

The background of the slide is a photograph of a rural landscape. In the foreground, there is a body of water, possibly a flooded field or a pond. In the middle ground, a large barn with a red roof and a tall, white, cylindrical silo are visible. The background is filled with a dense forest of bare trees, suggesting a late autumn or winter setting. The sky is overcast and grey. The overall tone of the image is somewhat somber and quiet.

Phase 1 ASRP Comments Discussion

February 6th, 2020

Phase 1 Comment Period

- November 15, 2019 – January 14, 2020
 - Public review by the greater stakeholder and practitioner community and the public
- January 7 – 8, 2020
 - ASRP Symposium, including small-group discussions

Summary of Commenters

Review comments received from:

16	Individuals	12	NGOs and Environmental Organizations
1	Tribal Member		
1	Local Jurisdiction	2	Trade Associations (Forestry and Dairy)
2	State Agencies		
1	Tribe	1	Private Forestry Company
1	Federal Agency	4	Group Discussions at January ASRP Symposium

General Next Steps

- Topics could be incorporated/addressed in Phase 2 and Phase 3 Work Plans for ASRP development and implementation
- Prepare memo addressing comments received on the Phase 1 document, as was done for the 2017 Initial Document

Comment topics for discussion

- **Support for Scenario 3 focus**
- Predicted salmon results are based on immediate implementation
- Ecological resilience
- **Concern whether the right issues are being addressed**
- Impacts from and on harvest and hatcheries
- **Confusion over buffer widths**
- **Inclusion of the estuary**
- **Protection**
- Focal species and species-specific information
- Invasive species
- **Monitoring and Adaptive Management**
- Work with forest landowners and federal agencies
- **Incorporating agricultural viability**
- Regulatory concerns
- **Implementation**
- Funding and capacity building
- Cost comparison to other restoration efforts and ESA listings
- Questions about dam and coordination with the larger Chehalis Basin Strategy
- ASRP resources (documentation and data)

General support for ASRP

“The Phase 1 ASRP has a solid foundation. The plan is informed by a diverse group of experts and is based on available science, drawing from the peer-reviewed literature, recent studies, and historical documents. Habitat-based models are used in a consistent way to set restoration goals.

While the ASRP restoration goals are far more extensive than restoration plans elsewhere in the Pacific northwest, we understand that these goals were informed by careful scientific thought and input. The use of available science increases our confidence in the restoration plan itself.”

-Coast Salmon Partnership

Support for Focus on Scenario 3

- Comments in support of proposed level of effort
- Priority to adaptively manage over time and adjust level of effort to what is needed to achieve objectives
- Questions about cost and achievable level of effort

Support for Focus on Scenario 3

Response/approach:

- Phase 2 ASRP refinement
 - Work with Board in early Phase 2 to narrow scope of scenario options to consider in fall 2020
 - Steering Committee will provide guidance on refinements to technical committees

Next Steps: March Board meeting - guidance from Board on scenario focus

Issues addressed in ASRP

- Scope of ASRP questioned/requests for all issues to be included
- Exploration of interactions between ASRP and other management actions
- Concern with ASRP characterization of issues leading to habitat degradation

Issues addressed in ASRP

Response/approach:

- Better acknowledge interactions with, and significance of issues outside the scope of the ASRP
- Communicate roles/responsibilities for success in salmon recovery

Next steps: refinement of messages and how ASRP fits into larger context of Basin and Regional management

Confusion over buffer widths

- Confusion on whether “buffer widths” are prescribed
- Concern that wide buffers could impact current land uses

Confusion over buffer widths

Response/approach:

- Clarify that:
 - Corridor widths in Phase 1 document were for purposes of cost estimating
 - Purpose is to provide corridors to restore ecological processes, not specific targets or regulatory “buffers”
 - There are location & landowner specific-influences on corridor widths in on-the-ground implementation

Next steps: Develop communication materials to help illustrate flexibility

Inclusion of the estuary

- Some specific estuary information provided by commenters
- Regulatory effectiveness/enforcement concerns
- Questions on feasibility of protection actions

Inclusion of the estuary

Response/approach:

- Incorporation already identified as Phase 2/3 task

Next steps: develop estuary inclusion recommendations from Science Review Team based on best available science

Protection

- Suggested ways to focus protection:
 - On headwater streams
 - Protect water quantity
 - Protect floodplains through acquisition or regulation
 - Incentives
 - Species-specific protection requests
 - Cool-water refugia
 - Enforcement of regulations (illegal fishing, development, etc.)
 - Community engagement, clarity on role of landowners and community groups in protection and stewardship

Protection

Response/approach:

- Clarify that protection is included within each scenario
- Develop specific protection actions/strategy
 - Protection of headwaters, working with forest practices management, better delineation of data gaps and what strategies need to be developed immediately versus over a longer timeline

Next steps: Engage DNR Forest Practices, Forest Landowners and communities

Monitoring and Adaptive Management

- Importance of Monitoring & Adaptive Management
- Interest from implementers in efficiencies with regard to data collection
- Excitement for innovative approach (adaptive management) to restoration at a Basin wide scale
- Questions on species that might be addressed
 - Invasive and native species monitoring

Monitoring and Adaptive Management

Response/approach:

- Full M&AM Plan buildout in Phase 2 ASRP

Next steps: continue plan development

Incorporating agricultural viability

- Concern about ASRP impacts on agricultural land uses

Incorporating agricultural viability

Response/approach:

- Coordination across Strategy needed to understand role of ASRP and other Strategy elements

Next steps: Guidance from the Board on how to address agriculture in the Strategy

Implementation

- Need for implementation schedule
- Questions about if the Phase 1 implementation framework is the right approach, interest in not following current processes for implementation
- Utilizing local knowledge
- Outreach and communication, and address lack of social science in the plan
- Interest to be part of the team

Implementation

Response/approach:

- Options for the implementation structure will be developed in Phase 2
 - Includes oversight and funding structures

Next steps: Focus on implementation planning, including program structure and oversight roles

Questions



For more information contact: Emelie McKain, WDFW
Emelie.McKain@dfw.wa.gov