

**CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP  
HABITAT WORK GROUP  
Lewis Conservation District Office  
1554 Bishop Road  
Chehalis, WA  
February 9, 2007  
9:30 AM**

**Meeting Summary**

---

**PEOPLE PRESENT**

Chanele Holbrook-Shaw, Thurston County Citizen	Randy Lehr, Grays Harbor College
Bob Amrine, Lewis County Conservation District	Jim Kliem, Consultant, Creative Community Solutions
Jim Hill, Lewis County Citizen	Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County	
Brian Abbott, Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC)	
Brett DeMond, LWC Consulting	
Chad Stussy, Department of Fish and Wildlife	
Kathy Jacobson, Chehalis Basin Education Consortium	
Eric Delvin, The Nature Conservancy	
Andy Olson, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation	
April Johnson, The Nature Conservancy	
Mike Kuttel Jr., Thurston Conservation District	
J Roach, Thurston County Citizen	

**Announcements and Introductions**

Bob Amrine called the Habitat Work Group meeting to order at order at 9:38 a.m. Everyone present provided self-introductions.

**Subbasin Profiles Update**

John Kliem, consultant, Creative Community Solutions, reviewed the agenda. Important next steps for the group are prioritization within the subbasins and between the subbasins.

Mr. Kliem reported most of the subbasin profiles have been received. He thanked members for their time and effort in submitting the information. Some updating is still necessary as there are some gaps in some of the subbasin profiles. The goal is that within the next several weeks, the information will be complete followed by a peer review. The process at that point should be concluded. Mr. Kliem encouraged members to consider the update of subbasin profiles as an ongoing task of the Habitat Work Group. Project funding sponsors consider the profiles to understand the needs of the subbasin and how it fits within the greater context of the subbasin and watershed as a whole. The profiles are the substance of the overall strategy.

After the product is completed, it will be the essential focus point for the community meetings. The information to be communicated to the community will include what's needed to address limiting factors within the habitat within each subbasin and based on scientific opinions what is necessary to improve conditions. The community, armed with the information will be able to provide their views and input on

**Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group**  
**Meeting Summary - February 9, 2007**  
**Page 2 of 11**

what is right and wrong and where should the emphasis be from a policy standpoint. The subbasin profiles are important in the next steps.

Mr. Amrine referred to the peer review and asked about the process. Mr. Kliem replied that the review should include reviewing the information and checking on the validity of the information and making adjustments as necessary. Mr. Amrine inquired about the status of the Newaukum River profile. Mr. Kliem reported Chad Stussy completed the profile. Mr. Kliem said he was under the wrong impression about the subbasin and had accidentally left it off the list.

Ms. Napier responded to inquires about the timing for updates of the profiles. The group previously discussed updating the profiles every two years. However, based on Mr. Kliem's suggestion, it might be beneficial for the group to consider an update of several subbasins annually. It's up to the group at this point.

Mr. Kliem said he has spent over a week and half just on editing some of the profiles. It was more work than he anticipated. He suggested the group should update three to four subbasin profiles annually. It may help to establish a work group or standing committee that is responsible to ensure the profiles are updated. The group should review its respective skills and assets and determine a way of completing the updates.

**Inter-and Intra-Subbasin Prioritization**

Mr. Kliem referred to prioritization. Currently, there is discussion about the issue of prioritization as well as different methodologies suggested over time. He noted that when he began working with the group; prioritization was generally based on number of stocks and miles of spawning habitat, which appeared to work for some time. However, some people began to question that as a valid tool for prioritization within a subbasin. There has since been some exploration and up to this point, the main focus of prioritization is priority stocks.

Ms. Napier cited several factors that were mentioned at the November meeting concerning Salmonid Stock Inventory (SaSI) profiles, other comments about upper basin Chum being impaired, that the Newaukum steelhead was formally depressed, whether that should be a species of concern, as well as tribal observations that Chum was limited in the Black River.

Mr. Kliem led the group through a discussion to help members consider the concept of prioritization.

The first question asked was, "Why prioritize the actions within the subbasin and between subbasins?"

Ms. Napier said from a local perspective, it helps reviewers rank projects by providing a set of criteria.

Brian Abbott said from the perspective of the Salmon Recovery Funding (SRF) Board Technical Panel, prioritization is the reason for having strategies. Often, it was just a shotgun approach. However, there weren't sufficient funds and the panel wanted groups to focus efforts where there was the largest impact of recovering a fish that was either depressed or endangered. The shotgun approach can work but it takes longer. A new era is underway for recovery plans in several areas of the state, where there are stringent recovery plans and areas of focus. The panel wants the strategy to document what method was used to determine the project list.

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group**

**Meeting Summary - February 9, 2007**

**Page 3 of 11**

Brett DeMond asked whether a larger region would use a similar model. Mr. Abbott said there is exploration underway. It is possible from the SRF Board's perspective for the coastal region to tell the Board what it wants to do. Ms. DeMond asked whether other areas are undertaking similar planning efforts or whether the prioritization method could be used region-wide. Mr. Abbott said other areas have strategies but that they are different.

Ms. Napier referred to some recent discussions with legislators. She said she met with Senator Hargrove. Senator Hargrove is a project sponsor in the region for the Quinault Lead Entity and he was able to be part of the process. He indicated the group is ahead of other counterparts in the region. There is interest by him to ensure other lead entities are compatible by utilizing similar processes because the region as a whole will suffer if similar planning and prioritization processes are not used.

J Roach asked Mr. Abbott whether the SRF Board prefers to have similar applications or a project model. Mr. Abbott indicated the Department of Fish and Wildlife developed a template strategy for entities to complete. However, the SRF Board recognizes each is a local group with its own strategy. Up to this point, the SRF Board hasn't required a similar planning process. There is no template for the levels of planning.

Randy Lehr asked whether the SRF Board has a prioritization process to assign weights to different plans. Mr. Abbott said the review panel employs a process to review strategies which is similar to an evaluation. Ms. Napier said it's been her experience that the SRF Board wants groups to know its area and articulate what is important, why, and how it was determined. The important message is that the entity undertook a process and determined the priority actions.

Mr. Kliem said there is a degree of competition when applying for funds. Strategy and prioritization are the main components of that process.

Mr. Kliem reviewed the summary of comments on why prioritization is important:

- Reviewers ranking projects
- Avoid shotgun approach – focus biggest impacts/funds to see results in end
- New era of recovery plans – focus areas/how it works in the future
- What methods were used to decide on projects
- Good reasoning in making arguments
- Known types of project proposals
- Address habitat restoration logically

Mr. Kliem noted there are good reasons for prioritizing both internally and externally.

Mr. Lehr asked how the SRF Board selects projects for funding. Mr. Abbott said the SRF Board wants to know if the planning entity is meeting its local strategy and established goals and priorities. Also, the SRF Board is undertaking regional area allocations, where in the past there was the issue of who would receive funding and how far down the list should be funded. The SRF Board decided to divide the funds before the grant round begins by area. Some of the competition has been eliminated to some degree by the new area allocation method. Mr. Lehr asked how area allocations are factored. Mr. Abbott said it is based on a number of different formulas and factors, such as, how big the area is, the number of watersheds, and spawning areas, etc. Ms. Napier provided additional comments about the level of review

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group**

**Meeting Summary - February 9, 2007**

**Page 4 of 11**

by the SRF Board. The application must answer questions concerning the certainty of the projects and the benefits.

Mr. Kliem pointed out that there is the question of what the consequences are for not prioritizing more or not prioritizing adequately. It may mean other funding sponsors may not want to fund if the entity doesn't convey a strong rationale about why the project has been selected for the subbasin.

Members noted other consequences of not prioritizing include inefficiency, impact of funds to the region, and not spending funds on the best projects.

Mr. Kliem asked members to comment about their vision for prioritization.

Ms. DeMond said it's important to consider the group has already prioritized the issues that are important. Ms. Napier said there is also the level of sequencing as there are several levels of priorities.

Mr. Kliem said there is also the issue of flexibility. The vision for a prioritization scheme should provide maximum flexibility in terms of funding projects.

Mr. Abbott said from the perspective of the SRF Board, Puget Sound has always been characterized as negative, such as endangered and threatened, whereas the coast includes some depressed stocks as well as healthy stocks. He suggested the group should consider the positive aspect and document where good projects could expand production of healthy stocks to maintain productivity rather than just restoring stocks.

Mr. Lehr asked if that perspective is factored in the statewide regional allocations. Mr. Abbott said not at this time. Mr. Lehr said it appears there is interest in promoting bottom-up strategies while at the same time the process imposes a top-down strategy.

Mr. Stussy suggested including addressing the most important needs of the basin and that the prioritization needs to be realistic and achievable.

Kathy Jacobson referred to a fishery task force issue where 85% of the fish in the basin are from hatcheries that are managed. She asked how they can be considered as a healthy stock if they are hatchery fish. She suggested it's important to develop the definition of healthy stock and whether they are natural or hatchery fish.

Mr. Lehr suggested the first set of prioritizations is to decide whether to focus efforts on protection or restoration efforts. Within those two categories, it will be easier to prioritize projects. However, if protecting habitat is a major component of the plan and it compromises the amount of funds allocated, it may be counterproductive. Mr. Kliem commented that the Skagit and Nisqually groups have been successful in securing funds for both restoration and protection. Chanele Holbrook-Shaw commented that the groups were able to agree on the formula while the Chehalis Basin Partnership has not reached agreement on a formula.

Mr. Kliem summarized the comments regarding the vision for prioritization:

- Showing the issues makes a priority
- Several priorities – levels/sequencing

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group**

**Meeting Summary - February 9, 2007**

**Page 5 of 11**

- Flexibility
- Think about healthy stocks – promote this fact coast – maintain that status
- Address most important needs
- Needs to be realistic-achievable
- Wild vs. hatchery>definition of “healthy”
- Protection of habitat

Mr. Kliem diagramed the suggestion into two boxes – the watershed as a whole and individual subbasins, such as the Black River. Under the watershed, all subbasins would be compared to determine the priorities within the subbasin and then the priorities would be determined such as restoration issues or protection issues that could be by specific species.

Discussion followed about where the efforts should focus - depressed stocks or healthy stocks. Mr. Stussy asked whether it pertains to stock sustainability versus stock recovery. Mr. Kliem said in earlier conversations he asked members to read an article about natural processes within the subbasin. The problems with fish are a symptom of a more difficult problem that is occurring within the subbasin. A watershed is a series of different natural processes that work together creating an environment that sustains salmonids in that area. It is a dynamic process. The idea was not so much to focus on symptomatic-type issues but looking at it as an organic environment and considering how to fix the watershed to bring it to its best level of sustainability. The idea was to consider the natural processes within the subbasin and recognize which ones are working well and the factors that keep the subbasin working well. Protection efforts could be focused on those as well as what is needed to fix the subbasin for those natural processes that have become disrupted. Members at that time listed the symptoms, such as sedimentation, and looked at the cause to understand what caused the symptom and developed a series of actions to work at overcoming the disruption.

A member asked whether it's possible to rank each symptom within each subbasin and use that as the starting point. Mr. Kliem noted that there are some sequencing actions that would benefit a specific species. Mr. Lehr pointed out that the group could take a list of subbasins with a ranking in order of healthy to unhealthy. He asked whether the group would begin at the top or the bottom on the list. Additionally, the same exercise could occur for subbasins where the group could rank all the problems from worse to least-impacted within that subbasin. The question is whether to start at the top or the bottom on the list.

Ms. Jacobson said some years ago, the City of Olympia decided to focus attention on Eld Inlet because it was one of the most intact watersheds and there was an opportunity to maintain the watershed through some restoration efforts to ensure the health of the salmon versus another watershed that the City knew would continue to be more impacted.

Mr. Kliem asked members about their preference for prioritization either at the watershed level or subbasin level. Ms. Holbrook-Shaw said previously the group ranked subbasins high, medium, and low. Mr. Kliem indicated it was due to two factors the group considered – number of fish miles and number of stocks. Ms. Holbrook-Shaw said one of her concerns was the possibility of a very good project that was located in a low or medium subbasin with no opportunity to advance the project to the top of the list. She said would like to find a way to have the ability to move projects forward. Mr. Kliem said it will be important to consider elements or factors within the prioritization process that would move up those types of projects for funding consideration. Generally, it is necessary to identify factors and elements that should be incorporated within the prioritization scheme.

**Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group**  
**Meeting Summary - February 9, 2007**  
**Page 6 of 11**

Jim Hill said he believes the targets are the number of species of fish and number of miles of habitat. Ms. Holbrook-Shaw said there also has to be consideration for potential species and not just what is currently present but what could occur.

Mr. Hill said sustainability should be part of any rationale.

Mr. Lehr said there also should be a pragmatic component of being able to demonstrate results to obtain additional funding. There may be a need to include something that will show a turnaround for results over a relatively short period of time.

Mr. Stussy questioned whether the process is taking the group to the point of identifying an overarching goal of the intent of the strategy. Mr. Kliem said the process will generate specifics as well as goals along with general statements of what members want to accomplish. Much of the input will be objectives, actions, and goals. The exercise is to solicit data from the group to fine tune.

Mr. Abbott referred to the state's overarching strategy that was developed in 1999 that speaks to sustainable and harvestable levels of stocks. That is the state's goal. Mr. Kliem noted it was included in the first strategy issue. Ms. Napier referred to barriers and suggested the possibility of prioritizing barriers because there is new information. She asked how new information is included. Mr. Hill indicated there must be a philosophy.

Mr. Roach asked whether the SRF Board looks at protection as a lesser priority than restoration. It appears that with protection there would be more time to act. Mr. Abbott said it depends on the local strategies. It is up to the lead entities to determine the focus. Some lead entities have been really successful with protection and acquisition because they have looked at the basin and have an acquisition strategy. The problem within the Chehalis Basin is size and determining where to start. Mr. Roach asked whether the protection factor provides more time to address the issue. Ms. Napier said it is site specific. Mr. Kliem said an example is the Nisqually, where tremendous amount of time is spent on protection. They have completed a number of acquisitions. In the Skagit, there are components within the strategy that pushes a specific percentage of its work as protection-oriented.

Mr. Delvin commented that often when considering acquisition projects versus restoration projects the comparison can be equated to comparing apples to oranges. He offered the suggestion of putting things in "bins" and that a percentage of the funds could be allocated to acquisition because acquisition is considered a good long-term strategy. The group may have to consider subbasin levels where acquisition isn't a Tier 1 action but that there will be "bins" of acquisition dollars and "bins" of restoration dollars.

Mr. Stussy asked Mr. Abbott whether other groups have done what Mr. Delvin suggested. Mr. Abbott said he is unaware of any specific instances but that it has been done.

Mr. Lehr said it speaks to the question of whether the group initially wants to focus on healthy stocks or degraded stocks and then select and focus on those efforts in subbasins. Ms. Jacobson said the question can also be answered by the percentage of acquisition versus restoration. If the group is acquiring property to maintain healthy stocks that is part of the equation. Ms. DeMond commented that it's important to consider the allocation as some actions provide greater benefits to fish stocks per dollar than what is justified for acquisition. Mr. Lehr said from an acquisition perspective, it is a tool that can be used to address healthy or degraded stocks. It could be included in any of the "bins." It is easier to

## Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group

Meeting Summary - February 9, 2007

Page 7 of 11

maintain as opposed to restoration. Mr. Amrine said the issue is also a struggle with respect to water quality.

Mr. Kliem referred to the governor's initiative of healthy and harvestable levels of salmon. The state has established that as the vision. During the process, it's important to consider the Salmon Recovery Act and the SRF Board's focus on critical pathways and how to achieve that. The prioritization process is essentially the group's track for achieving the state's vision. The group may want to apply that thinking at the watershed level and then within individual watersheds and focus on restoration and protection, and the type of fish that is present.

Mr. Kliem reviewed the summary of the comments on the flip chart:

### Watershed Level

Healthy, sustainable &  
harvestable levels of fish  
(state goal):

### Subbasin (Black river)

Restoration

Protection  
Species

Tier 1 Tier 2

Mr. Hill questioned the strategies in terms of how much should be maintained as healthy and how much should be restored. Mr. Kliem asked members to consider the factors to achieve the desired results. Some of the factors will be protection and some will be restoration activities as well as some being species-oriented. The group's suggestions included:

- Targets (# species, miles of habitat)
- Potential fish/new targets
- Cost effectiveness
- Sustainability of watershed
- Ability to demonstrate results
- A "bin" for protection & "bin" for restoration
- Split in protection and restoration
- How stocks use the system
- Importance of education of landowners > collaborative efforts

Andy Olson said it's important to consider the stocks depressed throughout the system and how it should be addressed from the harbor to the tributaries. April Johnson said in terms of endangered species, it goes from top to bottom. It's a very difficult issue. Mr. Kliem suggested a radical departure in thinking such as rather than looking at the issue from a landscape perspective, the group could look at it from a fish perspective by tracking the path of fish. He referred to the estuary as an example.

Mr. Lehr reported that while writing up the estuary section and looking at limiting factors, in several instances reports have addressed estuaries as being the biggest bottleneck for fish passage and survival. The percentage of smolt coming through the Chehalis main stem versus coming from the Humptulips was considerably reduced. There was a study completed in the early 90s that considered that issue and was the driving factor for most of the effluent discharge modifications at Weyerhaeuser and wastewater treatment facilities. However, there has been no follow-up since those modifications.

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group**

**Meeting Summary - February 9, 2007**

**Page 8 of 11**

Mr. Amrine said education is often overlooked of private property owners when it concerns the protection of streams for water quality and fish. He said he often sees the removal of trees that have fallen into streams. There should be a way to educate the public to show the importance of large woody debris. Ms. Jacobson commented that there should be a way to consider how to collaborate efforts and publicize the importance through public access TV and publications.

Mr. Kliem asked members to consider prioritization factors for both restoration and protection efforts. He summarized the comments on a flip chart:

### **Restoration Efforts**

- Depressed & healthy stocks
- Invasive species removal
- Habitat connection
- Cost benefit
- Surrounding conditions/riparian conditions
- Upstream activities
- Identify the biggest problem
- Documented fish use and production
- Triage approach - identify fixability of subbasin

### **Protection Efforts**

- Quality of habitat
- Connection with other protected habitat
- Education/Showcase
- Data collection
- Importance to fish
- Imminent threat
- Acquisitions to restore (diking objects)
- Cost benefit

Ms. DeMond suggested the actions would be a reflection of the ranked causes or symptoms by each subbasin. Projects or actions that are Tier 1 or Tier 2 could then be subranked.

Mr. Kliem asked members for input about healthy stocks and depressed stocks. Currently, prioritization is only factored on depressed stocks. He asked if there are other factors to include in the strategy for direction on projects and actions.

Members contributed the following suggestions:

- Hatchery vs. wild
  - Spring Chinook are wild stock and are depressed vs. Coho that are raised in hatcheries and intermixed with fish from other basins
- Return of pre-existing runs that are now gone (historic runs)
- Hatchery interaction with fish
- Fisheries management
- Other data resources other than SaSI
- Stock contributions to system

Mr. Kliem commented about hatchery activities to ensure hatchery activities do not impact listed species. Mr. Abbott said hatchery management could potentially impact priorities and location of projects. Additionally, any plan for coastal Washington will also be a factor in the plan and should be addressed at some point. Mr. Kliem noted that the hatchery and harvest elements have been very difficult for many groups to deal with. The harvest element is particularly complex due to international agreements as well as Bolt decision obligations.

Mr. Kliem said it appears there are three arenas that help towards prioritizing actions that will eventually lead to projects. There was the discussion about the importance of restoration and protection as well as

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group**

**Meeting Summary - February 9, 2007**

**Page 9 of 11**

fish stocks. There appears to be a three-pronged approach for establishing prioritizations within the subbasins. He asked members to provide any missing information.

Ms. DeMond said she is not comfortable with restoration vs. protection because it's important to show the SRF Board that there are healthy stocks that should be maintained. The previous discussion progressed into a discussion of protection being acquisition where the original comment was intended to convey which type of status should be addressed. The discussion changed from the original intent. She said she doesn't see them as separate but sees the actions as what is needed in each subbasin. The issue is whether to focus on healthy vs. depressed or a combination of both.

Ms. Napier said if the SRF Board is the main funding source; the group will need to concentrate on depressed until the funding focus changes. Mr. Abbott referred to the funding source, which includes federal funds that account for 75% of the Board's funds along with state funds that typically don't have requirements attached. It wouldn't necessarily be wrong to approach the SRF Board and indicate the focus will be on protecting healthy stock. The SRF Board may take issue with it but would recognize that the coast doesn't have listed fish and it doesn't fit into the same mold as the remaining areas of the state. However, the SRF Board does recognize the coast is different.

Mr. Kliem said he encourages groups to be proactive. If the group offers a well-reasoned argument, people will respond. If the group is just reactive, the group may not advance any projects. He said he has promoted a strategy that is related to fish. For example, he asked about the plan for spring Chinook in 22/23. The group could then outline how the fish use the various subbasins and chart out a course of strategy of priorities for fish. Each person looks at the issue different, but the strategy should be reflective of the group's intent.

Mr. Roach stressed the importance that whatever actions are considered they must make logical sense to the public otherwise the public will challenge the actions.

Mr. Kliem asked members to consider how all the pieces will fit together. Mr. Abbott asked how the three-pronged approach fits with prioritizing the basins. He noted the SRF Board Review Panel locked into prioritizing basins and preferred to have it narrowed down.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw expressed frustration and indicated it appears the group is repeating the same conversation. The group needs to figure out something and it needs to happen soon. ESA listed stocks are where the funding is. However, the basin does not have ESA listed stocks, except bull trout. It's a question of making the strategy fit with what the state wants or whether the group develops a strategy that will benefit the basin.

Discussion followed about the frustrations with the SRF Board. Ms. Napier pointed out that the SRF Board has encouraged the partnership to keep pursuing the steps as the partnership is pursuing the right direction. Ms. Holbrook-Shaw said she may be confused about the right direction because the coast doesn't fit with what's occurring in the state. Ms. Napier advised that the funding process is a series of steps forwards that will require ongoing work and more decisions. Mr. Hill suggested it's important to increase tolerance to a certain degree due to the lack of absolutes. Mr. Amrine said it appears the group must prioritize subbasins. There are 11 subbasins.

Discussion followed about the reality that the expectation is prioritization and decisions within and between subbasins. The group needs to develop a well-rational system for prioritizing how those actions

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group**

**Meeting Summary - February 9, 2007**

**Page 10 of 11**

will occur. Mr. Kliem said the SRF Board is not directing the group on how to do it but is conveying to the group that they will need to prioritize to meet the needs of fish and expend tax dollars on projects that provide the greatest benefit to fish.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw asked whether there is a tool or formula the group could use to prioritize subbasins. Mr. Kliem reiterated that each area does it differently. The process is complex because of competing interests. The charge is to figure out the issues and the factors that will provide the greatest benefit for fish within a subbasin and what the factors are to consider what subbasin is selected over another. Each group establishes its own set of criteria, which is unique to the area.

Mr. Kliem reviewed input from the group to help guide them in the next steps. The group has identified 11 subbasins. Within the subbasins, the group has to make decisions regarding Tier 1 and Tier 2 actions in terms of importance to fish. However, criteria have not been established. A Tier 1 action in one subbasin may not necessarily be used in another subbasin. Mr. Kliem indicated the group completed an exercise on the subbasin level. A discussion is needed at the watershed level. He asked members for direction on moving forward with the discussion.

Mike Kuttel, Jr., commented that he has not been involved in the process for several months and would like clarification on the availability of tools, such as maps, location of stocks, etc. to assist the group.

Members discussed available resources to help the group work through the issues.

Members recommended the following list of resources the group needs for its ongoing discussions:

- Maps showing stock and status
- Ability to do the job – organizations and groups working in areas
- What has been done in subbasins (map other SRF Board projects)
- Past work in subbasins
  - Land use
  - Comprehensive Plans
  - Historical changes
- Reality of what has occurred
- Fly the watershed
- Known areas of concern
- Chehalis ACE GI project

Members and Mr. Kliem discussed resources available on the internet and discussed how an aerial review of the watershed would be beneficial.

Mr. Delvin offered comments on what the Nature Conservancy might be able to assist with. Ms. Napier, Mr. Delvin, and Mr. Lehr offered to help determine resource availability. Suggestions included GIS maps of stock status, printout of the SaSI salmonscape maps, habitat maps, and enlarged maps of the subbasin.

Mr. Kliem offered words of advice on the factors the group will need to consider to render some decisions. The group knows the subbasins and should be able to discuss revealing what factors to consider and then apply them as to how they intermix with the subbasins.

Mr. Kliem recapped the group's discussions:

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group**

**Meeting Summary - February 9, 2007**

**Page 11 of 11**

- Why there is the need to prioritize?
- What happens if prioritization does not occur?
- What is the group's vision of what the prioritization scheme might be?

The group generally discussed what factors or elements they might consider and how prioritization might look. There was discussion about the need to do it on a subbasin scale and on a watershed scale. The group discussed the subbasin scale and priorities for restoration, protection, and stocks. There appeared to be no consensus about depressed stocks although there was some emphasis as well as on healthy stocks. Members also reviewed how restoration and protection is a tool for stock issues. There is understanding the group needs to pursue similar work on the watershed scale and the factors that are needed to prioritize.

Discussion ensued about the public meeting dates. Ms. Napier indicated the group's work must be completed prior to any public meetings. The goal is to have public meetings in April.

### **Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Habitat Work Group is March 9, 2007.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:07 p.m.

Prepared by Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary  
Puget Sound Meeting Services