

Bob Amrine Eric Delvin, Nikki Wilson, Bob Metzger, Randy Lehr, John Bolender, Dan Blatt, Gavin Glore, Laura Till, Chanele Holbrook Shaw, Bret Demond, Lonnie Crumley, Lee Napier, Brian Peck, Chad Stussy and John Kliem were present.

Bob Amrine opened the meeting.

Lower Chehalis Barrier Assessment

Gavin Glore and Dan Blatt presented their assessment findings to the group. The assessment was funded through SRFB. They inventoried the lower Chehalis Basin, primarily in Grays Harbor County. The subbasins included Satsop, Wynoochee, Humptulips, Wishkah and Hoquiam. They samples 2,382 sites. Out of that the total sites samples 1,332 were fish bearing, 915 were not fish bearing, and 135 were unknown. He also broke down the barrier by passability. 42 were total blockages. 574 were severe (33%) blockages. 289 were partial (67%) barriers.

This work should be wrapped up soon and submitted to WDFW's SHEAR program/database.

Strategy Update

John Kliem reviewed the scope of work for the Strategy Update 2006. The goal is to elaborate on the improvements made in the September 2005 version of the strategy.

The Process will include:

- Improving the format/structure off the strategy (especially subbasin chapters)
- Create stronger, more complete subbasin chapters with recovery actions.
- Identifying WRIA-wide strategies
- Identifying community issues/values
- Integrating community issues/values in WRIA-wide strategies

Today's agenda will include:

1. A focused conversation on the Beechie and Bolton (1999)
2. Improving the format/structure of the strategy
3. Subbasin Assignments

A focused conversation on the Beechi and Bolton (1999) article

- A suggestion was made to get community involvement as soon as possible, so that they can influence the final document. Let people know the purpose of the restoration so they will support the solution.
- There seems to be a disconnect between the use of the strategies by local governments. Can the strategy be considered as best available science for land use decisions.
- Strategy needs to recognize a willingness to do the work. Especially if that project is not specifically described in the strategy.

Improving the format of the Strategy-Subbasin Profiles

- Based on the December SRFB Review Panel comments (attached), we need a better link between the tables page 14 (Limiting Factor and habitat effect), page 70 (impacts on Habitat forming process) and page 78 (subbasin actions).
- Start with the habitat forming process that includes a determination of functioning or degraded, then describe the affect on the species.
- Develop a survey form to help identify habitat forming process, subbasin actions, and certainty.
- For next meeting, John will develop a template tool to help complete the subbasin profiles and distribute it before the next meeting. Committee members are asked to think about how they would apply the template to a subbasin that interests them.

John Kliem asked the group to share their issues with the current strategy:

- Fish miles for barriers corrections stated 3 miles for high priority action with some exceptions. That needs to be revised.
- Encourage work in the smaller tributaries which are often low priority areas.
- Hard to justify working in the smaller subbasin and/or smaller streams.
- Fill in the data gaps with recent assessments.
- Are we missing the projects that benefit multiple species and life history stages?
- Wetlands might need more focus/emphasis.
- Though not listed, depressed species need protection. Might consider using priority habitats for area without depressed stocks. Protection of tribal treaty rights.

The current strategy, September 2005 version, is available from Grays Harbor County's website http://www.co.grays-harbor.wa.us/info/pub_svcs/ChehalisBasin/Docs/WRIA22-23Strategy2005.pdf

The agenda for next month will include a debriefing of the SRFB meeting on January 5th and 6th, presentation from Brett Demond regarding funding recommendation for the current round of the Family Forest Fish Passage Program, and continued discussion and work with John Kliem to update the strategy. The meeting date is January 13th.

EXCERPT FROM ATTACHMENT 3 – Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Grays Harbor County**

Specificity, Focus, and Certainty of Strategy¹
<p>1. Species and stocks</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? • Is the status of each stock presented? • Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
<p>Rating: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent² <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>Depressed stocks are identified as the highest priorities.</i></p> <p><i>Species profiles could be very useful to prioritize stocks at a greater level of specificity.</i></p>
<p>2. Watershed and marine ecological processes</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the strategy clearly identify the watershed and marine ecological processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?
<p>Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent³ <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>

¹ See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, June 2005 update, for details.

² The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

General (watershed scale) processes are identified but should be more locally specific and prioritized.

Limiting factors analysis is basis for processes priorities.

Processes are generally identified by watershed but not well prioritized, and a clear rationale for those processes is not provided.

3. Habitat features

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: ___ Excellent⁴ **X Good** ___ Fair ___ Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Habitat features based on limiting factors analysis are identified as important but they are not prioritized as to their relationships to priority stocks.

4. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: ___ Excellent⁵ **X Good** **X Fair** ___ Poor

³ The strategy clearly identifies limiting watershed processes and prioritizes these watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

⁴ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and prioritizes these habitat features for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Watersheds are prioritized and priority actions are identified at that scale but there is a lack of direction about where the actions could be best applied within watersheds.

5. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for the highest biological priority salmon protection and restoration efforts?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Does the strategy identify what types of biological based high priority projects, areas, and actions do not currently enjoy community support necessary for successful implementation, and why?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Are project ranking criteria identified that reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy identify an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ___ Excellent⁶ ___ Good **X Fair** ___ Poor

In this years' strategy, the community outreach and strategy to address the highest priority biological needs is not focused or specific.

⁵ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

⁶ In an excellent strategy: The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

6. Certainty

The Review Panel will consider:

- How well supported are hypotheses/assumptions for (1) attributes (e.g., abundance, productivity distribution, diversity), and (2) watershed processes and habitat conditions, that are most limiting fish response? What is the nature of the data to support these hypotheses? [Watershed Data Quality]
- How well have the habitat actions been shown to work? [Empirical Support]

Rating: _____Excellent⁷ _____Good **X Fair** _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Although based on limiting factors analysis, it is not clear how other available information affected prioritization of processes, features, actions and areas.

Prioritization did not appear to be supported by modeling work (e.g., EDT, other).

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan

7. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:

- Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas?
- Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features?

Rating: _____Excellent⁸ _____Good **X Fair** _____Poor

Almost half of the projects do not address highest priority areas or stocks.

⁷ In an excellent strategy rating: The strategy addresses with empirical data all key assumptions related to factors most limiting watershed processes and habitat conditions affecting fish response, and clearly demonstrates that actions identified in the strategy will achieve the stated goals and objectives for the prioritized species/stock(s).

⁸ To achieve an excellent rating: The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

8. Fit of project ranking

The Review Panel will consider:

Does the rank order of the project list address the highest priorities identified in the strategy for:

- Stocks?
- Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Limiting habitat features?
- Actions?
- Geographic areas?
- Community interests?

Rating: ___ Excellent⁹ **X Good** ___ Fair ___ Poor

The order of the projects is reasonably consistent with the priorities in the strategy, but the priorities in the strategy are very broad.

⁹ To achieve an excellent rating: The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists¹⁰

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?
-

Narrative only:

Not applicable. No regional recovery planning organization operates in this lead entity area.

¹⁰ Not rated.