



January 16, 2008 Meeting Notes

Nearshore Steering Committee –Notes

January 16, 2008

11 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Mercury Room at the Army COE Seattle Office

Attendees: Bernie Hargrave, Curtis Tanner, Margen Carlson, Toni Lick, Dick Ecker, Debby Hyde, Mike Ramsey, Dan Hayes, Simon Geerlofs, Doug Myers and Lisa Bellefond for Jacques

Membership

Do we want to think about membership generally as we move toward planning and implementation?

Executive Committee

- If membership becomes an executive committee item, start with a reminder of the purpose of each committee
- Bill Ruckelshaus: no longer SRFB Chair
- Frank Shipley: acting position?
- Ecology: How to get full representation/participation?
- Rod Quinn: new position?
- Ron Sims participation?
- David Dicks, PSP: new participant?
- Possible new membership...
 - TNC (Lisa to raise issue internally)
 - TPL
 - Industry: port, railroad, quarries, real estate

Steering Committee

- Simon G.: NW Straits Commission rep? Confirm...
- James Schroeder: took job w/ TNC, so we need a NWF rep
- Doug Myers: rep for People for Puget Sound
- Jen Steger: reminder?
- Bill Dewey: reminder? May prefer to participate at Exec. Committee?
- Eric Johnson, Ports: wants to continue to be on committee but unlikely to come to meetings
- Doug Osterman: no longer chair of LEAG ~ Jeannette Dorner current chair
- Scott Redman: PSP rep?
- Brian Smith @ WSDOT might be a good addition for implementation

Nearshore Science Team

- Fred Goetz: no longer co-chair, what level of participation will he be able to sustain?
- No Doug M ~ need an Implementation Team liaison
- Possible new membership...
 - Rom Thom (monitoring & adaptive management) ~ Dick E. to check
 - Tim Quinn (terrestrial, riparian, modeling)

Implementation Team

- *Need to consider horsepower of IT in light of amount of work (GI, ESRP, etc...)*
- Doug no longer co-lead? (CT and Kathy F. to discuss)
- Miriam no longer co-lead ~ Jeff Dillon instead

- Robin Clark? Maybe...
- Betsy Lyons on maternity leave
- Theresa Mitchell: took new position, old position being replaced
- Terry Wright?
- Curtis?
- Add Mike Ramsey

ESRP

- Curtis and Mike to work on improving the table in the PSAR memo (larger font? Condense?)
- Remember to bring Erik Neatherlin back to the Steering Committee re: the HWS

ESRP/Legislature Coordination

- Doug, Debby, Ramsey, Jacques/Bill Robinson to have a conversation with Tim Smith before 02/06 Exec. Committee
 - Need to understand nature and extent of political pressure
 - What exactly is the issue we're solving? What are alternatives?
 - Are we having a difficult time garnering advocates for the program?
- Discussion of ESRP approach and a WWRP-esque approach:
 - More up-front work, less later
 - We've always requested the funding of a program, not a list
 - Protects scientific integrity/transparency of selection process
 - Insulates from political pressures
 - Flexibility to adapt \$\$ to current project needs
 - Lag time between proposals and \$\$ makes for a stale list
 - WWRP is run by the gov. and gov. holds ownership of real properties at the end (local thru state): as a result, is an understandable interest in this investment
 - In ESRP, however, funds go to NGOs, etc.: not necessarily same government interest
 - WWRP-esque program may require an increased staff investment ~ *also needed currently*
 - ESRP as a portfolio – not a list:
 - Offers opportunity to learn from programmatic enhancements
 - Is a model for strategic investment in restoration – will help us perfect concepts for GI
 - Simply issuing an RFP and assembling a list is inconsistent with a long-term GI and strategy
 - A WWRP-esque approach may be necessary to scale-up funding for projects
 - Nearshore Partnership still retains control of list development in either scenario

Workplan

- Steps to COE approval and Congressional spending authority – Steering Committee needs to understand these basics
 - Likely to include several iterations of review and revision
 - We've attempted to learn from other efforts and anticipate hurdles
- The \$12million ceiling and 2008 deadline are *not accurate*
- What are the connections among sound-wide change analysis, strategic needs assessment, and future scenarios?

- More detail about technical aspects of the workplan in a day-long, internal Nearshore Partnership symposium ~ plan for early March
- Revisit Steering Committee approval of workplan at regular March meeting
- Change analysis by June 2008
- Looking for reassurance that we're properly vetting approach and direction with COE (in-progress reviews & peer review plan)
 - Fall/winter '09 feasibility scoping meeting
- Partners need information quickly to inform budget requests to Congress
- **Changes to cost share can happen between signatories: Congressional approval not needed**
 - Same scope, more \$\$ OR Smaller scope, same \$\$
- Locals need to increase contribution to cost share. How does ESRP figure in?

Restore America's Estuaries (RAE) Conference

- Takes place on 10/11 – 10/15 in Providence, RI
- Title: Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership or PSNERP? (several votes for Partnership)
- General goal: to elevate importance of Puget Sound restoration on the national stage – commensurate with other major restoration efforts of national significance (e.g., Chesapeake Bay, Everglades). Some ideas for furthering this goal...
 - Schedule walk-throughs of all the Nearshore posters at specific times ~ guided tours
 - “Coffee House” conversations organized around themes and including panel participants from around the nation
 - try to avoid lengthy intro remarks
 - TNC grant to analyze PS ecosystem services may have a role (Jon Hoekstra is TNC contact)
 - **Wrap in other PS and/or Northwest attendees with a special caucus/meeting and/or insignia/branding** ~ a unified PS front is valuable
 - Newsletter/newspaper with articles on various PS issues and programs
 - NW Straits interested in contributing
 - TNC to contribute to newsletter & perhaps lend Mud Monster costume
 - Human dimensions coffee house idea is very interesting (esp. w/ PS urban-rural dynamic)
 - Lack of urgency on PS restoration
 - How does PS culture place limits on people's ability to feel that sense of urgency?
 - Need Steering Committee volunteers for document preparation, booth planning, and other participation at the conference
 - Will our target audience be there?
 - Past attendees have included senior federal staff

Executive Committee Agenda

- To be considered later: Are action area boundaries appropriate for our goal-setting exercise
- Make sure to prepare a list of new members for executive approval
- Be sure to include a map of the facility in the exec materials and put up good signs directing attendees to the room

Status of Nearshore Partnership (CT and Bernie)

- Highlight role/message of ESRP
- Compare current program w/ blue book description
- Point out prospects/status of WRDA
- Looking for support of scope, management of resources, and cost share amendment
- Be sure to highlight entire PS context

Federal Congressional Update (Tim)

Coordination with the PSP

- Jacques: Coordination to date (use presentation from November's Leadership Council mtg)
- Tim: Contribution of the Nearshore Partnership to the PS Action Agenda

Project Management Team Reports

Science Team

- **Revisit in the Feb/Mar Steering Committee agenda:** How can the Steering Committee support the completion of FWOP? Jacques, Mike Rylko, Doug, and Fred Goetz need to participate
 - Waiting for Marina Alberti's deliver of a FWOP methodology (how to connect scenarios to models to predict detail about the future)
 - Method may not be adequately tied to our other methods. How do we correct this?
 - Dr. Clark's presentation showed other approaches to modeling FWOP
 - What products are expected at the end of Phase II? What are the accompanying impacts on timing and costs?
 - COE needs a compelling story of what to expect in the future if the project isn't implemented
 - Can the TNC/Stanford ecosystem services modeling be used here and/or in the economic model?

Local Project Manager (Toni Lick's accounting report)

- Cost share agreement
 - Needs to be revised before 2009 (Bernie to check federal #s)
 - Revisit how accurately we are capturing local match?
 - COE may need local cash to carry out their review
- Think about how to market contributions that aren't eligible for match (perhaps can be called "leverage")



Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration Funding Authority Coordination

MEMO: 2 January 2008
TO: Nearshore Partnership Steering Committee
FROM: Paul Cereghino



Program Manager
Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program

PUGET SOUND
NEARSHORE
PARTNERSHIP



RE: Documentation of Coordination with Salmon Recovery Funding Board under Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration Funding Authority.

This memo documents coordination conducted between Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) and Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program (ESRP) as compelled by legislation authorizing Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) funding under the 2007-09 biennial budget.

On 15 August, 2007, Mr. Jim Fox approached the Nearshore Partnership Steering Committee with a request to review nearshore projects managed by the Restoration and Conservation Office for consistency with the goals of the Nearshore Partnership, and to evaluate potential overlap of funding activities by Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program as administered by Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). The following objectives were identified as feasible with available staff resources:

1. The project list being reviewed for funding by SRFB would be compared to the list reviewed by ESRP to identify projects that may receive funding from both sources.
2. For each of these overlapping projects, proposals were compared to examined where funding requests were complementary or duplicative in scope.
3. The Nearshore Partnership Implementation Team would provide assistance in technical review of SRFB nearshore "Projects of Concern".

For Nearshore proposals submitted to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board identified either as "preliminary projects of concern" (PPOC) or "needed more information" (NMI), the IT provided suggestions to SRFB project manager Mike Ramsey on how sponsors might address the technical concerns highlighted by the SRFB technical review team and in some instances identified additional issues that warranted further review by the SRFB.

Of the 73 proposed projects ranked under the 2007 ESRP request for proposals, 28 had elements that were also in the 2007 Lead Entity preliminary project list submitted to the SRFB (Table 1). This count of 'project' overlap includes both projects anticipated to receive 2007-09 SRFB funds as well as projects on the list but not likely to be funded at the preliminary project list stage. This also counts the multiple requests from South Sound Lead Entities for funding of Nisqually Refuge Restoration as a single 'project'.

In one case a proposal for funding was withdrawn from SRFB following recognition that funding was likely from both sources. In all other cases, funding was found to be complementary, such that SRFB and ESRP funds would work to fully fund the proposed action, or one of the two proposals was not anticipated to receive funds from one or the other program making overlap of budgets irrelevant. In total 9 projects are anticipated to receive funds from both sources. ESRP, with substantial flexibility in its funding process, and a deliverables based contracting approach, has asked for clarification of project need following SRFB proposal to avoid duplication of funding.

Consistent with goal of the Nearshore Partnership is to efficiently restore the nearshore ecosystem, the proposal analysis exercise suggested the following inefficiencies, which deserve additional discussion and will be considered as part of future program development and coordination:

1. While there is clear merit in each program independently selecting projects based on their own unique mandates and policy goals, the public interest would benefit by RCO and WDFW entering into a resource sharing agreement after completing project selection. Under such an agreement, resources could be passed to a 'lead funder' for the purposes of contracting and reporting. This would reduce administrative costs both within government and on the part of project sponsors.
2. The initial intent of 'match' accounting was presumably to insure that total project costs were shared between different levels of government, and public funds leveraged private resources. However, 'matching' requirements under the current panoply of public funding authorities has created a cumbersome system requiring the segregation, classification and reporting of different types of money with increasingly unclear benefits to restoration or government economy.

A simplified 'cost share' system across state restoration funding programs could maintain leverage of diverse funds while reducing the complexities of award administration by all parties. Such a system could focus project managers on developing clear and realistic accounting and projection of "whole project" costs rather than partial budget proposals catering to the proclivities of individual funds sources. If the goal of matching is to limit the proportion of state funds or insure leverage of private funds in a project or project phase, this would be enforced more efficiently through whole project budget analysis and cost share ratios.

3. Strategic assessment and prioritization of projects would benefit from clear business rules defining the scope of a 'projects'. To date project scope definition has been left to project sponsors struggling to build fully functioning restoration programs under varied programmatic matching and reimbursement requirements. 'Projects' are not necessarily defined as ecological treatments that can be tracked and linked to ecological outcomes. 'Project' scope is frequently lumped and split in response to aforementioned matching requirements and preferential funding for construction at the expense of other critical project phases like design and effectiveness evaluation.

Table 1 - Consideration of SRFB funding for projects reviewed by SRFB under Salmon Recovery and Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration funding.

Projects in grey shading are those where funding is being considered by both programs. The amount of the request is indicated in dollars. Projects shaded but with not SRFB request amount were proposed but not in line for funding at the time of the review. Due to the nature of both ESRP and SRFB review, actual project funding and final funding level may vary from proposed. Some projects may have received SRFB in an earlier phase of project development. The following notation indicates the result of budget investigation: (1) funding from each source is complementary and directed toward discrete and independent costs, (2) funding requests overlapped but were easily resolved through withdrawal of one of the two applications, (3) some SRFB funding was evident at earlier stages of implementation associated with this 'project', (4) budget details were not investigated as the project is not anticipated to receive funding from either SRFB or ESRP or both. The 9 Projects in bold are anticipated to receive joint funding and so are receiving additional review to minimize the risk of funding in surplus of need. RCO funding level was based on the time of review, not final award amount.

Proposal ID	Nickname	2007 RFP Proposal	RCO (SRFB+PSAR)	Sub-Basin	Sponsor
ESRP07-69	Nisqually Refuge Dike Setback (1)	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 2,452,165	South Sound	Ducks Unlimited
ESRP07-20	Lily Point Acquisition	\$ 2,022,500		South Georgia Straits	Whatcom Land Trust
ESRP07-38	Pilot Point Acquisition (1)	\$ 500,000	\$ 460,000	Admiralty Inlet	Kitsap Co Parks
ESRP07-30	Green Point Acquisition (WITHDRAWN)	\$ -		Straits of Juan de Fuca	Clallam County
ESRP07-56	Red Salmon Slough Revegetation and Engineering	\$ 48,188		South Sound	Nisqually Indian Tribe
ESRP07-27	Dungeness Estuary Tidal Reconnection (3)	\$ 207,000		Straits of Juan de Fuca	Jamestown S'kallam Tribe
ESRP07-49	Port Susan Bay Dike Setback (2)	\$ 191,325	\$ 136,040	Whidbey Basin	The Nature Conservancy
ESRP07-43	Lower Dosewallips Floodplain (1)	\$ 610,000	\$ 202,000	Hood Canal	Wild Fish Conservancy
ESRP07-11	Little Quilcene Estuary Reconstruction (3)	\$ 200,006		Hood Canal	Hood Canal SEG
ESRP07-15	Salmon Creek Fill Removal (1)	\$ 300,000	\$ 642,243	Straits of Juan de Fuca	North Olympic Salmon Coalition
ESRP07-01	Woodard Bay Restoration Feasibility & Design	\$ 150,000		South Sound	WA Dept of Natural Resources
ESRP07-03	Smugglers Slough Tidal Reconnection (3)	\$ 784,000		South Georgia Straits	Lummi Nation
ESRP07-10	Big Quilcene Ring Dike Removal (1)	\$ 199,887	\$ 75,000	Hood Canal	Hood Canal SEG
ESRP07-09	Duckabush Robinson Road Levee Setback (1)	\$ 200,228	\$ 99,400	Hood Canal	Hood Canal SEG
ESRP07-73	Snyder Cove Culvert Modification (1)	\$ 83,833	\$ 45,667	South Sound	People for Puget Sound
ESRP07-73	Snyder Cove Bulkhead Feasibility	\$ 25,165		South Sound	People for Puget Sound
ESRP07-26	Crescent Harbor Tidal Reconnection (1)	\$ 417,722	\$ -	Whidbey Basin	Skagit River System Coop
ESRP07-25	Swinomish Channel Fill Removal (1)	\$ 313,827	\$ 495,000	Whidbey Basin	Skagit River System Coop
ESRP07-05	Camp Kilworth Acquisition (SKIPPED)	\$ 450,000		Central Basin	City of Federal Way
ESRP07-53	Tarboo/Dabob Bay Acquisition & Slope Restoration	\$ 504,500		Hood Canal	The Nature Conservancy
ESRP07-59	Klingel Levee Setback	\$ 57,000		Hood Canal	Great Peninsula Conservancy
ESRP07-48	Deer Harbor Bridge Replacement (4)	\$ 153,741	\$ -	San Juan	People for Puget Sound
ESRP07-17	Pitship Pocket Estuary Tidal Reconnection (4)	\$ 300,000	\$ 380,250	Straits of Juan de Fuca	North Olympic Salmon Coalition
ESRP07-62	Titlow Beach Pocket Estuary Feasibility & Design	\$ 51,860		South Sound	South Puget Sound SEG
ESRP07-31	Fisher Slough Tidal Reconnection (4)	\$ 416,900	\$ 381,255	Whidbey Basin	The Nature Conservancy
ESRP07-64	Lone Tree Lagoon Adaptive Management (3)	\$ 59,400		Whidbey Basin	Skagit River System Coop
ESRP07-47	Seahurst Park N Shoreline Feasibility	\$ 313,898		Central Basin	City of Burien
ESRP07-34	Cliffside Beach Wood Removal Design	\$ 220,734		South Georgia Straits	NW Straits Commission
ESRP07-61	Kayak Point Nearshore Feasibility & Restoration	\$ 143,361		Whidbey Basin	People for Puget Sound
ESRP07-24	League Island Dike Setback (4)	\$ 218,658	\$ 97,750	Whidbey Basin	Ducks Unlimited
ESRP07-54	Turners Bay Lagoon Tide Gate/Road Removal (4)	\$ 90,050	\$ 89,892	Whidbey Basin	Skagit River System Coop
ESRP07-29	Right Smart Cove Acquisition & Fill Removal (4)	\$ 122,000	\$ 80,000	Hood Canal	Wild Fish Conservancy
ESRP07-72	Post Point Lagoon Fill Removal & Revegetation	\$ 57,644		South Georgia Straits	City of Bellingham
ESRP07-67	Tarboo - Dabob Bay Acquisition - Ph 1 (4)	\$ 992,500	\$ 693,186	Hood Canal	NW Watershed Institute
ESRP07-21	S. Fork Skagit Monitoring	\$ 73,895		Whidbey Basin	Skagit River System Coop
ESRP07-71	Marine Riparian Initiative (4)	\$ 107,500		Hood Canal	Hood Canal SEG
ESRP07-45	Beaconsfield Bulkhead Removal (4)	\$ 120,000	\$ 380,739	Central Basin	Cascade Land Conservancy
ESRP07-51	Maury Is Bulkhead Removal Monitoring	\$ 73,367		Central Basin	People for Puget Sound
ESRP07-02	Dry Slough EstuaryFunction	\$ 101,100		Whidbey Basin	Skagit Conservation District
ESRP07-41	Chuckanut Estuary Restoration Feasibility	\$ 60,000		South Georgia Straits	Nooksack Salmon Enhancement
ESRP07-63	Squalicum Creek Restoration & Fish Passage	\$ 335,585		South Georgia Straits	Port of Bellingham
ESRP07-36	Dockton Seawall Assessment	\$ 150,000		Central Basin	King Co Roads
ESRP07-52	Jefferson County Shoreline Acquisition	\$ 500,000		Admiralty Inlet	WA St Parks
ESRP07-04	Deepwater (Pt. Susan) Derelict Gear	\$ 39,331		Whidbey Basin	Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians
ESRP07-07	Cornet Bay Restoration Design (4)	\$ 133,000	\$ -	Whidbey Basin	Island Co MRC
ESRP07-23	Taylor Bay Acquisition (4)	\$ 500,000	\$ 499,000	South Sound	Key Peninsula Metro Parks
ESRP07-65	Pt Heyer Drift Cell Preservation - Ph 1 (4)	\$ 1,550,342	\$ 360,000	Central Basin	King Co Water & Land
ESRP07-19	Liberty Bay Oyster Restoration	\$ 149,260		Port Madison and Sinclair Inlet	The Nature Conservancy
ESRP07-37	Elwha River Estuary Restoration	\$ 391,000		Straits of Juan de Fuca	Clallam County
ESRP07-16	So. PS Watertype Assessment	\$ 120,000		South Sound	Wild Fish Conservancy
ESRP07-66	Smith Island / Union Slough Restoration	\$ 250,000		Whidbey Basin	City of Everett PW
ESRP07-40	San Juan Co LIDAR Survey	\$ 50,000		San Juan	San Juan Co MRC
ESRP07-12	Twanoh Falls Bulkhead Removal (4)	\$ 175,087	\$ -	Hood Canal	Hood Canal SEG
ESRP07-57	Pickett Springs Saltmarsh (4)	\$ 146,022	\$ 141,673	San Juan	People for Puget Sound
ESRP07-08	March's Point	\$ 117,000		Padilla and Samish Bay	Skagit Co MRC
ESRP07-42	Padden Estuary Restoration Feasibility	\$ 60,000		South Georgia Straits	Nooksack Salmon Enhancement
ESRP07-50	Richmond Beach Nearshore	\$ 300,000		Central Basin	City of Shoreline
ESRP07-60	Chico Estuary Acquisition & Restoration (4)	\$ 128,000	\$ 143,000	Port Madison and Sinclair Inlet	Kitsap Co DCD
ESRP07-32	State Park Hydrodynamic Model	\$ 100,375		Whidbey Basin	Skagit River System Coop
ESRP07-06	Beachcrest (4)	\$ 137,800	\$ 38,205	South Sound	South Puget Sound SEG
ESRP07-44	Birch Bay Estuary Feasibility	\$ 60,000		South Georgia Straits	Nooksack Salmon Enhancement
ESRP07-22	Kitsap Nearshore Assessment	\$ 110,000		Central Basin	Kitsap Co DCD
ESRP07-13	Nisqually Delta Monitoring	\$ 68,000		South Sound	Nisqually Reach Nature Center
ESRP07-18	Ebey Island Dike Setback	\$ 1,500,000		Whidbey Basin	WA Dept of Fish & Wildlife
ESRP07-46	Drayton Harbor Estuary Feasibility	\$ 60,000		South Georgia Straits	Nooksack Salmon Enhancement
ESRP07-28	Donkey Creek Restoration	\$ 553,500		Port Madison and Sinclair Inlet	City of Gig Harbor
ESRP07-70	Washington Northern Abalone Recovery	\$ 149,202		Central Basin	Puget Sound Restoration Fund
ESRP07-55	Marshland Subarea Plan	\$ 99,935		Central Basin	City of Everett PW
ESRP07-39	Hood Canal Watershed Land Use Assessment	\$ 27,000		Hood Canal	Wild Fish Conservancy
ESRP07-33	Puget Creek Beach Restoration	\$ 465,000		Central Basin	Pierce County
ESRP07-35	Carpenter Creek Restoration	\$ 637,000		Central Basin	Kitsap Co
ESRP07-68	Early Action Monitoring Components	\$ 157,000		South Sound	South Puget Sound SEG
ESRP07-14	PS Marine Sanctuary Assessment	\$ 32,116		General	Wild Fish Conservancy
ESRP07-58	Meadowbrook Creek Restoration (4)	\$ 121,250	\$ 359,077	Straits of Juan de Fuca	Ducks Unlimited



Project Managers' Reports`

**Local Project Manager's Report to
Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership Steering Committee
16 January 2008**

- ✓ Change Analysis
 - Draft agreement w/ NW Indian Fisheries Commission currently being reviewed by WDFW and NWIFC
 - NWIFC Costs = \$74K (direct) + \$11K
 - NWIFC to deliver current conditions layers
 - Whidbey Basin & S. Central PS by March 25
 - Hood Canal & San Juan by April 15
 - North Central PS, Strait of JdF, and South PS by April 30
 - WDFW contributing \$12K in-kind
 - WDFW will deliver historic typology to NWIFC Jan. 14 thru March 4
- ✓ Status of Cost-share agreement
 - In FY 2007, total Corps spending passed cumulative spending by local sponsor (>50% of project total)
 - In FY 2009, total Corps spending would exceed \$6M (50% of \$12M current limit for study) if FY 2007/08 funding levels were achieved
- ✓ On-the-horizon
 - Coastal Habitats in Puget Sound Science Workshop, Jan 29-31
 - WDFW has agreed to co-sponsor event
 - Restore America's Estuaries
 - Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership "Patron Level" sponsor (\$5K)
 - NST developing 2 proposals for Program
 - ◆ PSNERP Poster session
 - ◆ Restoration coffee houses
 - Program Symposium
 - Proposal, endorsed by NST to organize PSNERP symposium
 - Day-long session (@ UofW?)
 - Introduce and explore major areas of PSNERP technical products
 - ◆ Nearshore typology
 - ◆ Change analysis
 - ◆ Strategic needs assessment
 - ◆ Future w/out project
 - "Internal" meeting, open to all direct participants in PSNERP
 - late February or early March?

Fiscal Year 08 Federal Nearshore Appropriation: The president signed the Omnibus Appropriation bill for FY08. The Nearshore project received \$1,279,000 and Puget Sound and Adjacent Waters Restoration Program received \$2,952,000. For the Nearshore, this is the second year of full federal funding due to the hard work of the sponsors who persuaded Congress to invest in this investigation.

With full funding in FY07 & 08, two issues are now emerging. First, the federal share has out-stripped the non-federal funding capability which must be brought back into balance. Secondly, the funding surge let's us see what we can complete this year and estimate what it will take to finish the feasibility report. Our "next look" suggests that we will have to amend the Feasibility Cost Share Agreement. This is a common event midway through these large investigations, particularly when they start slowly like the Nearshore has. Yet, it can challenge the team when we are really working at a high rate of productivity.

Typology Data Sets: SSHIAP is working to complete their QA/QC on the current conditions typology with WDFW funding a portion of their work in return for our historic typology data set to complement theirs. SSHIAP expects to complete their dataset by April 08. Anchor Environmental is scheduled to provide the first of seven subbasin typology in the first of February and complete the last by March 08.

Armoring Dataset: The Change Analysis team, with Tim Strickler's assistance before he left PSP, identified gaps in a composite dataset they "stitched" together from various regional datasets. They are writing a scope of work for the Anchor team to fill the data gaps since this must be done before we complete the change analysis.

Change Analysis: The first Process Unit/ Accounting Unit/ Drainage Unit layers have been completed with a QC/QA "fly-bye" done with the NST at their 8 Jan 08 meeting. At the meeting, many method refinements were made, particularly at the estuary and open shoreline interfaces. The team is evaluating those refinements now because they may increase the necessary effort to prepare the datasets for Change Analysis.

Future Without Project: Marina and Michal's continue writing results from the expert-panel workshops. However, we are disappointed that they missed their revised, self-imposed deadline for the report to the NST, who were forced to cancel their January discussions about FWOP. These repeated delays are impacting our ability to advance this portion of the investigation.

Artist Charrette Workshop: He has been on-hold since he delivered his "composite" sketches built on the workshop products. Once we have a FWOP report that is complete enough to share, he can finish his without project sketches. We have extended his completion date until May 08 which should provide sufficient time for UW School of Urban Ecology to complete their report.

Bernie
14 Jan 08