

Executive Summary / Report Overview

Context

Building on the draft 3-scale framework supported in principle through the *Salmon Action Dialogues*, this draft summary report documents lessons learned from the Washington State Salmon Recovery Strategy (WSSRS), a 3-tiered model that has been in existence for over 20 years. A total of 11 interviews were carried out over 9 weeks with Washington Salmon Recovery representatives and BC salmon leaders to inform this process

This Report Includes:

Deep Dive into the Washington Model

- Detailed summary of major components of the “Washington Way” summarized in Appendix I. For each “tier”:
 - Scope of Responsibility
 - Links/interactions with other tiers/agencies/initiatives
 - Funding practices
 - Staff and core budget

Key learnings from WSSRS

10 Key Takeaways from the Washington Model for consideration when crafting a “made in BC” salmon recovery strategy (BCSRS) including:

- The importance of long term, secure salmon recovery funding scaled accordingly to the work that needs to be completed
- The need for strong science and indigenous knowledge based recovery plans to guide project prioritization and funding decisions
- The importance of project development and implementation at the watershed scale

Suggested key principles & elements of a BCSRS

Drawing from lessons learned through the interview process, the report includes recommendations on guiding principles, framework structure and resourcing needs with brief examples below:

Principles: Salmon focus, Partnership, Transparency; Knowledge based

Framework:

- Tier 1 – Tripartite collaborative partnership between Federal, Provincial and First Nations Governments
- Tier 2 – Regional organizations with a focus on recovery planning, Project selection and technical support & coordination of watershed scaled organizations (monitoring, data management, etc)
- Tier 3 – Place based organizations supporting development and implementation of technical projects by local project proponents

Resourcing

- A straw dog is presented outlining how each tier could be staffed and funded to allow for initial program delivery

DRAFT PSF/FNFC Summary Report: US Lessons for Salmon Recovery in BC - V4

- Projected budget of ~ 80M required to initiate model and begin to implement meaningful work on the ground

Conclusion

- BC Salmon Stocks are in decline and there is no indication current recovery efforts are effective
- There is no mechanism to allow for a coordinated effort and strategic approach by senior governments, First Nations and “salmon community”. We have a “Major Systems Problem”
- A “made in BC” 3-tiered salmon recovery strategy is the best option for working towards salmon recovery in British Columbia in terms of dealing with climate change challenges and respecting First Nations leadership as we take the first steps down the path of reconciliation.

Background & Context

The Pacific Salmon Foundation (PSF) has been working in partnership with the First Nations Fisheries Council of B.C. to engage First Nations leaders, Crown Government, and a coalition of the willing to drive the development of a collaborative framework for salmon recovery in B.C. This work is designed to address a major gap in salmon recovery – a strategic plan and coordination – by designing and implementing a framework that supports the many entities working on salmon.

Building on the draft 3-scale framework supported in principle through the *Salmon Action Dialogues*, this draft summary report will focus on lessons learned from the Washington State Salmon Recovery Strategy delivery model – a 3-tiered model that has been in existence for over 20 years. A total of 11 interviews were carried out over 9 weeks with Washington Salmon Recovery representatives from the Governor’s Office to local watershed-based organizations from coastal Washington to the upper Columbia. Governance and subject matter experts from BC were also interviewed. The results of those conversations: who, what, how, scope of responsibility, decision making (including polarizing issues such as project prioritization and budgets) are summarized in this report along with key “takeaways”, “red flags” and suggested principles and elements of a BC Salmon Recovery Strategy informed by what we’ve learned through this process. This report is seen as a first step in fostering dialogue and discussion to inform development of a strategic collaborative approach to salmon recovery in British Columbia.

10 Easy Pieces

“Takeaways” Lessons Learned from the Washington State Model

Based on our conversations with Washington State Salmon Recovery officials the following recommendations or “lessons learned” are relevant to strategic salmon recovery planning in British Columbia and should be considered with any planning initiative moving forward:

1. The Washington State Salmon recovery Structure was created by state law. **Legislated Salmon recovery tool(s) that aren’t subject to changes in government or policy are a critical component of long-term success**

DRAFT PSF/FNFC Summary Report: US Lessons for Salmon Recovery in BC - V4

- This law precipitated bold collaborative action. There is currently no “Forcing Mechanism” in BC to facilitate meaningful positive change
 - Washington State has the mandate to manage salmon, the U.S. Federal government has the mandate to manage species at risk – **both have a clear “salmon recovery” role mandated by law.** This is not the case in BC.
2. **Long term, secure, salmon recovery funding** (not sunset programs) has been key in Washington State. Over 100M committed annually for over 20 years through successive state and federal administrations.
 3. Investment in science and Indigenous knowledge based **regional level recovery plans** to provide guidance to watershed organizations is essential and drives all decision making in Washington State, ensuring resources are allocated to areas of need.
 - Established recovery plans are used by third party funders (outside the purview of WSSRP) to guide funding decisions – **ensuring salmon dollars from all sources are well spent.**
 4. The role of a centralized “salmon office” within government with good access to decision makers and a **salmon advocacy role at Federal and State levels** is a key piece of the Washington model that seems effective and appreciated by all levels of engagement.
 5. Modest ongoing and **ensured core capacity funding** (separate from project funding) at regional and local level are essential to success of this model
 6. **Flexibility** in organizational structure within the framework established by law at both regional and watershed level has evolved to reflect the specific challenges, demographics and culture of the regions and is strongly advised.
 7. While WS tribes are true co-managers of harvest and hatchery operations (Boldt decision) they engage in recovery work similarly to other organizations – not in G2G relationship. Suggest a true **collaborative model** (led by Feds/Province/FN) more applicable to BC.
 8. Many regional organizations and local entities feel that lack of influence on land and water use decisions makes their work – and ultimate success– challenging. How can a BC eSalmon Recovery model address **habitat protection** as well as restoration?
 9. Harvest and Hatchery management decisions in Washington state are **not included in Recovery Planning mandate.** These are bilateral decisions made by Tribes and the State. Some Regional Organizations and Local Entities find lack of a voice in these decisions detrimental to recovery efforts
 10. **Washington State Salmon Recovery model is “scalable”.** The structure supports both complex high density areas and rural watersheds with more intact salmon populations in different but effective ways.

The View from here...

BC Salmon Leaders Perspectives

Representatives from the **First Nations Fisheries Council**, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, BC Ministry of Water, Land and Resource Stewardship and the POLIS Project for Ecological

DRAFT PSF/FNFC Summary Report: US Lessons for Salmon Recovery in BC - V4

Governance were also interviewed and provided their perspectives on the Washington State Salmon Recovery model and related thoughts on strategic salmon recovery in BC. Certain relevant themes were repeated by many of the interview participants as presented below in bullet form:

- *You have a chance to improve the status quo and even if you only improve it incrementally, it makes a HUGE difference. Salmon are so consequential*
- *In order to be successful you need good information, clarity on roles and responsibilities and robust solutions that engage watershed residents in a substantive way*
- *Perfection is the enemy of good. Naval gazing isn't going to fix anything with salmon in crisis – we need to take action where we can*
- *Not all of our issues are unique to BC – we should borrow what we can from Washington*
- *Important to note that in recovering salmon we are advancing reconciliation and preserving both ecosystems and sustainable economic opportunities.*
- *Salmon recovery model in BC needs to be empowered by legislative authority and be multi-tiered. Need to get the governance right.*
- *We need a formal commitment for 3 levels of govt. to work on this. UNDRIP provides extra motivation for change to status quo.*
- *Collaboration space between the 3 authority holders can become more natural when enabling community level work*
- *The option exists to advance salmon recovery through BC's Watershed Security Strategy. This should be explored.*
- *It's a real shift for the department, to acknowledge we can't be successful just using our levers and doing what's in our control. We can't do it on our own. We need to spend more time being a good partner. We need to consider a collaborative/co-planned way.*
- *Developing salmon recovery plans is manageable and an important step in the right direction.*
- *What we have going for us in BC, because there hasn't been a system, is an organic bottom-up system – i.e. community-based stewardship and FN's leadership in individual watersheds. It's streamlining what's already there and providing guidance and support, which I think we have the resources to do.*
- *We need to leverage and augment existing processes – it could happen in a more organic way – rather than a top down structure like in Washington*
- *Build on existing salmon and watershed structures – many exist and are functioning well.*
- *There's still a lot of space – while making sure we have a starting place with habitat but longer-term movement for co-management*

Initial Recommendations for Discussion

Building on what we have learned from the Washington State Model, the following initial recommendations are intended to initiate discussion and reflection on a “best path forward” for a BC Salmon Recovery Strategy.

Overview

Despite significant effort and best intentions, salmon recovery efforts in British Columbia have been largely unsuccessful. There are many reasons for this, the challenges are significant, but lack of coordinated effort and strategic approach by Senior governments, First Nations and the “salmon community” has not been helpful – and can be addressed.

It should also be noted that, with the passing of the *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act* in 2019, British Columbia is entering a new era of collaborative resource management that provides a real opportunity for a different approach to salmon stewardship in B.C. as we take the first steps down the path of reconciliation.

For long term success we need to move forward together on two fronts:

Governance

- move towards a fair and equitable sharing of salmon recovery decision making through an empowered tri-partite model including Federal, Provincial and First Nations governments
 - Currently the FNFC is engaged in discussions with senior governments towards establishing such a model to provide for improved Wild Pacific salmon conservation and stewardship.
 - *By working together, First Nations and Crown governments have an opportunity to support the coordination of a cohesive salmon restoration strategy across multiple levels and jurisdictions. This will provide opportunities to prioritize and maximize collective work and further meaningful implementation of the Declaration Act, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act, and the Government of Canada’s 10 Principles.* (FNFC Communique, Dec. 2022)
- Progress on this will be essential in establishing the “Provincial Tier” of a three-tiered recovery system.
- An Interim Agreement or Letter of Understanding expressing a commitment to work towards a more formal partnership could be sufficient to begin progress on this piece – and allow the implementation to begin as the hard work of negotiating a final agreement progresses
- The governance piece is not simple - and will take time, but the PSF/FNFC salmon action dialogue series has helped open the door to these discussions and can continue to be influential in this work.

Management/Implementation

- We need to develop a strategic, collaborative, effective and inclusive model for salmon recovery programming delivery that prioritizes work and empowers local watershed players.
- The PSF/FNFC collaborative relationship is ideally positioned to provide leadership on the management piece – and should do so. Lessons learned from the Washington State model can inform how we do this, recognizing some aspects of the model are more applicable than others.
- Building on existing relationships, and forging new ones, a “made in BC” 3-tiered implementation strategy is the best option for working towards salmon recovery in British Columbia.

We should not wait for the governance discussions to reach a conclusion before leaning into the work required to develop and populate a salmon recovery model.

- Demonstrating “readiness” will encourage progress on the governance front and encourage agencies to consider the advantages of streaming available funding through a well designed strategic model to ensure maximum benefits to salmon

Principles

A BC Salmon Recovery Framework should be based on the following principles:

- Salmon focus
 - All decisions and all outcomes should be grounded in the common interest of salmon sustainability.
- Partnership
 - Effective, respectful and committed partnerships at all levels (provincial, regional, watershed) will be required.
 - At each scale, success will require entities who are not used to working closely with each other to do so.
- Transparency
 - All decisions at all levels should be transparent and open to scrutiny by all partners and the general public
- Knowledge Based
 - Western Science and Indigenous knowledge will provide the basis for planning and decision making
- *Mukw'stem 'o' shilhukw'tul* – Everything is interconnected
 - We are all connected to each other, to salmon, to the watersheds that support them and to this important work. Our decisions and actions are important.

Framework

Provincial Tier

DRAFT PSF/FNFC Summary Report: US Lessons for Salmon Recovery in BC - V4

Organization

- Tripartite partnership between Federal, Provincial and First Nations Governments
 - Collaborative decision making by equal partners
 - Formal agreement required; Interim agreement as First Step
 - Initial focus on Habitat restoration; opportunities for expanded scope to include coordinated habitat protection measures and/or incremental management initiatives (eg. Escapement target development)
 - Some form of legislated empowerment of recovery model to be considered
 - Commitment of Sr. Governments to fund model moving forward – both capacity and project dollars (see “Resourcing” below)

Roles and Responsibilities

1. Allocates funds to Regions
 2. Leads salmon advocacy work with Sr. governments
 3. Sets Standards for Recovery plans
 - a. Provides centralized support to complete and refresh recovery plans
 4. Provides Coordination between regions on overarching issues
 5. Compiles information from regions to complete Provincial scale status and progress reports
- Project Funding Dynamic
 - Provincial tier has responsibility of allocating available resources between the Regions.
 - Provincial Tier to appoint a high level technical committee to establish criteria to guide allocation of funds between regions.
 - This system will need to be flexible to accommodate unforeseen circumstances and impacts (eg. Big Bar, Flooding & wildfire impacts etc.) that could change allocation strategies between regions.
 - Funding allocation between regions should be reviewed annually

Regional Tier

Organization

- No need to re-create the wheel
- Scan existing regional structures and organizations and adjust/adapt/modify systems in place; Eg.
 - FNFC (13 regions)
 - DFO PSSI planning unit (15 eco-region sub areas)
 - PSF Salmon Recovery Economy Document (14 regions suggested)
- Professional staff provided guidance by “Citizens Committee” or Board comprised of respected community leaders (Not necessarily subject matter experts)

Roles and Responsibilities

1. Develop Regional Recover plans
 - a. Regional Salmon Recovery plans key to success of this initiative
 - i. Developed at Regional level following provincial template with guidance provided by First Nations, technical experts and salmon community

DRAFT PSF/FNFC Summary Report: US Lessons for Salmon Recovery in BC - V4

- ii. Provide roadmap for prioritized funding allocation
2. Coordinate Data Management and Monitoring between watershed tier organizations across the region
3. Allocation of funding to watershed tier organization(s) in the area
4. Provide data to Provincial tier for wrap up reporting
5. Final vetting and approval of project proposals
6. Coordinate communication between watershed tier organizations
7. Provide overarching technical support function to watershed organizations
8. Implement regional scale technical work (monitoring, data management, communications) not project scale restoration works.

Project Funding Dynamic:

- Proposals recommended for funding thru watershed tier process vetted by Sr. technical committee (comprised of subsets of Watershed level technical committees) and referred to Citizens Committee for comment prior to funding approval.

Watershed Tier

Organization

- Many effective watershed organizations already exist in BC
- Flexibility required to support and empower existing capacity
 - Depending on circumstance, coordination at watershed scale could be embedded in regional office (Upper Columbia model) or decentralized throughout region (Puget Sound model)
- Watershed Coordinator(s) supported by Technical committee populated by local subject matter experts from agencies, First Nations, ENGO's local governments and academic institutions.

Roles and Responsibilities

1. Creation of downscaled recovery plans based on Regional Recovery plan
2. Support project proponents in development and implementation of projects
3. Call for project proposals, adjudicate and make funding recommendations to Regional Organization
4. Coordinate communication and training opportunities between project proponent organizations

Project Funding Dynamic:

- Technical committee will adjudicate proposals submitted by project proponents using criteria informed by the established regional recovery plan. A subset of each watershed level technical committee will sit on the regional technical committee.

Resourcing

Washington State model review

- Washington State funding model is scalable and varies significantly between regions and local entities depending on complexity of the work, state of the stocks and capacity of the communities
- Approx 100M flows through system from GSRO (Fed and State \$) for capacity and project funding

DRAFT PSF/FNFC Summary Report: US Lessons for Salmon Recovery in BC - V4

- Hundreds of millions of additional grant based funding take advantage of the Salmon Recovery Framework to allocate funding
- Puget Sound Partnership Regional Organization is an anomaly with 69 state funded employees, an operating budget in 9 figures and an environmental mandate far broader than salmon recovery

Tier	Staffing Range	Core funding range	Project funding range
GSRO	7		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • +/- 100M • Allocated to Regional Organizations
Regional Organizations (7)	4 - 69	hundreds of thousands to tens of millions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • millions to hundreds of millions (not all through GSRO) • Allocated to Local Entities
Local Entities (25)	1-5	80-300K	Millions to tens of millions (Not all through GSRO)

BC Model Projected Requirements

Note:

- These numbers are for discussion and framing only, no detailed costing analysis has been carried out at this time.
- Included in this report to provide “order of magnitude” estimate and to emphasize that there will be real costs associated with the real benefits generated by a BC Salmon Recovery strategy

Tier	Number	Total Staffing	Core funding/ organization	Total Core funding	Project Funding/ organization	Total Project Funding
Provincial	1	4	200K	200K		
Regional	14	35	500K	7M	500K (planning, monitoring, data management)	7M
Local	28	42	100K	2.8M	2M	56M
Totals		75		10M		63M

Total costs of rough “straw dog” model

- Staffing 75 @ 80K average – **6m**
- Core funding – **10M**
- Project funding – **63M**

Total recover cost **79M/Annum** for modest start

Additional Points to Ponder

DRAFT PSF/FNFC Summary Report: US Lessons for Salmon Recovery in BC - V4

1) As documented in the PSF report (2023) *A Salmon Recovery Economy*, “there are very many existing federal and provincial programs and initiatives that align very well with.... Salmon recovery.” (see table below from that report)

<i>Table 2: Existing federal and provincial programs aligned with the proposed Salmon Recovery Economy</i>	Federal	Provincial
Two Billion Trees Program		BC Watershed Security Fund
Canada Nature Fund for Aquatic Species at Risk		BC Fish Passage Program
Aboriginal Fund for Species at Risk		BC Climate Preparedness and Adaptation Strategy
Canada’s Climate Change Adaptation Strategy		Together for Wildlife
Habitat Stewardship Program		First Nation Adapt Program
BC Salmon Restoration and Innovation Fund		BC Salmon Restoration and Innovation Fund
Pacific Salmon Strategy Initiative		Stronger BC - Jobs & Training

- Resources from these programs could be streamed into a BC Salmon Recovery Strategy framework – which would ensure best possible allocation of those resources.

2) Although initially senior levels of government would be expected to provide the funding for this initiative, an option for ongoing funding (or augmenting sr. government contributions) to operationalize a BC Salmon Recovery Strategy could be organized under a Project Financing for Permanence (PFP) like the successful Great Bear Rainforest fund.

Summary

Over the past 9 weeks a series of interviews have been undertaken with officials engaged in all levels of the Washington State Salmon Recovery Strategy as well as representatives of DFO, BC WLRS and the POLIS Institute. This work was undertaken to inform ongoing discussion and exploration of the viability of a 3-tiered framework to promote and enable salmon recovery in British Columbia.

This brief report captures the outcomes of those interviews, documents aspects of the Washington State model that should inform our work in BC, and offers some initial thoughts to prompt further discussion on what a BC Salmon recovery model might look like, touching on governance, principles, a suggested framework and preliminary scoping on costs.

This work is not based on exhaustive research but rather on candid conversations with individuals who are engaged in the lived experience of working to restore sustainable salmon populations in their watersheds. It is hoped that it will provide value to the ongoing *Salmon Action Dialogue* discussions hosted by the Pacific Salmon Foundation in partnership with the First Nations Fisheries Council, and to the important work of ensuring brighter future for salmon populations in British Columbia

Appendix I

Washington State Salmon Recovery Strategy Model

Overview

Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO)

- responsible for state-wide strategy, high level coordination, influence and funding

Regional Organizations (RO)

- Regional Recovery Plans; Fiscal and technical coordination at regional level

Lead Entities (LE)

- Watershed based, focused on habitat projects on the ground.
- LE support project proponents
- Projects locally developed, regionally ranked through mechanisms that are clearly understood

Governors Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO)

Summary – GSRO:

- Provides high level guidance for salmon recovery
- Advocates/advances salmon friendly policy and funding at political level
- Coordinates “core funding” for regional organizations
- Coordinates data management
- Reports out on progress at high level

Scope of responsibility

- Role of GSRO is outlined in statute: be the holder of the state wide **salmon recovery strategy** (SRS)
 - Updated in 2021 (more emphasis on Climate Change and data) with associated workplan. <https://rco.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/GSRO-GovSalmonStrategy-2021.pdf>
 - aligned with tribal priorities and regional recovery orgs
- State Legislation
 - <https://app.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=77.85&full=true>
 - Established GRSO and regional salmon recovery boards to implement projects.
 - Regional organizations aligned with federal ESA listings and watersheds.
- Liaison between all the partner organizations and tribes to advance policies and seek out federal and state funding
- Provides the structure to enable the multiple authorities involved with/impacting salmon recovery to work together.
- Significant GR role - advocates for salmon priorities & funding at state and federal levels

DRAFT PSF/FNFC Summary Report: US Lessons for Salmon Recovery in BC - V4

- Salmon Recovery Strategy 3 tiered approach implemented “top down” through a vision from state government driven by ESA (federal) listings. Creation of GSRO, Regional organizations and Local entities was through legislation
- GSRO has a staff of 7

Links to/Communications with other tiers and other agencies/Initiatives

Regional Organizations & Local Entities

- Allocates core federal and state funding to Regional Organizations and local entities
- Host Regional Organization meetings (Council of Regions)
- Host Washington Salmon Coalition (all Local Entities)
- Biennial Salmon Recovery Workshop

Washington Tribes

- One Tribe Rep on Joint Natural Resources Sub Cabinet when tiered system was created
 - No formal process to vet law with tribes
- Legal requirements to “co-manage” (Boldt decision) with respect to hatcheries/harvest.
- “Co-management” used “loosely” in salmon recovery realm
- There is no specified role for Tribes in the tiered Washington State Salmon Recovery structure. RO’s and LE’s have taken their own approaches

Harvest & Hatchery Decisions

- No Direct authority.
 - GSRO works with responsible agencies and decision makers through the governors office.

Habitat Protection

- No Direct mandate
- GSRO works with responsible agencies as they are developing their budget and policies and compiles the relevant policies for the governor’s salmon package.

Funding

Sources

- Upon initiation of Salmon Recovery Strategy – Federal/State funding partnership:
 - Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund – federal; annual appropriation; 100m/5 states (NOAA); associated with ESA listings
 - Matching legislated state contribution
 - These two allocations were the genesis of funding now and still anchor the program
- This funding is now augmented by various funding initiatives that are (currently) far greater
 - 11 different major funding accounts <https://ofm.wa.gov/sites/default/files/public/budget/statebudget/highlights/budget23/08-Salmon.pdf>

Allocation

- Operational funding
 - Not outlined in the statute: originally negotiated by GSRO with federal and state input (Top down)
 - Allocation to Regional organizations based on criteria (how big, how many salmon populations etc.) and Federal ESA policy

DRAFT PSF/FNFC Summary Report: US Lessons for Salmon Recovery in BC - V4

- Fixed percentage to each regional organization. Attempts to re-negotiate have been unsuccessful, funding formula remains static
- Project funding
 - Originally project selection was at a state level with criteria established and decisions made by a centralized Salmon Recovery Funding Board <https://rco.wa.gov/boards/salmon-recovery-funding-board/>
 - Now SRFB approves blocks of \$ to regional organizations and provides policy direction
 - Regional organizations have established criteria and decision making processes to allocate project funding to each local entity
 - Fixed percentage to each regional organization.

Regional Organizations

Summary – Regional Organizations:

- Liaison between State and Federal policy, funders and local watershed entities
- Responsible for Regional salmon recovery plans
- Provide broadly scoped scientific and technical guidance to local entities
- Coordinate distribution of core funding to local entities
- Often coordinate data management and monitoring

7 in all; 3 interviewed :

Coastal Washington

- Salmon recovery on Washington's outer coast
 - NW watersheds draining directly to the Pacific.
 - 6 federally recognized Tribes, multiple municipal jurisdictions.
 - 4 Local Entities
 - Only RO without ESA listed species (and no access to federal ESA funding from NOAA)

Puget Sound Partnership

- All watersheds draining into Puget sound
- Very large population base (compared to other ROs) -4.5M
- Unique - State agency with structure set by law; responsible for a suite of Environmental Initiatives as well as Salmon Recovery
- 69 staff
- 16 Local Entities
- Massive portfolio of funding partners

Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board

- 4 staff
- 1 local entity
- Challenges associated with Hydro dams
- 3 Counties, 2 Tribes represented on Board
- Project decisions made by technical & citizens committees

Regional Organization Scope of responsibility

DRAFT PSF/FNFC Summary Report: US Lessons for Salmon Recovery in BC - V4

- RO's originally created by State based on
 - Federal ESA framework (Like conservation units)
 - Existing organizations
- Develop and monitor (not necessarily implement) a recovery plan for their region.
 - Regional plans roll up into the state wide plan.
- Policy Development to address barriers to success in their region (funding, legal etc.)
- Provide technical guidance to, and guide consensus between, Lead Entities
- Work with Lead Entities and project sponsors to ensure projects fit with Regional Priorities and strategic plans
- Deliver core funding to local entities
- Recruit funding for Region wide planning, guidance and project implementation

Links to/Communications with other tiers and other agencies/Initiatives

GSRO

- Council of regions (GSRO led) meets quarterly
- RO's engaged by GSRO to develop salmon recovery strategy update (2021) and State of the Salmon reporting

Local Entities

- Some variability between RO's – generally they lead/coordinate
 - Technical meetings between Local entities – “Implementation Planning”
 - Quarterly “Committee level” Local Entity meetings - LE's provide content

Washington Tribes

- Tribes are co-managers with equal authority to the state enshrined in law, specifically applied to harvest and hatchery management – not habitat restoration
- Efforts to reflect Tribes Nationhood at Regional organizational level are made by each RO.

Harvest & Hatchery Decisions

- Regional Organisations have no Authority

Habitat Protection

- No regulatory authority
- RO's exert influence at political and operational levels

Funding

- Regions receive “core” federal and state operational and partnership funding from GSRO on a fixed percentage basis
- Regions also seek funding for their own operations (generally not project funding) independently
- Regions allocate core project funding to local entities, generally on a fixed percentage basis (if more than one LE)
 - Species diversity, amount of fresh water habitat and estuarine habitat are all used to develop the allocation formula
- Different RO's have different ways of recruiting additional funding and vastly different budgets eg:
 - Coast region is a not for profit charitable organization and seeks funding from private foundations
 - PSP is a state organization involved in many other environmental initiatives (other than salmon recovery) and has a vast portfolio of funding partners

DRAFT PSF/FNFC Summary Report: US Lessons for Salmon Recovery in BC - V4

- Different RO's have different methods of providing guidance to project selection for funding.
 - Typically RO's decide on "project funding envelope" going to each Local Entity and Local Entities make funding decisions based on guidance and policy from RO. Process is streamlined if only 1 LE
- Local Entities recruit project funding independently. Funders request support from RO as part of funding criteria (projects must fit into regional recovery plan)
- All projects recommended by RO's are vetted through centralized SRF Board for final approval

Staff and Core budget

Coast region

- 4 Staff
- 300K core capacity funding
 - Core capacity funding augmented by grant driven funding
 - 60K additional capacity funding to each Lead Entity
- 1.7M core project funding
- Vast majority of project funding comes from external grant driven/private foundation sources

Puget Sound Partnership

- 69 staff; unique in that it is a state agency
- PSP receives funding from a variety of revenue streams with a total budget in 9 figures (not all for salmon recovery)
- PSP guarantees minimum of 150K core funding to all 14 Local Entities
- Also coordinates additional salmon grants into "large capital projects" fund and runs competitive process with Local Entities (10's of millions)
- Local Entities and Individual project sponsors benefit for PSP efforts to raise profile and secure federal and state funds

Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board

- 4 staff (includes LE coordinator)
- Core capacity funding in 6 figures
- Core project funding in 7 figures
- Majority of project funding comes from external grant driven sources

Local Entities:

Summary – Local Entities: 3 (out of 25) Local Entities interviewed:

Chehalis Basin partnership

- Small organization on Washington's coast
- No formal structure, member organizations provide administrative support in kind
- 1 Employee (Coordinator)
- Hosts "habitat work group" - community based steering committee that reviews projects and endorses them

North Pacific Coast

- Small organization on Washington's N coast

DRAFT PSF/FNFC Summary Report: US Lessons for Salmon Recovery in BC - V4

- Citizens committee – like a board of directors – 12 members – provides direction
 - 6 initiating members prescribed by GSRO (Tribes, City, County)
 - 6 community members (forestry, NGO's, academic, citizens)
- Technical Advisor committee (20-30) provide tech direction to support CC decisions
- 1 half time employee
- 400K core project funding; 86K core process funding

Upper Columbia Basin

- Embedded in Regional Organization
- Board of directors – 5 members; 3 County (local government) and 2 Tribal representatives
- Funding decisions made by Technical committee & Citizens committee for endorsement by board
- 1 employee (Coordinator)

Structure and Scope of responsibility

- Watershed Based, focused on delivery support for projects on the Ground
- High Level of Variability between LE's. 25 variable lead entities across the state created by, and enshrined in, state legislation
- Local Entities can be an ENGO, Tribe, or local government
- Different lead entities have different priorities and approaches to restoration
- All have a mechanism for assessing and prioritizing funding proposals – usually against a consensus based prioritized restoration plan for the area or region.
 - This Overarching restoration plan is key
- Roles is somewhat analogous to watershed based CSP program- recruit and distribute funds according to agreed upon plan and criteria

Links to/Communications with other tiers and other agencies/Initiatives

GSRO & Regional Organizations

- Relationship between Local Entities and Regional Organizations varies throughout the state
 - Chehalis – 4 lead entities make up board of regional organization which provides policy direction and overarching support (eg. Monitoring)
 - Many RO's have only 1 LE embedded in RO office
- GSRO doesn't engage with local entities aside from granting and setting state priorities.
- Local entities largely rely on Regional Organizations to represent their interests at the state level

Other Lead Entities

- Washington Salmon Coalition
 - Monthly business meetings with all LE
- “All Hands” meetings
 - Quarterly more technically focused meetings including training
- Monthly learning and sharing
 - 1 hour ted talk
- Formal mentoring partnership for new LE coordinators

DRAFT PSF/FNFC Summary Report: US Lessons for Salmon Recovery in BC - V4

Washington Tribes

- Come to the table with technical staff to participate in habitat restoration planning/delivery
- Engagement typically technical – not at council/political level
- Tribes members of LE boards can bring concerns expressed back to their leadership for “G2G action”

Harvest & Hatchery Decisions

- No Direct authority. Mandate of tribes, state and feds
- Tribes members of LE boards can bring concerns expressed back to their leadership for “G2G action”

Habitat Protection

- No Direct mandate
- Coastal Regional organization is considering how to be more effective in this realm that role.
- Tribes members of LE boards can bring concerns expressed back to their leadership for “G2G action”

Funding

Sources

- “Core” operational and project from state (and usually federal flowing through state) based on fixed formula
- Other project funding opportunistic proposal based
 - Does not necessarily flow through LE or salmon recovery tiered system but funders look for endorsement by LE and “fit” with restoration plan

Allocation

- Operational funding
 - Fixed formula for federal/state core funding
- Project funding
 - Lead entity provides structure (variable between entities) to select projects to be funded according to agreed upon plan and priorities
 - Funding selections recommended to RO and SRFB for approval

Staff and Core budget

Chehalis example:

- Capacity funds (operating) – mostly state funding: 80K up from 60K
 - Modest guaranteed core funding key success factor
 - Adequate funding for half a full time position and ops costs. Other half funded by local partners (eg. Local govt, Tribe for top up and/or similar work)
 - Tribes and Local government contribute through administrative and fiscal management in kind.
 - LE does not implement projects itself