

# PSNERP-Nearshore Science Team (NST) Monthly Meeting Synthesis 18 April 2007

**Venue:** Deans Conference Room, OCE SCI, University of Washington, Seattle, WA

**Attendance:** Si Simenstad (Co-Chair; UW), Fred Goetz (Co-Chair; USACE), Justin Boevers (UW), Hugh Shipman (DOE), Tom Mumford (DOE), Megan Dethier (UW), Miles Logsdon (UW), Curtis Tanner (USFWS), Tom Leschine (UW), Jan Newton (UW), Bernie Hargraves (USACE)

**Guests:** Andrea Woodward (USGS; Puget Sound Integrated Landscape Monitoring Program), Miriam Gilmur (USACE)

## **Primary Meeting Topics:**

1. Monitoring initiatives to develop “lessons learned” at project to program scales
2. ESP Special Considerations
3. Development of NST Case Study
4. Change Analysis update

## **Monitoring:**

- Two initiatives: (1) develop guidance for ESRP and other project-scale monitoring, and (2) evaluate large-scale, programmatic monitoring for GI and long-term Puget Sound restoration.
- Project-scale monitoring being approached by small (\$19,000) RFP that is due back to WDFW (sponsor) on April 20<sup>th</sup>, with notice to proceed on May 7<sup>th</sup>; despite it being directed to ~five firms, only two consulting firms appear to be submitting (Battelle; Lucinda Tear); selected contractor to meet with Monitoring WG May 14 or 21, and with NST on 27 or 28 June
- Assessment and design of programmatic monitoring will be initiated with “lessons learned,” primarily with primary help of the NST Research Assistant, Justin Boevers
- patterned after original Brie VanCleve “Lessons Learned” model, he will be developing “Lessons Learned” study of how other major restoration projects designed and managed their monitoring programs
- primary NST liaisons with Justin will be Tom Leschine (his SMA graduate committee chair), Tom Mumford and Si Simenstad
- Deliverables:
  - living, annotated biography
  - draft set of questions
  - definitions used in prior programs; recommendations to NST for operational definition
- information architecture should be an important question

## **ESRP Special Considerations:**

- ESRP RFP that is going out on April 23
- How the NST could benefit or provide criteria to the steering committee overseeing the RFP process to identify projects that might be valuable to the NST?
- Provides opportunity to recommendations project types to be enhanced with supplemental funding that focus learning on (1) management measures or (2) nearshore ecosystem processes of particular uncertainty
- However, much of NST guidance is already reflected extensively in Research Plan Appendix.
- NST members uniformly agreed that specific types of projects could be difficult to identify and decide upon (among NST members), and that a better measure might be to select projects by the rigor of the scientific method.
- However, general NST agreement that the following should be included in the ESRP RFP language: “[The PSNERP NST]...encourages restoration projects that devote significant effort to monitoring and assessment of nearshore ecosystem responses to the management action,

involving rigorous scientific sampling/experimental design, appropriate replication, use of comparable reference sites, statistical tests of significance.....” and that NST members reviewing the ESRP proposals (as individuals) would likely have a consensus on how to judge these criteria

***Development of NST Case Study:***

- PMT is looking to the NST for recommendations as to how and why case studies would be valuable to the NST and what case studies would be the most valuable to the NST.
- Case studies are valuable to observation more so than hypothesis testing, and do not necessarily require critical statistical rigor to be informative
- It was decided that *each* NST member bring a proposal for a case study to the next meeting using two PowerPoint slides to present to the NST.

***Change Analysis Update:***

- The “AU-by-AU Fly-By “ exercise was considered extremely valuable by NST members who participated in the exercise.
- Significant insight appeared to be that the coarse-scale approach in change analysis can miss smaller details such as streams, and small details may cumulatively add-up to a significant contribution, but could be easily overlooked.
- Change analysis for WRIA9 will very likely be more simple than change analysis for the rest of Puget Sound, there are more complex features outside of WRIA9. It was also identified that one of the concerns with the change analysis is the errors from several different sources of data.
- Change Analysis WG is meeting April 30 to review results of AU-by-AU Fly-By, along with relevant results from Future Without Project Lite, and start to prepare recommendations for revising change analysis methods, protocols and data sources for scaling up to Sound-wide change analysis.

***Miscellaneous (Lunch topics):***

- NST member commitment levels and expected performance was brought before everyone with a list of responsibilities that is ‘expected’ of the members (prepared by Si).
- Many members have sponsoring agencies that fund their time to the NST, many members are contributing mostly non-paid time. A tier of commitment was proposed to consider as a solution to keeping current members who may not be able to contribute .25FTE.
- Some concern expressed about attendance at meetings, especially for those individuals who are the only member representing a specific discipline, such as social scientist. It was requested that NST members attend meetings in full when possible, to learn the interdisciplinary pieces that other members contribute.
- Suggested that (web site and other) technology could be better used in this collaborative process for allowing those not physically present to telecommute. The website could be improved and used more effectively in its current form.
- Agreed that performance of NST members at meetings needs to also be attentive to the floor speaker, respect who has the floor, and to reduce distractions.