

Bob Amrine Rick Hirschberg, Chanele Holbrook Shaw, Mark Mobbs, Eric Delvin, Lonnie Crumley, Randy Lehr, Jim Hill, Lee Napier, Chris Streans, and Mike Kuttel Jr. were present.

Bob Amrine opened the meeting and asked people to introduce themselves.

SRFB

- Napier reviewed the schedule with the group. The next deadlines for this process would be June 30 for the next draft, which would be reviewed during the July 8 meeting. Last month the group discussed setting September 9 as the date to review and score the proposals. Since the reviewers are meeting more with the sponsors through the site visits and review of the draft applications, we will not meet with the sponsors on September 9.

Peterson Creek-Rick reviewed the proposal for the group. Comments and questions from the group included:

- You should have marked the Section 401 box. Rick said that it might be exempt from this process.
- Outreach will include working with CD regarding planting. He also included signage to educate the public about the project.
- On-going monitoring? Yes, we monitor velocity & fish presence.
- This is the higher priority for the County because it's probably receiving funding through USFWS.

Frase Creek-Document fish presence, include proposal that addresses the bedrock removal. Address if bedrock is a barrier and how he will address it. It might not be a barrier during the high flow season. The reviewers would like this explained.

Ask Rod to resubmit and attend the next meeting.

Bunker Creek-

Site for sale for the last five years. The asking price is high. The landowner is not willing to change the location. This is the better location to place the bridge. The landowner is contemplating just dumping gravel over the existing culverts. He may withdraw the application. Historically used by chum, but not observed in recent years.

Mills

This site is an island, what is the value to salmon habitat. The site seems to be better tied to prairie riparian type of land. Approach is to preserve this type of land and include outreach as part of the Foundation's mission. Would this be a fit for the Grassland Program? Intend to remove all restoration components. Describe how you minimize damage from recreational use of the site.

Sampsom would augment flows? Agricultural ditch may be enhanced through storage in the wetlands to enhance flows. Confluence between Northcraft and Cozy Valley Creeks is located on the site.

Wishkah Sediment Reduction

Alder Creek

Fish passage for the tidegates.

The scope changed a bit to incorporate this into the intensely monitored watershed program. This will significantly change the budget. And may include another partner through Bonneville.

Fortify application with explanation of the on-going outreach through the class work.

Bring the worksheet with project summaries for next time.

Strategy Update

Ran out of time for a report

The next meeting is July 8, 2005 at the Lewis Conservation District.

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 project¹². 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

¹² 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.

