

Katherine Humphrey

1. Chapter 3 of the plan appears to be promoting buffers as a solution yet again. Buffers are beneficial to water quality. Setting aside arbitrary large buffers adjacent to streams may or may not be of benefit. Ecology and tribes attack agriculture first because we are a tiny group now, and with international trade, entirely replaceable. Agriculture is located near streams because of use of water for irrigation, and because this is generally where the most fertile soil is. HB1838 was proposed by Inslee and the tribes to create 'big dumb buffers'. The bill failed because people thought that putting farmers out of business with arbitrary buffers was a bad idea. Farmers live on the land everyday. Destroying it and the wildlife we share it with are not the goals of any farmer in business that I know. I am quite concerned to see buffers yet again.

2. The plan outlines purchasing yet more land for the state to create 'robust riparian buffers'. The downside is: areas I am familiar with, where the state has purchased land, have not become 'robust' areas for wildlife, but have become seed banks for noxious weeds. There is a serious lack of proper land management by our state agencies and it is concerning to see wanting more land they can not properly care for.

3. The Voluntary Stewardship Program was created collaboratively with tribal, agriculture, government and environmental groups. It should be stressed and utilized more. Carrots over sticks.

4. I am quite dismayed to read section 3.2.3 These types of programs do a good job of growing staff and providing economic opportunities for savvy businessmen. I have never, ever, ever seen data to support that credit trading schemes have ever made our land, air or water cleaner! Please let me know if you have!