

**CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP  
HABITAT WORK GROUP (HWG)  
Lewis Conservation District Office  
1554 Bishop Road  
Chehalis, WA  
June 8, 2007  
9:30 AM**

**Meeting Summary**

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Chanele Holbrook-Shaw, Thurston County Citizen  
Bob Amrine, Lewis County Conservation District  
Chad Stussy, Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)  
Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County  
Jason Lundgren, Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC)  
Eric Delvin, The Nature Conservancy  
Brett DeMond, LWC Consulting  
Brian Peck, WDFW  
Mike Kuttel Jr., Thurston Conservation District

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Randy Lehr, Grays Harbor College  
Jim Hill, Lewis County Citizen  
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services

**Call to Order and Introductions**

Chair Bob Amrine called the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) Habitat Work Group (HWG) meeting to order at 9:40 a.m. Everyone present provided self-introductions.

**Final Preparation for the June 14 and 15, 2007 Field Visits**

Ms. Napier distributed and reviewed an updated field visit schedule. Each reviewer will receive a copy of all project proposals. Eleven letters of intent and 10 project proposals were received. One project, Decker Creek Acquisition Project, was withdrawn as it is not ready to move forward.

Ms. Napier shared observations about the project proposals. The North Fort Little Hoquiam River Dam Removal project cost was initially lower and as a result the project sponsor reexamined the costs resulting in an increase in the project cost. The project is approximately \$1 million with the City contributing \$300,000. The project sponsor inquired about submitting a funding request to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) for \$800,000. Ms. Napier said she advised the project sponsor that the SRFB is more inclined to fund several projects rather than one large project. She said she encouraged them to retain their original \$250,000 funding request. However, the application was not revised to reflect the last conversation concerning the funding level.

A new project sponsor, Sam's Canal Rehab in McCleary, asked many questions about completing the project application. The project application is not likely complete at this point as the sponsor is new to the process. She asked members to be constructive in their comments to the project sponsor.

Another project of issue is the Beaver Creek Fish Passage Project in the Johns River area. The sponsor is a state agency and needs a local partner. The project sponsor asked several organizations to partner, but all declined. The Quinault Indian Nation (QIN) does not believe it would be the appropriate project partner. Additionally, an incomplete application was submitted, which may make it challenging to members when conducting the site visit and review. A partner's contribution could include survey work

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

### **Meeting Minutes**

**June 8, 2007 Page 2 of 8**

or some willingness to help out. Jason Lundgren said the partner needs to be capable of completing the project and playing a role in the design. Ms. Napier said the task force was also asked to be a partner with its role likely involved in contracts and construction. Randy Lehr asked about the level of involvement and about the possibility of the college serving as a project partner. Ms. Napier said student monitoring could suffice. It was noted that the college's non-profit foundation could be the partner rather than the college as the college is considered a state agency. Mr. Lundgren reviewed the criteria to qualify as a project partner. Mr. Lehr said it appears the project is a worthwhile project and if securing a project partner is the only stumbling block, the foundation could play a role in monitoring or outreach work.

Brett DeMond commented about the high project cost. Ms. Napier reviewed the project budget of \$612,000 and indicated she will follow up with the sponsor for additional budget information.

*Ms. Holbrook-Shaw arrived at the meeting.*

Ms. Napier reviewed field trip times and order of site visits. The last site visit is in McCleary on the first day. After morning site visits on the second day, members will meet at the Lewis Conservation District Office with project sponsors not scheduled for site visits. The goal is to conclude the meeting by 3:00 p.m. Ms. Napier asked project sponsors scheduled for their project presentation on the second day to provide pictures of the site and aerial photographs.

Chair Amrine inquired whether the North Fork Little Hoquiam River Dam Removal project sponsor will include other sources of funds within the application so that there is assurance that the project can proceed. Ms. Napier said that's the issue as it's unlikely the sponsor will receive \$800,000 from the SRFB. Mr. Peck reported the sponsor applied to a new potential funding program, "The Open Rivers Initiative," which is a dam removal program through Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). However, the funds are for fiscal year 2008. The funding decision will not be rendered until next spring. The project sponsor applied for \$250,000. Mr. Amrine suggested the funds could be leveraged for other funds.

Ms. Napier asked about the possibility of a contingency list if a project is not funded for some reason. Mr. Lundgren affirmed a contingency list is possible. He indicated the details can be worked out as the process proceeds or the sponsor could request funding for design only. Ms. Napier said she shared with the project sponsor that the group is often somewhat reluctant to offer too much in assistance as it is often not well received. The project sponsor indicated he would welcome suggestions by members.

Mr. Lehr asked whether the project is eligible for the freeman process. Mr. Peck said the process is active water diversion and that the project would not be eligible.

Mr. Lundgren said some projects are missing maps. He asked to receive maps for Beaver Creek, Mill property acquisition, Sampson acquisition, and Sam's Canal Rehab project.

Ms. Napier referred to the strategy in final draft form and described how the strategy will be sectioned and posted on the website. She offered to provide copies electronically to members wanting a copy.

Chad Sussy suggested another piece of useful information pertains to WDFW's recent process for the lower Chehalis to identify the times for spawning and rearing of different fish species within the Chehalis Basin. Draft information is available on a spreadsheet. The information will be useful for project sponsors when filling out applications.

## Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group

### Meeting Minutes

June 8, 2007 Page 3 of 8

Ms. Napier addressed questions and described the informal site visit process to evaluate projects. Mr. Peck added that for fish passage projects, the sponsor should provide inventory information. Mr. Lundgren said for restoration projects any level of design survey work would also be helpful for him so he can forward the information to the review panel. Ms. Napier confirmed the requests for the information. Members will receive another e-mail of the two-day site visit schedule.

### Review of the Criteria to Rank the 8<sup>th</sup> Round Grant Cycle Projects

Ms. Napier reported Mr. Lehr developed a process to assist rating the projects. The projects will not be scored until August allowing time to refine the criteria, if necessary.

Mr. Lehr briefed members on the draft document to assist members in objectively ranking and comparing projects. The committee previously discussed ways to prioritize and compare projects and the criteria and factors to use in the comparisons. He said he considered the concerns and challenges in terms of comparing and ranking projects and developed a draft of general factors for ranking projects based on a combination of fish stocks, quality and quantity of habitat, partnerships and outreach associated with the project, and how much confidence there is in the project manager. Subsequently, the categories are listed separately. Members previously debated weightings for each of the factors. The draft attempts to capture the discussions and to provide some level of objectivity for comparing projects.

Mr. Lehr reviewed the ranking criteria, maximum score, and general considerations for the categories of Fish, Habitat, Partnerships/Outreach/ and Likelihood for Success. After review and discussion, members agreed with the following matrix to rank and weight projects:

Ranking Criteria	Scoring	General Considerations	Total
<b>Fish</b>	<b>100 (Max)</b>		
Status of Stocks Benefited	variable	What is the status of the stocks affected by this project?	
Number of Stocks Benefited	variable	How many stocks will likely be affected?	
<b>Habitat</b>	<b>100 (Max)</b>		
<b>Barrier Removal</b>			
Quantity	25	How much habitat will be opened (i.e., to the next barrier) by this project?	
Quality	25	What is the quality of the habitat to be opened?	
Culvert Rank	50	How is the culvert ranked using the Chehalis Culvert Ranking process?	
<b>Acquisition Projects</b>			
Quantity	50	How much habitat will be acquired or accessed by this project?	
Quality	50	What is the quality of the habitat to be opened?	
<b>Enhancement/Restoration Projects</b>			
Quantity	50	How much habitat (riparian or instream) will be enhanced or restored?	
Alignment with Sub-basin Priorities	50	Does the project align with Tier I, Tier II or Tier III sub-basin priorities?	
<b>Combination Projects</b>			
Quantity	30	How much habitat will be enhanced, restored or acquired?	
Quality	30	What is the quality of the habitat to be acquired or opened?	
Alignment with Sub-basin Priorities	40	Does the project align with Tier I, Tier II or Tier III sub-basin priorities?	
<b>Partnerships/Outreach</b>	<b>75 (Max)</b>		
Outreach Plan	40	How likely is it that the outreach plan will engage the public in salmon recovery?	
Partner Contribution (Matching)	30	What percentage of the project is comprised of match funding?	
Veteran Participation	5	Does the project involve veteran participation?	
<b>Likelihood for Success</b>	<b>50 (Max)</b>		
Qualification of Project Manager	5	Is the project sponsor established a track record of success?	
Monitoring Program	25	Does the project containing sufficient pre post-monitoring to	

# Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group

## Meeting Minutes

June 8, 2007 Page 4 of 8

Cost Appropriateness	45	Are the stated costs consistent with the expected outcomes?	
Design/site Appropriateness	Yes/No	Projects will not be considered without an appropriate design/site.	
Land Owner Participation	Yes/No	Projects will not be considered without landowner consent	
<b>2 Total Points</b>			

Ms. DeMond commented that a similar process undertaken by her company revealed that weighting Fish and Habitat equally results in Fish outweighing Habitat. Subsequently, fish species was ranked less to balance the weighting. Mr. Lehr said Fish and Habitat are rated evenly and the combination of the number of stocks benefited and the status of the stocks, if scored at the maximum, would result in 100 points. Under the proposed scheme, Fish would be given equal precedent and it puts them on a one-to-one scale without either category having precedence over the other.

Mr. Sussy noted it's likely the highest score for fish would pertain to an estuary. Mr. Lehr said there are 31 fish stocks and eight are depressed. However, the breakout of specific stocks within a subbasin is not known. He asked members if Fish appears to be a reasonable weighting. Nonsalemoids species are not factored because of SRFB funding requirements. Mr. Peck asked whether life stages benefited by the project are addressed. Mr. Lehr said it's addressed on a subjective basis in Habitat. There is no easy way to address multiple life stages. Mr. Peck asked whether SalmonScape would be useful to address life stages as the tool identifies migration, spawning, and rearing. He said he would hesitate to use that layer and overlay it to a project specific area as a project can have benefits to life stages even if they are not immediately at the project location. Mr. Sussy mentioned with the progression of EDT (Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment), next year might be a point where it would be useful for that kind of information. He suggested postponing the issue.

Mr. Lehr asked for feedback on the scoring and ranking criteria for Fish. Members shared their respective opinions and suggestions and offered the following comments:

- The matrix tends to weight fish heavily. Most of the projects will score something in Habitat. The scoring tends to emphasize depressed stock.
- A suggestion to reduce the maximum total for Fish to 50 points from 100 points.
- Recognition that depressed stocks are a priority and consistent with the strategy.
- Consider running some hypothetical projects through the matrix that have the likelihood for similar success to determine how the projects rank.

Mr. Lehr reviewed scoring and ranking criteria for Habitat. The intent is to provide some type of quantitative comparison between different types of projects – Barrier Removal, Acquisition, Enhancement/Restoration, or Combination Projects. The ranking criteria are generally based on habitat quality and habitat quantity. For example, a barrier correction project that is opening up greater than three miles of stream habitat is the equivalent to an acquisition project that is acquiring more than 100 acres with the acreage spread over 6 to 9 stream miles. These modifiers are intended to reflect the distribution of habitat projects. Stream miles are considered linear stream miles.

Discussion followed about factoring in both sides of the stream with most members agreeing that both sides of the stream should be counted. Members discussed establishing the value. Ms. Holbrook-Shaw shared that several of the acquisition projects she is working on will likely result in restoration of habitat of approximately one mile if both sides are considered. Mr. Sussy said ongoing habitat issues involve protection versus restoration. Five miles of habitat that isn't protected could be degraded, which is less beneficial than two miles of habitat that is protected. The goal is to try and bridge the gap between those differences. All groups wrestle with the issue. The Nisqually group is heavily focused on acquisitions.

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

### **Meeting Minutes**

**June 8, 2007 Page 5 of 8**

Protection of land offers the best opportunity against degradation of habitat. Ms. DeMond offered that in other areas upstream involving only forest land, the land is protected by Forest and Fish Rules. Mr. Sussy said there are arguments for and against and that Forest and Fish Rules are in negotiations and that perhaps the rules may not offer the best protection.

Mr. Amrine hesitated voicing an opinion until some numbers are run through the model. He said he likes the idea of lowering the numbers.

Mr. Sussy agreed with the proposed modifiers and that the focus of the criteria is on what the acquisition could provide in benefits to salmon. Mr. Lehr asked whether the criteria should also be the same for enhancement or whether higher numbers should be assigned for riparian enhancements as the numbers are the same for both acquisition and enhancement/restoration. Ms. Holbrook-Shaw suggested the reality of the situation should also be considered as she is struggling to pursue large enhancement projects but is finding there are no funds for the maintenance component or monitoring, such as trying to figure out how to water 5,000 trees. She said she tends to lean toward quality versus quantity and potential impacts as well as planting larger trees.

Mr. Sussy referred to riparian enhancement and suggested lowering the values. He suggested the left column could be the miles and the modifier could be the width. Members generally agreed. Mr. Delvin referred to a project he is pursuing that is difficult to categorize. The project involves huge areas that will be treated and is best categorized as an enhancement project, which will rank higher than another project involving planting. Mr. Lehr said it's possible to add another category.

Discussion followed on different project comparisons involving tree plantings, invasive species removal, restoration of the native riparian community, and how to quantify and rank the various projects.

Members discussed and provided guidance on modifying the values.

*Jim Hill arrived at the meeting.*

Mr. Lehr adjusted some of the numbers and descriptions on the habitat ranking matrix based on input from members. Members shared different opinions and details on different projects and how the matrix might be applied to different types of projects. Their comments centered on:

- Consider acres versus stream miles as the value. Depending upon the size of the system, values will vary. Larger systems have larger floodplains versus smaller systems with smaller floodplains.
- Consideration of buffer widths.
- Consider adding a note to eliminate the modifier under riparian stream miles if it is an entire floodplain that is being treated.
- Members discussed how the equation will apply for a project that includes a small patch of invasives followed by a planting. The matrix treats the project as a combination and would consider the quantity and the quality of the habitat and the alignment of the subbasin priorities.
- Why isn't alignment with subbasin priorities a question under Barrier Removal and Acquisitions? The reason is because the effort wouldn't be done to existing habitat. The project just makes the habitat more available and/or is being acquired to avoid degradation over the long-term.

**Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group  
Meeting Minutes  
June 8, 2007 Page 6 of 8**

- Comments on zero points for acquisition of 10 acres or less.
- Members discussed values and modifiers assigned to Barrier Removal. Mr. Lehr said the driver for barriers is the culvert ranking followed by finer qualifiers.
- Mr. Lehr offered to do some statistical analysis to test the ranking process.
- Mr. Lehr addressed comments about combination projects and explained how they will be ranked.
- A concern that the acreage under modifying criteria for wetland is too high. Mr. Lehr confirmed he will run several of the projects through the ranking to test the values. Mr. Peck suggested waiting for the results of the tests as it has been his experience with several projects that opened up acres of wetlands and several miles of stream.
- Ms. DeMond referred to Likelihood for Success Cost Effectiveness criteria and suggested the ranking score is too low because of the importance. Mr. Lehr said cost effectiveness is also captured to some degree in Partnership Contribution. Discussion ensued on the description with members agreeing to rename the criteria as “Cost Appropriateness” and increase the total points to 45 from 15.

*Ms. DeMond left the meeting.*

After review and discussion, members agreed to the following Habitat Ranking Form:

	Primary Criteria	Modifying Criteria	Combination Criteria (30)
<b>Barrier Correction (Culverts/Dams)</b>	<b>Stream Miles (13)</b>	<b>Wetland (12)</b>	<b>Stream Miles (15)</b>
> 3 stream miles	13	>30 acres	12
1 to 3 stream miles	10	20 to 30 acres	10
0.5 to 1 stream miles	8	10 to 20 acres	7
<0.5 stream miles	5	< 10 acres	5
<b>Barrier Correction (Off Channel/Floodplain)</b>	<b>Total Acreage (50)</b>	<b>No Modifier</b>	<b>Total Acreage (30)</b>
>5 acres	50		50
3 to 5 acres	35		35
1 to 3 acres	20		20
< 1 acres	5		5
<b>Acquisition (Riparian) Projects</b>	<b>Total Acreage (20)</b>	<b>Counting both stream sides</b>	<b>Total Acreage (10)</b>
>100	20	<b>Stream Miles (30)</b>	
70 to 100	15	> 2	30
30 to 70	10	1 to 2	25
10 to 30	5	0.5 to 1	20
< 10	0	0.25 to 0.5	15
		< 0.25	10
<b>Acquisition (Off Channel/Wetland)</b>	<b>Total Acreage (50)</b>	<b>No Modifier</b>	<b>Total Acreage (30)</b>
>30 acres	50		50
20 to 30 acres	35		35
10 to 20 acres	20		20
< 10 acres	5		5
<b>Riparian Enhancement</b>	<b>Stream Miles (25)</b>	<b>Buffer Width (25)</b>	<b>Stream Miles (15)</b>
> 1	25	>200 ft	25
0.5 to 1	20	100-200 ft	20
0.25 to 0.5	15	50 to 100 ft	15
0.1 to 0.25	10	35 to 50 ft	10
< 0.1	5	< 35 ft	5
<b>Exotic Species - Riparian</b>	<b>Stream Miles (50)</b>	<b>No Modifier</b>	<b>Stream Miles (30)</b>
>100	50	preference given to floodplain coverage	50
70 to 100	35		35
30 to 70	20		20
10 to 30	10		10
< 10	5		5
<b>Instream Enhancement</b>	<b>Stream Miles (50)</b>	<b>No Modifier</b>	<b>Stream Miles (30)</b>
> 0.5 stream miles	50		50
0.25 to 0.5 stream miles	35		35
0.1 to 0.25 stream miles	20		20
<0.1 stream miles	5		5
<b>Off Channel/Wetland Enhancement</b>	<b>Total Acreage (50)</b>	<b>No Modifier</b>	<b>Total Acreage (30)</b>
>5 acres	50		50
3 to 5 acres	35		35
1 to 3 acres	20		20
< 1 acres	5		5
<b>Estuary</b>			

## Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group

### Meeting Minutes

June 8, 2007 Page 7 of 8

- A suggestion that if a pre-proposal indicates landowner consent was not received, the final proposal should not be requested. The score should be a Yes/No rather than points.
- A suggestion to break out cost into a separate category that could have partner contribution (match) and cost appropriateness for a total of 100 points. Mr. Lehr questioned whether the suggestion is consistent with the strategy. Members discussed increasing the point value to 100 for Partnerships/Outreach and whether doing so would askew the importance of Fish and Habitat. A member offered the suggestion of creating a separate category for “Costs.” After further exchange of viewpoints, members agreed to retain the two criteria separately with points.
- Members discussed matching contribution amounts. Members agreed to the following match contribution points:

Match	Points
>50%	30
35 to 50%	25
25 to 35%	15
15 to 25%	5

- Members discussed the importance of public outreach. Ms. Napier said very few of the projects will score 40 points for outreach. There should be a very clear distinction if the criterion will be followed. A member suggested revising the criterion to read “Is the scale of the outreach appropriate to the project.” Ms. Napier suggested retaining the language as written because of the importance of engaging the public in salmon recovery and because it is where the group’s work is falling short. Discussion ensued on whether the application includes information about the proposal’s public outreach and whether sufficient time is available for project sponsors to include the information. Ms. Napier suggested developing supplemental questions that are not asked by the SRFB. Members stressed the importance of informing project sponsors to include information about the project’s outreach plan. Members agreed to retain the criterion at a maximum point value of 40.
- Discussion followed on the Monitoring Program. Ms. Napier said during the construction of a project, implementation monitoring can occur. Members commented about asking project sponsors to provide a report. A suggestion was offered to require a six-month post report. Members were reminded that the requirement is not included in the application. However, applicants are asked to describe long-term stewardship and maintenance obligations for the project. Ms. Napier said the technical review questions include stewardship and maintenance questions.

*Ms. Holbrook-Shaw left the meeting.*

Members suggested having Mr. Lehr rank some of the applications to ascertain whether any calibration is necessary.

#### **Update – Coast Regional Recovery Project**

Ms. Napier provided an update on the Coast Regional Recovery Project. The contract is coming to a close. There have been discussions about the regional concept and input has been sought from others who have formed regions. Some interviews have been conducted to obtain a sense of what would be

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

### **Meeting Minutes**

**June 8, 2007 Page 8 of 8**

acceptable within a regional process and any concerns. The group has formulated all the information into a report, which is available. The intent is to form a regional government, but the details need to be resolved. There is interest in maintaining a lead entity identity and having a regional governance to serve as the umbrella to assist in coordination. The next round includes a preference for Grays Harbor to be the fiscal agent. An executive director and administrative staff will be required. The SRFB is being solicited for funding.

Mr. Hill shared information about an earlier meeting he attended concerning the formation of a transportation group that considered the SBP's model of five levels of consensus as a basis for governing the new transportation group.

#### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, Chair Amrine adjourned the meeting at 12:52 p.m.

Prepared by Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary  
Puget Sound Meeting Services