

PSNERP-Nearshore Science Team (NST)

Monthly Meeting Synthesis

1-2 April 2008

Venue: Dean's Conference Room, Ocean Sciences Building, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

Attendance: Si Simenstad (Chair; UW), Justin Boevers (UW), Kurt Fresh (NOAA), Guy Gelfenbaum (USGS), Bernie Hargrave (USACE), Tom Leschine (UW), Tom Mumford (DOE), Hugh Shipman (DOE), Curtis Tanner (USFWS)

Guests: Jen Burke (UW), Scott Campbell (USACE), Margen Carlson (WDFW), Paul Cereghino (NOAA, WDFW), Michael Rylko (EPA)

Primary Meeting Topics:

1. Future Risk Assessment Project ("FRAP")
2. Strategic Science Peer Review Panel
3. PSNERP Symposium
4. Future Without Project (FWOP) Scenario Building
5. Human Dimensions
6. Change Analysis Issues
7. ESRP 2009

Future Risk Assessment Project (Si, channeling for Miles): approach to RFP

- There is a need and opportunity (\$100,000 available) to develop future change assessment (at least land cover/use) that can be directly inserted into change analysis to assess spatially-explicit risk of future change; risk is at a minimum considered change to more developed land cover.
- Could incorporate at a minimum three scenarios, aka Willamette Basin Alternative Futures Analysis: (1) continue existing trends; (2) less growth with increased environmental consciousness and conservation; and, (3) unregulated growth and an increase in natural resource utilization.
- Key elements would include: (1) a working geodatabase supplied to contractor by PSNERP; (2) three or more futures; (3) landcover transitions in uplands (buffer and drainage); deliverables will include: (1) narrative describing drivers of change for each future; (2) rules for allocation of change; (3) GIS data layers; (4) transition matrices

Highlights: NST recommends RFP process that optimizes creative ideas of how to approach this need, advises and responds to scenario building report, and draws on potentially new expertise.

- NST will convene oversight group (Miles leads) to work with WDFW (Curtis) to develop scope of work, let contract, coordinate with Anchor for "DataFrame", schedule coordination points with contractor, and schedule NST reviews.
- Project could be feasibly divided into three components: (1) Organizing, documenting, creating Template Geodatabase; could be done directly by Anchor under IDIQ (\$5-\$10K); (2) Allocation Modeling of Upland land cover/use change (\$20-\$30K); and, (3) Nearshore modifications and buffer change (\$40-\$60K); component #3 has lots of opportunity for creative thinking and might be expanded by additional funding.

Strategic Science Peer Review Panel (Si and Curtis): Brainstorming approaches

- Steering Committee has given green light for NST to pursue process for selecting panelists and choose/condense "5 big questions"
- Margen has agreed to provide assistance; formal peer review request should come from Jeff Koenings and include job description, scope of work, expectations and 5 big questions
- NST debated list of 5 big questions and honed them down somewhat; Si and Curtis will finalize
- Initial commitment is for 1 year, involving 2 meetings, expandable to second year; first meeting as soon as feasible, to focus on existing foundations of Project; second meeting in fall to focus on Change Analysis and Strategic Needs Assessment; each of 5-6 panelists will receive \$5000 and travel expenses for 2.5-3-day meetings and 1-2 weeks preparation and report finalization.

Highlights: NST recommended that they choose the Panel chair and ask them to work with us to fill out the panel

- NST discussion ranked three top candidates for chair: 1. Denise Reed, 2. Sam Luoma, and 3. Don Boesch; during break, Si called Denise Reed and she tentatively agreed to chair the Panel and fill out Panel within the week—negotiations to follow
- NST resolved to convert the planned June 3-4 NST meeting to the first Strategic Science Peer Review Panel meeting, including one day for field trip

PSNERP Symposium (Curtis): Planning

- Symposium scheduled for May 12 will include three major topics: Change Analysis, Future Without Scenarios, and Strategic Needs Assessment
- Likely points of interest, and perhaps most “fuzziest” is SNAR and “hand-off” between Change Analysis and SNAR
- Meeting will be comparatively closed and confined to Steering Committee, for which it is designed

Future Without Project-Scenario Building (Fred): Summarization of NST Review Comments

- Fred summarized history of Future Without Project (affectionately known as FWOP), the scope of work presented to the Urban Ecology Project, and the evolution of the resulting scenario-building process that led to the Phase 1 report
- Extensive discussion centered around: (1) use of scenarios as broad regional context for Feasibility Report and how it can contribute to “compelling story”; (2) how it doesn’t exactly fit the USACE’s usual “most expected future” norm and how not all scenarios necessarily meet the plausibility test; (3) concern about lack of nearshore specificity and spatially-explicit utility for direct integration with Change Analysis and Strategic Needs Assessment (but see “FRAP” above); (4) still need to have a separate assessment of modeling approaches to developing spatially-explicit future change that taps into the scenarios; and, (5) how to present the scenarios to stakeholders.

Highlights: The NST did not have a uniform recommendation, but believes that the scenarios need to be retained for the Feasibility Report in some context and form, but that spatially-explicit modeling for specific nearshore change needs to be pursued by simple modeling approaches.

- NST does recommend that the scenarios report be sent out to Peer Review
- We still need a process and decision on identifying metrics: 1-2 compelling stories on how it makes a measurable difference in ecosystem goods and services

ESRP 2009 (Paul): Potential Changes in Process and NST Input

- Paul presented opportunities and needs for NST role with ESRP ’09-’11
- Anticipating \$28M for ’09-’11, but rumors believe this is a generous figure
- Considerable discussion about how NST could help improve process

Highlight: NST agreed in principle to work with Paul to enhance science in ESRP 2009 process

Change Analysis Issues (Jen Burke): levees/dikes and difference in shoreline vs. delta process units

- Jen Burke described the existing need and possible approaches for data generation for levees/dikes and how we might develop these data in a timely and efficient, yet objective manner
- No Puget Sound-wide data set exists: some major river systems are completed but not moderate or smaller estuaries; LiDAR could be used (now covers ~75% of Sound) but some major deltas missing; aerial photographs could also be utilized in a quicker “heads up digitizing” approach
- Considerable, vociferous discussion ensued about not only how to delineate levees/dikes, whether to delineate them as polygons or line features, or just attributes to shorelines, and why to include levees/dikes outside the deltas; strong pushback from some NST members that this major stressor should not be simply ignored because it posed a technical challenge

Highlights: Jen, Si and other NST advocates of levee/dike inclusion will test effectiveness of several methods, to see if they can be included as estuary modifications and can be specifically identified as requiring unique management action, developing a threshold for minimum levee/dike to be included

- Also decided to run SPU and DPU through multivariate analysis both together and separately