

Brian Peck, Autumn Salamack, Bob Metzger, Brett Demond, Lonnie Crumley, Randy Lehr, Scott Potter, Jeanne Kinney, Mark Swartout, Lee Napier, Jim Jacobson, Chris Streams, and Mike Kuttel Jr. were present.

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

Community Salmon Fund

Autumn Salamack introduced the Community Salmon Fund program to the group.

- The RFP was released mid-April and are due back to National Fish and Wildlife Foundation by June 3, 2005.
- Grants are available for requests up to \$50,000.
- The match is 50% of the amount of grant funds requested. Their matching funds must be non-federal sources.
- The program seeks to fund smaller types of projects.
- All projects must be completed by October 2006.
- Project sponsors will know the funding decisions by early fall.
- The program does not fund mitigation, conservation easements, or acquisition types of projects.
- Project design is eligible as long as it leads to on the ground restoration.
- There is \$120,000 available to the Chehalis Lead Entity program. This amount was awarded to all lead entities.
- What about permitting and ESA consultation? Autumn will follow up on this question.
- Outreach and education projects are eligible if combined with on the ground construction.
- The projects should be private lands unless they can be shown to be a demonstration type of project on public lands.
- The SRFB granted a million dollars to NFWF who also equally matched the SRFB dollars.
- If after the June 3 deadline, there are not enough projects to expend the \$120,000, then the money would most likely be returned to a general pool.

The review process includes:

- Sending out the proposals a month ahead of time.
- Review and score applications ahead of time
- Meet to finalize scores
- Reviewers may discuss proposal with the sponsors or may ask NFWF to follow up with questions.
- The project review sheets are available to project sponsors via the website. The address is nfwf.org/programs/graysharbor.htm.

SRFB Grant Program

Napier distributed a revised schedule for the sixth round of SRFB for the Chehalis Basin. The one change from the last schedule was the IAC application workshop on June 14 in Montesano.

Project Sponsors submitted the Letters of Intent on May 3. On May 17 and 18 the project sponsors will visit the sites.

Napier asked for feedback from the group regarding the schedule. Currently there are 14 sites to visit during the two day period. She doesn't think the group can visit all sites. She proposed visiting only the on the ground sites and the Dry Creek Assessment and then making arrangements to visit the three acquisition sites at another time. This schedule would also need to include time to hear a presentation from Bob Amrine on the barrier assessment. The group agreed with Napier's proposal.

Napier also asked the group for input regarding the final local review of the applications. In the past, the review included site visits and meeting one on one with the sponsors. The reviewers felt they could accomplish the second interaction with the sponsors during their review of the draft applications. They asked Napier to encourage project sponsors to meet with the TAG during the regular meetings scheduled for months of June, July, and August. For the September 9 meeting of the TAG, it would include only project reviewers discussing and ranking the projects. Project sponsors would be asked to be available to answer questions by telephone.

The group had the following suggestions for the site visits:

- Ask reviewers to present their proposal to the entire group before allowing people to wander around the site. This would help to insure that everyone heard the same information.
- Chad would take notes regarding reviewer comments or concerns. Project sponsors would be expected to address the comments either in the application or in not applicable to the application, they would submit a written response. This would help the reviewers to understand how their advise was used by the sponsor.
- During the site presentation sponsors should explain the site assessment, species presence and relationship of project to stream condition. If the sponsor cannot provide the answers, then the reviewers would direct the sponsors to a resource for help.

This year the SRFB asked Lead Entities to only submit projects that they want considered for funding. Napier reminded the group that in the past we submitted all proposals. However, this year the SRFB seems to expect us to submit only our top projects. The group felt that if we had projects of concern after our site visits we should share that with the sponsors to encourage them to not submit the full application. They group felt that if someone submitted a complete application, which is a lot of work, then it should be submitted to the SRFB. For information related to the SRFB Technical review see last page labeled Appendix C.

Napier asked the group for guidance to the acquisition project sponsors during their presentation. The group would like to hear responses to the following questions:

- How will the acquisition benefit the resource?
- Is it a direct benefit?
- Are there land use controls or other protection measures in place to preserve the area?
- What is the status of the land owner negotiations/agreement. The group recognized that usually this is finalized after a project is funded.

- Provide a historic orientation to the land use and the existing conditions through a series of aerial photographs.

Strategy Update

Napier distributed the proposed geographic division for the Chehalis Basin. This proposal would create 11 subbasins verses the current 34 in the strategy/work/LFA. The current geographic boundaries for the subbasins are unclear. She proposed creating 11 subbasins based on a combination of the Watershed Administrative Units (WAU). The new subbasin delineation would combine WAUs that drain directly into the Chehalis or contain large tributaries such as the Black and Skookumchuck. The group was asked for last month and via e-mail for their initial impressions. A suggestion was made to consider using H

The next meeting is June 10, 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.

