



PLAUCHÉ
& CARR^{LLP}

Riparian Taskforce Final Report: Facilitation Process and Recommendations

Pursuant to Section 117(12), Chapter 297, Laws of 2022

December 2022

Table of Contents

I.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
II.	THE BUDGET PROVISIO.....	2
III.	THE PRELIMINARY REPORT	3
IV.	THE ROUNDTABLE PROCESS.....	4
V.	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	5
A.	Protect Existing, Functioning Riparian Areas	5
B.	Restore Degraded Riparian Corridors.....	6
C.	Create and Fund a Robust Monitoring Program to Evaluate the Effectiveness of Protection and Restoration Programs	10
D.	Improve Salmon Recovery Program Coordination	11
E.	Topics for Continued Facilitated Dialogue	12
	APPENDIX A ROUNDTABLE PARTICIPANTS.....	1
	APPENDIX B FIRST ROUNDTABLE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
	APPENDIX C SECOND ROUNDTABLE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
	APPENDIX D THIRD ROUNDTABLE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1

I. Executive Summary

The Governor's Office contracted with Plauché & Carr LLP (P&C) to convene an independent facilitated process engaging tribes, legislative leadership, local governments, agricultural producers, commercial and recreational fishery organizations, business organizations, salmon recovery organizations, forestry and agriculture organizations, and environmental organizations to develop a suite of policy tools and funding priorities to improve riparian habitat and ensure salmon and steelhead recovery pursuant to Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 5693, Sec. 117(12) (2022) (the budget proviso), provided in Section II of this report. The budget proviso sought recommendations for improvements to land use planning and development that ensure the protection and recovery of salmon, standards to protect and to restore areas adjacent to streams and rivers, financial incentives for landowners to protect and restore streamside habitat, recommendations to improve salmon recovery program coordination among state agencies, and recommendations for additional changes when voluntary measures and financial incentives do not achieve streamside protection and restoration. This report details the facilitation process P&C undertook and resulting recommendations.

P&C's work started with an extensive interview process to develop an understanding of the varied perspectives of the constituencies identified in the budget proviso. P&C worked with the Governor's Office, the Office of Financial Management, and staff at other key state agencies to develop a list of interviewees made up of leaders of the groups identified in the budget proviso for inclusion in the facilitated process concerning riparian habitat.

Between July and September 2022, P&C engaged over 80 individuals through 50 initial interviews/listening sessions made up of representatives from tribes, legislative leadership, local governments, forestry and agricultural organizations, business organizations, environmental organizations, and salmon recovery organizations. While P&C initially envisioned undertaking approximately 25 interviews, as the interview process unfolded, new interviewees were identified that provided important perspectives. Ultimately, P&C decided to extend the interview phase of its work, believing that a robust interview process would help make roundtable discussions more efficient and effective.

In October, P&C published its Riparian Taskforce Preliminary Report which detailed the interview process and several "themes" that emerged in this initial phase of work. P&C's initial report is described in Section III of this report. You can find the preliminary report on [OFM's website](#).

After the initial phase of the facilitation process, P&C convened three, half-day roundtable discussions. Roundtables were held in person between October and December in Olympia. The goal of the riparian roundtables was to develop recommendations as specified in the budget proviso. To this end, the roundtables explored the themes identified in the interview process, including broad areas of agreement and disagreement, and sought opportunities for agreement and to better understand and define areas of disagreement. The roundtable process is described in detail in Section IV of this report.

From the start of its work, P&C recognized that, realistically, it would not be possible to reach agreement on a comprehensive suite of actions to address the complex issues around riparian habitat in only a few months' time. Rather, the roundtable discussions provided an opportunity for a new start to conversations around riparian habitat and salmon recovery. P&C is pleased that these

discussions resulted in key insights into some initial policy changes and spending priorities to improve riparian habitat and salmon and steelhead recovery. Recommendations informed and refined by the roundtable discussions, and levels of support for each recommendation, as P&C heard them from participants in the roundtable process, are provided in Section V of this report. The suite of recommendations reflects roundtable participants' shared interest in continuing dialogue on these issues with the goal of further substantive agreement to address riparian habitat improvement and to ensure salmon and steelhead recovery within a defined timeframe.

P&C's work on the facilitated process was coordinated with P&C's work to implement a separate 2022 supplemental operating budget proviso. This proviso sought an independent contractor to review the effectiveness of existing voluntary and regulatory programs for protecting and restoring areas along streams and rivers (Section 130(22), Chapter 297, Laws of 2022) (the effectiveness analysis budget proviso). P&C's work on the effectiveness analysis budget proviso was undertaken in collaboration with technical experts at Industrial Economics, Inc. (IEc). Under the effectiveness analysis budget proviso, P&C and IEc conducted a detailed technical analysis founded in data collection and interviews guided by agency staff responsible for implementing riparian-related voluntary and regulatory state programs. The analysis' key findings and recommendations regarding state program effectiveness, use and outcomes informed P&C's facilitation process and final recommendations. Interested parties can find the final effectiveness analysis, Effectiveness of State Programs on Riparian Habitat Protection and Restoration: Analysis and Recommendations on [OFM's website](#).

II. The Budget Proviso

The budget proviso authorizing the independent facilitated process that P&C is leading can be found in state law (Section 117(12), Chapter 297, Laws of 2022):

\$50,000 of the general fund—state appropriation for fiscal year 2022 and \$250,000 of the general fund—state appropriation for fiscal year 2023 are provided solely for the governor to invite federally recognized tribes, legislative leadership, local governments, agricultural producers, commercial and recreational fisher organizations, business organizations, salmon recovery organizations, forestry and agriculture organizations, and environmental organizations to participate in a process facilitated by an independent entity to develop recommendations on proposed changes in policy and spending priorities to improve riparian habitat to ensure salmon and steelhead recovery.

(a) The recommendations must include:

- (i) Ideas for improvements to land use planning and development that ensure the protection and recovery of salmon;*
- (ii) Standards to protect areas adjacent to streams and rivers;*
- (iii) Standards to restore areas adjacent to streams and rivers;*
- (iv) Financial incentives for landowners to protect and restore streamside habitat;*
- (v) Recommendations to improve salmon recovery program coordination among state agencies; and*
- (vi) Recommendations for additional changes when voluntary measures and financial incentives do not achieve streamside protection and restoration.*

(b) Preliminary recommendations shall be submitted to the legislature and governor by Oct. 1, 2022, with a final report by Nov. 1, 2022.

- (c) The office of the governor may contract for an independent facilitator. The contract is exempt from the competitive procurement requirements in chapter 39 RCW.*

III. The Preliminary Report

P&C's Riparian Taskforce Preliminary Report details the initial phase and findings of P&C's work through October 2022 and outlines the process for roundtable discussions toward identifying recommendations. This Preliminary Report includes an in-depth description of the interview process, the people and organizations involved, and several themes that P&C identified over the course of the interviews as they were conveyed by interviewees. You can find the Preliminary Report on [OEM's website](#).

The themes P&C identified over the course of the interviews provided P&C with a roadmap for the collaborative dialogue in the next phase of the process, the three roundtable meetings. P&C hoped that the dialogue at the three roundtable meetings would provide a framework, and enhance mutual trust and respect that would, with additional time and continued dialogue, support developing a more comprehensive strategy to address the complex issues involved in improving salmon and steelhead recovery in Washington.

P&C identified the following broad areas of agreement within the interview themes:

- Washington's salmon runs are on the decline, and that decline has significant impacts on tribes and tribal resources.
- While there seems to be a focus on agriculture, Washington State needs comprehensive strategies that consider a broad swath of uses impacting riparian habitat, including rural residential development and urban development.
- Washington State needs better monitoring and adaptive management to learn what strategies are most effective.
- Voluntary incentive programs are an important tool for addressing riparian impacts and should be more robustly funded.
- Washington State agencies need to better coordinate their salmon protection and restoration programs.

P&C also identified the following areas of disagreement:

- While there is agreement that voluntary programs are underfunded, there is significant disagreement on whether voluntary programs, alone, can achieve fully functioning riparian corridors.
- Whether 200-year Site Potential Tree Height (SPTH₂₀₀) is the right buffer standard for riparian habitat.

- From one perspective, $SPTH_{200}$ as the standard for riparian restoration is generally accepted in the science and has been adopted by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and other state agencies.
- From another perspective, $SPTH_{200}$ is too restrictive, not necessary to achieve salmon recovery in all areas, doesn't allow flexibility for individual solutions, and has dramatic economic impacts on some farms.
- Whether regulatory requirements are needed to achieve riparian goals.
 - From some, P&C heard the view that regulation is not needed and poses a significant challenge, particularly in areas where existing uses or structures impact riparian function.
 - From others, P&C heard that regulatory action is the only way to reverse the trend of declining salmon populations.

IV. The Roundtable Process

P&C convened three half-day, in-person roundtable discussions to which P&C invited a broad group of key leaders from tribal, state and local government, various industry sectors (including timber, agriculture and residential development), and environmental and salmon recovery organizations. The goal of the roundtables was to identify recommendations for changes in policy and spending priorities to improve riparian habitat that could be supported by the roundtable participants. The intent was to identify recommendations on the specific areas identified in the budget proviso.

Roundtable discussions resulted in key insights into some initial policy changes and spending priorities to improve riparian habitat and ensure salmon and steelhead recovery. Recommendations resulting from these discussions, and levels of support for each recommendation as P&C heard them from roundtable participants, are provided in Section V of this report.

The three riparian roundtables were held in the Olympia area October 14, Nov. 7, and Dec. 9 at the Natural Resources Building, the Nisqually Indian Tribe Health and Wellness Center, and the Washington Farm Bureau offices, respectively. Appendix A provides the individuals who participated in one or more of the roundtable meetings.

The purpose of the first roundtable was to confirm the areas of agreement and disagreement P&C identified during the interviews, as described in Section III. In introductions, roundtable participants emphasized the critical state of salmon in Washington, the impact that has on tribes, the challenges facing the agricultural community and local economies, and expressed gratitude for other participants' willingness to come to the table to discuss solutions. After introductions, P&C provided an overview of its work under both the budget proviso and the effectiveness analysis proviso and shared interview themes from P&C's Riparian Taskforce Preliminary Report. The

remainder of the meeting was dedicated to participant feedback on the areas of agreement as P&C had identified them and included discussion on program funding, prioritization and goals. An executive summary of the first roundtable is provided in Appendix B.

At the second roundtable, P&C focused the discussion on areas of disagreement to better understand and define the more challenging issues around riparian protection and restoration. The meeting focused on riparian buffers and voluntary programs. For riparian buffers, participants were asked to discuss the practical, on the ground challenges with the SPTH₂₀₀ riparian buffer standard. For voluntary programs, participants were asked to address enhancements that could be made to voluntary programs to improve riparian habitat for salmon and steelhead. An executive summary of the second roundtable is provided in Appendix C.

The first two roundtable discussions informed draft recommendations crafted by P&C that were provided to participants in advance of the third roundtable. The third and final roundtable focused exclusively on participant feedback on these draft recommendations and walked through each proposed recommendation individually. Some roundtable participants also provided written feedback before and after the roundtable discussion. The input from roundtable participants was incorporated into the recommendations and also forms the basis of the descriptions of roundtable participant support for each recommendation provided in Section V of this report. An executive summary of the third roundtable is provided in Appendix D.

V. Recommendations

This section of the report provides recommendations developed through the facilitation process on proposed changes in policy and spending priorities to improve riparian habitat and to ensure salmon and steelhead recovery. Recommendations are organized by topic area and are not listed in any order of priority. At the end of each recommendation, P&C provides the specific areas identified in the budget proviso that are relevant to that recommendation as well as a brief description of the level of roundtable support for the recommendation.

A. Protect Existing, Functioning Riparian Areas

Recommendation 1: For protection of existing, functioning riparian corridors, local land use regulations should implement the SPTH₂₀₀ standard, as described more fully in WDFW Riparian Ecosystems Volumes 1 and 2 (2020) (WDFW Riparian Guidance (2020)), in riparian corridors that currently meet those standards, and those standards should be applied to all applications for new development impacting those existing, functioning riparian corridors. Where a riparian area does not meet the SPTH₂₀₀ standard but provides some level of riparian function, the current level of riparian function should not be degraded.

- 1.a. Provide guidance to local jurisdictions under the Growth Management Act (GMA) (Critical Areas Ordinances) and Shoreline Management Act (SMA) (Shoreline Master Programs) that the WDFW Riparian Guidance (2020) establishes the standards for delineating, evaluating, planning and managing riparian ecosystems.

- 1.b. Set a target date for local governments to incorporate WDFW’s Riparian Guidance (2020) into local GMA Critical Areas Ordinances and Shoreline Master Programs and provide funding to local governments to undertake that incorporation.
- 1.c. Provide an exemption from appeals for local government legislative actions that incorporate WDFW Riparian Guidance (2020).
- 1.d. For riparian-related land use regulations implemented under the SMA and GMA, conduct an evaluation specific to the compliance and enforcement process, as recommended in Recommendation # 4 of the Effectiveness of State Programs on Riparian Habitat Protection and Restoration: Analysis and Recommendations (2022) (“Effectiveness Analysis Recommendations”).
 - This compliance review should build off the work currently being undertaken by the Washington Department of Ecology under the SMA. That work includes funding from the legislature in 2022 to hire six new ongoing shoreline compliance positions at Ecology.

Comments: This recommendation responds to Subsections (a)(i) and (a)(ii) of ESSB 5693, Section 11712.

The overall recommendation was generally supported by roundtable participants.

B. Restore Degraded Riparian Corridors

i. Establish Consistent, General Standards for Riparian Restoration Projects in Washington State

Recommendation 2: To improve riparian habitat for salmon and steelhead recovery in riparian corridors that do not currently achieve SPTH₂₀₀, the recommendations in WDFW Riparian Guidance 2020 should be implemented where feasible.

- 2.a. Recognizing that it may not be feasible to achieve SPTH₂₀₀ in all riparian corridors, and because restoration to standards less than those recommended in WDFW Riparian Guidance 2020 can still provide significant improvements to riparian habitat, improving riparian habitat to less than the standards described in WDFW Riparian Guidance 2020 is appropriate where:
 - The presence of a structure, a property line, infrastructure (*e.g.*, roads, railways, pipelines, powerlines or other utilities), or topography impedes the ability to meet or achieve the standards described in WDFW Riparian Guidance 2020.
 - The property in question is a small parcel in which the riparian management zone would cover more than 50% percent of the parcel.
 - A restoration project proponent can:
 - Demonstrate, through a science-based analysis, that the restoration project achieves the goal of restoring riparian function

(*i.e.*, continuity, shade, pollution removal, contributions of detrital nutrients, recruitment of large woody materials and bank stability); and

- Provide statements of support, and an indication that the project achieves important science-based restoration goals, from the following:
 - A natural resource management tribal biologist working for a tribe whose treaty territory includes the project location; and
 - A WDFW habitat biologist.

2.b. Fund and convene a facilitated process to discuss and make recommendations, no later than Jan. 1, 2024, for strategies to address degraded riparian corridors in urban areas, where restoration of functioning riparian corridors is infeasible. Such strategies should include payments of fees to fund restoration in other areas of the watershed where restoration of significant riparian function is feasible.

Comments: This recommendation responds to Subsection (a)(iii) of ESSB 5693, Section 11712.

This overall recommendation was generally supported by all of roundtable participants, although roundtable participants offered a variety of alternative approaches for determining appropriate variations from the WDFW Riparian Guidance 2020.

ii. Enhance Existing Voluntary Incentive Programs for Restoration of Degraded Riparian Corridors

Recommendation 3: For the next two years, significantly increase funding of existing voluntary incentive programs, including funding to address existing backlogs and waitlists for programs including but not limited to Voluntary Stewardship Program (VSP), Forestry Riparian Easement Program, Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP), and Natural Resource Investments Program. Ensure that programs receiving increased funding address the following:

- Set riparian protection goals consistent with the SPTH 200, while recognizing exceptions, in accordance with Recommendation 2.a., where that standard is not achievable. Tribal and WDFW biologists should consult with appropriate Conservation District staff in making the determinations discussed in Recommendation 2.a.
 - Provide funding for enhanced training of Conservation District Staff to assist in implementing this recommendation.
- Encourage the use of programs like the Commodity Buffers Program in more Conservation Districts.

- Provide incentives so that the compensation paid matches market rental rates and commodity pricing.
- Where feasible, prioritize restoration activities in reaches of streams for which the Washington Department of Ecology has included the stream reach in its list of impaired waters under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act based on temperature impairment.
- Evaluate and, if appropriate, authorize the use of pay-for-success contracting and private investment approaches to riparian habitat improvement projects.

Comments: This recommendation responds to Subsections (a)(iii) and (a)(iv) of ESSB 5693, Section 11712.

This overall recommendation was generally supported by all roundtable participants, although roundtable participants offered a variety of alternative approaches for determining appropriate variations from the WDFW Riparian Guidance 2020.

Recommendation 4: Engage with federal agencies and Washington’s Congressional delegation to work toward modifications to federal voluntary incentive programs, including, without limitation, the CREP program, to better align with state programs, including providing increased funding so that compensation matches market rental rates and commodity pricing, as well as establishing riparian protection goals consistent SPTH 200, while recognizing exceptions where that standard is not achievable, as discussed in Recommendation 2.a., above.

Comments: This recommendation responds to Subsections (a)(iii) and (a)(iv) of ESSB 5693, Section 11712.

This recommendation was generally supported by roundtable participants, although representatives of agricultural interests and the Conservation Commission expressed concern with the feasibility and timeline for accomplishing a change in federal programs.

iii. Create a New Voluntary Incentive Program, with a Regulatory Backstop, by Jan. 31, 2024

Recommendation 5: Fund and convene a facilitated process among state and local agencies, tribal governments and stakeholders to create and recommend, by no later than Jan. 31, 2024, a new incentive program that is focused on improving riparian habitat for salmon and steelhead recovery, that establishes firm, readily measurable goals, and that establishes a regulatory program that will go into effect if those goals are not achieved.

5.a. In creating a new incentive program, the facilitated process should consider the following:

- Set riparian protection goals consistent with the WDFW Riparian Guidance (2020), while recognizing exceptions where the standards in that Guidance aren’t achievable.
 - Where the standards in the WDFW Riparian Guidance (2020) are not achievable, offer flexibility to increase eligibility and interest

while maintaining a rigorous science-based review process to ensure riparian habitat functionality goals are met.

- Establish significant tribal roles in project prioritization, funding and implementation.
- Establish eligibility criteria that include both fish-bearing and non-fish bearing waters (where non-fish bearing waters have a nexus to salmon recovery), in accordance with WDFW Riparian Guidance (2020).
- Establish eligibility criteria that include projects to protect or improve riparian habitat regardless of whether existing regulatory protections apply.
- Establish eligibility criteria that apply to all riparian areas of the state, including areas in agricultural production, in rural residential use, and in urban use.
- Ensure sufficient, reliable funding is provided to achieve significant program participation, including support of a substantial outreach and education program on the importance of riparian habitat restoration and protection.
- Provide landowners with assistance on aggregating projects to provide greater riparian habitat improvement and protection.
- Provide incentives for early program participation such that “early adopters” are rewarded.
- Provide a simplified process to ensure robust participation, including:
 - Sufficient funding for landowner outreach and technical assistance.
 - Create a single, simplified application process that is readily usable by all potential funding recipients.
 - House the program in a single state lead agency, while ensuring collaboration with all state agencies in program administration.
- Evaluate and, if appropriate, authorize the use of pay-for-success contracting and other private investment approaches to riparian habitat improvement projects.
- Where feasible, prioritize restoration activities in reaches of streams for which the Washington Department of Ecology has included the stream reach in its list of impaired waters under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act based on temperature impairment.
- Adopt specific goals at the program level with respect to quantity and quality of riparian habitats restored or protected by Jan. 31, 2027, and every three (3) years thereafter.

- 5.b. The incentive program should also include a regulatory and/or compensation strategy that applies to all existing land uses/activities if the program fails to meet the established three-year goals. In creating a regulatory and/or compensation strategy that applies to existing uses/activities, the facilitated process should consider the following:
- The priority areas identified in the Watershed Planning process discussed in Recommendation 7, below. Within those priority areas, initial focus should be on areas in public ownership.
 - Regulatory standards should ensure improvement of riparian habitat for salmon and steelhead recovery.
 - Consider alternative mitigation strategies including but not limited to mitigation banks or payment of fees in urban and industrial areas where restoration of riparian function cannot be restored. Such fees shall be dedicated to restoration in other critical riparian habitat areas in the same watershed, as identified in the Watershed Planning Process discussed in recommendation 7, below.

Comments: This recommendation responds to Subsections (a)(iii), (a)(iv) and (a)(vi) of ESSB 5693, Section 11712.

This recommendation was generally supported by roundtable participants, although representatives of agricultural, timber, and local government interests expressed a preference for not creating the regulatory program discussed in recommendation 5.b. unless and until the goals established by the incentive program are not met. Some of the state agency representatives expressed a preference for modifying and enhancing existing programs rather than creating a new incentive program.

C. Create and Fund a Robust Monitoring Program to Evaluate the Effectiveness of Protection and Restoration Programs

Recommendation 6: Establish and fund a robust monitoring program consistent with Recommendation #1 in the Effectiveness Analysis Recommendations that allows state and local government agencies, tribal authorities, and interested stakeholders to monitor the effectiveness of protection and restoration efforts across programs with respect to both the reach (e.g., participation in voluntary programs) and carry through (e.g., success of riparian protection efforts, including ensuring ecological integrity of the habitat over time) of the programs.

- 6.a. In addition to the items discussed in Recommendation #1 of the Effectiveness Analysis Recommendations, the monitoring program should include:
- Data from in-stream monitoring of water quality parameters, including instream flow rate, temperature and nutrients, downstream of the riparian areas enhanced by the program sufficient to document any change in those parameters as a result of the enhancement efforts funded under the program, taking into account changes in baseline conditions as a result of climate change.
- 6.b. The monitoring program should build off the work done by the Centennial Accord Agreement, Riparian Pathway 3 Group, as described in the Group's July 9, 2021, Riparian Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan.

Comments: This recommendation responds to Subsections (a)(v) and (a)(vi) of ESSB 5693, Section 11712.

All roundtable participants expressed strong support for creating and funding a robust monitoring program to monitor the effectiveness of restoration efforts. Roundtable participants expressed a variety of perspectives as to the details of such a program, some of which are reflected in this recommendation.

D. Improve Salmon Recovery Program Coordination

Recommendation 7: Provide funding to enhance Regional Salmon Recovery Plans and Lead Entity Strategies to ensure protection and restoration efforts within watersheds are targeted to optimize and expedite improving riparian habitat for salmon and steelhead recovery.

- 7.a. Fund and convene a facilitated process with state and local agencies, tribal governments, and stakeholders to set overall goals, outcomes and targets/metrics that can be readily adopted by Lead Entity groups for use in their watershed level plans.
- The facilitated process should also consider restoration strategies that can be incorporated into watershed plans to attract private investment in improving and protecting riparian habitat for salmon and steelhead recovery, including the use of riparian restoration/mitigation banks, use of performance-based contracting and other public-private partnership strategies, and other methods of purchasing improvements in riparian habitat for salmon and steelhead recovery.
 - The facilitated process should also consider startup funding strategies to help attract such private investment in improving and protecting riparian habitat for salmon and steelhead recovery.
- 7.b. Utilize WDFW's High Resolution Change Detection mapping work to better understand current riparian conditions in watersheds.
- 7.c. Require local jurisdictions to incorporate the results of these watershed planning efforts into local land use plans and development regulations and provide funding for that incorporation.
- 7.d. Require that state programs prioritize projects within watersheds based on these enhanced watershed plans.

Comments: This recommendation responds to Subsections (a)(i), (a)(ii), (a)(iii) and (a)(v) of ESSB 5693, Section 11712.

All roundtable participants expressed strong support for this recommendation.

Recommendation 8: Consider legislation that would designate a single, cabinet level agency to act as the lead agency for salmon recovery with authority across agencies to ensure agency actions are consistent with the individual watershed plans discussed in Recommendation 7 and the state's overall salmon recovery strategies, as those strategies are articulated in the Governor's Statewide Salmon Strategy, the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Plan and the Chinook Salmon Implementation Strategy.

Comments: This recommendation responds to Subsection (a)(v) of ESSB 5693, Section 11712.

Roundtable participants had mixed perspectives on this recommendation. Several roundtable participants expressed support for designating a single agency to ensure consistency with the Governor's Salmon Strategy, with some suggesting the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office was an appropriate agency to be so designated. Other participants disagreed that the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office was the appropriate agency to be so designated.

While most roundtable participants agreed that designating a single agency as the lead agency for salmon recovery was necessary, at least one participant expressed concern about providing that lead agency with authority across agencies, given the differing statutory authorities governing state agencies.

Recommendation 9: Fund and convene a facilitated process with state and local agencies, tribal governments, and stakeholders to develop factors for sequencing and aggregating riparian habitat protection and improvement among recovery goals, types of projects and watersheds to maximize benefits to salmon populations.

Comments: This recommendation responds to Subsection (a)(v) of ESSB 5693, Section 11712.

This recommendation was not broadly supported among the roundtable group and raised particular concerns with Tribal representatives. Because of limitations related to Tribes' treaty territories, a limited number of Tribes will benefit from restoration strategies in any given watershed. Thus, if a particular watershed is prioritized for restoration, other watersheds might receive less restoration funding. Recognizing the varied tribal treaty territories, the Tribes have adopted a "no watershed left behind" approach that avoids prioritizing efforts between watersheds.

P&C has nevertheless included this recommendation in its final report because a number of interviewees, and some roundtable participants, expressed significant concern that, without prioritizing or at least sequencing, restoration strategies among watersheds, restoration funding may be spread too broadly to achieve significant salmon recovery (often referred to as the "spread the peanut butter" approach). P&C believes addressing these concerns bears further examination.

E. Topics for Continued Facilitated Dialogue

Recommendation 10: In accordance with the above recommendations, fund and convene a facilitated process to address the following items:

- Developing strategies to address degraded riparian corridors in urban areas where restoration of functioning riparian corridors is infeasible. (Recommendations 2.b. and 5.b.).
- Creating a new voluntary incentive program with a regulatory backstop (Recommendation 5).
- Establishing overall goals, outcomes and targets/metrics for use in Watershed Plans (Recommendation 7.a.).
- Sequencing factors to maximize ecological uplift for salmon (Recommendation 9).

Comments: This recommendation responds to all Subsections of ESSB 5693, Section 11712.

All roundtable participants expressed strong support for continuing the dialogue among the group that has participated in the roundtable discussions to date, emphasizing the need to maintain momentum and to keep these discussions moving forward during the 2023 Washington Legislative Session and beyond.

Appendix A | Roundtable Participants

1. Ben Adams, Board Member, Washington Association of Wheat Growers
2. Bill Clarke, Attorney at Law and Lobbyist, Washington Realtors and Washington Public Utilities District Association
3. Carl Schroeder, Deputy Director of Government Relations, Association of Washington Cities
4. Chad Bowechop, Tribal Council Member, Makah Tribe
5. Chris Pettit, Executive Director, Washington State Conservation Commission
6. Darcy Nonemacher, Government Affairs Director, Washington Environmental Council
7. Daryl Williams, Environmental Contractor, Tulalip Tribes
8. David Bergvall, Associate Director of Policy and Environment, Manulife Investment Management
9. David Herrera, Fisheries and Wildlife Policy Advisor, Skokomish Tribe
10. Derek Sandison, Director, Washington State Department of Agriculture
11. Diana Carlen, Vice-President, Gordon Thomas Honeywell Governmental Affairs, and Consultant, Washington Association of Wheat Growers, Washington Potato and Onion Association, and Manulife Investment Management
12. Don Gourlie, Legislative Policy Director, Puget Sound Partnership
13. Edward Johnstone, Chairman, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
14. Erik Neatherlin, Executive Director, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office
15. Fran Wilshusen, Executive Director, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
16. Guido Levy Jr., 6th Tribal Council Member, Nisqually Indian Tribe
17. Haley Kennard, Natural Resource Policy Analyst, Makah Tribe
18. Hansi Hals, Natural Resources Director, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe
19. Heather Bartlett, Deputy Director, Washington State Department of Ecology
20. Jason Spadaro, Executive Director, Washington Forest Protection Association
21. Jay Gordon, Policy Director, Washington State Dairy Federation
22. Jeff Davis, Director of Conservation Policy, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
23. Jeff Dickison, Contractor, Squaxin Island Tribe
24. Jim Cahill, Senior Budget Assistant to the Governor for Natural Resources, Office of Financial Management

25. Jim Peters, Habitat Policy Analyst, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
26. Jeremy (J.J.) Wilbur, Tribal Council Vice Chair, Swinomish Indian Tribal Community
27. Jon Devaney, President, Washington State Tree Fruit Association
28. Justin Allegro, The Nature Conservancy
29. Justine Capra, Governmental Affairs Director, Nisqually Indian Tribe
30. Kadi Bizyayeva, Tribal Council Member and Fisheries Director, Stillaguamish Tribe
31. Kate Dean, Commissioner, Jefferson County
32. Kris Peters, Tribal Council Chairman, Squaxin Island Tribe
33. Laura Blackmore, Puget Sound Partnership
34. Leighanna Scott, Council Member, Nisqually Indian Tribe
35. Loni Greninger, Tribal Council Vice Chair, Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe
36. Margen Carlson, Habitat Program Director, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
37. Mark Streuli, Lobbyist, Washington Cattlemen’s Association, Potato Commission
38. Matt Harris, Director of Governmental Affairs, Washington State Potato Commission
39. Megan Duffy, Director, Washington Recreation and Conservation Office
40. Natalie Lowell, Environmental Policy Analyst, Makah Tribe Office of Marine Affairs
41. Nick Streuli, Executive Director, Policy & Outreach, Office of Governor Jay Inslee
42. Paul Jewell, Policy Director – Water, Land Use, Environment & Solid Waste, Washington State Association of Counties
43. Ron Shultz, Director of Policy and Government Relations, Washington State Conservation Commission
44. Ron Wesen
45. Rosella Mosby, President, Washington Farm Bureau
46. Ruth Musgrave, Senior Policy Advisor for Natural Resources, Office of Governor Jay Inslee
47. Wes McCart, Commissioner, Stevens County
48. Willie Frank III, Tribal Council Chairman, Nisqually Indian Tribe

Appendix B | First Roundtable Executive Summary

Friday, Oct. 14; 12:00-4 p.m.

Natural Resources Building
NRB Room 172
1111 Washington St SE
Olympia, WA 98501

This document provides a meeting agenda and executive summary from the first of three riparian roundtable discussions facilitated by Plauché & Carr in its work to convene a facilitated process to identify and develop recommendations on proposed changes in policy and spending priorities to improve riparian habitat to ensure salmon and steelhead recovery, as authorized in the budget proviso. The executive summary intends to summarize comments from roundtable participants and may paraphrase statements and other points of discussion.

Agenda

- I. Introductions**
- II. Welcome from Governor Inslee's Office**
- III. Overview of Riparian Habitat Improvement Budget Provisos Initial Reports**
 - a. Initial technical report
 - b. Initial facilitator report

----- BREAK -----
- IV. Part I of Riparian Habitat Improvement Policy Changes and Spending Priorities Discussion, addressing the following themes from interviews:**
 - a. Salmon populations are declining to the point of crisis
 - b. The State needs to provide additional funding for monitoring and adaptive management
 - c. The State needs to enhance funding to the right riparian programs
 - d. The State needs better coordination among state agencies on riparian habitat
- V. Wrap up**
 - a. Maintaining transparency and reporting out from this Roundtable to others
 - b. Second Roundtable focus: Diving deeper into Riparian Habitat Improvement Policy Changes and Spending Priorities
 - c. Establishing date for Second and Third Roundtable

Executive Summary

I. Introductions

- a. Welcome, agenda overview and participant introductions.
 - i. Several participants emphasized the critical state of salmon in Washington and the impact that has had on tribes, expressed the importance of meeting and gratitude for others to come to the table to discuss solutions.

II. Welcome from Governor Inslee's Office

- a. Nick Streuli welcomed the group on behalf of the Governor's Office and acknowledged and took responsibility for the problems with how things rolled out last legislative session.

III. Overview of Riparian Habitat Improvement Budget Provisos Initial Reports

- a. Initial technical report
 - i. Peter Dykstra gave an overview of the initial report from the budget proviso Plauché & Carr is implementing to evaluate the effectiveness of existing voluntary and regulatory programs toward achieving a science-based standard for a fully functioning riparian ecosystem. The report summarizes initial work performed and provides preliminary themes heard on whether state voluntary and regulatory programs are achieving riparian goals. The final report will be submitted by Dec. 1 and will include recommendations regarding program effectiveness that will tie into the roundtables.
- b. Initial facilitator report
 - i. Billy Plauché gave an overview of the initial report from the facilitation process budget proviso. The report summarizes the interview process taken by Plauché & Carr and provides themes that came out of interviews. Themes heard in interviews can be bucketed into areas of fairly good agreement, clear disagreement, and issues where it is uncertain whether there is agreement or disagreement. The broad areas of agreement include the following:
 1. Our salmon runs are on the decline and that has significant impacts to tribes and tribal resources;
 2. While there seems to be a focus on agriculture, we need a systems solution that looks at housing, timber, urban development, and a broad swath of uses impacting habitat;
 3. We need better monitoring and adaptive management to learn about what we are doing that is the most effective;
 4. Voluntary programs are underfunded; and
 5. The state needs to coordinate and prioritize its salmon protection and restoration programs.
 - ii. The areas of disagreement include the following:
 1. While there is agreement that voluntary programs are underfunded, there is disagreement on whether voluntary

programs alone can achieve fully functioning riparian corridors.

2. Whether SPTH₂₀₀ is the right buffer standard. From one perspective, SPTH₂₀₀ is generally accepted in the science, adopted by WDFW, and is what the Governor has committed to. From another perspective, SPTH₂₀₀ is too restrictive, not necessary to achieve salmon recovery in some places, doesn't allow flexibility for individual solutions and has dramatic economic impacts on some farms.
3. Whether regulatory requirements are needed to achieve riparian goals. From some, we heard regulation is not needed and poses a huge challenge for the built environment. From others, we heard that regulatory action is the only way to get there.
- iii. In response to a question regarding WDFW's mapping and watershed prioritization work, Jeff Davis provided the work would be completed by the end of the fiscal year and offered to provide examples for discussion.

---- BREAK ----

IV. Part I of Riparian Habitat Improvement Policy Changes and Spending Priorities Discussion, addressing the following themes from interviews:

- a. The rest of the meeting focused on several themes, below, as they were heard in interviews to help frame recommendations called for in the proviso.
 - i. Salmon populations are declining to the point of crisis
 - ii. The State needs to provide additional funding for monitoring and adaptive management
 - iii. The State needs to enhance funding to the right riparian programs
 - iv. The State needs better coordination among state agencies on riparian habitat
- b. Peter Dykstra asked the group to dig in, considering there is agreement that salmon are in a critical state, that this is impacting tribal treaty rights, and that what we are doing is not working, whether there are questions on that, comments on how that is phrased, or if participants have clarifications or additions to that.
 - i. Jon DeVaney asked, when we say that we are doing isn't working, is it because of other factors or is it because we aren't doing enough?
 1. Peter Dykstra responded that is unclear.
 2. Billy Plauché responded that we heard both.
 3. Peter Dykstra provided that we heard that there are many other causes of salmon decline, but that riparian habitat is a priority problem but not whether it was the main or only problem.
 - ii. Chairman Johnstone emphasized that, if not everyone agrees that salmon are in crisis, we need to talk about that. Also, that development

and other uses have impacted salmon and wherever we can get to SPTH₂₀₀ is important.

- iii. Daryl Williams commented that we are still losing juvenile salmon due to heat despite efforts since the 1980s and that growth management planning has only been required since the 1990s. He emphasized that we need adequate buffers, that SPTH₂₀₀ is what the science supports, and that there is support for a voluntary effort with a regulatory backstop. Further, voluntary measures have not worked because of lack of funding but also because some landowners are unwilling and more needs to be done to restore salmon.
- iv. Vice Chairman Wilbur emphasized that the tribes have treaty rights and that, while he agrees that voluntary programs have been underfunded, they have not and cannot get us there, alone, and that a regulatory backstop is needed.
- v. Councilmember Bizyayeva shared that the Stillaguamish Tribe is seeing lack of habitat and decline in salmon despite hatchery supplementation and that what is being done for recovery is not enough and not fast enough.
- vi. David Herrera commented that billions of dollars have been invested in salmon recovery and most of that has gone to good projects and the tribes have made cutbacks to protect fish. Also, recognized there is other work that needs to be done but there is focus on riparian habitats now.
- vii. Jason Spadaro commented that forestry wants to be a part of the solution and also keep their businesses afloat and also see many other things causing impact and want to see everyone do their part. Also, Jason Spadaro expressed that voluntary and incentive programs have a more receptive pathway than regulatory and that we should find a way to make them more effective.
- viii. Commissioner Dean commented that we have spent a lot of money on recovery and that we need to do a deeper analysis of what is working to leverage efforts.
- ix. Peter Dykstra clarified that what we have heard is that what has been done is not working to get to the desired outcome and not that individual salmon recovery investments are not good projects.
- x. Chairman Peters commented that many in the group talk at different tables on different issues and that we need to work together and stay focused on riparian habitat in this roundtable effort.
- xi. Daryl Williams commented that the situation is getting worse despite voluntary efforts, we are not getting enough done to make a difference, and it will take a huge increase in funding and landowner participation.
- xii. Jay Gordon commented that funding efforts last session were successful, there are voluntary programs with backups in projects waiting for funding, and the group should coordinate and make recommendations to Senator Rolfes.

- c. Peter Dykstra asked the group, focusing on funding, to provide thoughts on the programs that the group would want more funding for and that the regulatory programs conversation is important and also needs to continue.
 - i. Carl Schroeder commented regarding coordinating funding with efforts to address downstream fish barriers and to focus dollars on areas where we can build on success to achieve real outcomes. Also that, for cities, it is hard to see where there are skyscrapers how we can achieve riparian improvement.
 - ii. David Herrera shared concern that voluntary programs all have different standards and that the approach relies on random acts of kindness that we hope will all come together for an outcome. Also, that there would be support for voluntary programs that would lead landowners to implement buffers with the objective of meeting a riparian standard.
 - iii. Peter Dykstra noted there are a number of voluntary programs provided in the technical analysis preliminary report.
 - iv. Paul Jewell supported Carl Schroeder's comments and commented that there would also be support for better coordination and collaboration with tribes and others on where funding should go. Also, that the Voluntary Stewardship Program (VSP) was only provided funding needed to implement on-farm practices under the program last year and that the funding provided last year is not enough for voluntary programs.
 - v. Chairman Johnstone expressed support to getting sufficient funding for VSP and other voluntary programs including for engagement and monitoring.
 - vi. Billy Plauché observed that some are saying that the programs are underfunded and that some are saying no amount of funding is enough to get to the goal.
 - vii. David Herrera commented that the voluntary programs could not be enough even if they are fully funded, so what do we want to achieve? Also, that is one of the reasons the riparian standard is important.
 - viii. Daryl Williams commented that that the programs have different standards, and that we need higher minimum standards to get to where we need to be. Also, that CREP payments are still less than a landowner would get by farming their property and mentioned an effort in Skagit to see what would be needed to get landowners to do this.
 - ix. Ron Wesen asked a question regarding whether in Skagit where there is a dike if there is also riparian area there and that he hears that a buffer would need to be there and high enough to cover the dikes.
 - x. David Herrera commented that we should dive into those details and use this process to work out these kinds of questions.
 - xi. Laura Blackmore commented that the Salmon Recovery Funding (SRF) Board adopted some language incorporating SPTH₂₀₀ into their standards already.

- d. Billy Plauché asked the group to consider state programs and whether prioritization is possible to get to outcomes faster considering the current “spread the peanut butter” approach.
 - i. Daryl Williams commented that there has been a policy of “no watershed left behind” and it is challenging to prioritize as all tribes are in critical need to maintain lifeways.
 - ii. David Herrera commented that if there was a riparian standard everyone adopted then it would be a point to revisit how salmon recovery dollars are spent and prioritization could be done.
 - iii. Peter Dykstra asked the group whether, considering voluntary programs, is the standard a way to incentivize participation or are there issues purely with not enough dollars for projects that are lined up.
 - iv. Commissioner McCart commented that farms, like skyscrapers, have value and we need to be flexible in meeting standards and supported having a suite of standards people can use. Also, that funding should be focused to get more done and, if that means more money needs to go to coastal watersheds that may be okay, but it doesn’t mean we leave the East side out.
 - v. Mark Streuli shared hopes we can get adequate funding for voluntary programs and that there are people who want to do the right thing but there is not money to do it.
 - vi. Jay Gordon commented that Conservation Districts need a toolbox of different ways to get landowners to participate and that, if there is a standard, we are not going to make it and there are other ways to get to the outcome.
 - vii. Chairman Johnstone emphasized that we are out of time on the issue and, while there has been a lot of work done, we need to do more and SPTH₂₀₀ is an important part of what needs to be done.
- e. Billy Plauché noted that there may be agreement that SPTH₂₀₀ may not work everywhere but that it is the standard we should aim for.
 - i. Chairman Peters commented with appreciation for everyone coming to the table and expressed interest in using WDFW’s mapping to get into the details in different places and make a plan.
 - ii. Jeff Davis responded that WDFW is willing to assist.
 - iii. Jason Spadaro commented that the data should guide the group’s decisions and may help show where there is flexibility to get to outcomes and success.
 - iv. Vice Chairman Wilbur commented that Ecology has identified over 2,200 impaired streams and the group should look at that data.
 - v. David Herrera commented that there are 32 watersheds where we need to dig into these details and that we don’t need to reinvent the wheel.
 - vi. Daryl Williams emphasized the need to move quickly as time is running out before salmon species go extinct.

V. Wrap up

- a. Peter Dykstra thanked participants and provided that the group can build on the idea to look deeper into data and a longer-term framework for this

conversation in the coming meetings. Peter asked participants to look at the proviso and to consider ideas for recommendations to meet its elements. Peter provided that the second roundtable would either be Nov. 7 or 8 and that we would develop and share notes from the first roundtable with the folks we interviewed.

- i. Maintaining transparency and reporting out from this Roundtable to others
- ii. Second Roundtable focus: Diving deeper into Riparian Habitat Improvement Policy Changes and Spending Priorities
- iii. Establishing date for Second and Third Roundtable

Appendix C | Second Roundtable Executive Summary

Monday, Nov. 7; 12:00-4 p.m.

Nisqually Indian Tribe Health and Wellness Center
4840 Journey St SE
Olympia, WA 98513

This document provides a meeting agenda and executive summary from the second of three riparian roundtable discussions facilitated by Plauché & Carr in its work to convene a facilitated process to identify and develop recommendations on proposed changes in policy and spending priorities to improve riparian habitat to ensure salmon and steelhead recovery, as authorized in the budget proviso. The executive summary intends to summarize comments from roundtable participants and may paraphrase statements and other points of discussion.

Agenda

- I. Welcome from Chairman Frank**
- II. Introductions**
- III. Meeting overview**
 - a. Review of first roundtable meeting
 - b. Meeting goals and objectives of second roundtable meeting
 - c. Overview of read ahead materials
- IV. Discussion Item 1: Buffers**
 - a. **Relevant required recommendations from proviso:**
 - i. Ideas for improvements to land use planning and development that ensure the protection and recovery of salmon;*
 - ii. Standards to protect areas adjacent to streams and rivers;*
 - iii. Standards to restore areas adjacent to streams and rivers;*
- V. Discussion Item 2: Voluntary Programs**
 - a. **Relevant required recommendations from proviso:**
 - i. Financial incentives for landowners to protect and restore streamside habitat;*
 - ii. Recommendations for additional changes when voluntary measures and financial incentives do not achieve streamside protection and restoration.*
- VI. Wrap up**
 - a. Follow-up items
 - b. Third Roundtable focus: Review of draft recommendations (to be circulated in advance of meeting)

Executive Summary

I. Welcome from Chairman Frank

- a. Chairman Frank welcomed the group to the Nisqually Health Center.

II. Introductions

III. Meeting overview

- a. Review of first roundtable meeting
- b. Meeting goals and objectives of second roundtable meeting
- c. Overview of read ahead materials
 - i. Billy Plauché and Peter Dykstra provided an overview of the agenda, discussed readahead materials, and provided the meeting goal and that these conversations will inform recommendations under the budget proviso. Participants were asked to respond with the challenges for them with regard to the two substantive agenda items.

IV. Discussion Item 1: Buffers

- a. **Relevant required recommendations from proviso:**
 - i. Ideas for improvements to land use planning and development that ensure the protection and recovery of salmon;
 - ii. Standards to protect areas adjacent to streams and rivers;
 - iii. Standards to restore areas adjacent to streams and rivers;
- b. Paul Jewell noted that local governments regulate for no net loss / protection and commented that local government should have a voice in the discussion on standards.
- c. Commissioner McCart shared an example of how differing East and West side environments should be considered when discussing standards.
- d. Mark Streuli commented that we should leverage federal funding and use mapping to find where to make best use of funds.
- e. Commissioner Dean shared the challenges for local government in being responsible for competing interests, and that riparian areas and prime agricultural areas both have value. She noted that what might be necessary to get ecological functions in one watershed may not be the same in another.
- f. Diana Carlen noted that mapping is essential to understand buffer standards.
- g. Ben Adams commented that buffer standards need to make sense and provide real benefits.
- h. Daryl Williams shared that what farmers are willing to do for restoration is a mixed bag, and that we need buffers to reduce water temperatures at pace and scale to restore water temperatures for fish. He also provided an example from King County of a working collaboration on riparian restoration.
- i. Rosella Mosby shared two examples of county agricultural committees. She also asked Daryl Williams if farmers are willing to engage or if there is pushback.
 - i. Daryl Williams responded that there is some pushback but that, overall, farmers are willing to work with them.

- ii. Rosella Mosby commented that we should move forward in a way that we do not harm food production for people. She also noted that there are some bad apples in farming, as in every industry, but that for her farm they work with Conservation Districts because they care about the long term.
- j. Peter Dykstra asked how big and real the tension is in agriculture and how voluntary or other mechanisms weigh on their choices right now.
- k. Jon Devaney noted that buffers are a big issue for farmers working on small acreage and that buffers may make it more economical to sell to developers.
- l. Ron Wesen shared that the county has made efforts to restrict development in areas where it would compete with agriculture.
- m. Chairman Johnstone emphasized that salmon are food and commented that we need to come together on a pathway and to get the funding needed.
- n. Peter Dykstra asked for participants to discuss restoration and legal challenges.
- o. David Herrera emphasized that the tribes want to hear others' challenges and that understanding those challenges is fundamental to getting to solutions. He noted that we can write new laws if the current ones aren't adequate. He also commented that all downstream uses, agriculture, urban, and rural areas are part of this discussion and that each has things they can do to make a difference.
- p. Commissioner McCart noted that a recommendation coming out of this process is that the conversations continue. He further noted that the ability of local government to regulate something that already exists is limited by the constitution.
- q. Darcy Nonemacher shared the concern that it will take a long time to address water temperatures even if we start now.
- r. Daryl Williams agreed that we need to look at all downstream uses, not just agriculture but also cities and residential areas. He also commented that SPTH₂₀₀ may not work everywhere and that there are many factors that would go into variances.
- s. Carl Schroeder noted that local government doesn't have the resources necessary to financially compensate beyond what is required and that there are issues beyond existing uses. He commented that it seemed like addressing water temperatures and prioritization are key.
- t. Chairman Johnstone commented that Eastern Washington tribes should be included in these discussions.
 - i. Peter Dykstra responded that folks from Eastern Washington were unable to get over the pass and that we hope to have them at the next discussion.
- u. Commissioner Dean shared the burden land use lawsuits have on local government and the need for a legal back stop to address the issue.
- v. Ron Wesen commented that a better approach with landowners is to focus on functions.
- w. Chairman Frank commented that we need to come together to build common ground and that it will take time and patience.

- x. Council Member Bowechop emphasized challenges in communicating tribal cultural and spiritual values and that the discussion should avoid property rights.
- y. Paul Jewell commented that changing laws and constitutions is very hard to do and that those laws guide the principles of and are embedded in what we do. He noted that there are inequities between urban and rural areas and that addressing salmon restoration is a shared responsibility. Paul Jewell also observed that prioritizing funding did not have support across tribes and asked if there is a way to maximize progress.
- z. Daryl Williams shared a preference to work together instead of going to court and context on the tribes' agreement to ensure no watershed is left behind and to recognize all tribes' rights are important.
- aa. Council Member Bizyayeva commented that more roundtable meetings would be needed for the longer-term discussion, but that there are things in the short term that can be done and that we can come together to support, even without legislation.
- bb. Council Member Bowechop shared an example from the Obama Administration and Makah Tribe in addressing issues and shared context in the trust responsibilities to tribal membership to uphold their treaties.
- cc. Peter Dykstra asked participants, regarding SPTH₂₀₀, as a regulatory backstop or a goal, how can we address challenges through recommendations.
- dd. Commissioner McCart commented that it is important for farmers to see that things are working for their neighbors and that monitoring is important.
- ee. Council Member Bizyayeva shared experience with landowner willingness to participate in voluntary programs.

V. Discussion Item 2: Voluntary Programs

- a. **Relevant required recommendations from proviso:**
 - i. Financial incentives for landowners to protect and restore streamside habitat;
 - ii. Recommendations for additional changes when voluntary measures and financial incentives do not achieve streamside protection and restoration.
- b. Billy Plauché noted that a draft set of recommendations from these conversations will be circulated prior to the third roundtable on the 28th. The sole agenda item for the third roundtable will be to go over those recommendations. He asked participants to address what enhancements can be made to the programs and to discuss program monitoring and funding needs.
- c. Jay Gordon emphasized the need to allow flexibility and a local process to account for local knowledge and unique circumstances in watersheds.
- d. Mark Streuli commented that it will take a lot more funding for voluntary programs and support from the group coming together to make it happen.
- e. Billy Plauché asked about challenges in sharing monitoring information.
 - i. Mark Streuli shared that this is an ongoing issue and that farmers are concerned about competition.

- ii. Ron Shultz noted that federal programs like CREP cannot document or disclose certain information.
- iii. Daryl Williams commented that tribes would like to see which farms are in a program and to be able to monitor and know what has been planted.
- iv. Ben Adams added that database payments by farmer can be located.
- v. Ron Shultz added that there are different views of effectiveness, whether that is riparian condition overall, number of landowners signed up, etc.
- vi. Commissioner McCart noted that the Voluntary Stewardship Program has monitoring and reporting and that effectiveness standards vary by program.
- vii. Billy Plauché shared an example from the Skagit County Conservation District which has created a policy to incentivize landowners to get to SPTH₂₀₀.
- viii. Darcy Nonemacher commented that it is not enough to know which trees are planted but to be monitoring trees over time.
- ix. David Herrera added that it makes sense to have one package of standards instead of many various standards.
- x. Jon Devaney commented that many tools are needed in the toolbox and discussed eligibility for Inflation Reduction Act funds.
- xi. David Herrera provided an example of a Chinook recovery program on the Skokomish River and that, for each watershed, there could be a roadmap for recovery.
- f. Ben Adams asked if there is a system to inform and educate landowners about incentive programs.
 - i. Ron Shultz responded that there could be improvement here in terms of communicating what we are trying to achieve and then provide the programs that can be used to get there.
- g. Vice Chair Greninger asked about property tax incentives.
 - i. Paul Jewell noted that there are challenges with that approach for local governments. Counties only have funding from property, sales, and fees and reducing one creates financial challenges.
- h. Jason Spadaro shared experience with the forestry industry that we need local based solutions and flexibility and that applies for farmers as well.
- i. Daryl Williams shared that, without buffers, we cannot get there.
- j. Fran Wilshusen thanked Commissioner Dean for bringing up ecological services and provided that the State of the Watersheds documents our current conditions and that we are out of time and need to think clearer and bigger.
- k. Darcy Nonemacher commented that there is a meaningful opportunity for carbon with salmon and riparian corridors.

VI. Wrap up

- a. Follow-up items
- b. Third Roundtable focus: Review of draft recommendations (to be circulated in advance of meeting)

- i. Billy Plauché concluded, noting that the third roundtable will be Nov. 28 and draft recommendations will be sent out prior to that meeting.

Appendix D | Third Roundtable Executive Summary

Friday, Dec. 9; 8:30 am-12:30 p.m.

Washington State Farm Bureau
Harvest Room
975 Carpenter Rd NE
Lacey, WA 98516

This document provides a meeting agenda, the draft roundtable recommendations discussed at the meeting, and executive summary from the third and final riparian roundtable discussion facilitated by Plauché & Carr in its work to convene a facilitated process to identify and develop recommendations on proposed changes in policy and spending priorities to improve riparian habitat to ensure salmon and steelhead recovery, as authorized in the budget proviso. The executive summary intends to summarize comments from roundtable participants and may paraphrase statements and other points of discussion.

Agenda

- I. **Welcome**
- II. **Roundtable Recommendations**
- III. **Wrap Up**

Draft Recommendations

The following draft recommendations were provided to roundtable invitees in advance of the third roundtable meeting for discussion and were revised after the third roundtable. Final recommendations are provided in Section V of this report.

Draft recommendations from facilitated process, in accordance with the proviso requirements (note: enumerated items in bold italics are taken from the proviso)

(i) Ideas for improvements to land use planning and development that ensure the protection and recovery of salmon;

Recommendation 1: Ensure that local land use regulations apply a science-based standard that ensures improvement of riparian habitat for salmon and steelhead recovery to all new subdivisions and other proposals for new development or redevelopment.

- 1.a. Continue efforts currently underway to provide guidance to local jurisdictions under the Growth Management Act (“GMA”) (Critical Areas Ordinances) and Shoreline Management Act (“SMA”) (Shoreline Master Programs) that the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Riparian Ecosystems, Volume 2: Management Recommendations (2020) (“WDFW Riparian Guidance (2020)”) establishes the default standards for delineating, evaluating, planning and managing riparian ecosystems.
- 1.b. Consider setting a target date for incorporation of WDFW Riparian Guidance (2020) into local GMA Critical Areas Ordinances and Shoreline Master Programs.

- 1.c. For riparian-related land use regulations, such as the SMA and GMA (Critical Areas Ordinances), conduct an evaluation specific to the compliance and enforcement process, as recommended in Recommendation # 4 of the Analysis of the Effectiveness of State Programs on Riparian Habitat Protection and Restoration (2022) (“Effectiveness Analysis Recommendations”).

Recommendation 2: Provide funding to enhance Regional Salmon Recovery Plans and Lead Entity Strategies or to create a new watershed-based planning process, to ensure protection and restoration efforts are targeted to optimize and expedite improving riparian habitat for salmon and steelhead recovery.

- 2.a. Develop factors through a facilitated process with state and local agencies, tribal governments, and stakeholders for prioritizing riparian protection and restoration efforts within watersheds. Existing watershed level efforts that could provide useful examples in this process include:
 - King Conservation District Snoqualmie/Skykomish River Watershed Planning Effort
 - SCC Tucannon River efforts
 - Ecology’s Office of Chehalis Basin – Aquatic Species Restoration Plan
 - DNR’s Snohomish Watershed Resilience Action Plan
 - Yakima Basin Integrated Plan
- 2.b. Coordinate with WDFW's High Resolution Change Detection mapping work to better understand current riparian conditions in watersheds.
- 2.c. Work with local jurisdictions to incorporate the results of these watershed planning efforts into local land use plans and development regulations.
- 2.d. Convene a facilitated process to develop riparian restoration strategies that can attract private investment in improving and protecting riparian habitat for salmon and steelhead recovery, including the use of riparian restoration/mitigation banks, use of performance-based contracting and other public-private partnership strategies, and other methods of purchasing improvements in riparian habitat for salmon and steelhead recovery.

(ii) Standards to protect areas adjacent to streams and rivers;

Recommendation 3: For protection of existing, functioning riparian corridors, the recommendations in WDFW Riparian Guidance 2020 should be implemented.

(iii) Standards to restore areas adjacent to streams and rivers;

Recommendation 4: To improve riparian habitat for salmon and steelhead recovery in riparian corridors that are not fully functioning currently, the recommendations in WDFW Riparian Guidance 2020 should be implemented where feasible.

- 4.a. Recognizing that it may not be feasible to meet that standard on all lands, and because restoration to standards less than those recommended in WDFW Riparian Guidance 2020 can still provide significant improvements to riparian habitat,

improving riparian habitat to less than the standards described in WDFW Riparian Guidance 2020 is appropriate where:

- The presence of a structure, a property line, infrastructure (*e.g.*, roads, railways, pipelines, powerlines or other utilities), or topography impedes the ability to meet or achieve the standards described in WDFW Riparian Guidance 2020.
 - The property in question is a small parcel in which the riparian management zone would cover more than 50 percent of the parcel.
 - A restoration project proponent can:
 - Demonstrate that the restoration project achieves the goal of restoring riparian function (*i.e.* continuity, shade, pollution removal, contributions of detrital nutrients, recruitment of large woody materials and bank stability); and
 - Provide evidence of support for the project from the following:
 - A natural resource management tribal biologist working for a tribe whose usual and accustomed areas include the project location; and
 - A Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife habitat biologist.
- 4.b. Convene a facilitated process to further refine appropriate instances where strategies for improving riparian habitat to standards different than the standards in WDFW Riparian Guidance 2020 may be appropriate to make continued progress on salmon and steelhead recovery.

(iv) Financial incentives for landowners to protect and restore streamside habitat;

Recommendation 5: Convene a facilitated process among state and local agencies, tribal governments and stakeholders to create a new incentive program that is focused on improving riparian habitat for salmon and steelhead recovery and that applies to all riparian areas of the state, including areas in agricultural production, in rural residential use, and in urban use.

- 5.a. In creating a new incentive program, the facilitated process should consider the following:
- Set riparian protection goals consistent with the WDFW Riparian Guidance (2020), while recognizing exceptions where the standards in that Guidance aren't achievable.
 - Where the standards in the WDFW Riparian Guidance (2020) are not achievable, offer flexibility to increase eligibility and interest while maintaining a rigorous science-based review process to ensure riparian habitat functionality goals are met.
 - Expand eligibility to include both fish-bearing and non-fish bearing waters, in accordance with WDFW Riparian Guidance (2020).
 - Expand eligibility to include projects to protect or improve riparian habitat regardless of whether existing regulatory protections apply.

- Ensure sufficient and stable funding is provided to encourage significant program participation, including support of a substantial outreach and education program on the importance of riparian habitat improvement and protection.
- Provide landowners with assistance on aggregating projects to provide more riparian habitat improvement and protection.
- Provide a simplified application and administration to ensure robust participation, including:
 - Sufficient funding for landowner outreach and technical assistance.
 - Create a single, simplified application process that is readily usable by all potential funding recipients.
 - House the program in a single state lead agency, while ensuring collaboration with all state agencies in program administration.
- Evaluate and, if appropriate, authorize the use of pay-for-success contracting and other private investment approaches to riparian habitat improvement projects.
- Enhance and improve tribal roles in project prioritization, funding and implementation.
- Adopt specific goals at the program level with respect to quantity and quality of riparian habitats restored or protected at 5, 10, 15 and 20-year increments.

Recommendation 6: For the next two years, while the new program discussed in Recommendation 5, above, is being developed, significantly increase funding of existing voluntary incentive programs, including funding to address existing backlogs and waitlists for programs such as the Forestry Riparian Easement Program, Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) and Natural Resource Investments Program. Ensure that programs receiving increased funding address the following:

- Set riparian protection goals consistent with the WDFW Riparian Guidance (2020), while recognizing exceptions where the standards in that Guidance are not achievable.
- Encourage the use of programs like the Commodity Buffers Program in more Conservation Districts.
- Provide incentives so that the compensation paid matches market rental rates and commodity pricing.
- Evaluate and, if appropriate, authorize the use of pay-for-success contracting and private investment approaches to riparian habitat improvement projects.

Recommendation 7: Engage with federal agencies and Washington's federal legislative delegation to work toward modifications to federal voluntary incentive programs, including, without limitation, the CREP program, to set riparian protection goals consistent with the WDFW Riparian Guidance (2020), while recognizing exceptions where the standards in that Guidance are not achievable.

Recommendation 8: Establish and fund a robust monitoring program consistent with Recommendation #1 in the Effectiveness Analysis Recommendations that allows state and local government agencies, tribal authorities, and interested stakeholders to evaluate the effectiveness of the restoration efforts undertaken pursuant to these new or enhanced voluntary incentive programs to ensure the programs result in actual, tangible improvements in riparian habitat.

- 8.a. In addition to the items discussed in Recommendation #1 of the Effectiveness Analysis Recommendations, the monitoring program should include:
- Data from in-stream monitoring of water quality parameters, including instream flow rate, temperature and nutrients, downstream of the riparian areas enhanced by the program sufficient to document any change in those parameters as a result of the enhancement efforts funded under the program, taking into account changes in baseline conditions as a result of climate change.

(v) Recommendations to improve salmon recovery program coordination among state agencies; and

Recommendation 9: Consider legislation that would designate, or create, a single, cabinet level agency to act as the lead agency for salmon recovery with authority across agencies to ensure agency actions are consistent with the State's overall salmon recovery efforts, as articulated in the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Plan and Chinook Salmon Implementation Strategy.¹

Recommendation 10: State programs should prioritize projects within watersheds based on the results of the enhanced watershed planning effort in Recommendation 2, above.

Recommendation 11: Convene a facilitated process to develop factors for sequencing riparian habitat protection and improvement among recovery goals, types of projects and watersheds to maximize benefits to salmon populations.

Recommendation 12: Implement the interagency coordination recommendations included in Recommendations 2, 4, 5, 6 and 8, above and Recommendation 13, below.

(vi) Recommendations for additional changes when voluntary measures and financial incentives do not achieve streamside protection and restoration.

Recommendation 13: Convene a facilitated process among state agencies, tribal governments, local governments, and stakeholders to develop a regulatory or compensation strategy that applies to existing land uses/activities if the enhanced voluntary programs discussed in Recommendations 5 and 6 do not achieve the concrete targets established under that recommendation.

- 12.a. In creating a regulatory or compensation strategy that applies to existing uses/activities, the facilitated process should consider the following:
- The priority areas identified in Recommendation 2. Within those priority areas, initial focus should be on areas in public ownership.
 - Restoration standards should ensure improvement of riparian habitat for salmon and steelhead recovery.
 - Where restoration of fully functioning riparian habitat is not feasible, adequate mitigation should be required. o Consider simplified mitigation

¹ Louisiana's Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority could provide a useful example of a single overall lead agency recovery/restoration organization.

strategies such as mitigation banks, payment for ecosystem services, and impact fees to achieve watershed scale restoration.

(vii) General Recommendation

Recommendation 14: Provide funding to establish and implement the facilitated process discussed in these recommendations to address the following items:

- Watershed planning and prioritization (Recommendation 2a)
- Private investment strategies (Recommendation 2d)
- Exceptions to WDFW Riparian Guidance (2020) standards (Recommendation 4b)
- Creating a new voluntary incentive program (Recommendation 5)
- Watershed sequencing factors (Recommendation 11)
- Regulatory backstop (Recommendation 13)

Executive Summary

I. Welcome

- a. Rosella Mosby and Chairman Peters welcomed the group to the Washington Farm Bureau office.
- b. Peter Dykstra noted that the sole agenda item was to work through all of the draft roundtable recommendations, starting with some context behind the recommendations and getting feedback on how they are structured. Peter Dykstra noted that the Swinomish Tribe and Yakama Nation were unable to attend but had provided comments and asked that we share those in the conversation.

II. Roundtable Recommendations

- a. Billy Plauché conveyed that the draft roundtable recommendations were structured to be responsive to the budget proviso, which resulted in losing some of the context and caused some confusion for participants. He also noted that the two main areas of disagreement for the group remain the WDFW Riparian Guidance and voluntary versus regulatory programs. For areas with functioning riparian buffers, the recommendations focus on protecting those buffers. For areas where existing uses are occurring in the riparian corridor, the WDFW Riparian Guidance is recognized in the recommendations as a goal to aim for, but the recommendations allow variation where that does not work. For voluntary programs, the recommendations address sufficient funding as well as adjustments to those programs to aim for the WDFW Riparian Guidance while recognizing that guidance cannot be met everywhere and providing for science-based exceptions. Also, the recommendations provide for robust monitoring in order to assess how voluntary programs are succeeding. The recommendations provide for addressing a regulatory approach over the next 12 months that would kick in if the voluntary programs do not reach the goals. Billy Plauché added that participant feedback would be used to tweak the draft recommendations and that final recommendations will be included in a final

report to the state Legislature. The report will synopsise the roundtable process and articulate the recommendations, including the level of support of different participants for recommendations.

- i. Chairman Peters commented that it isn't a voluntary versus regulatory approach, but that we need to fund voluntary programs, including monitoring and benchmarks, and that regulatory is needed further down if voluntary programs are not getting there.
- ii. Paul Jewell commented that it was not clear in the draft recommendations how the Voluntary Stewardship Program (VSP) is implicated and that urban solutions need to be a part of the recommendations.
- iii. Derek Sandison supported the idea that urban lands and all lands need to be a part of the solution, and that there could be a pathway to create a fund that contributes to riparian projects and buffers but that this is an all-watersheds problem.
- iv. Mark Streuli expressed appreciation for Chairman Peters' comments and added that they were surprised not to see VSP mentioned in the draft recommendations. Mark Streuli shared that he can appreciate why we would want a mix of voluntary and regulatory approaches and that proper funding is important to help bring farmers to the effort. He added that there are many factors impacting salmon recovery.
- v. Peter Dykstra explained that there was no intention to leave out VSP in the draft recommendations and that it was considered as part of voluntary programs and that it didn't need to be called out.
- vi. Diana Carlen expressed appreciation for the roundtables and for those who had participated, and that it was good to hear that VSP was not intentionally left out of the draft recommendations. Diana added that they want to see if we can get to where we want to be if we fully fund the voluntary programs. Diana invited the tribes to visit some farms.
- vii. Ron Wesen asked if the draft recommendations were in a particular order or if they were prioritized.
 1. Peter Dykstra responded that the draft recommendations are not prioritized but are in numerical order as responsive to the budget proviso questions. Also, some of the recommendations answer more than one of the questions in the proviso.
- viii. Commissioner McCart suggested that the recommendations not be numbered, only bulleted and to note that these are not in order of priority.
 1. Jon Devaney suggested ordering the recommendations in a cohesive plan as Billy Plauché had explained them.
 2. Vice Chair Greninger agreed with Jon Devaney's suggestion.
 3. Peter Dykstra asked if there was consensus from the group that the recommendations should be structured that way. [Group agreed].
- ix. David Herrera commented that the proviso came out of a process with a lot of pushback from people who felt it was unfair they didn't get to provide input and that the proviso was intended to provide the opportunity for that. David Herrera added that, for this reason, he is less concerned about the specific tasks in the proviso and more that the group is here and talking through it and to get a riparian standard in place to protect Treaty and state

resources. Also, that he views this as a conversation on how we are going to get that standard and asked for others to speak to the impacts so that the group can understand and address them. David Herrera shared the TFW and Forest Habitat Conservation Plan and addressing impacts to small forestland owners through the Forestry Riparian Easement Program and Small Forestland Owner Office at the Department of Natural Resources as an example of this sort of collaboration.

b. Recommendation 1

- i. Peter Dykstra asked the group to start with Recommendation 1 and added that the recommendations would be reordered later.
- ii. Commissioner McCart commented that the recommendation wording should be done carefully and noted there are sensitivities around what “guidance” means in the context of local jurisdictions. The Commissioner commented that, under the Growth Management Act, local governments need flexibility to be able to use best available science, whether that includes or is in addition to agency guidance. The Commissioner added that he is good with the approach of using voluntary programs with a regulatory backstop. The Commissioner also expressed concern about potential takings issues with a regulatory backstop and that the legislature needs to address and take responsibility for takings issues that could be created. The Commissioner added that it takes 100 or more years to get the full benefits of planting a tree today and to be sure that targets are realistic and achievable.
- iii. Diana Carlen commented that the Growth Management Act and Shoreline Management Act already require that best available science be incorporated and, so, is not sure what the recommendation is suggesting. Diana added that if it is suggesting that the WDFW standard is best available science, that is not something the group had discussed and would not feel comfortable saying that the standard must be incorporated.
- iv. Billy Plauché added that this recommendation should be read with the technical effectiveness analysis and that there is work going on to implement this already. He pointed out that the term “best available science” is not used in the recommendation, and it is not the facilitators’ charge to adjudicate what that is.
- v. Paul Jewell noted there is an ongoing conversation on the no net loss standard, and that counties have used best available science in their critical areas ordinances. Paul Jewell added that Recommendation 1 focuses on local government new development and redevelopment and that is good because this is how local government can participate. He suggested combining Recommendations 1 and 4 and commented that local governments would be assisted greatly by a SEPA or GMA appeal exemption.
- vi. Commissioner Dean expressed appreciation for the recognition that the local level is where this is probably implemented and that it is important to call out that local jurisdictions need funding to implement.

- vii. David Herrera commented that he could understand the legal challenges with implementing it and that he was open to looking at any changes for GMA and SMA to move forward.
- viii. Ron Wesen clarified that, from a local perspective, protecting what is there has been done for 20 years and that someone else does not need to do that.
- ix. Paul Jewell voiced support for 1c (an evaluation similar to effectiveness analysis Recommendation #4) and that monitoring and data programs are something they are trying to get support for and agree with.
- x. Heather Bartlett provided that Department of Ecology is hiring staff to be able to do that work and that it hasn't been done in the past.
- xi. Jay Gordon expressed concern for the deference to the WDFW Riparian Guidance in Recommendation 1 and 7 and that the guidance is opinion and not science.
- xii. Billy Plauché clarified that the recommendations recognize the WDFW Riparian Guidance as a goal to aim for, but that it is not practical or feasible everywhere, and provide a way to get to the benefits without using the WDFW standard where achieving that standard isn't feasible.
- xiii. Peter Dykstra added that the effort is not to analyze or opine on all the science, but that we are trying to set a goal of fully functioning riparian ecosystems.
- xiv. Jon Devaney commented that, rather than a broader goal, this recommendation feels more like it is tied to regulation.
- xv. Nick Streuli added that the Governor's Office perspective is that we rely heavily on the science from our agencies to do that, and that the issue is then how you take the science and commitment and make it happen on the ground.
- xvi. David Herrera commented that Recommendation 1 is about protecting what we have and stopping the bleeding and gets at new uses and activities and redevelopment, and that restoration is a separate item. David provided that the question is what do local governments need to protect existing areas?
 1. Paul Jewell responded that we can agree that SPTH₂₀₀ could be used to protect/maintain currently existing fully functioning riparian areas and that considering an exemption for local governments from appeals when they adopt that standard would help.

[Break 10:00 – 10:10am]

- a. Chairman Frank welcomed the group back, reminded all that people have been working on these issues for over 40 years and that we must take this opportunity to work together and move forward. He shared that there is interest in visiting farms and invited others to visit Nisqually, as well.
- c. Recommendation 2
 - i. Commissioner McCart commented that we should try to work with existing watershed groups and not create new ones if we don't need to.

1. Peter Dykstra clarified that is the intent and to create ones only where one is not in existence.
 2. Megan Duffy supported the idea as a way to avoid more complexity.
 - ii. Daryl Williams agreed and added that salmon recovery groups are looking at the watershed level.
 - iii. Laura Blackmore added support for the recommendation and provided that the local watershed groups are the places this should happen and to provide as much direction to them as possible.
 - iv. Paul Jewell voiced support for 2d, in particular.
 1. Vice Chair Greninger agreed and suggested providing startup funding.
 - v. David Herrera and Chairman Peters added that many of the edits they provided were to make statements in the draft recommendations more declarative, directive, and action oriented to make progress quickly.
 1. Peter Dykstra responded that there is a balance between areas of the recommendations that need additional time to work out and others where more action-oriented language could be added.
- d. Recommendation 3
- i. The group provided support for Recommendation 3 and agreed that existing functioning riparian areas should be protected and not degraded.
- e. Recommendation 4
- i. Billy Plauché clarified that language in the recommendation was adapted from Recreation and Conservation Office policy but changes were made to include both WDFW and tribal biologists, recognizing they are co-managers.
 - ii. Heather Bartlett added that the agencies should think about how to make it easier for landowners and restoration projects.
 - iii. Commissioner McCart expressed concern that landowners will refuse to work with any form of government.
 1. Jim Peters commented that is the reason a regulatory backstop is needed.
 2. Jason Spadaro commented that forestry addresses this concern through use of a team that may be seen as more balanced, addresses perception of consolidated power in decision-making.
 - iv. Peter Dykstra relayed a comment from the Swinomish Tribe about a process to establish a regulatory backstop so that if riparian planting activities do not achieve a specific goal in a certain time period, that the regulatory program would take effect.
 - v. Ron Shultz commented that we should communicate the goal and outcome with landowners, not that “you must do X.”
 - vi. Paul Jewell commented that local government needs support and financial resources for code enforcement.

- vii. Daryl Williams commented that it would be helpful to have a single application process.
- f. Recommendation 5
 - i. Peter Dykstra explained that this is a new program in addition to, not to replace, existing programs.
 - ii. Commissioner McCart commented that it is important that there be a nexus to salmon recovery and to avoid including projects that don't get to the goal.
 - iii. Billy Plauché relayed the Swinomish Tribe provided that we should include for prioritization waters that are impaired based on temperature on Ecology's 303(d) list.
 - iv. Ron Shultz expressed concern in creating a new program.
 - 1. Peter Dykstra explained that some do not want a program they have been working on for years to be changed, others say programs do not coordinate well, and there was not broad enough support to morph existing programs and added that there is a recommendation to fund existing programs now to get as far as possible quickly.
 - v. Daryl Williams commented that existing programs have their own limitations.
 - vi. Nick Streuli commented that, from the state perspective, it is outcome-driven and that the purpose is to maximize effectiveness.
 - vii. Peter Dykstra noted it would also cause a delay to need to retool the dozens of existing programs when we can work to fund them to make progress now.
 - viii. Megan Duffy provided that riparian protection is not always salmon recovery, and it would be hard to retool the required purpose or directive of existing programs.
 - ix. Jason Spadaro expressed concern that creating a new program could take away from providing funding to existing ones that need it.
 - x. Mark Streuli commented that there are many factors impacting salmon and that the voluntary programs were identified as making significant progress and are a part of the success.
- g. Recommendation 6
 - i. The group did not share additional thoughts and comments on Recommendation 6.
- h. Recommendation 7
 - i. Peter Dykstra shared that this recommendation came out of roundtable support to leverage federal programs as much as possible.
 - ii. Ruth Musgrave noted that we are working with the federal government to use what they have to support our efforts but that modifications can take time at the federal level.
 - iii. Eric Neatherlin noted that we need federal investments to support our state programs.

- iv. Jim Peters shared experiences of working at the federal level with a diverse group of interests toward a shared goal and how powerful that could be if the group could come together.
 - v. Chris Pettit commented that there is an opportunity in this recommendation to have a broader conversation and consider the opportunities to leverage federal funding.
- i. Recommendation 8
- i. Laura Blackmore expressed support and recommended including the riparian pathways work on methods.
 - 1. Vice Chair Greninger agreed.
 - ii. Ron Shultz asked what is done with the monitoring.
 - 1. Peter Dykstra responded that the monitoring is tied to the metrics set out in other recommendations and that the monitoring is essential to informing if and when to shift to a regulatory approach.
 - iii. Jason Spadaro expressed concern with water quality as a metric.
 - 1. Billy Plauché responded that the benchmarks are what is most important and that the recommendations have not provided what those benchmarks should be.
- j. Recommendations 9, 10, 11, 12
- i. Laura Blackmore commented that the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office should be empowered to do this and that we do not need a single cabinet-level entity.
 - 1. Megan Duffy and Derek Sandison agreed.
 - ii. Ron Shultz commented that it becomes problematic when you have an agency dictating to other agencies whether what they are doing is consistent with what we need to do.
 - iii. Jon Devaney expressed concern that creating a new agency could take time and detract from progress.
 - iv. Jason Spadaro commented that he would rather see the funding going to work on the ground.
 - v. Jim Peters commented that a state agency needs to coordinate and help focus the work of other agencies.
 - vi. Chairman Peters commented that GSRO is fine but that there is nothing that we can do to hold GSRO accountable if it doesn't meet goals and ensure progress continues.
 - vii. Vice Chair Greninger agreed that creating a new agency should not cause delays.
 - viii. Fran Wilshusen shared concerns on keeping salmon recovery a priority for the agencies long term in Washington.
 - ix. Peter Dykstra noted that we can add language on reporting and accountability as well.
 - x. Commissioner McCart commented to include coordination with local government.
 - xi. Fran Wilshusen commented that we should avoid prioritizing watersheds.

- xii. Daryl Williams noted that watershed plans include all the stakeholders.
- xiii. Billy Plauché clarified that this was an attempt to use sequencing, rather than prioritizing between watersheds since there are challenges there.
- xiv. Fran Wilshusen commented that some plans need to be updated and need funding and that prioritizing between watersheds is a problem for tribes.
 - 1. Megan Duffy noted that RCO submitted a request for funding to update regional plans.

k. Recommendation 13

- i. Chairman Peters voiced agreement with Recommendation 13.
- ii. Fran Wilshusen commented that the tribes want to support voluntary programs but need certainty that progress will be made.
- iii. Jason Spadaro supported that urban lands be added separately in the recommendation.
- iv. Jon Devaney expressed concern about eligibility to use federal funding and regulations.
 - 1. Peter Dykstra responded that this would be considered in future conversation under the recommendations.

l. Recommendation 14

- i. Peter Dykstra stated that Recommendation 14 was to continue the roundtable process and that he and Billy Plauché had heard broad support from the group to do that.
- ii. Jay Gordon expressed support for continuing and broadening the conversation to include other salmon issues that are heavy lifts, such as pinnipeds.
- iii. Chairman Peters commented with support that the roundtable participants should work together on some of these challenging issues, like pinnipeds, ocean acidification and others.
- iv. Chairman Frank supported that the conversation continue, and that work needs to get done so we don't wait another 40 years to make progress.
- v. David Herrera commented that the group should keep focused and work on riparian issues and that there is a lot of ongoing work on other issues.
- vi. Daryl Williams expressed urgency to keep the conversation moving and address a regulatory approach in the next year.
- vii. Derek Sandison supported continuing the conversations as soon as possible to not lose momentum.
- viii. Jason Spadaro expressed support to continuing the conversation with the group over legislative session so that progress isn't lost.

III. **Wrap Up**

- a. Billy Plauché conveyed that the recommendations would be revised and incorporated into a final report to be submitted to the Office of Financial Management in the following week.

- b. Peter Dykstra concluded and offered that himself, Billy Plauché, Diani Taylor, and Amanda Carr are available to help with conversations, however they work out, and if anyone wants to reach out on these items.