

Bob Amrine Eric Delvin, Kelly Verd, Dan Blatt, Gavin Glore, Laura Till, Chanele Holbrook Shaw, Bret Demond, Lonnie Crumley, Lee Napier, Brian Abbott, Mark Mobbs, Chad Stussy and John Kliem were present.

Bob Amrine opened the meeting.

Family Forestry Fish Passage Program

Brett DeMond presented the proposals for this round. Statewide 25% of the proposals are from the Chehalis. Out of the statewide funding 36% of the funding was distributed to sponsors in the Chehalis Basin. Also statewide miles opened are over 70 with 22.34 of those miles in the Chehalis Basin.

Brett asked sponsors to describe projects funded in Round 2. Bob reported on Shrader and Pierson on Independence Creek. Brian asked for projects during a high flow event. Lonnie managed the Galyean project on Garrard Creek Tributaries and the Armstrong project on Fairchild Creek.

Brett reviewed the projects proposed for funding during Round 3. The final list will be approved by WDFW on January 31, 2006. She would like LE concurrence with the list.

Lee asked if the group supported the ranking of projects? The group concurred with the ranking as proposed by staff

SRFB Update

Napier updated the group regarding the funding decision by the SRFB on January 6, 2006. 3 out of 12 projects were funded in the Chehalis Basin. It was her understanding that based on the strategy for the 2nd incremental funding cost the group. This criteria evaluated the quality of the strategy. The application of this criteria severely penalized groups that submitted the projects on the list that were not high priority.

Latest NOAA MOA states that federal dollar should benefit ESA listed areas.

Strategy Update

John Kliem presented the strategy templates concept to the group.

Bringing together resources for each subbasin:

- Primer on Limiting factors
- LFA 22/23
- Draft Without Project Conditions Report (USACE)
- WDFW Stream Catalog
- WRIA 22/23 EDT Report
- Other technical documents
- Internal reports of memos
- Professionals with local knowledge
- Protecting Aquatic Ecosystems (WDOE)

- Beechie/Bolton article

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

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.
- Use the subbasin template form to help identify habitat forming process, subbasin actions, and certainty.
- For next meeting, committee members are asked to think about how they would apply the template to a subbasin that interests them.

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 next meeting is February 10, 2006.

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.