

V. Toolbox for Recovery

➤ PERMIT STREAMLINING

I. Current Situation: *Where are we now?*

Background

Land development, transportation and many other types of projects that involve work in or near streams, estuaries, or nearshore marine waters create inherent risks to salmon habitat. Projects that are for the sole purpose of protecting or restoring salmon habitat can also create incidental risks of harm to salmon. Because of these risks, projects that involve work in or near aquatic resources are highly regulated through a large number of federal, state and local permit programs. It is essential to salmon recovery that these permit programs are well-coordinated and provide a consistent level of protection to prevent or mitigate the potential impacts of permitted projects on salmon habitat. Effective and efficient permit programs also benefit project sponsors, including sponsors of habitat protection and restoration projects.

Salmon habitat has already been degraded or is threatened with degradation in many areas of the state. Many agencies have programs that either sponsor or regulate habitat protection and restoration projects. Until the Salmon Recovery Planning Act (1998) and the Salmon Recovery Funding Act (1999), there was no overall program framework for undertaking salmon habitat protection and restoration projects. The design review and regulation of these projects has not been consistent and, all too often, permit procedures have been time consuming and expensive.

This chapter addresses two strategies that are related to permitting and are part of protecting and restoring salmon habitat within the context of the Statewide Salmon Recovery Strategy. These strategies are: 1) streamlining permit procedures for habitat protection and restoration projects and other projects affecting aquatic resources; and 2) developing and applying design guidelines for habitat protection and restoration projects and other projects affecting stream corridors.

These strategies have a direct bearing on the implementation of habitat protection and restoration projects. The results of these efforts will be more efficient processes for approving habitat protection and restoration projects and greater assurance that on-the-ground or in-the-stream projects will achieve results that are beneficial for habitat. These two strategies are strongly linked because efficient, effective review and approval of projects is dependent upon successfully streamlining permit procedures while developing and implementing good guidelines for project design. They also have a broader purpose of protecting habitat from the impacts of projects that are for purposes other than habitat protection or restoration. Success in these efforts is also a part of the state's ESA

response strategy, which will enable state permit programs and permitted projects to be in compliance with the ESA.

Current Applicable Policies and Programs

This chapter does not attempt to describe the organizational and procedural details of the many programs related to habitat protection and restoration. There are many federal, state, tribal and local programs that have roles in the funding, authorization and implementation of habitat protection and restoration projects.

Examples of major state programs involved in reviewing and permitting projects that may impact aquatic resources include the following:

- State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) – SEPA checklist, project reviews, assessments and impact statements, and use of substantive authority.
- Hydraulic Project Approvals (HPA) – Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife administered permits and conditions for projects that propose to use, obstruct, divert or change stream beds or flows.
- 401 Water Quality and Coastal Zone Management Consistency Certifications – Department of Ecology review and certification of project compliance with state water quality standards and state coastal zone management policies for federal projects or projects requiring federal permits.
- Forest Practices Permits – Department of Natural Resources (DNR) permits for timber harvest and other practices involved in forestry operations.
- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits – Federally authorized permit program delegated to Department of Ecology for various types of permits to discharge wastewater or stormwater to surface waters.
- Pesticide Application and Management – Department of Agriculture permit program for applying or supervising the use of pesticides for commercial agriculture.
- Surface and Ground Water Withdrawals – Department of Ecology administered program for use surface or ground water.

A new statewide framework for habitat protection and restoration projects has been established through the Salmon Recovery Planning Act of 1998 (ESHB 2496) and the Salmon Recovery Funding Act of 1999 (2E2SSB 5595). These new laws have established a logical, pragmatic framework and process for habitat protection and restoration projects.

This framework includes: using state and local technical expertise to identify and assess limiting habitat factors and potential protection and restoration projects within a region (i.e. one or more Water Resource Inventory Areas); designating local lead entities to establish local priorities; and allocating resources and approving projects for funding based upon statewide objectives. These objectives will be established through the Statewide Strategy to Recover Salmon and by the Salmon Recovery Funding Board.

Other legislation passed in 1998 laid a foundation for improved permit processes for habitat protection and restoration projects. An Act Facilitating the Review and Approval of Fish Enhancement Projects (2SHB 2879) has established authorized approaches to streamline state and local permit requirements for certain habitat protection and restoration projects.

The strategies to address permit streamlining and design guidelines for habitat protection and restoration projects have a common theme of building upon existing efforts that have been underway for some time. The solutions being undertaken are intended to increase the level of support for these efforts and make them more effective. As these separate but interrelated efforts proceed, it is also important for them to be well coordinated. That need is acknowledged and is an integral part of the strategy.

II. Goal and Objectives: *Where do we want to be?*

Goal:

Ensure projects affecting waters of the state, including habitat protection and restoration projects, are designed to be fish friendly and reviewed consistently, and permit decisions are made efficiently.

Objectives:

- Make permit requirements and procedures for projects affecting waters of the state, including habitat protection and restoration projects, more effective and efficient. Continue to improve permit processes to ensure that beneficial habitat enhancement and restoration projects, and projects that incorporate effective habitat protection measures and flood hazard reduction features can proceed efficiently.
- Provide consistent and specific guidelines for the design and review of projects affecting waters of the state, including salmon habitat protection and restoration projects.

III. Solutions: *What is the route to success?*

Permit Process Streamlining

1. Past Work

An Interagency Permit Streamlining Workgroup (IPSW), which includes staff from the Departments of Ecology (Ecology), Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), and Transportation (WSDOT), local governments, and federal regulatory and resource agencies, have been working for more than two years. The IPSW has made a number of contributions to permit streamlining to identify problems and solutions that would streamline all permits (including emergency permits) that affect waters of the state. Examples of contributions include:

- 1) Memorandum of Understanding between WDFW, Association of County Engineers and Public Works Directors, Ecology and WSDOT to streamline permit process during emergencies.
- 2) Implementation and training on flood hazard reduction strategies and permit streamlining for watershed restoration projects under SB5442, passed in 1997 session.
- 3) Definition and identification of "imminent threat" and an expedited (i.e. 15 day) HPA process in such circumstances, immediate oral approval for HPAs during emergencies, plus authorization for 5 year HPAs for maintenance projects, when they are consistent with approved county flood plans.

2. Overview of 2SHB 2879 – An Act Facilitating the Review and Approval of Fish Enhancement Projects

The legislature passed 2SHB 2879 (Chapter 249, Laws of 1998), providing for streamlined permitting for certain types of fish habitat enhancement and restoration projects. Projects that meet the criteria established in the law, and which do not have adverse environmental impacts that cannot be mitigated by a Hydraulic Project Approval (HPA) are exempt from local permits and fees, and do not require review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).

Fish habitat enhancement projects eligible for streamlined review are limited to those that:

- Eliminate human-made fish passage barriers;
- Restore eroded or unstable stream banks, using bioengineering; or
- Provide instream structures that benefit naturally reproducing fish stocks.

Projects must be approved in one of the following ways:

- By WDFW, under the Regional Salmon Enhancement Program, or the Volunteer Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Program; or
- By the sponsor of a watershed restoration plan, as provided by law; or
- By the WDFW as a department-sponsored fish habitat enhancement or restoration project; or
- Through the review and approval process for the Jobs for the Environment Program; or
- Through the review and approval process for conservation district-sponsored projects; or
- Through a formal grant program established by the legislature or the WDFW for fish habitat enhancement or restoration; or
- Through other formal review and approval processes established by the legislature.

The legislation streamlines permitting for many habitat enhancement and restoration projects. There are projects, however, that do not meet the criteria, and so cannot take advantage of the streamlined process. In addition, projects may meet the criteria, but may require federal permits (e. g. section 404 permit) or local permit (e. g. road construction)

V. 288

Statewide Strategy to Recover Salmon – Extinction is Not an Option
Permit Streamlining

and may have significant adverse environmental impacts, requiring review under SEPA. This type of project would not qualify for the streamlined process.

There are, of course, many projects that are not "enhancement" or "restoration" projects that create impacts to fish and habitat. It may be possible in some cases to provide incentives, including streamlined permitting to encourage project proponents to make choices that cause less impact.

3. Emergency Permitting

Criteria and procedures for use of emergency permit exemptions and funding can lead to projects that adversely impact fish and habitat. The ability to get emergency permit exemptions, and emergency funding, can drive project decisions, including construction alternatives and timing, that harm fish and habitat.

To be eligible for emergency funding from the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Natural Resource Conservation Service, for example, projects typically must be completed within 40 - 180 days of the emergency event. Also, projects must include only the amount of work necessary to correct the damages caused by the event. This can encourage people or agencies to wait until the damage has occurred, to work during or after the flooding event when damage to fish and habitat is greater, and to fail in addressing the cause of the problem and preventing its reoccurrence.

In addition, projects that include design or structure revisions to address flood hazard reduction or future flood avoidance are automatically penalized with a reduction in the funds available. Federal, state and local agencies have been discussing changes needed to address emergency permitting without causing any further harm to salmon habitat.

4. Joint Aquatic Resource Permit Application (JARPA)

The Departments of Ecology, Fish and Wildlife, and Natural Resources worked with cities, counties, and federal agencies to develop a single permit application form to keep what was originally seven to nine different application forms and over ten different permit actions. With passage of the legislation on fish enhancement projects (2SHB 2879), use of JARPA is now mandatory for certain types of recovery projects. The JARPA "cover sheet" information has been revised to reflect the eligibility requirements of the new legislation. A few other improvements for enhanced usability were also incorporated.

The use of Joint Aquatic Resource Permit Application (JARPA) is expected to become more widespread. Its use in eastern Washington, rural western Washington and southern Puget Sound is almost universal, but some communities with major populations aren't using JARPA. The application use to date strongly suggests a consolidated permit process could be developed for well-designed, watershed-based stream rehabilitation and fish habitat recovery proposals, as a first step toward more widespread permit streamlining. Such consolidation could be made under multiple current authorities, with

appropriate legislation. However, use of rigorous watershed-based stream corridor management criteria and guidelines is essential to the success of permit consolidation.

5. Further Work

The Joint Cabinet will provide ongoing resources and support for the efforts of the Interagency Permit Streamlining Workgroup (IPSW). The IPSW has been reorganized and renamed as the Permit Streamlining Oversight/Advisory Committee. The new structure includes five technical sub-committees - Interagency Stream Corridor Workgroup; Mitigation Workgroup; Fish Habitat Improvement Subcommittee; JARPA workgroup; and Flood Hazard Reduction sub-committee. These workgroups and related subcommittees have developed a formal working relationship, through the umbrella of the Permit Streamlining Oversight/Advisory Committee.

The Permit Streamlining Oversight/Advisory Committee's goal is to gain consensus among all participating agencies on changes to laws, rules and programs that will help improve and broaden streamlined permitting and funding opportunities for habitat enhancement, restoration, and protection activities.

The work of the Permit Streamlining Oversight/Advisory Committee will include:

- coordinating the implementation of 2SHB 2879 and seeking consensus among local, state, tribal and federal agencies as to acceptable habitat protection and restoration project applicants, project types, and project sizes and scales that protect public safety;
- elevating issues and recommendations, particularly for changes in federal requirements, as needed to the Joint Cabinet;
- identifying and seeking the funding needed to implement permit streamlining activities for habitat enhancement and restoration required but not funded by 2SHB 2879.

The Permit Streamlining Oversight/Advisory Committee should continue the efforts outlined in Table 9 illustrating committee structures for 2 years, or until June 30, 2002. At that time, the Joint Cabinet will evaluate the progress being made and the need to continue this work.

Table 9 – Permit Streamlining Organizational Structure

Mitigation Workgroup (2SHB 2496)	Interagency Stream Corridor Workgroup	Fish Habitat Improvements Committee (2SHB 2879)	Joint Aquatic Resource Permit Application (JARPA) Subcommittee	Flood Hazard Reduction Subcommittees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Develop Acceptable Interagency Strategies for Mitigation and Criteria for Use ◆ Work with stakeholders, WSPI, and other existing workgroups ◆ Implement Strategies in watershed plans ◆ Provide training ◆ Complete pilot tests of new preservation policies for Nationwide Permits ◆ Create interagency agreement for use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Develop Integrated Stream Corridor Management Guidelines ◆ Develop guiding principles and users manual ◆ Provide training ◆ Identify permit streamlining incentives for using guidelines ◆ Create interagency agreement for use ◆ Develop guidelines on restoration and mitigation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Suggest revisions to 2SHB 2879 for increased habitat improvements ◆ Training on 2879 requirements to local governments, WDFW, and applicants ◆ Develop Corps and Ecology general permit ◆ Develop criteria for habitat improvements ◆ Report to legislature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Make annual revisions ◆ Suggest legislative revisions ◆ Provide updates and training to local govts. And JARPA agencies ◆ Increase use of and effectiveness of form ◆ Develop and implement JARPA phase II - single state permit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ <u>3110 Subcommittee</u> ◆ Implement HB3110 and draft 1998 legislation ◆ Implement flood hazard reduction initiatives ◆ <u>Levee Vegetation Workgroup</u> ◆ Revise Federal Levee Vegetation requirements ◆ Emergency Permit Subcommittee ◆ Revise federal funding requirements that drive poor project planning and construction ◆ Develop "imminent threat" exemptions/general permit ◆ Criteria for mitigation

While streamlining the permit process is an important endeavor, adequate staffing for implementation of state permits is still a prime concern. Improperly designed "restoration" projects can cause considerable damage to the ecosystem. Projects intended for fish restoration can damage other parts of the ecosystem; for example, wetlands. State guidance is needed to direct local reviewers in dealing with ESA issues and coordinating with the Federal government.

In addition, a necessary ingredient for permit streamlining is the availability and use of consistent guidelines for designing, reviewing and approving projects in stream corridors.

Development and Application of Integrated Stream Corridor Management Guidelines

1. Context

The context for salmon habitat restoration work is provided by completion of a comprehensive characterization of the watershed. Such a characterization identifies resource issues within the watershed as these relate to salmon habitat recovery. This characterization is an essential step because it will help watershed communities direct limited financial and human resources to the projects that best address the habitat needs of at-risk salmon stocks within the overall basin or sub-basins. Using a watershed characterization, areas that – if restored – would best address known habitat deficiencies

for the respective stock, such as limited winter rearing habitat, providing base flow support to streams, or alleviating flood impacts can be identified and then targeted for project sponsorship and funding. Thus, an early emphasis on watershed characterization can save time and expense.

Following an understanding of the watershed through characterization and limiting factors analysis, the next level of guidance needed is specific to the type(s) of habitat protection and restoration work being implemented on the ground. These protection and restoration actions cover a range of habitat elements and processes, including such areas as headwater spawning beds, stream corridors, wetlands, shorelines, etc. All of these features require specialized guidelines, to provide ecologically sound and consistent direction for the design of habitat protection and restoration activities.

Salmon habitat restoration or rehabilitation projects will be done by programs and projects that may focus on various scales: specific habitat needs, stream corridor function, and/or ecological health of watersheds or river segments. There is a pressing need to assure these efforts are based on good understanding of the physical and biological dynamics of stream corridors to successfully recover salmon stocks, to avoid inadvertent damage to existing riparian and fish habitat, and to avoid causing undesirable new flooding impacts elsewhere on the stream. A common understanding of stream science, and a statewide consensus on appropriate techniques and treatments for habitat rehabilitation will optimize funds spent on salmon recovery efforts. A technical consensus will also facilitate streamlining of permitting and improve efficiency and effectiveness of regulatory programs.

Regardless of the scale of restoration, it is more likely to be successful if done through a process of four restoration elements: 1) watershed characterization and assessment; 2) protection of existing habitat; 3) science-based remedial action; and 4) monitoring, evaluation and feedback.

2. Guidelines Needed

The approach being recommended addresses the need for integrated guidelines for carrying out salmon habitat restoration and fully mitigating habitat damage by in-stream and stream corridor modifications, construction, and developments. Such guidelines would address the nuts and bolts technical details that people can apply in the field to restore or rehabilitate habitat or stream corridor function or minimize future damage. Table 10 is a preliminary list of habitat elements and related guidelines for habitat restoration that are currently needed (only a few of which are under development or are available) and identifies gaps in those guidelines.

The table includes several elements beyond detail design guidelines; such as, watershed assessment and monitoring and evaluation. These three restoration elements, i.e. characterization and assessment, remedial action, and feedback, must be developed concurrently so they can relate and interact. Characterization and assessment and monitoring protocols must relate directly to the guidelines that tie them together. A common analogy is the patient with clogged arteries; it does the patient no good to apply

a band-aid over his heart and then monitor his condition by taking his temperature. A patient assessment is needed that leads to specific remedial actions and monitoring that are relevant to the case along with maintaining healthy body functions.

The habitat element in Table 10 describes specific physical habitats or processes required as part of restoration efforts. The “Need” column lists documents that describe this element as a habitat need.

A guideline addresses a level of quality to be designed to or a process through which a design or assessment is developed. The desired level of quality must be understood in order to develop an appropriate guideline. The guidelines for habitat restoration are based on optimum habitat conditions and goals. The “Desired Conditions” column lists known documents that describe optimum conditions for each habitat element.

Restoration is considered to be restoration of natural conditions. This is not possible in most situations. Rehabilitation is considered to be the modification of habitats to achieve a functional goal. Stock recovery can be achieved without necessarily meeting the desired condition of some habitat parameters. The “goal” is a standard that a rehabilitation project must accomplish to effectively recover a specific stock; it is likely a watershed and species specific parameter. For example, the optimum width of a floodplain for restoration of a specific stream type might be 200 feet but, based on the topography and geomorphology of the channel and floodplain, a specific goal might vary and be substantially more or less than 200 feet in places. The “Goal” column in Table 10 lists known documents that recognize habitat condition goals.

The “Guideline” column lists known documents that contain on-the-ground nuts and bolts procedure used by a practitioner to achieve the desired condition or goal. It is the actual “what to do” or “how to do it” to achieve a stated rehabilitation goal. Items listed in the guidelines column may provide a comprehensive or partial standard for the specific element.

Table 10 is very preliminary; there are certainly additional habitat elements and documents that can be added. It is included here only to generally show the extent of information available as a first step in development of habitat restoration guidelines. It shows us the guidelines that are currently available, and those that are not. Blank cells in the table may represent information gaps for habitat recovery. It is not expected that specific guidelines will necessarily be required for every habitat element. Many elements within the table will be combined as guidelines are developed. Items listed in Table 10 are not necessarily officially adopted or accepted by state of Washington resource agencies.

It is important to remember that it will be crucial to fund, schedule, and carryout performance monitoring of restoration projects to assure success of the project and the techniques and technologies utilized.

Table 10. Habitat Elements and Habitat Restoration Guidelines

Habitat element	Need(s)	Desired Condition	Goal	Guideline(s)
Ecosystem Scale				
Watershed assessment	NMFS, WSP			WDOE, CF&G
Monitoring, Evaluation	NMFS, WSP	TFW		CF&G
Frequency, magnitude, and duration of disturbances	NMFS, WSP	NMFS, WSP		
Nutrient cycling	WSP			
Flushing flows		NMFS		
Reach Scale				
Channel complexity	WSP	TFW, NMFS		
Channel condition (w:d)	NMFS	NMFS, HB1309		ISPG
Channel condition: pool/riffle		TFW, HB1309		
Channel condition (form)	ISPG	TFW, HB1309		ISPG
Sediment quality and transport	WSP	WSP, TFW		
Sediment control measures	WSP, WDFW (WAC)			
Streambed stability		TFW		
Riparian area dimensions	NMFS, WSP	NMFS, WSP	SWC	SWC
Riparian structure	WSP, TFW, WDFW (Rip)	TFW, WDFW (Rip), SWC, HB1309		SWC, CF&G
Refugia	NMFS, ISPG	NMFS		
Wetlands	WSP			
Hyporheic connectivity				
Floodplain connectivity	NMFS	NMFS		
Side channel connectivity	ISPG	ISPG		ISPG
Estuary tidal, water quality restoration	WSP			
Near shore marine habitat	WSP			
Near shore migration corridor	WDFW (WAC)			
Microhabitat Scale				
Spawning gravel quality	WSP, NMFS	NMFS, HB1309		
Spawning gravel sources	WSP			
Spawning gravel supplementation	WSP			
Spawning gravel sorting		NMFS		CF&G, BCME
Summer rearing habitats; debris, pools	WSP, NMFS	NMFS, SWC, HB1309		CF&G, BCME
Winter rearing habitats; side channel habitats	NMFS	NMFS		
Large woody debris		HB1309, TFW, NMFS		
Streambank	NMFS, WDFW (WAC)	NMFS, ISPG		ISPG, CF&G

Note 1. Table 10 is representative, not inclusive.

Note 2. For abbreviations see next page.

Abbreviations:

BCME:	British Columbia Ministry of Environment watershed restoration manual
CF&G:	California Dep't of Fish & Game restoration manual
HB1309:	Ecosystem Standards for State-owned Agriculture and Grazing Land
NMFS:	National Marine Fisheries Service draft Essential Fish Habitat
ISPG:	Wash. Dep't of Fish & Wildlife Integrated Streambank Protection Guidelines
SWC:	Skagit Watershed Council
TFW:	Timber Fish and Wildlife/Forest Practices Rules
WDFW (Rip)	Wash. Dep't of Fish & Wildlife draft Riparian document
WDFW (WAC)	Wash. Dep't of Fish & Wildlife WACs
WDOE:	Wash. Dep't of Ecology Watershed Characterization Process
WSP:	Washington Wild Salmonid Policy

3. Strategy for Integrated Stream Corridor Guidelines

There are numerous stream habitat elements for which habitat restoration guidelines are needed as shown in Table 10. The eventual product will be an “*Integrated Stream Corridor Management Guidebook*.”

- The Guidebook will consist of a series of specific documents that provide detailed restoration and protection guidelines for all significant restoration and protection activities. The stream corridor management guidelines must mesh with and be complemented by larger scale and more broadly scoped ecosystem and watershed protection approaches and strategies. Other activities that will need to be meshed and coordinated with guidebook development include:
 - Review and amendment of federal standards such as Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Field Office Technical Guides (FOTGs); (See Chapter IV. A. 1. Agricultural Strategy to Improve Fish Habitat)
 - Habitat Conservation Plan developed by Department of Fish and Wildlife for its Hydraulic Project Approval permitting program;
 - Design and approval process for projects under permit streamlining of fish enhancement projects authorized under 2SHB 2879;
 - Rule changes as necessary under the Shoreline Management Act, Floodplain Management Act and the Hydraulics Code;
 - Project selection and funding for habitat restoration.

An example of habitat protection guidelines is the WDFW's *Integrated Streambank Protection Guidelines* (ISPG). The ISPG is a draft document that describes a process for bank erosion assessment and bank stabilization design. While it is generally agreed that streambank stabilization is undesirable, we know that some stream reaches will continue to be stabilized. Therefore it is deemed necessary to develop habitat mitigation/restoration guidelines for this activity. Some restoration activities may also require streambank stabilization to which these guidelines would directly apply.

The proposed solution includes the completion and implementation of the ISPG as a model for additional guidelines to be developed and as an important element of the Integrated Stream Corridor Management Guidebook. It will also serve as a starting point to develop the scope of the entire Integrated Stream Corridor Management Guidebook.

V. 295

Support for ISPG implementation, particularly for outreach and training needs, will be important. The ISPG can also serve as a foundation, at least in part, for the collaborative process for review and amendment of Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Field Office Technical Guides (FOTGs) that is underway and for the Habitat Conservation Plan being developed by the Department of Fish and Wildlife for its Hydraulic Project Approval permitting program.

The Integrated Stream Corridor Management Guidelines will be implemented through a variety of means: as “best available science” for interpretation of permit conditions and mitigation under the Shoreline Management Act and the Hydraulics Code; as minimum standards for permit streamlining; and as the basis for state-federal agreements on interpretation of the Natural Resource Conservation Service’s (NRCS) Field Office Technical Guides (FOTG).

4. Interagency Stream Corridor Workgroup and Workplan

A workplan has been developed building upon the on-going efforts of the Interagency Stream Corridor Workgroup. The ISCW includes members from the Departments of Fish and Wildlife, Ecology, Transportation, and the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). The long-term goal of achieving integrated stream corridor management guidelines for the state, which are also agreed to by federal agencies, will require additional funding to enable continuation and timely completion of the work of the Interagency Stream Corridor Workgroup.

Some funding was provided by the 1999 legislature to the Department of Transportation. The ISCW is also obtaining funding through the Salmon Recovery Funding Board for the activities listed in Table 11.

Twelve general project types have tentatively been identified as needing technical guidelines (see Table 11). Specific guidelines will be identified through a technical scoping process and technical workshops that will include design engineers, resource managers, contractors, regulators, interested parties, and other technical experts.

Guiding principles will first be developed as a basis for the technical guidelines. The proposal includes development of the guidelines themselves, integration with related standards and rules at other levels of government, initial and continued technical outreach and training, and periodic updates as we learn from restoration monitoring activities.

Users of the guidelines will include local government public works and community development departments; local conservation districts; quasi-governmental and private watershed and salmon restoration groups; state and federal agency resource managers; resource management consultants; and others with specific interest in salmon habitat protection and restoration and a need for detailed information.

In addition to providing the best science for specific project design, the guidelines will be used in the evaluation of projects for funding decisions, permit streamlining, and in making permit decisions more consistent and predictable.

At present, the complete guidebook is contemplated to include eleven guideline volumes in addition to the Integrated Streambank Stabilization Guidelines that have already been drafted. Each volume will include a variety of specific products including hardcopy, CD-ROM, and internet publications; technical, regulatory, planning, and landowner workshops; and other information publications.

**TABLE 11. INTEGRATED STREAM CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT GUIDEBOOK
Proposed Components of Habitat Protection and Restoration Guidelines**

Sequence	Component	Habitat issues addressed	Application of Guidelines
1.	<i>Integrated Streambank Protection Guidelines</i> (in preparation)	spawning, rearing habitat, lost opportunity mitigation	HPA, SMA, FOTG, ESA compliance, FEMA DSR's, Corps 404/10, Flood hazard management plans, PL 84-99
2.	Channel Design Guidelines	channel relocation, channel condition, channel complexity	HPA, SMA, FOTG, ESA compliance, Corps 404/10
3.	Fish Passage Design Guidelines (in preparation)	adult and juvenile salmonid migration barriers, anadromous and resident species	HPA, SMA, FOTG, FERC, ESA compliance
4.	Macro-Habitat Restoration Techniques	Instream structures, gravel restoration, refugia	HPA, FEMA DSR's
5.	Sand and Gravel Removal Guidelines	Sediment, channel complexity, spawning quality and stability	HPA, SMA, FOTG, ESA compliance, Corps 404/10, Flood hazard management plans
6.	Floodplain / Riparian Corridor	Riparian structure and dimensions, refugia, floodplain-channel surface and sub-surface hydraulics, sediment storage, water quality, lost opportunity mitigation	HPA, SMA, FOTG, ESA compliance, GMA, Flood hazard management plans, Surface Mining Reclamation Permit
7.	Estuary Restoration Guidelines	tidal wetlands, rearing habitat, tidal surge sediment management, estuary productivity	HPA, SMA, Corps 404/10
8.	Design of Fish Protection Screens at Water Diversions	fish protection at water diversion screens	HPA, FOTG, FERC, ESA compliance
9.	Siting and Design of Off-Channel Rearing Habitat	off-channel rearing	HPA, SMA, GMA, Flood hazard management plans
10.	Shoreline Salmonid Habitat Restoration Guidelines	Migration corridor, primary food production	HPA, SMA
11.	Marine Shoreline and Near-Shore Activities	Migration corridor, sediment sources, primary food production, beach hydrology, predation, shading, water and sediment quality	HPA, SMA, Corps 404/10, DNR aquatic land leases
12.	Other instream activities (pipeline crossings, blasting)		HPA, SMA, FOTG, ESA compliance, Corps 404/10, DNR aquatic land leases

The applications listed here are examples of potential applications; this is not intended to be a complete list. Other existing and proposed guidance efforts will complement this proposal (e.g. *Stormwater Management Manual for the Puget Sound Basin*, WSDOT bridge scour analysis work, *Comprehensive Planning for Flood Hazard Management Guidebook*, *Ecosystem Standards for State-Owned Agricultural and Grazing Land*, *Management Recommendations for Washington's Priority Habitats*)

Acronyms:

Corps 404/10	Army Corps of Engineers permits
ESA compliance:	Endangered Species Act compliance under Sections 7 and/or 10.
FEMA:	Federal Emergency Management Agency; DSR: Damage Survey Report
PL 84-99	Army Corps of Engineers levee vegetation standards
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission hydroelectric plant licensing
FOTG:	Field Operating Technical Guide; National Resource Conservation Service
GMA:	Growth Management Act
HPA:	Hydraulic Project Approval; Washington Fish and Wildlife
SMA:	Shoreline Management Act master plans and/or guidance

IV. Adaptive Management and Monitoring: *Are we making progress?*

The general success of project permitting, permit streamlining and integrated stream corridor guidelines in contributing to habitat protection for all projects affecting waters of the state will generally be measured by monitoring positive or negative changes in habitat conditions as part of the overall strategy for adaptive management and monitoring in the Statewide Strategy to Recover Salmon.

The specific success of project permitting, permit streamlining and integrated stream corridor guidelines can be monitored through a coordinated tracking and reporting system for projects. A tracking and reporting system for habitat protection and restoration projects is now being developed by the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation working with the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office.

ESA Compliance Strategy

Comprehensive and integrated design guidelines for various types of projects that are accepted by the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as protective of salmon are the keys to ESA compliance for state permit programs. These design guidelines would eventually cover the range of habitat issues and project types outlined in Table 11 above, including protocols and methods for the watershed characterization that is needed to assess projects in a watershed context. These guidelines would be applied to all relevant projects potentially affecting salmon habitat, including habitat protection and restoration projects. Project sponsors and designers would be encouraged and assisted to use these guidelines during the preparation of project designs and permit applications.

In addition to developing and using accepted guidelines for projects, several ESA compliance mechanisms outlined in the Core Elements (Chapter IV.) may be relevant to specific permit programs. Examples of permit programs where these mechanisms are relevant include the following:

- Forest Practices Permits are likely to be recognized in Section 4(d) rules and a programmatic Section 10 permit may also be pursued.
- Section 7 consultation between the U.S. EPA and NMFS and USFWS on the state's water quality standards is an essential step for NPDES permit recognition under ESA.
- Section 7 consultation by the Corps of Engineers on its permit programs may provide an avenue for ESA coverage of state 401 CWA and Coastal Zone Management certifications.
- WDFW is pursuing a negotiated Habitat Conservation Plan and a Section 10 Incidental Take Permit for its Hydraulic Project Approvals.