

NOTES

BACKGROUND QUESTIONS (from PPT):

1. What is the essence of the platform for the topic? (2-3 sentences)
2. What aspects of the platform are headed in the right direction?
3. What improvements were suggested by break-out session participants? (top 3-5)
4. What questions still remain to be answered? (top 1-2)
5. What happens next and who will be involved or responsible in the next steps?

Facilitators: Brenda Kramer (BK), Seattle Parks & Recreation, Janna Rolland (JR), Janna Rolland Consulting

Presenters: Kurt Fresh, NOAA Fisheries, Scott Redman, Puget Sound Action Team

Issue Experts: Kathy Fletcher, People for Puget Sound, Fred Goetz, US Army Corps of Engineers, Jayni Kamen, Mason County Board of Commissioners, Mike Shelton, Island County Board of Commissioners, Jacques White, The Nature Conservancy, Daryl Williams, Tulalip Tribes

NOTES:

11:47 Facilitator Introduction

The reason for the session is to figure out what we all agree on and what issues need to be raised and addressed by people interested in nearshore and marine areas of Puget Sound.

OUTCOMES

- Build consensus around platform statement
- Affirm agreements
- Highlight areas needing further work (commitments, implementation, challenges, and opportunities)

NOTES

GROUND RULES

- All voices get heard
- Offer suggestions towards outcomes above
- Respect each others time and opinions on issues
- Document what we agree on
- Use white paper on walls for important items not being mentioned

OVERVIEW

- Will get presentations from Kurt & Scott on platform statement
- Will engage in dialog around the statements
- Will break
- Will open up for full discussions

1:53 PRESENTATIONS

Scott Redman: (see presentation slides)

Want to get collective interpretation at the end of this

The meat of the document is the protection and restoration strategy for the nearshore

Looking for areas of agreement and things we need to discuss

Really want to have a better understanding of how to make nearshore protection happen

Proposed Platform

Recovery focused on Chinook, Hood Canal summer chum and bull trout

Strategy is largely based on nearshore and marine chapter that PSAT prepared with a nearshore policy group, technical advisory group, the Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team and Shared Strategy

The regional chapter has made headway, but scientific foundation and policy sections are still under development

Platform document is not the final answer – it is a strategy that can guide more specific actions - part of what we're doing today is refining this; hope to take what we do today to make a better nearshore chapter

- Can find full nearshore chapter under development online (PSAT website)

Kurt Fresh: (see presentation slides)

Geographic Scope – The Nearshore

We need to make sure we understand what nearshore is – quite often it is often confusing
Talking about interconnected systems of estuary & shoreline habitats; includes some areas offshore (~20m) and some upland portion of the landscape

Lifecycle model (King County diagram)

Focus of this session is nearshore but we cannot forget about the entire Puget Sound environment including freshwater as part of the salmon recovery landscape

Guiding Principles

1. *Salmon recovery is a life cycle process* – a fundamental principle of why we're here; need to pay attention to migration and spawning cycles, incubation habitats, rearing and migratory corridors in freshwater as well, delta type habitats (system of channels and marshes), and beaches/shorelines which includes upland and offshore
(process diagram slide)

2. *We have learned a lot but much to learn* – we know enough to start taking action; (Kurt describes process diagram);

3. *Freshwater, nearshore and marine waters must be able to support all life stages* – we are concerned about all life stages and viability factors such as productivity, abundance, spatial structure and genetic diversity

4. *Protection ensures that restoration improves conditions* – to get more fish we have to make things better; need restoration of habitat to move forward; at same time must have protection to ensure restoration actually improves conditions; need to reduce effects of hatchery fish and pay attention to harvest, commensurate with what we're trying to do throughout the landscape
(slide about protection & restoration)

5. *Recovery is fundamentally both protection and restoration*; protection and restoration strategies give us different actions, but both improve salmon population viability; has to be adaptive

6. *Areas of Puget Sound vary in their importance to Puget Sound salmon and their vulnerability to impacts*; not all places are equal; make sure we have the right habitats in areas such as Admiralty Inlet to reduce risk

7. *To achieve recovery we have to have strategies* – protection and restoration strategies will help guide actions

Strategies

- 1. Protection of habitats and water quality** - put things through the salmon filter, especially with land use decisions; consider multiple scales (beach to region); what tools do we have and what tools do we need?; consider that people are part of the landscape and aren't going away; paying attention to what is functioning and protecting those areas is important to salmon
- 2. Protect against catastrophes**, such as oil spills
- 3. Restore when and where appropriate:** make sure restoration is science based and strategic; monitoring and adaptive management is important – a large number of projects are done without monitoring; target multiple spatial and time scales; ecosystem process based; commitments for implementation and monitoring important
- 4. Continue to learn and apply that knowledge in future:** adaptive management – we are trying to figure out what that means; we need an organizational structure to coordinate and cooperate at all levels(return to process slide above): the need for adaptive management is main point to take from this slide; process has a feedback loop; cannot forget to monitor

Suggested 10-year Action Plan

We want to explore what we agree on

Strategy -Protect all functioning:

- drift cell sediment processes
- estuarine habitats of major river deltas
- marine shorelines, esp. pocket estuaries, eelgrass and other shallow, low-velocity, fine substrate habitats
- freshwater sources that directly affect estuaries, marine shorelines and shoreline processes
- riparian areas

Protection actions:

By regulatory means:

- Governments need to enforce existing regulations and when necessary improve regulatory programs (reference to Critical Areas Ordinances, Shoreline Master Programs, etc)
- State and fed agencies need to support local government protection and restoration efforts

NOTES

- guidance, funding, model policies/programs, Best Management Practices, education outreach, help identify and design protections for key habitat areas at the greatest risk for development

Non-regulatory actions:

- Identify key habitat areas at greatest risk and focus protection efforts in those areas – governments & NGOs
- Improve incentives and education for private property owners
- Ensure protection from catastrophic events such as oil spills – governments and industry
- Increase protection of susceptible basins – dischargers, land owners, and regulatory agencies

Others?

Strategy - Restore, when and where appropriate

- Tidal exchange processes in river deltas
- Marine shorelines (esp. pocket areas, etc)
- Sediment delivery from sources such as feeder bluffs, etc.
- Marine riparian functions related to water quality

Restoration actions:

- Move forward in restoring key portions of Puget Sound shorelines and beaches – governments & NGOs
- Others? Note sure what else we could say but we should start to add to this list

Learn More and continue to work together

- Suggestions? – Adaptive management is part of this

Key Questions from document

- How can we help local governments protect functioning nearshore habitats?
- How do we determine if we are protecting existing functions? Monitoring
- What more is needed to protect against oil spills and other potential catastrophic events?
- With limited funding, how should restoration priorities be determined?
- How can we ensure coordination and cooperation in research, protection and restoration?

COMMENTS FROM ISSUE EXPERTS (2:20)

Fred Goetz, working with partnership known as Puget Sound Restoration Program, Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Program (PSNERP) is how USACE still refers to the program):

2500 miles of shoreline of habitats described by Kurt and Scott; the partnership is an example of collaboration where we aren't at odds with each other; trying to develop a comprehensive ecological restoration plan, depends upon planning commitment and learning of everybody in this room; if you want commitment, this is an opportunity to do it today in a way that hasn't been done before; we haven't added ecological goods and services to our USACE projects before, this is new for us; here to listen and learn; Corps has similar questions (references AAAS meeting)

- how do you **get science to inform**;
- really comes down to **human behavior**
- we are the geomorphic agents of change – we are the catastrophic event that is shaping the landscape that we don't take into account
- how we **communicate** is the key - how do we get information to the people that will use it, and change behavior

Daryl Williams, Tulalip Tribes: Scott & Kurt did a good job of presenting what is before us today; the proposal is broad enough, need to go into more detail on issue they are currently working on;

- **we have a limited knowledge** of how salmon use the nearshore environments, especially between the stream deltas; intertidal zones where they get a lot of their food from; feed off of juvenile crab and shrimp; Chief Seattle once said all things are connected; need more discussion in that area
- more discussion about connectivity
- **will take a long time** to build environment back- 50 years partial recovery, full recovery 100-150 years out; need old growth trees; need trees on beaches for natural protection, shoreline shrubbery for juvenile feeding, etc.; can't replace overnight
- **sediment issues:** bulkheading is a big issue, especially on east side of Puget Sound: that stops recruitment from sediments coming down the bluffs; nutrients. All stream crossing are culverts from Everett to Tacoma; we're eroding our beaches; need to figure out a way to stop or slow erosion process; just protection shoreline isn't going to maintain habitat

NOTES

- **need to restore intertidal** zones and
- **reduce erosion rates**
- **open up culvert crossings** at RR tracks to allow sediments from streams to supply beaches
- need expertise in these areas – **will require trial and error**
- **add NGOs to list of involvement with oil Spills** to improve response time at least provide initial response; recent examples prove we need quicker response capabilities; better equip governmental organizations
- **tribes haven't had funding sources** to get trained and equipment involved with responding
- legislators and oil industry want to **get public more involved**
- **water quality is important** to look at; can have a big impact on salmon
- juvenile salmon are not as hardy as rainbow trout at surviving outfalls

Jacques White, TNC: will talk about things he thinks are good, general comments about document and approach and then some big picture issues; starting a marine conservation program at TNC; also representing Kathy Fletcher of PPS

- **Good things**
 - nearshore platform is step in the right direction, a good thing
 - larger PSAT document (draft chapter) will embody latest thinking in our understanding of relationship between nearshore habitat and salmon; it should be considered/looked at by people here
- **General comments**
 - **10 years is too short** – but a good amount of time to “gear up”: maybe a 140 years is too long, but should be shooting for 20-50 year range, we shouldn't shy away from thinking that far ahead; wondering how long it will take to delist? **what is our goal? delisting or healthy environment?**
 - **governments should be thinking about salmon and benefits** you get from restored and intact ecosystem (**good and services**), aesthetics, etc.
 - what do we need to do to achieve recovery – **looking for new tools**
TNC worked with WA to develop new tool for submerged lands conservation lease – **can lease submerged lands from WA DNR for conservation**

NOTES

- **engaging in better conservation:** Island County and others developed voluntary stewardship programs, consider contacting them or partnering to get their expertise; **partner with others where expertise exists**
- **Big picture**
 - Some think this is **too protection focused**; there should be equal focus on **restoration**; need to balance these things; aren't going to get to recovery without restoration effort
 - problem with land use regulation Critical Areas Ordinances: we set goals for jobs and housing, but we don't set goals for specific habitat performance in the same way, so what happens is we give designation of non-significance to too many areas (see next)
 - asks scientists to come up with best targets for habitat protection that equals recovery for talking to land use regulators: goals, places, etc. **habitat recovery goals**
 -

Mike Shelton, Island County Commissioner for 12 years: Island County is unique; made up of 2 major islands - Whidbey and Camano; on west we have important habitat for South Sound migration; on east side we have habitat for fish from natal estuaries around the Sound

- History of Island County
 - Extensive diking in early history, especially in support of agricultural practices; we have numerous dikes that have reduced the amount of nearshore habitat; they also have long lines of million dollar homes on them, that over time, the county has developed around the shoreline; because shoreline is pretty much developed, we have had a lot of interior development (in rural part); we are very densely populated in interior; as interior development occurred, runoff from it turned fertile farmland to freshwater wetlands; thinks this is an area of restoration
 - there is potential to **open up freshwater wetlands to nearshore habitat**
 - Examples of existing projects: US Navy participants in project: tide gage, Oak Harbor has their sewage treatment plant right there; are worried about what would happen in case of a spill from the plant
 - **getting people on board** (especially Navy where decisions are made in DC) **is a difficult thing**

NOTES

- Dugualla Bay: there has been some interest in opening that back up; hope people will recognize that locally **some places cannot or will not be restored**; because a number of jobs dependent on that area (runway & wetlands don't mix); suggests **there are some places that are off limits; too much of a risk** and potential economic impact
- **how we can support local governments: gaining knowledge**; you're never a hero in your own home town – that's a problem in local government; it's not good enough to send a sample ordinance and expect people to buy off on it;
 - **need scientists to explain reasoning** behind what we (local governments) are proposing to do;
 - should be **recognized that local governments have done a considerable amount of work in protection salmon** - 1984 zoning was higher density residential in the Comprehensive Plan); opportunity was there for intense development; but the county later downzoned to 1 house per 5 acres; important that as we look to local government to provide regulatory protection to give credit for what they've already done

Jayni Kamen, Mason County Commissioner:

- **Recognize what local governments have done already** to further effort; feels some of former commissioners lost elections as a result of some of the difficult decisions that made to pass critical areas ordinances
- **what we can do to help local governments:**
 - tax incentives are always good as a land owner, but as a local government, we survive on property taxes; tax incentives can hurt local governments
 - **financing and resources for monitoring phase**
 - **we need best available science** to justify our ordinances and measures and stay in compliance with Growth Management Act; we appreciate the research; its costly for us to do the science and educate community to sustain our efforts
- **important to look at a multi species approach**, especially in nearshore environment
- believes in **holistic approach** to this; ways that we protect those businesses that thrive on healthy environment, not just salmon
- Mason County very dependent on **water quality** and shellfish resources;
- on research, appreciate the training and information; **would like to see research in helping rural communities develop research towards sustainable industries**

NOTES

- would love to see a **rural technology research center** to help develop economic strategies that are compatible with sustaining all of our resources

(3:06 Break for 15 minutes – instructions to use white space on walls)

(3:26 return)

BK: Would like to start with your questions

Participant: downzoning issue/question for Shelton: perception that downzoning will cause hardship, did that happen in your case and was there any kind of mitigation offered or considered to deal with that?

Mike Shelton: no, basically GMA says urban development needs to occur in an urban setting; we have a ton of possibilities in the rural setting; don't believe that we don't have lots of development on the nearshore, we do; GMA says we will do this, so we did this; still have some people that won't speak to me but we did it

Fred Goetz: wants to be more specific:

- need to consider catastrophic events: perceives oil spill to be a communication failure, management issue, interagency cooperation issue/tracking.
- how do we support local governments: a **communication** issue: need to get info that is useable in a timely fashion to local governments and local land owners; **develop cross-jurisdictional communications tools**; question of social science – communicating with people from different perspectives; **how do we ensure regional coordination**; a whole need to look at how our institutions coordinate and cooperate with each other.
- 10 years is not long enough;
- **watershed perspective:** didn't see it much in the platform; so far we haven't seen much connection to upriver/downriver, and connection between drift cells; get your head out of your planning unit (Curtis Tanner); cross-jurisdictional communication
- **funding is a big issue:** counties could benefit from funding; e.g. Sammish tribe...surveyed streams for habitats and injuries; clearinghouse for knowing what resources are there;
- can work at larger scale to create a **technical assistance group** that helps others

Sean Edwards: Snohomish County: question for Jacques White:

- it is useful to have habitat performance measures; studied forestry policies a little bit and there was attempt in timber fish and wildlife process to set this kind of habitat and that it wasn't very well excepted by the industry, do you have any comments on how we might address that at the nearshore

Jacques White: obey the precautionary principle; don't think we're going to be sorry that we didn't build that last shopping mall

- argues **erring on side of not building** when there might be a problem
- may want to look at having a **technical group** who are willing to go to meetings with locals and commissioners to explain and justify; has talked with TRT....provide best guesses about what should be incorporated into Critical Areas Ordinance and other GMA plans.
- having **geographically specific plans** for restoration and protection is essential;
- Think of net gains

Mike Shelton: we of local governments need to recognize that our shorelines are different:

- **some regulations need to be site specific;**
- regulate where regulations accomplish our goals, not where its useless or where another approach, like incentives, works better

GENERAL COMMENTS/CONCERNS/QUESTIONS (3:40)

Kurt Fresh: my whole background is as a scientist, and personally passionate about **transferring science** information to people who want to use it; asked the question, what can scientific community do better than we are doing now? is it a bibliography, an analytical paper, giving a presentation, etc.?

Bruce Bruzell: retired surgeon: town v. gown situation (local v. outsiders); sees very few people from the town; need to **put resources where they are needed**; difference between rural and urban area approaches and needs; look at ways of delivering and not just studying in areas least able to apply regulations.

NOTES

- if all money is going into research to create regulations and not how to accomplish this, funds should go to rural communities on how to follow up; **more money should be allocated to areas that have a weak tax base;**
- create an apparatus for delivering funds to communities least able to provide

Curtis Tanner, PSRP: strengths and weaknesses from my perspective:

- appreciate that one platform addresses nearshore; appreciates tone and work of Shared Strategy and the PSAT to elevate notion of nearshore habitat is essential to recovery
- agrees that we need to plug holes in bucket through protection of habitat, before spending on restoration; need to stop decline in nearshore habitat
- feels strongly that **platform statement takes weak stance on issue of restoration;** we must restore some areas now
- **we need to frame the language about the nearshore in a way that is strong and action oriented: we frame it as mysterious, but we do know what that is important to salmon recovery, it's not all a mystery.... (ALL AGREE)**
- we should not devalue restoration; we can at least **say the rate of restoration must exceed the rate of habitat loss to recover salmon**
- **Platform statements should be bold that excite and inspire**
- Need to excite the public and go away from notion that we don't know anything

Leslie Anne Rose, Citizens for Healthy Bay, Tacoma: local perspective additions:

- **Stormwater is a problem in Puget Sound;** it all ends up in Puget Sound; suggests that should be its own category; led to our 500 million dollar problem in Commencement Bay
- Concern: industry and business ask for certainty and predictability; **citizens have the same expectations.** Need to know that things needed to restore ecosystems are going to happen
- They are working on Critical Areas ordinances; a lot of resistance to efforts to minimally protect water in Commencement Bay
- We can encourage, induce anything we want to get buy-in from local governments and industry, but there is the time and place for regulations
- **Regulation needs to be part of this**

NOTES

Jeff Dickinson, Squaxin Island Tribe in South Puget Sound: highlighted things that need work:

- Shared Strategy for Puget Sound is about salmon recovery; not just Chinook; granted there is a need for a number of watersheds in Puget Sound to address Chinook
- the **intent of the Shared Strategy is to recover ALL of our salmon stocks**; this should be recognized
- should be if we're doing everything to recover salmon it will help Chinook, not the other way around; we risk potential of losing other species down the line if we ignore them and focus only on listed species; need to act now to recover all the species
- Protection v. Restoration dichotomy: acknowledges drafts of platform statement have gotten better over time; saw unrealistic promotion of protection as primary strategy; platform statement still says protection is primary strategy; it **has to be both protection and restoration**

ALL discussed protection and restoration strategies - some participants think they are not equal, but tiered

- says we have to do restoration and have to do it now; note protection should include acquisition; shift given to restoration is that somehow we're not ready; doesn't think PSNERP will come down from on high to tell us what to do - they are not the only ones that can help us prioritize restoration
- PSNERP can help inform, gather, and coordinate on a regional Puget Sound scale, but **nature of science and recovery is a whole bunch of small experiments at the local level**; we need to learn from them
- Acknowledge that we will not be successful in all projects but that we will learn from them
- There is an important bottoms-up element to this that is not reflected in the platform statement - reliance on identifying certain kinds of habitat restoration is flawed:
 - It is a regional/sub-regional issue that shouldn't be dictated by someone else; need to make prioritizations at the local level and not be dictated by a plan that says pocket estuaries are the most important thing

Bill Sullivan, Klamath Tribe Natural Resources Coordinator:

- **any time you mention water quality you need to mention water quality**
- **need clean water**

NOTES

- **need quantity of water**
- shouldn't always strive for minimum flows; for every bill that protects water quality and quantity, we have 50 bills that takes it away;
- if we don't have clean water or enough we're doomed for failure
- need to be conscious of legislative activities
- dramatic need to protect against oil spills
- NPDES program; **license to pollute is a problem**
- look at something more than the dramatic event of an oil spill

Scott Redman: question for Randy, Tom, and Peter: how can we evaluate our results to see if we are achieving protection? can you do that locally? we don't know how fast the bucket is being emptied.

Randy Schuman, King County Natural Resources and Parks: for the King County Critical Areas ordinance, they are looking at that at landscape scale; how much you've lost and next stage is looking at difference in water quality (upstream and downstream); problem is that the only areas touched by Critical Areas Ordinance are areas where people are looking for a building permit; they are analyzing the actual change in land use, but it is difficult at a big scale

Peter Best, City of Bainbridge Island: this is a nearshore question, limited number of actions that get permitted under that program every year so there's a timescale issue; we are able to do a detailed site inventory in my jurisdiction and update it every 7 years to coincide with regulatory updates; bulkheads and docks are easy to count;

- **harder stuff is how the biological resources and habitats are shifting over time and how actions that are being permitted and regulated**
- **issues of sediment budgets** - one of the key issues in drift cells is sediment;
- **significant increase in local commitment needs to be made but biological assessments/habitat assessments need outside funding; monitoring**
- planning needs **to be geographically specific**

BK: Do you have specific comments directed at the paper in terms of drift cells; paper made suggestions for areas, is there agreement about those areas?

Kurt Fresh: Remember this platform statement came from a lot of different sources; it's intended to help support the major recovery chapter that PSAT is putting together. There is a heavy dose of the **need to be spatially explicit** ;

R: Are there other funding priorities?)

Jacques White: pet peeve: p. 7, 10-year action plan: "drift cell sediment processes...." wording is convoluted; other comments:

- regulatory authorities jurisdictions are so chopped up in space (water, water line, water level, above water level, etc), nobody is looking at the shore from one parcel to the next;
- **regulations need to address nearshore function by looking up and down and across the shoreline and jurisdictions**
- **analyze our regulatory system to figure out a way to make it easy to address ecological functions being identified by Kurt**
- really need to match regulatory mechanisms to ecosystem

Chris Davis, CommEnSpace: elegant point by Squaxin; spatial unit that is relevant; must and can think at a broader scale than local restoration work; can become too focused on local activities without looking at broader scale process; struggle with issue of scale; local planning should not exclude broader scale planning

Participant: temporal component: in urban environment we do not have luxury of time; development makes it difficult; price for development is not acreage but square footage.

Tiffany Spear, Master Builders Association: regarding priorities:

- CAO issue: to have regulations imposed on people that is more rigorous is upsetting; **need communication and give and take from both sides;**
- **funding:** local governments should be **looking at acquisition** instead of forcing local property owners to limit activities; to purchase is much cleaner way to handle issue;
- protecting nearshore habitat: recognize part of nearshore habitat is industry that has been there a long time and work with them to figure out how to get that portion of the economy to work together with us;

NOTES

Participant: echoed what Tiffany said; also agrees that protection must occur simultaneously with restoration

- listen to the local commissioners too - tax payers are throwing us out of office; platform is trying to point out that while we would like to do all of this at one time, we can't; when we examine how we prioritize it, **buy it and protect before you screw it up**; think about what is going to cost to fix it up (protect it)
- **priority must first be in acquiring and preserving in what we have**
- **then restore what we screwed up**
- Asks: how many people are here today who do not work for government, tribe, agency? (few if any); there is an issue of getting into this dialog, a lot of volunteers out there that are involved but are not here, they have a voice only because of people that are here representing them

Scott Hansen, Puget Creek Restoration Society: concerned about our quality of life mainly because of salmon birds/rockfish/crab; concern; GMA says protect critical areas . . .

- need to **get cities and counties to recognize nearshore as critical area**
- Shoreline Master Programs: it isn't until end that they address nearshore areas, document should address **getting municipalities to focus on that nearshore is critical area**

BK: Any other voices that we haven't heard yet that have a response to the paper? none

Daryl Williams: wants to add to what Jeff from Squaxin Island Tribe said: limiting factor in Snohomish is nearshore habitats; we do not have habitat to support the fish coming out of the river;

- **just protecting isn't going to meet our needs; need to do restoration;** existing developments cause us to continue to lose habitat
- local jurisdictions may treat areas of their shoreline differently; there may be reasons for that; unlike state, tribe never sold off their shorelines/tidelands; we have more control over that; can see jurisdictions looking at their shoreline in terms of protecting and only that because of lack of development; other jurisdictions may have a more pressing need for restoration instead; seems to support place-based, geographic specific approach; supports zoning different areas

- **Participant** (Local Commencement Bay representative): Emphasizing restoration over protection can be counterproductive; some will say they already do restoration so “we don’t have to do anything”

JR: any strong supporting statements?

Participant: agrees with what everyone is saying here; However, **given limited resources we have to make choices; point is protection is cheaper than restoration**

- **among all choices you must select option that applies specifically to your case (MANY HANDS WENT UP TO AGREE);** can’t say choose one over the other without looking at the particular situation
- some areas (urban areas) have to opt for restoration because there is nothing to protect;
- need to look at relationship to upstream areas

BK: We might ask presenters to highlight for us they see some of the common things that came out of the discussion in terms of outcome and giving feedback

Ryan Dicks, Cascade Land Conservancy); one thing that sticks out is the acquisition theme;

- **huge role for fair market value acquisition** for protection and restoration
- should be more clearly stated in the platform

Peter Best, City of Bainbridge Island: regarding local governments enforcing regulations and improving regulations;

- **needs to have improve implementation of regulations;** means being more proactive and engaging not just of applicants but community

Julie Hall, Seattle Public Utilities: Shoreline Master Programs create some disincentives to restoration especially in developed areas; in cases, it makes sense to take a regional stance in trying to address those

Deb Hagelson, Outreach Coordinator for ____: we obviously can’t buy up all the property; a lot of it is **educating people;** if you buy things and remove all the people and the residents, you’re skewing the reality of the situation; still need to maintain our communities;

- emphasis on maintaining existing uses but create a balance

Bruce Bruzell : re: acquisition; sounds so pie in the sky; why doesn't somebody say something simple –

- **why don't you tell me if my tax burden will go down if I do something on my beach that will make changes (LOTS OF HANDS OF APPROVAL)**
- as a farmer why do I have to pay taxes on waterfront property?

BK: back to presenters and issue experts

WRAP UP:

Scott Redman:

Outcomes: essence:

- Nearshore must be protected and restored to recover salmon
- Protection needs to be a full toolbox including regulation, incentives, education, acquisition, conservation easements
- Science is a key part of platform to inform protection and restoration and build adaptive management to manage into the future
-

Jacques White:

- we need to act now, we have enough information to do good stuff now; need to act both locally and regionally and thinking in terms of local actions relevant to local problems and planning on regional level
- timeframe: starts now and goes for a long time;
- we've already started and continue to ramp up

JR: What aspects of the platform are headed in right direction?

- All of our corrections from today: 3 prongs: protect, restore, learn more
- The fact that nearshore is in the document is a good step

Doug Myers, PSAT: n wants to see it more specific; need quantified statements

Salmon Recovery Funding Board representative: from the SRFB perspective, hardest part is prioritization; funds are limited so we need to prioritize what is going to be done; a geographically specific approach is important when determining where to protect and restore

JR: what questions still remain to be answered?

- What does it take to achieve recovery? We have not specified what it takes: how much, what acres, what mileage, spatially explicit goals (some disagreement: you'll never get there if you expect that)
- How do we set priorities?
- How can we distribute the effort to relatively resource poor places commensurate with the problems?

Gwen Maxfield, Island County: agrees with what Scott said above; protection still works as the primary strategy in rural areas; there is an urban/rural difference; a distinction has to be made so rural areas don't feel burdened by restoration

Bill Graber, Puget Sound TRT: thinks there needs to be an acknowledgement of how far this nearshore plan (draft nearshore chapter prepared by PSAT upon which platform was based) has come in a very short time; some of the watershed plans took 10-15 years; nearshore finally getting recognition; in long term, Jeff's comments are well taken; in short term, assignment is an ESA recovery plan for Chinook and summer chum – that's what PSAT team was tasked to bring to Shared Strategy in the draft nearshore chapter;

- TRT agrees it should be multi-species plan in the long term;
- in short term we need to bite off what we can do
- what is it we can accomplish in the short term?
- what is it we have to do in the long term?

Kurt Fresh: try to synthesize what he heard

Context: next revisions of the draft nearshore chapter will have to address these in some capacity

- What happens next, who will be responsible in the next steps
- This document needs to be communicated to local chapters
- Large scale regional recovery document with a framework for working together
- Monitoring: need relevant tools (bioassay is a good tool)

NOTES

- Critical importance of local government: a lot has already happened, we don't get any credit; we give them unfunded mandates, need monitoring for them
- Need for science to get to all levels of people involved in salmon recovery, not just local government
- A lot of comments on **protection and restoration: its not an either or but both** to achieve recovery; need to do a better job; **amended by Jacques: protection is good everywhere all the time**
- Make sure salmon recovery doesn't just involve specific species; need an ecosystem aspect to this but to some degree the immediacy of ESA listed species should be highlighted/balanced
- Spatially explicitness: need to think about correct scales for different things that we do
- Platform was weak in recognition in terms of social science: need to recognize people are going to change when they want to change: education/outreach and communication is essential
- Confusion on tools: salmon recovery is a set of nested toolboxes (easements, acquisitions, etc.): recognize a lot of ways to do it and there might be other ways; be flexible
- **Nearshore is important** – strong theme
- Make platform more explicit – need to know what we're going to do: we have a set of strategy statements, we need set of actions – how much, where, etc.
- Water quantity: recognize quantity is just as important as quality

(END 5:03pm)

FOLLOWING ARE TRANSCRIPTIONS OF WALL COMMENTS ON FLIP CHART PAPER

1. Need coordinated technical efforts (among government and non government) on multiple scales

- Short-term: monitoring actions, integrating existing knowledge into actions/plans
- Mid-term: refining, verifying, expanding existing knowledge to improve future planning & actions

NOTES

- Long-term: anticipate & evaluate long-term/distant issues, like sea level rise
- Risk assessment: need to anticipate and evaluate risks across geography, potential magnitude, & time scales like oil spills.

2. How do we deal with the need for habitat at our river deltas/estuaries, yet they can be heavily developed; areas where restoration will be logistically difficult and require more experimental techniques? Ex. Ballard Locks, Elliott Bay, Commencement Bay

3. Is there hope for cooperation from railroads to provide source of sediment? Is there technological feasibility to both maintain RRs, yet let some feeder bluffs nourish beaches (under tracks)?

4. Is “nearshore” enough? Do we need to look deeper than 60 ft? Do we have changes in productivity or the overall ecosystem in Puget Sound that will adversely affect salmon?

Examples

- Invasive species like the tunicate recently found
- Changes in food web (we have an increase in jellyfish according to anecdotal accounts – have we changed predator/prey base?)
- We have 2 groups of organisms in marine waters for which there is no management authority under federal law:
 - Migratory Bird Act and Marine Mammal Act
- Both have predicted big increases in target species while we struggle w/salmon recovery
-

5. How will you know if your Puget Sound restoration actions have increased salmon survival?

6. In developing shoreline regulations, what is relative importance of pulling back bulkheads to provide shallow water habitat in nearshore, versus re-establishing eroding bluff sediment flow by removing/prohibiting sediment barriers such as roads, houses, bulkhead?

7. In developing actions and strategies we should use precautionary approaches when faced with uncertainty. In particular, we should not let uncertainty prevent us from making decisions about restoration.

8. (a) Restoration versus protection is not the correct approach. Rather analyze the value of each drift cell, analyze the risk(s) and then reach into the “tool box” (of restoration and protection tools) and apply those that would be most effective at achieving your goals for that drift cell.

(b) Remember that “protection” tools also include conservation easements and shoreline landowner stewardship, in addition to fee-simple purchases of shoreline property and regulations (CAO & SMP). Conservation easements are not often utilized along the nearshore. Why is that?

(c) We need regulatory consistency in the nearshore across jurisdictional lines, particularly regarding the cumulative impact within drift cells and from stormwater impacts

(d) If we use a site specific regulatory approach along the nearshore, how will local governments handle that with limited financial resources and staff?

9. Page 8, #3: The implication here is that bulkheads are “over-regulated”. In fact, SMPs don’t often require permits for bulkheads and they are proliferating. Streamlining will not improve this situation, improved SMP, CAO’s and other regulatory tools and incentives “may” improve conditions over the long-term

10. Publicize alternatives to bulkheads and get planning departments to promote alternatives to applicants

11. Develop viable alternatives to bulk-heading for local landowners – investigate alternative technologies.

12. Will the platform statement take into consideration any change in sea-levels? Is this a concern?

13. How much of what kind of nearshore habitat is “enough” for two to four of naturally self-sustaining salmon populations in each of five sub regions of the Sound?

14. With respect to acquisition and funding – perhaps a possible method to meet habitat protection/restoration goals is to call on private industry. Business people live in and love our natural resources also. Government and non-profits should not be expected to carry the burden – especially when financial resources are limited. Partnerships with large corporations regarding land acquisition could open many potential and critically located sites. Let’s get creative. Not all businesses are capitalistic bastards – they care too. Also there are start-up corporations who make a business solely out of habitat restoration (Wildlands of WA) – there are many options.

15. Platform statement fails to recognize one of the most important premises of the PSAT’s draft nearshore chapter: the need for nearshore restoration actions that support regional salmon recovery needs. That is, some actions will be necessary which help recover non-natal populations by providing rearing habitat, support spatial structure and improve opportunities for expression of diversity of life history strategy. We may need to take actions that provide benefits primarily for fish from other Puget Sound sub-basins.

16. The platform statement takes an overly cautious position on restoration. We DO know enough to advance nearshore restoration actions with confidence. Furthermore, the risk of failing to act, even in the face of uncertainty, is too great.

17. Platform statement seems to suggest that a high level of uncertainty exists relative to restoration actions in the nearshore. As Kurt said, “We know enough to do something”. This should be reflected in the platform document.

18. Also, the title of the document suggests the nearshore is “mysterious” – let’s not persuade folks that we don’t know anything about the nearshore. The title is the first impression – how about – “Role of nearshore in salmon recovery”?

19. If uncertainty is preventing a strong commitment to restoration, then we must act decisively to close these gaps in our understanding. Platform statement should express a commitment to identifying the specific areas of uncertainty that prevent bold action, and commit to exploring those areas with dedicated research, effective hypothesis-based monitoring, on-going restoration actions, and a commensurate focus on the risks associated with uncertainty.

-END WALL POSTER COMMENTS—6:30pm

NOTES

*Below you will find a summary of additional comments submitted by people in **Summit Comments & Evaluation forms**; (these comments were submitted post-breakout, and may reflect the views and opinions of individuals who did not participate in the breakout session dialogue.)*

- Shared Strategy needs to embrace the nearshore environment as key to salmon recovery.
- We need better science for the nearshore, but we certainly know enough to act. A clear picture of nearshore ecology must inform the discussion. We must examine the risks associated with uncertainty against the risks associated with inaction and indecision.
- Disparate urban and rural needs were apparent in the session. People can understand the need for restoration in Commencement Bay—but rural areas lack such obvious contamination. Funding support for protection in rural areas, as well as scientific basis for action, are important and helpful.
- Nearshore is critical to salmon recovery, but also to fishing, recreation, shellfish industry, and others. We can use this to our advantage—nearshore is greater than salmon recovery and we need to communicate this to public.
- How do we link MRCs with salmon recovery?