

**CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP
HABITAT WORK GROUP
Lewis Conservation District Office
1554 Bishop Road
Chehalis, WA
January 11, 2008
9:30 AM**

Meeting Summary

PRESENT

Chanele Holbrook-Shaw, Thurston County Citizen
Brett Demond, LWC Consulting
Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County
Debbie Carnevali, WDFW

Randy Lehr, Grays Harbor College
Cheri Lindgren, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Lonnie Crumley, Stream Works Consulting
Mike Johnson, Pacific and Grays Harbor Conservation
Districts
Kathleen Jacobson, Chehalis Basin Education Consortium

Jim Hill, Citizen, Lewis County
Bob Amrine, Lewis County Conservation District
Jason Lundgren, Interagency Committee for Outdoor
Recreation (IAC)
Mike Kuttel Jr., Thurston Conservation District

Welcome & Introductions

Chair Bob Amrine called the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) Habitat Work Group (HWG) meeting to order at 9:39 a.m.

Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) 8th Round Debrief

Lee Napier distributed a list of successfully funded 8th round Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) projects for the coastal region. Eight projects were submitted for funding consideration. Ms. Napier reviewed project sponsors. SRFB awarded the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership \$2 million for allocation between eight projects.

Ms. Napier distributed copies of the 8th round review panel ratings and narratives for Grays Harbor County. Each year, the review panel evaluates strategy based on established criteria. Ratings range from excellent, good, fair, and poor. Strategy plays a role in the credibility of a project. Panel members conveyed that the Grays Harbor County strategy has not changed which is frustrating because members spent considerable time discussing strategy. Ms. Napier reviewed the criteria, rationale for rating, and respective ratings. The panel determined the county's rank order of projects appears to fit the priorities in the strategy. However, project sponsors didn't demonstrate effectively how the strategy fits with their respective project.

Jason Lundgren said IAC is updating materials based on feedback from the review panel. The SRFB funded 219 of the 350 projects submitted for funding.

Ms. Napier pointed out that the panel is also reviewing a lot of material. Brevity is probably best. It's important for project sponsors to state why the project is important and describe how it fits within the overall program.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group

Meeting Summary

January 11, 2008 Page 2 of 6

Mr. Lundgren said Grays Harbor County was responsive to the SRFB review panel. He and other Boardmembers appreciated project sponsors who went above and beyond call of duty.

Ms. Napier reviewed comments for acquisition projects. Sponsors need to clearly describe why the habitat feature proposed for preservation is important to acquire and why the location is important. She noted the number of project sponsors and respective areas of focus were limited.

Ms. Napier reported the Salmon Impeding Noxious Weed Project and other noxious weed proposals were heavily scrutinized. The Board had difficulty drawing a correlation between how removing the problem benefited salmon. Panel members indicated they would like to have seen the entire project and how it ultimately would benefit salmon habitat.

Mr. Lundgren reported project sponsors should anticipate additional scrutiny and questions from the Board on acquisition and invasive species proposals. Watersheds within western Washington with acquisition activity have received non-capital type assessment grants to prioritize parcels based on landowner willingness and habitat values. It's likely the review panel and staff will work to develop additional criteria and questions.

Ms. Napier reported she was invited to a meeting about the Black River sponsored by the Nature Conservancy and Capital Land Trust. It was helpful to learn how the organization prioritizes its work. The Nature Conservancy is pursuing partnership opportunities and might submit an assessment that looks at acquisition priority approaches. The HWG could develop assessment criteria and ask the Nature Conservancy to also entertain sponsoring projects outside the Black River corridor.

Mr. Lundgren reported the Washington Biodiversity Council recently published its strategy.

Randy Lehr said Grays Harbor College might have additional data to help prioritize acquisitions.

Chair Amrine and Ms. Napier indicated they will follow up on forwarding geo spatial information to Grays Harbor College. Mr. Lehr said the college could create a data layer, which would be a step towards developing a more strategic approach to identify acquisitions for riparian preservation.

Members discussed the community issues strategy, which received a fair rating and steps the Partnership took to engage with the community (booth at the Watershed Festival). Ms. Napier explained survey respondents were interested in riparian projects, preserving riparian areas, and cleaning up the water to preserve salmon habitat. She said she would like to conduct similar outreach activities to help improve the community issues rating. Mr. Lundgren said RCO is hosting a lead entity training day in February. An agenda topic includes outreach strategies.

Kathy Jacobson mentioned she recently submitted a grant to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). One task is conducting a community forum as part of the Chehalis Watershed Festival to talk about climate change.

Members discussed identifying a coordinator for establishing a date (possibly last week in September) and booking a location for this year's Watershed Festival.

Discussion ensued about how to tie education and outreach with SRFB funding applications. Mr. Lundgren said the SRFB doesn't provide funding for education or for educational materials. Another

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group
Meeting Summary
January 11, 2008 Page 3 of 6

issue the Board doesn't fund is effectiveness monitoring. The SRFB does pay for implementation monitoring, however.

Ms. Napier reported education outreach provided by project sponsors could be reflected as a match on the project application. Community issues and monitoring are contributions project sponsors should be willing to make voluntarily to continue to secure grant awards.

Mr. Lundgren explained some projects, such as culvert replacements on private property, are more conducive for volunteer efforts. Community involvement is an overarching issue.

Brett Demond asked whether the SRFB provided additional financial resources for projects damaged during the December flooding event. Mr. Lundgren said small cost increases were awarded to two open projects. Additional funds could be awarded to the completed Perry Creek project because the landowner is not eligible for Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) relief.

Ms. Napier and Mr. Lundgren agreed that the coastal region did well in the 8th round. Ms. Napier thanked everyone for their work.

Chanele Holbrook-Shaw thanked the local strategy ranking group and everyone for their support of the Heernett Environmental Foundation.

Follow up Review of the Habitat Project Map

Ms. Napier distributed a project funding by lead entity region document listing all projects in closed and active status. Fifty-nine projects received \$6.2 million in IAC funding.

Mr. Lehr said at the last meeting, the HWG discussed the best way to integrate, organize, and coordinate Chehalis Basin restoration projects into the server system using filtering criteria. He displayed the Grays Harbor College website. A spreadsheet containing criteria used to define projects was presented for additional discussion. Mr. Lehr reviewed filter options of positional coordinates, project sponsor, start date, completion date, funding source, project type, and habitat features, etc. to differentiate the restoration projects. He asked for feedback concerning filtering options identified to date.

Members suggested adding wetland to the channel/floodplain criteria and upland to the habitat type criteria. Members discussed engaging the GIS Clearinghouse with the habitat work schedule. Mr. Lehr said there is value associated with a separate system for the Chehalis Basin that articulates with other data sources.

Mr. Lundgren reported the SRFB should have its PRISM mapping tool up and operational in the near future.

Discussion followed about reports produced by the SRFB that are available to the public showcasing Chehalis Basin projects and funding allocations that could be used for public outreach purposes.

Members asked Mr. Lehr to add tribal and federal to the funding source category.

Mr. Lehr displayed the habitat work schedule on the internet. One goal is for the map contents box to replicate a number of data layers that can be turned on and off and reflected on a map creating a clearinghouse for the Chehalis Basin. Characteristics used to describe the projects were reviewed.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group
Meeting Summary
January 11, 2008 Page 4 of 6

Members discussed whether restoration is a habitat type. Debbie Carnevali suggested renaming enhancement to enhancement/restoration.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw asked whether it's important to know how a project ranked when it was funded. A new category was added called "priority level @ funding."

Remaining criteria components and query options were examined. Mr. Lehr reported some projects need non-truncated latitude/longitude coordinates so they are correctly located on the map. Members discussed using polygons versus points. Mr. Lehr suggested using points is easier.

Mr. Lundgren commented that the PRISM mapping feature will be exportable.

Mr. Lehr reported he will e-mail the Excel spreadsheet to members and to Brian Peck for feedback. He asked members to populate their respective projects with coordinate details. In response to questions concerning the ability to store photos, Mr. Lehr said photos can be dropped in once the habitat work schedule is converted to an Access database. Members were asked to title and label photographs prior to submitting them for the schedule.

Discussion followed about projects with multiple funding sources, including primary program types and secondary funding. Mr. Lehr indicated he can add funding source and matching source categories to the spreadsheet for sorting purposes. Lonnie Crumley suggested it might be helpful to break out funding sources by state and federal for auditing purposes.

Mr. Lundgren suggested Ms. Napier e-mail Scott Chapman about running a query in PRISM to obtain as much of the information as possible for all SRFB projects within the Grays Harbor County lead entity area, including latitude and longitude coordinates. Mr. Lehr reported another resource to identify latitude and longitude coordinates is TerraServer. He provided a demonstration. He also presented a culvert inventory map processed according to ranked tiers 1-3. The tiers are independent of specific subbasins.

Chair Amrine departed the meeting.

Members discussed the status of ranking and developing costs estimates for culvert projects.

Kick Off the 9th / 2008 SRFB Grant Cycle for the Chehalis Basin

Ms. Napier distributed handouts on the 2008 SRFB grant cycle. She reviewed a proposed timeline and key milestones. HWG meetings were noted on the schedule. Upcoming meetings will include a component of SRFB on the agendas. The SRFB plans to conduct a lead entity application workshop in May (tentative). She encouraged everyone to attend.

Mr. Lundgren suggested integrating the application workshop with the HWG's regular meeting on May 9, 2008.

Ms. Napier said she anticipates the review panel will be available to provide assistance prior to and following project sponsors entering the final draft application into PRISM. Mr. Lundgren said the checklist is similar to the handout. All application materials, early and final, will be submitted through PRISM, as this methodology will streamline the application review process.

Ms. Napier reported mandatory early applications are due March 7, 2008. Based on input from members, project site visits with the review panel are tentatively scheduled for the week of May 12, 2008. Project

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group
Meeting Summary
January 11, 2008 Page 5 of 6

sponsors will then enter their early application materials and final drafts into PRISM. Hard copies will not be accepted. Final draft applications are due July 31, 2008. She said she anticipates distributing applications to the review panel during the first part of August. The HWG will review project applications at its August 8, 2008 meeting. A prioritized list will be presented to the Partnership on August 22, 2008. Final applications, including signed landowner willingness and partner contribution forms, are due August 8, 2008. Other key dates include:

- Draft project review forms sent to lead entities and project sponsors in early October
- Regional presentation to the SRFB review panel (important for project sponsors to attend to answer any questions) the week of October 13, 2008
- A draft 2008 grant report available for review beginning October 29, 2008
- SRFB funding meeting scheduled for December 11, 2008

Ms. Napier provided an overview of potential 8th round SRFB program changes.

Mr. Lundgren reported project sponsors can now begin entering application materials into PRISM.

Flood News Articles

Ms. Napier shared copies of a *Chronicle Online* article dated January 9, 2008, about Representative Richard DeBolt introducing several new bills to address persistent flood problems in Lewis County. A number of articles have appeared in several publications concerning the recent flooding event.

Ms. Jacobson indicated some annoyance as the *Chronicle Online* article is irresponsible. Only one side of the problem is represented. She asked whether it's appropriate for the Partnership to respond and discuss the issues.

Discussion followed about the Partnership's role.

Ms. Napier said the matter is scheduled for discussion at the Partnership's January 25, 2008 meeting.

Ms. Jacobson indicated she plans to contact Brian Midke as a private citizen.

Ms. Napier said she's disappointed about the attacks on people and agencies contained in a number of news articles. Mr. Crumley suggested having David Montgomery with the University of Washington weigh in on the issue. Mr. Lundberg said the timing is good for a group to submit an article that speaks to how trees slow velocities, store water, trap sediment, and help prevent flooding. Mr. Hill suggested a project capturing and documenting the flood event would be appropriate.

Ms. Demond departed from the meeting.

Ms. Jacobson said the fact that the riparian areas worked well at Rainbow Falls and the Black River reach held were because of the wetland systems, which should be discussed.

Mr. Hill said science and accurate information should be the focus rather than hearsay, emotions, and opinions.

Discussion followed about the Partnership drafting a response letter describing benefits associated with trees and riparian corridors to control flooding. Ms. Napier expressed concerns about how to manage the

**Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group
Meeting Summary
January 11, 2008 Page 6 of 6**

involvement of the Partnership and the Partnership's role. The Partnership is working to implement the watershed plan. If the Partnership's work plan adds flooding, she questioned who will step up and support the efforts.

Mr. Lundgren departed from the meeting.

Mr. Crumley said he could contact Ray White.

Mr. Lehr added that Bob Nimand at the University of Washington is another potential resource.

Mr. Lehr departed from the meeting.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Ms. Napier adjourned the meeting at 12:15 p.m.

Prepared by Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services