

Bob Amrine Chanele Holbrook Shaw, Mark Mobbs, Eric Delvin, Lonnie Crumley, Jim Hill, Lee Napier, and Mike Kuttel Jr. were present.

Bob Amrine opened the meeting.

Lee Napier briefed the group regarding the status of proposals. Originally she received 15 applications. Several were withdrawn.

## **SRFB**

Sampson Acquisition- Chanele introduced the proposal. She corrected the cost estimate by adding additional dollars to cover the cost of the appraisal. This proposal is for acquisition only. The restoration work will occur with other funding sources.

- Breakdown the sponsor match (\$150,000) that is currently shown as cash.
- She mentioned other potential partners for future restoration efforts. The group suggested letters of support.
- This proposal is acquisition only with the intent of restoring the site with other funding. It was suggested that she describe (restoration plan) the options that she foresees as funding opportunities in her application.
- Napier read the five year plan to the group. The suggestion was made to include a salmon monitoring component as measurement for success. Monitoring suggestions included: coho production, smolt trapping, or escapements. To determine the best way to monitor consult WDFW, the Chehalis Tribe, of the CD.
- Describe your overall goal in the five year plan and also the application. What do you expect to see in five years? This would also allow for adaptive management
- The property does include the confluence, which was a question from the site visit.
- Describe the instream work in the five year plan.

Mills Acquisition- Chanele continues to ask the owner to reduce the cost of the land. She also removed restoration components from the application.

- Will the appraisal still be valid if funded? She will double check with Brian Abbott.
- Make sure the goals and objective are salmon centric.
- Point out that this is historically a perennial reach. This may help to address the concerns that this area is an island.
- What is the quality of the effluent from the fish farm? Ecology's NPDES permit may answer this question.
- Update the task and time Section V of Section 13.
- Also describe, as suggested above, any potentially contributing partners.
- If possible determine the lineal distance of perennial vs. intermittent flows this may help determine the amount habitat. Lewis CD has some limited survey information.

Forest Creek Barrier Removal-Lonnie increased the budget due to recent construction experiences. He described the changes and circumstances to the group. He did verify that the debris observed by the group during the site visit was not a beaver dam. If this is funded, then the Family Forestry Fish Passage Project downstream will also get funding.

- A letter of support or other documentation would strengthen the application by describing other partners related to the FFFPP
- Why use a multi-plate? The County wants a 100-year fix and this is typical construction for this sponsor.

Wishkah Sediment Control Project-Lonnie was able to get a copy of the report from Rayonier which was very helpful in furthering the development of this proposal. He also has several letters of support.

- What is the total road miles that constitutes the 86% of sediment loading?
- He will make some changes to the stock status description. He has conflicting information and is working with WDFW staff.
- Of the 161 independent drainage in the state, the Chehalis has the largest native population.
- Part of the foraging habitat for bull trout and recently spotted at RM 20. Check bull trout in Section 12.
- Do you describe the landslide area in the application? He has considered this and cannot avoid the area due to topography. Please describe this situation and the solution in the application.

Decker Creek-The group had the following comments/questions:

- How much benefit does this proposal provide verses the Green Diamond HCP?
- What are the HCP buffers?
- What is gained by this proposal? Describe how habitat features such as LWD recruitment, shading and hydrology are not adequately addressed through the HCP.
- Provide more detail in the Problem Statement, page 16.

The group would like Eric to attend the next meeting to help understand if the questions are addressed.

Alder Creek-The group had the following comments/questions:

- Good analysis of your options.
- Good work on site, but what about the downstream (City of Aberdeen) area? What about the crossing near Swansons? And other road crossings for the road. Expand on the barrier questions on page 19, objective one. The map/aerial photograph suggestion the potential for a dozen based on street crossing. The group suggested a quick survey.
- Fish passage for the tidegates? Discussed on page 19.
- What are the benefits for salmon?
- Should he segment this proposal to save cost? Some feel his approach is right on. High cost for 2 miles of habitat. The biggest selling point is the educational component.
- Page 13 and 17 are conflicting with respect to the % of spawning and rearing habitat. Correct page 13.

Peck asked if there was a way, to consistently quantify the upstream habitat for the barrier projects? Most proposal had PI's.

**Strategy Update**

Ran out of time for a report

The next meeting is August 12, 2005 at the Lewis Conservation District. The group expects to review draft proposals for the Barrier Assessment, Decker Creek Acquisition, and Alder Creek. Napier will brief the reviewer regarding the process to be used to rank the projects on September 9.

## APPENDIX C - TECHNICAL REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF PROJECTS

To help ensure that every project funded by the Salmon Recovery Funding Board is technically sound the Review Panel will note for the SRFB any projects it believes have low benefit to salmon, a low likelihood of being successful, and/or have costs that outweigh the anticipated benefits of the project<sup>12</sup>. The Review Panel will not otherwise rate, score, or rank projects. The Panel will take into account that at the time of application to the SRFB, some restoration projects will not have been completely designed and some acquisition projects may not have specific parcels identified. It is expected that projects will follow BMPs, when available, and will meet any state and federal permitting requirements.

### Criteria

For restoration and protection projects, the Review Panel will determine that a project is not technically sound and cannot be significantly improved if:

1. It is unclear there is a problem to salmonids the project is addressing.
2. Information provided, or current understanding of the system, is not sufficient to determine the need for, or the benefit of, the project.
3. The project is dependent on other key conditions or processes being addressed first.
4. The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits and the project sponsor and lead entity have failed to justify the costs.
5. The project does not account for the conditions or processes in the watershed.
6. The project may be in wrong sequence with other habitat protection, assessments or restoration actions in the watershed.
7. The project uses a technique that has not been considered to be successful in the past.
8. It is unclear how the project will achieve its stated objectives.
9. It is unlikely that the project will achieve its stated objective.
10. There is low potential for threat to habitat conditions if the protection project is not completed.
11. The project design is not adequate or the project is improperly sited.
12. The stewardship plan is insufficient or there is inadequate commitment to stewardship and maintenance of the project and this would likely jeopardize the project's success.
13. In addition to applying the above criteria, the Review Panel will identify projects that have not been shown to address an important habitat condition or watershed

---

<sup>12</sup> These projects will remain on the project lists evaluated by the Review Panel and forwards to the SRFB unless the lead entity decides to withdraw them. Only the SRFB has the authority to remove a project from the lead entity list.

