

## SUMMARY OF NOTES – NST MEETING 2-3 SEPT 2008

### DAY 1

People present: Tom Leschine, Miles Logsdon, Tom Mumford, Charles “Si” Simenstad, Curtis Tanner, Randy Schuman, Megan Dechier, Mary Ramirez, Hugh Shipman, Rachel Lipsky

#### ITEM 1: ECOSYSTEM FUNCTIONS, GOODS, AND SERVICES MATRIX EXERCISE (Miles, Mary)

1. Miles reviewed the method and noted problems with low response and misunderstandings of how to use the Catalyst web tool process.
2. Group discussed the need to track mental models used in completing matrices, clarified the instructions for Tier 2, and reviewed the initial draft of completed matrices
3. **Conclusion**: Miles will reopen the web tool so that all can change matrix responses or complete new matrices. He will email instructions and notification when it’s reopened.

#### ITEM 2: PUGET SOUND PARTNERSHIP SCIENCE ACTIVITIES (Curtis, Tom M)

*Brie Van Cleve and Jenna Norman (WDFW NST Asst, Database Mgr) arrive; Randy and Mary leave*

1. Tom M reviewed PSP activities including collaboration with Mary Ruckelshaus (Risk Assessment using DPSIR), Biennial Science Work Plan
2. Group discussed concern that “provisional” is being dropped from Indicators and that Indicators need to be tied to the Conceptual Model
3. Group discussed ways that NST can communicate better with other components of the PSP

#### ITEM 3: DISCUSSION OF THE SSPRP REPORT AND NST RESPONSE (Brie)

1. Brie: NST should formulate a response for the Executive Committee meeting 9/26. She sent around a matrix that can be used in addressing SSPRP’s concerns point by point.
2. Group expressed concern that filling out and returning this matrix as presented could open up NST to ongoing dialog with, and oversight by, the SSPRP. Discussed options for responding in a way that values input and maintains a desirable relationship between NST and SSPRP.
3. **Conclusion**: NST members can choose to use matrix or not as a way to reply to specific items raised by SSPRP, but will not use the agree-disagree component. Some response will be formulated in time for the meeting, even just “we will meet to discuss this further”

#### ITEM 4: STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT, MESSAGING (Brie)

1. Brie gave an update on the stakeholder process – Andrea Takesh (Corps) was working with Margen to develop Communications Plan/Stakeholder Strategy. Need to communicate with Margen before she leaves in 2 mos. Rachel will be working on this as well. She will get in touch with Margen ASAP.
2. Group agreed that NST needs to clarify messaging and role of the public in PSP activities

#### ITEM 5: RAE POSTERS (Mary – returned)

1. Group reviewed posters. Some have been formatted by Kathy, others are in rougher draft form. Group made suggestions for format, content and continuity between posters.
2. **Conclusion**: Mary will send out a new request including deadlines. Need to print end of Sept or beginning of Oct. 1<sup>st</sup> drafts are due on Mon 9/8. Mary will post a PPT on the website with all 9 posters. At least 5 posters will be ready to print 9/22.

## DAY 2

People present: Tom Leschine, Tom Mumford, Charles “Si” Simenstad, Curtis Tanner, Randy Carman, Megan Dechier, Hugh Shipman, Rachel Lipsky, Dan Tonnes

### ITEM 1: SCIENCE MORNING PRESENTATION (Dan)

1. Dan presented his thesis on the movement and role of wood in the Puget Sound marine ecosystem. Group discussed his findings and their application to PSP work.

### ITEM 2: CHANGE ANALYSIS UPDATE & DATA QA/QC PROCEDURES (Bernie)

*Randy C and Dan have left; Randy S and Bernie have arrived*

1. Bernie gave an update: Jen and Scott are working on ongoing data quality issues with Anchor. Flybys are completed and goal is to have Change Analysis done by end of Nov.
2. Group discussed ways to share data with other projects and agencies

### ITEM 3: PUGET SOUND/GEORGIA BASIN CONFERENCE

1. Group discussed ways to contribute. Suggestions included showing regional scale results, beginning the stakeholder interaction process, and demonstrating GIS data from Change Analysis in a visually appealing way. Submission deadline is 10/10.

### ITEM 4: DISCUSSION OF REVISED PSNERP GI STUDY WORKPLAN (Bernie, Curtis)

1. Bernie: Project management team has a lengthy work plan in review now. They anticipate 4 broad components: (1) ~10 sites for Priority restoration action (2) ~5 Scientific Demonstration sites. (3) Science and Technology program (4) Continuing planning (immature projects). This is the request to Congress, assuming all works out. Numbers (10, 5) above are just for planning purposes. Group discussed developing an agenda for the NST for the next 2 years, especially to support part (3) above.
2. Bernie: A model certification process must happen for the Change Analysis. Also, funding for UW folks will soon come out of non-Fed side, though FWS will still be paid the same.

### ITEM 5: DISCUSSION OF FUTURE NST TASKS & ACTIVITIES

1. Next meetings: Oct 7-8, Nov 9-10, Dec 9-10 (Olympia), Jan 6-7, Feb 3-4, March 3-4 (Olympia), Apr 7-8, May 5-6, Jun 2-3 (Olympia)
2. Group discussed updates to websites, tasks for Oct meeting, closure of FWOP, transition to FRAP, and possibilities for next Sci Morning (or skipping it to have a directed discussion)