

# PSNERP-Nearshore Science Team (NST)

## Monthly Meeting Synthesis

22-23 August 2007

**Venue:** Dean's Conference Room, Ocean Sciences Building, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington (except for Science Morning [in afternoon] seminar at Fisheries Sciences)

**Attendance:** Si Simenstad (Chair; UW), Justin Boevers (UW), Megan Detheir (UW), Kurt Fresh (NOAA), Fred Goetz (USACE), Bernie Hargraves (USACE), Tom Leschine (UW), Tom Mumford (DOE), Jan Newton (UW), Hugh Shipman (DOE), Randy Shuman (METROK), Curtis Tanner (USFWS)

**Guests:** David Marmorek (ESSA Technologies, Ltd.), Jen Burke (UW), Mary Ruckelshaus (NOAA), Bill Graeber (TRT), Rebecca Ponzio (Shared Strategy), Paul Cereghino (NOAA)

### **Primary Meeting Topics:**

1. *Science Morning* [afternoon]: David Marmorek on adaptive management
2. Coordination meeting with TRT on PSNERP interface in nearshore Puget Sound
3. Human dimensions and rehabilitation: UW Fish Friendly Shoreline student project
4. PNNL-BMSL report on Monitoring and Adaptive Management Guidelines for Nearshore Restoration Proposals and Projects

**Science Morning:** David Marmorek seminar (PSNERP-NST sponsored SAFS-public), "*Applying Adaptive Management to Regional Scale Ecosystem Restoration: Strategies for Dealing with Scientific and Institutional Challenges*"

- David Marmorek was broadly complementary of PSNERP-NST guidance document content on monitoring and adaptive management, although he disagreed with (our) statement about that adaptive management is best done at large scales: the larger the scale the harder it is.
- He described about how 'adaptive management' has become a term of plastic words and needs to be used appropriately. Adaptive management factoids:
  - AM is improving the program but not providing THE solution!
  - AM is a transitory process!
  - AM is not a panacea!
  - If it is not feasible to do an experiment, then there really is no AM!
  - Terms 'success' and 'failure' are not good for restoration, it's a scale of effectiveness!
  - "Restoration is not rocket science, it is much harder!"
- Points from follow-up discussion with NST:
  - Centralized vs. individual project monitoring:
    - If objective is to get consistent monitoring protocols across a large program or set of projects, it is better for the same entity to conduct the monitoring. Comes back to what is the critical set of uncertainties? Don't waste time/money with the no-brainers.
    - Buy-in from local, project-scale monitoring can be great, but what is their expertise and capacity and general attitude is that money spent on monitoring could be better spent on more restoration. And, perception of projects being deemed as failure could be problematic, they worry about being judged.
    - Small projects are often left out of monitoring, but cumulatively it is a big gap in data. With a number of small projects, don't need to monitor them all, instead monitor a subset.
    - Where does all this information get stored (National River System is trying to develop such a database). How do you develop an institutional framework that can receive information and implement it in adaptive management approach?
    - David asked with programs such as ESRP, is the objective to actual make change or to give away money? What is it that you REALLY need to know? What is limiting "success?"
    - Cumulative effects can only be done with a centralized system, but considerable pushback on outside monitoring for projects that local sponsor is helping fund.
  - Long-term monitoring, that can most effectively incorporate adaptive management, is challenged by short funding cycles and institutional memory: need to take it public, with websites, journals,

available to different levels of expertise. For instance, CALFED asks projects to present information from their projects in regular public meetings.

***Coordination meeting with TRT on PSNERP interface in nearshore Puget Sound:***

- Presentations and discussion between PSNERP-NST and TRT representatives (Mary Ruckelshaus, Bill Graeber, and Rebecca Ponzio)
- Si presented general NST role, perspective and responsibilities, and specifically strategy for Change Analysis that leads to strategic needs assessment and ultimately a conservation/restoration portfolio. Highlighted conservation-biology framed scales of strategic restoration: 1) protect what is least impaired; 2) build on least impaired complexes; 3) fill impaired gaps toward increased connectivity; 4) target limiting factors behind impairment; and, 5) address larger-scale complexes and physiographic features that have cumulative function.
- Rebecca discussed opportunities for TRT and NST to collaborate. Shared Strategy works at regional level to provide policy guidance, mostly through watershed groups; current regional plan is a baby step in identifying what can be done and isn't project/space/species specific. TRT groups are struggling with nearshore components, mostly with inconsistent levels of detail and analysis.
- Mary Ruckelshaus described (hand-out) guidance from TRT and gaps related to nearshore coverage. TRT produced watershed assessment guidance document and worked as liaisons with each watershed on implementation. TRT has to account for fish numbers, but aside from that much overlap with PSNERP strategy of restoration and protection.
- Next step is to go back and see if there is a mandate, want, and/or need for collaboration. NST will draft a formal response to the request that the TRT and NST interact. But, future of TRT is unclear; thus, so is who NST would communicate with starting in 2008. It was decided for now the future relationship would be informal and Si and Mary will be in contact, and Rebecca will draft a work plan for TRT-NST relationship.

***Human Dimensions and Rehabilitation: UW Fish Friendly Shoreline (Tom L.):***

- Last year, T. Leschine was a mentor for a Keystone Project, part of a year-long class through the UW's Program on the Environment that offers a graduate certificate in Environmental Management. His presentation described the project his team of students studied: residents' attitudes, perceptions and beliefs about armoring their property on Lake Washington. Students' PowerPoint presentation is available online at <http://courses.washington.edu/lkwasrvy>.
- The students found that the permit process is the most common concern among residents.
- Tom suggested that human dimensions lessons learned for PSNERP from this work included: 1) gauge public attitudes, knowledge, and support for restoration; 2) investigate practical questions (perceived barriers, incentives) to restoration on private or adjacent public land; 3) examine "willingness to pay scenarios; and, 4) establish public education targets.

***PNNL-BMSL report on Monitoring and Adaptive Management Guidelines for Nearshore Restoration Proposals and Projects (Tom M.)***

- Discussion of draft PNNL-BMSL analysis (contract from WDFW) of project-level restoration monitoring suggested that the draft was generally useful but still fell a bit short of expectations, and specifically needed more depth in some sections, such as including an analysis of the projects in the tables. Report still seems a bit academic: need to extract fundamentals, i.e., the minimum acceptable information that should be gathered.
- For monitoring approach, determine fundamentals of monitoring a project. Find the recommended reporting method for providing info from restoration. Suggestion that a database be funded to identify monitoring of past projects and identify which information is the most useful. Retrospective analysis mentioned again as a needed action for creating database.
- Monitoring Working Group proposes to include the PNNL-BMSL report in a NST guidance document, in time for next ESRP RFP.