Merrill, Hannah

Subject: RE: SMP NNL AND PSNERP 373 page Restoration report

From: pearl hewett [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, April 04, 2013 1:35 AM
To: zSMP
Cc: Karl Spees; harry bell; Jo Anne Estes; notac@olypen.com; [redacted]; Brian and Brooke; Randy Dutton; Jim Boyer; [redacted]; info@justwateralliance.org; Vi; Windy Boulden; Misty Rains; Delane Hewett; Tristin Hewett; mary pierce pfaff; Jay Petersen; Keith Olson; Norman MacLeod; Miller, Sheila Roark; connie beauvias; McEntire, Jim; Chapman, Mike; Sandy Rains; Rick Forschler -; Don; Dawn Rains; Frank M Penwell; Ross Krumpe; Van De Wege, Rep. Kevin; Hargrove,Jim
Subject: SMP NNL AND PSNERP 373 page Restoration report

Comment on SMP Update
NNL and RESTORATION
Pearl Rains Hewett Trustee
George C. Rains Sr. Estate
Member SMP Update Committee

We have been advised that **RESTORATION** is not required by law on the SMP Update.

While researching NNL I found a report prepared by ESA Adolfson Margaret Clancy
Initial Findings from Clallam County Summer 2012 - date 9/26/12
Shoreline Planners Meeting a 39 page report (view the entire report on line)

My serious concerns on **RESTORATION** are from the following (PSNERP) report.
(it was mentioned briefly, in the 39 page report)

(PSNERP) **PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT**
A 373 PAGE REPORT ON THE RESTORATION OF PUGET SOUND
This is not a casual report of restoration for mitigation.

Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife.

FINAL May 2009, GEOSPATIAL METHODOLOGY USED IN THE PSNERP COMPREHENSIVE CHANGE ANALYSIS OF PUGET SOUND

While this 373 page, RESTORATION PROJECT has not been disclosed to us, I am requesting a discussion of it at the April 9, 2013 SMP Committee Meeting.

As the Geospatial data is expanded, what serious consequences will it have for shoreline private property owners in the future?

PSNERP **PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT**
A 373 page report on the restoration of Puget Sound
Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife

---

http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/shorelines/smp/toolbox/docs/summer2012_measuring_nonetloss.pdf

Initial Findings from Clallam County
Summer 2012 date 9/26/12
Shoreline Planners Meeting a 39 page report (view the entire report on line)

Presentation Overview

What is No Net Loss?

Background on Clallam County's EPA grant

Steps for assessing NNL

Examples for marine shorelines

Ensuring NNL moving forward

What is No Net Loss?

As shoreline development occurs, ecological functions stay the same (or are improved) over time

Some Complexities:

How do you measure ecological functions?

At what scale do you account for gains or loses?

How do you segregate the effects of SMP development from other activities that affect ecological functions?

Can you have development and still achieve no net loss?

Can/should we rely on restoration when funding for restoration is limited and uncertain?

How do NNL and salmon recovery fit together?

Goals of Clallam County's EPA Grant

“Measure” shoreline conditions at the parcel and reach scales

Document how future development would affect shoreline conditions over time

Where, how much, what type?

Link potential changes in the shoreline ecology to specific SMP management decisions and tailor the SMP to achieve desired outcomes

Identify restoration actions to offset specific functional losses (if any)

Share methods and strategies with others

Indicators everyone’s talking about them

Puget Sound Partnership

- Willamette Partnership (EPA)
- Oregon Division of State Lands (ORWAP)
- Ecology (Chapter 4 - shoreline handbook)

Considerations for Selecting Indicators

Data readily available (now and in the future)
Relationship between indicators and shoreline functions
Correlation between indicator and SMP decisions

Measured with reasonable accuracy at reach scale
Build from Ecology & PSP (Puget Sound Partnership) indicators
Reflect conditions of importance or value

Metrics that Indicate Shoreline Health
Percent of shoreland mapped as feeder bluff
Percent of aquatic area supporting submerged aquatic vegetation (kelp)
Percent closed canopy forest within 200 feet of the ordinary high water line
Forage fish suitability index

Metrics that Indicate Shoreline Alteration
Percent of shoreline classified as modified
Percent of feeder bluffs with armoring
Percent of armoring outside feeder bluffs
Number of overwater structures

NNL Assessment Steps

Step 1. What do we care about?

Maintaining shoreline ecological functions by protecting habitat forming processes.

Step 2. What are the components of healthy shorelines?
Marine Shorelines
Nearshore Functions
Feeder bluffs /sediment sources
Riparian vegetation
Aquatic vegetation
(eelgrass, kelp beds)
Pocket estuaries / stream mouths
Salmon (stock status)
Forage fish

Components
Selected as part of Inventory & Characterization Consistent with regional efforts
PSP Puget Sound Partnership
PSNERP **PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT**
Ecology

PSNERP
FINAL May 2009
GEOSPATIAL METHODOLOGY USED IN THE PSNERP
COMPREHENSIVE CHANGE ANALYSIS OF PUGET SOUND
PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT

http://wagda.lib.washington.edu/data/geography/wa_state/wageol/metadata/PSNERP%20CA%20GEOSPATIAL%20METHODOLOGY.pdf

Prepared for
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,Seattle District
and Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife

Prepared In Support of Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership

In Association With

Additional Anchor Team consultants and

Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Inventory and Assessment Program

Northwest Indian FisheriesCommission

Point No Point Treaty Council

Skagit River System Cooperative

University of Washington Wetland EcosystemTeam

Scope and Definitions

The PSNERP GI study area includes the entire portion of Puget Sound, and the Straits of Juan deFuca and southern Strait of Georgia that occur within the borders of the United States; data is also acquired for water shed drainage areas of Puget Sound rivers that extend into Canada.

The PSNERP GI Study Area was divided into 7 sub-basins for analysis and reporting.