

Action Agenda recommended edits Prepared by Doug Peters, NEP Coordinator at Commerce

A1.1 NTA 2: By 2012, The Puget Sound Institute will work with Ecology, Commerce, WDFW and other partners to develop a tool to improve and support spatial landscape data collection, sharing, and analysis to improve the ability of agencies to make land use decisions based on watershed assessments.

p.37, last par. Proposed edits (added underlined words): “These goals and policies encourage compact urban growth patterns, increased density, strategic redevelopment, and resource and rural lands protection.”

(Sentence repeats on top of p.38.)

p.46 fourth blue box has typo – analyzed.

p.47 “At the same time, many salmon-bearing rivers and streams traverse farmland, which often includes results in degraded or removed habitat. In some cases the habitat has been removed entirely from agricultural lands.” ~~degrades or changes the habitat~~

p.50 “The restoration of habitat needed for salmon recovery is generally reflected in the strategies and actions associated with the protection of workings lands as well as the restoration of habitat.”

p.51 The Voluntary Stewardship Program at the Washington State Conservation Commission (WSCC), created in 2011, requires counties across the state to either opt into the program or resume the process of updating their critical areas on agricultural lands under existing GMA processes.

Counties will likely have to both things, but in different areas within their jurisdictions. As written this is not clear. Request Conservation Commission to clarify this item.

In general, most state agency environmental protection incentive programs have been defunded. This is not clear when reading the text.

p.70 “As a public resource, fish are protected by state Forest Practice Rules which require landowners to restructure fish barriers by 2016 in a way that allows unobstructed fish passage. The program provides 75–100 percent of the cost of constructing removing the barrier, with the funding provided varying based on the quality of the habitat, number of salmon and trout species benefiting from the correction, and project cost.”

Is the Family Forest Fish Passage Program (or any of the other listed programs) funded? If not, then the AA should state this to avoid creating false expectations of funding when it is unavailable. It is also noteworthy that this Program only addresses small forestry operations, not agricultural operations.

p.74 Intro Par.: “Floodplains are lush regions that provide food and fresh water.” ~~as well as good agricultural land through soil and habitat formation~~

p.77 last sentence: Major funding sources include Pacific Salmon Recovery Funding ~~from~~ through NOAA, which provides funding for elements necessary to achieve overall salmon recovery, including habitat projects and other...

p.78 second sentence: They will be identified ~~by~~ for the final update.

p.80 Is there a source for this statement? (which has a major typo) .., yet Washington has a similarly low mitigation ~~failure~~-success rate,...

p.84 This strategy approaches freshwater protection and conservation from ~~three~~-four perspectives:

- Regulation, monitoring, and enforcement
- Water demand and conservation
- Supply, including reuse, rainwater, and stormwater management
- Ground water supplies and recharge

A 8.2 NTA 1 top of p.88 typo: dumber should be **number**.

p.97 A 9.3 last sentence typo: The following is a list of entities that need to be kept strong and integrated for salmon recovery:

p.103 typos: **A10.1 NTA 3: WDFW will use an augment existing species plans to create actionable work plans for imperiled terrestrial and freshwater species without existing or specific plans.**

p.105 2nd bullet typo:

Compensating small forest landowners for not harvesting timber along riparian corridors

p.120 “GMA and SMA direct local jurisdictions to plan for growth and development while ensuring the ongoing functionality of the ecosystems supported by ~~no net loss of~~ critical areas (wetlands, streams, slopes, etc.) or of no net loss of shoreline ecosystem functions and processes.” It is important to note that the GMA definition of critical areas includes their associated ecosystems.

p.126, B.2.1 last sentence: “Overwater structures also have the potential to introduce contaminants into sensitive areas because older creosote- or copper-treated wood pilings or decks are known to leached toxics such as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and copper arsenate compounds.” (Note same typo is in top paragraph on p.139.)

p.300 This photo at the start of the section on Local Areas, of an highly armored shoreline with condos set too close to the water, sends a completely bad message. How about something that shows a desired end state, instead of a (seemingly intractable) problem?

p.468 Management Conference: Inaccurate citation to RCW 70.85.090 should be to RCW 77.85.090.