeholder-developed restoration and protection goals and objectives; weighted ecosystem functions, goods, and services; and using the nearshore project database. Supporting materials at NEPA public meetings should clearly reflect these connections. Any concerns that stakeholders reveal during the NEPA process must, of course, be addressed. Please see the “Involving the Public in NEPA” section of this document.

*Products*

In addition to the plain-talk materials the convey the program’s analyses and findings, the program must produce meeting materials (brochures, fact sheets, presentation slides) that clearly reflect the connections among earlier program stakeholder involvement activities and the resulting list of restoration and protection sites.

*Media Strategies*

**Program Participants**

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Role</b>
Army Corps of Engineers	Lead on NEPA. Will coordinate outreach with WDFW.
WDFW	Lead on nearshore project database and any SEPA requirements. Provide support to USACE during NEPA.

## Establishing/Improving Relationships with Other Restoration Programs and Partners

### Program Need

It is necessary for the program to establish, maintain, and improve its relationships with others in the restoration and protection community in order to incorporate, and contribute to, the best scientific and technical thinking regarding ecosystem restoration and protection. The tools and analyses utilized by PSNERP must be informed (and even evaluated) by the needs and thinking of this restoration community. In turn, it is important for the ultimate success of the program that the restoration community understands PSNERP to be a scientifically rigorous effort.

### Objective

To establish collaborative and respectful relationships with other local, regional, and national restoration/protection programs and partners, and to improve the existing relationships that the program has developed with other local, regional, and national restoration/protection programs and partners.

### Timeline

Activity	Begin	Duration
Participate in conferences		Ongoing
Provide informational materials to others		Ongoing
Utilize networks of PSNERP team members		Ongoing
Technical workshops		
Maintain a website		Ongoing

### Audience(s)

*Not an exhaustive list; please add as necessary.*

Restoration and protection community

Tribes

Local governments

WDFW Watershed Stewards

### Methods

#### *Activities*

- *Participate in conferences*

Program staff and partners should continue to participate in local, regional, and national conferences. This participation may include simple attendance, presentation of posters and/or talks, sponsoring a conference booth, and/or chairing a special session or panel. It is possible to establish and improve relationships with others using any of these means, but it is incumbent upon the individual PSNERP conference participant to keep this objective in mind and actively pursue it. Participation beyond simple attendance will increase the program's visibility at any given event and increase the likelihood of establishing new relationships with others.

- *Provide informational materials to others using existing meetings and outreach efforts*

The multiplicity of restoration and protection efforts and partners in the Puget Sound can be thought of as providing many opportunities for sharing information about the Nearshore Partnership and PSNERP. Meetings and/or events that have been established for another

purpose may still offer an appropriate opportunity to share Nearshore Partnership/PSNERP informational materials, and are certainly appropriate opportunities to establish and improve relationships with other restoration partners.

- *Utilize the collegial networks of PSNERP team members*

The staffs of most Nearshore Partnership member organizations have other duties and are involved in other topics and issues. Individuals should remain alert for opportunities to connect and/or leverage their other activities to highlight the goals and accomplishments of the Nearshore Partnership and PSNERP to build awareness and inter-program relationships.

- *Technical workshops*

- *Maintain a program website*

Perhaps the easiest way to provide some visibility and share information is to maintain an updated program website. The current website can be found at

[www.pugetsoundnearshore.org](http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org).

#### *Products*

It is critical to the success of this particular stakeholder involvement activity to make all of the following products available to partners in hard copy and on the Nearshore Partnership website.

- Puget Sound Newsletter
- Updated Frequently Asked Questions
- Plain-talk materials that describe the program's analyses and findings
- PSNERP technical publications

#### *Media Strategies*

### **Program Participants**

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Role</b>
All Nearshore Partnership members	Participate in conferences and use existing meetings and networks to share information about PSNERP and build relationships with others.

## Earning Institutional Support for Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership and the PSNERP GI

### Program Need

The ultimate success of Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Program (PSNERP) depends on earning and maintaining institutional support for the program and its goals. There is much work to be done to complete the PSNERP GI, which will require sustained local, state, and federal investments. In addition, it is anticipated that submitting a request to Congress for a Puget Sound Nearshore Restoration construction authority and, subsequently, earning approval of this request, will require strong support from Washington State’s Congressional delegation, and from the executive management structures of WDFW, the State of Washington, and the Army Corps of Engineers and its parent organizations.

### Objective

To help Washington State’s Congressional delegation, and the executive management structures of WDFW, the State of Washington, and the Army Corps of Engineers and its parent organizations to understand the need for a Puget Sound Nearshore Restoration construction authority so that they will advocate for this authority in Congress and associated forums.

### Timeline

Activity	Begin	Duration
Congressional outreach	<i>May increase while in session and close to key votes</i>	Ongoing
Legislative outreach	<i>May increase while in session and close to key votes</i>	Ongoing
Briefings to Governor’s Office		Ongoing
Briefings to executive management		Ongoing
Briefings to executive branch		Ongoing

### Audience(s)

*Not an exhaustive list; please add as necessary.*

WA’s Congressional Delegation

- Senators Patty Murray and Maria Cantwell
- Representatives Jay Inslee, Rick Larsen, Brian Baird, Norm Dicks, Jim McDermott, Dave Reichert, and Adam Smith (districts 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 9 respectively)

Executive Management of partner organizations

WA Governor’s Office

WA State Legislature

Nearshore Partnership Executive Committee

## Methods

### *Activities*

- *Congressional outreach*

Coordinate with staff from Washington’s congressional delegation to provide briefings and offer other opportunities for elected officials to participate in restoration site tours or other activities as they are available. In particular, identify activities that give an elected official an opportunity to interact with, or feel proud of, efforts that are taking place within his or her geographic boundaries. Additionally, seek out opportunities to maximize outreach in Washington D.C., seeking time with elected officials (or their staff) who have influence over Army Corps of Engineers budgets and/or Water Resources Development Act decisions. It will be useful to time these briefings to occur as close as possible to key votes on budgets and/or authorizations, such as the Water Resources Development Act.

- *Legislative outreach*

Coordinate with legislative staff to provide briefings and offer other opportunities for elected officials to participate in restoration site tours or other activities as they are available. In particular, identify activities that give an elected official an opportunity to interact with, or feel proud of, efforts that are taking place within his or her geographic boundaries. It will be useful to time these briefings to occur as close as possible to key votes on budgets and/or authorizations.

- *Briefings to Governor’s Office*

Coordinate with Governor’s Office staff to provide briefings and offer other opportunities for the Governor or her staff to participate in restoration site tours or other activities as they are available. In particular, identify activities that give the Governor an opportunity to interact with, or feel proud of, her constituent’s efforts. It may also be useful to extend briefing invitations to Office of Financial Management budget and policy staff.

- *Briefings to executive management of partner organizations*

Generating institutional support for the Nearshore Partnership and the General Investigation is one of the important roles of the Nearshore Partnership’s Executive Committee. All program partners should make an effort to keep the executive management teams of their respective organizations abreast of highlights and emerging issues within, and related to the Nearshore Partnership. Nearshore Steering Committee members have traditionally played this role in preparation for Nearshore Executive Committee, but participants in other parts of the program should take advantage of any opportunity to share information with their executive management.

- *Briefings to the executive branch*

Army Corps of Engineers staff should seek and/or take advantage of existing opportunities to provide briefings to executive management structures of their parent organizations in Washington D.C. This is likely to include, but not be limited to, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the President’s Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

### *Products*

- Joint news releases (see below)
- Puget Sound Newsletter
- Updated Frequently Asked Questions
- Plain-talk Posters and Program Diagrams/Models

- Briefing papers for executives per Executive Committee Agendas
- Photographs and other visuals (e.g., maps) that demonstrate the accomplishments of the program

*Media Strategies*

- Work with congressional and Governor’s Office staffs to generate media events that their respective elected officials can sponsor and/or appear at. Dedication events or site tours for successful restoration and protection projects are likely choices for such media coverage.
- Work with congressional and Governor’s Office staffs to write news releases that highlight the role of the Governor, a senator, or a representative in gaining funding for the program or a particular activity.

**Program Participants**

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Role</b>
WDFW	Advocacy in Washington D.C., lead w/ Governor’s Office, lead w/ briefings to own executive mgmt, co-lead with other executive briefings
Army Corps of Engineers	Advocacy in Washington D.C., lead w/ briefings to own executive mgmt, co-lead with other executive briefings

## Fostering Broad Program Understanding and Support

### Program Need

In addition to the focused and specific needs for stakeholder input to the Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Program (PSNERP), there is a need to develop general support for the program within the Puget Sound region. Public understanding and support is a facet of the political support necessary to implement this program. In addition, restoring the health of Puget Sound will require some changes in public attitudes and behaviors. Toward this end, it is vital for the broader Puget Sound community to have access to the information, assumptions, and analyses that underpin the PSNERP General Investigation (GI).

### Objective

To foster understanding of, and support for PSNERP within the broader Puget Sound community.

### Timeline

Activity	Begin	Duration
Coordinate with partner organizations		Ongoing
Provide informational materials to others		Ongoing
Utilize networks of PSNERP team members		Ongoing
Maintain a website		Ongoing

### Audience(s)

*Not an exhaustive list; please add as necessary.*

State and federal agencies

Congressional delegation

Tribes

Local government representatives (state, county, and city)

Non-governmental organizations

General public

Restoration and protection community

Media

Community groups

### Methods

#### *Activities*

- *Coordinate communication and outreach activities with those of partner organizations*

There are many restoration and protection efforts and partners in the Puget Sound, and it is critical to coordinate our efforts to reach out to other members of the restoration community, the public, and the media. The general public and the media, in particular, should not be expected to keep track of all the various efforts, and yet their participation is needed on many fronts. We can help each other and help ourselves by coordinating our communication and outreach activities to avoid duplication and reduce confusion and frustration. When planning an activity or a series of meetings, use the Nearshore Partnership email distribution list (and/or others) to ask whether any partner organizations are conducting, or are aware of any activities that are similar in timing, scope, or geographic location. This coordination is especially important with regard to the Puget Sound Partnership.

- *Provide informational materials to others*  
The multiplicity of restoration and protection efforts and partners in the Puget Sound can also be thought of as providing many opportunities for sharing information about the Nearshore Partnership and PSNERP. Meetings and/or events that have been established for another purpose may still offer an appropriate opportunity to share Nearshore Partnership/PSNERP informational materials, and are certainly appropriate opportunities to establish and improve relationships with other restoration partners.
- *Utilize networks of PSNERP team members*  
The staffs of most Nearshore Partnership member organizations have other duties and are involved in other topics and issues. Individuals should remain alert for opportunities to connect and/or leverage their other activities to highlight the goals and accomplishments of the Nearshore Partnership and PSNERP to build awareness and understanding.
- *Maintain a website*  
Perhaps the easiest way to provide some visibility and share information is to maintain an updated program website. The current website can be found at [www.pugetsoundnearshore.org](http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org).

#### *Products*

- *Puget Sound Newsletter*
- *Updated Frequently Asked Questions*
- Fact sheets summarizing program technical reports and major findings
- *Plain-talk Posters and Program Diagrams/Models*  
As discussed above, outreach to and communication with stakeholders must be supported by “plain-talk” materials that help stakeholders understand:
  - how the physical features of the nearshore have changed;
  - how these changes have affected ecosystem functions, goods, and services (EFG&S);
  - how these changes impacts valued ecosystem components;
  - how the physical features of the nearshore and the associated EFG&S are likely to change in the future if we do not act; and
  - what we can do about these changes.

These materials are likely to include PowerPoint presentations, fact sheets, brochures, maps, and/or display posters/boards. It will be *critical* to engage a communications and/or outreach specialist in the development of these materials so that they are easy to understand! These materials can be used through the visioning workshops, restoration objectives focus group meetings, and other outreach efforts.

- A PSNERP “speakers bureau” to respond to requests for presentations
- Text for newspaper articles and news releases
- Seek time on local news stations to provide footage of projects being implemented on the ground.

#### *Media Strategies*

- Be proactive about contacting print, radio, and television media regarding upcoming meetings, site tours or dedications, celebrations, or volunteer opportunities

- Engage local media through phone contact in advance of public meetings. Consider having program partners meet with interested reporters prior to the public meetings or other events. Look into possible tours of demonstration projects before the meetings. Each of these activities will generate interest in the meetings and feasibility report.
- News releases prior to meetings, site tours or dedications, celebrations, or volunteer opportunities

**Program Participants**

**Participant**

**Role**