

**CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP
HABITAT WORK GROUP
Lewis Conservation District Office
1544 Bishop Road
Chehalis, WA
June 13, 2008
9:30 a.m.**

Meeting Summary

PRESENT:

Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County	Cheri Lindgren, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Lonnie Crumley, Streamworks Consulting	Jamie Glasgow, Wild Fish Conservancy
Chad Stussy, Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)	Randy Lehr, Grays Harbor College
Todd Baun, City of McCleary	Janet Strong, Chehalis Basin Land Trust
Brett DeMond, Streamworks Consulting	Eric Devlin, The Nature Conservancy
Mike Kuttel, Thurston Conservation District	Janel Spaulding, Grays Harbor College
Craig Swanson, Lewis County	Joel Green, Quinault Indian Nation
Nancy Allison, Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership	Jim Hill, Citizen, Lewis County
Chanele Holbrook-Shaw, Citizen, Thurston County	Birdie Davenport, Department of Natural Resources

Welcome, Introductions, and Adjustments to the Agenda

Chad Stussy called the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) Habitat Work Group (HWG) meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Everyone present provided self-introductions.

Janel Spaulding introduced herself and shared information on her education and professional background. Ms. Spaulding said she envisions her position with the Partnership as public outreach and involvement in the community to include working on restoration projects and coordinating activities between the Partnership and the Citizens Advisory Committee and the Water Quality Committee.

Chanele Holbrook-Shaw and Jim Hill arrived at the meeting.

Nancy Allison reported she is the Executive Director of a new regional coastal organization recently formed as the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership. The organization is coordinating efforts of individual lead entities along the coast, which includes WRIAs 20 through 24. During the initial stages Ms. Allison reported she is establishing the organization. The main focus is developing the interlocal agreement between the lead entities and establishing the organization's policy board.

Ms. Napier commented that representation is needed from the basin because of the size of WRIA 20, which is represented by many entities. A balance of interests is needed for each of the WRIAs. She asked members to consider becoming involved in the new organization or provide her with contact information of individuals that should be involved. Ms. Allison said now is the critical time for becoming involved because the structure is forming and representation is under development.

Mr. Stussy inquired about the process for establishing the new board. Ms. Allison said she has been interacting with lead entity coordinators, such as Ms. Napier and her counterparts in the other WRIAs. A conference call was held earlier in the week with an agreement for Ms. Allison to develop a concept paper on the interlocal agreement. Lead entity coordinators will present the interlocal to their respective group to gain input. After the interlocal agreement is adopted, work will begin on the structure of the policy board.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group
Meeting Summary
June 13, 2008 Page 2 of 10

Jim Hill inquired about the timeline for completing the process. Ms. Allison estimated an interlocal agreement should be adopted by the end of the year with process on forming the policy board well under way before the end of the year. It's critical to have each lead entity group represented on the board. Ms. Allison said she has already been speaking to some of the citizen groups from WRIA 20. The WRIA 20 groups are very vocal. She invited members to contact her and/or work with Ms. Napier.

Birdie Davenport arrived at the meeting.

Chanele Holbrook-Shaw referred to gas prices and suggested considering a conference call/e-mail or forum process for maintaining communication. Ms. Allison acknowledged that there have been some concerns by citizens concerning the cost to travel to meetings. There likely will be funding availability for citizens if they are a member of the policy board. The issue is what occurs prior to the formation of the board. Ms. Allison said she's committed to involving citizens and will work on the issue of participation through cost effective methods.

Ms. Napier said there is a reservation line through AT&T that members and citizens can use. She suggested investing in a speakerphone for teleconferencing.

Andy Olson arrived at the meeting.

Review Criteria for Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) Projects

Mr. Stussy reported on a previous meeting to discuss some criteria for acquisitions and assessment projects. The briefing will be a review of the initial information discussed at that meeting. The information represents a good start in terms of criteria to review acquisition and assessment projects. Previously, there were no criteria for assessments. The group took the information the SRFB review panels use when considering assessment projects. The language was revised and reconfigured to reflect a rating system.

Mr. Lehr reported last year, efforts began on combining different iterations of how projects can be evaluated to compare the different types of projects for ranking them into a prioritized list. The categories or factors considered included comparing fish projects that were benefitting multiple stocks, and if projects addressed depressed stocks, healthy stocks, or unknown stocks, the projects received different points depending on where they were located and the number of species involved. For example, a project addressing depressed and multiple stocks would receive a score higher than a project addressing a relatively healthy stock and only one species.

The second component involved habitat. Many nuances came up during the habitat discussion. The question is how to compare different projects as they relate to habitat. The project types include barrier removal, acquisition, enhancement/restoration, or a combination project with some elements of each of the project types. Depending on which of the project categories best described a project, the intent is to assess the habitat based on the quantity of habitat affected by the project and the overall quality of the habitat. There are a number of ways of describing those outcomes. Another consideration involved a restoration or enhancement project and how well the proposed activities align with what is necessary and beneficial in particular subbasins. The group reviewed a parallel project and identified limiting factors in different subbasins, and based on those limiting factors, the group categorized them into tier 1, tier 2, and tier 3. Those categories for each subbasin are listed in a separate spreadsheet Mr. Lehr shared with members.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group
Meeting Summary
June 13, 2008 Page 3 of 10

Another component with added detail included looking at acquisition projects and judging the quality of the habitat not only as to how it benefits fish or the resources, but what level of threat is facing the property, such as potential development in the future. The matrix developed for the habitat component of the project enables a score of up to 100 points and for the fish component a score up to 100 points is possible. Types and number of fish are weighted equally to the quantity and quality of habitat.

Another factor the group considered for a project as a whole involved the connection of the project to external activities, such as partnerships and outreach. Factors to consider include whether an outreach plan is in place and how much of a contribution is received from matching funds or partnerships. The intent of this scoring factor is to assess how much a project impacts beyond the immediate benefits of the project to fish or habitat.

The last criterion pertains to how well the project is likely to succeed. For example, does the project sponsor have the qualifications and track record of success. Although the assessment can be qualitative, the questions to address include whether a monitoring program is in place, cost appropriateness, site or design appropriateness, and landowner participation. Within this category, the factors weighted most heavily include fish and habitat, partnership outreach, and likeliness for success.

Mr. Lehr said the group discussed how to compare different projects in terms of habitat quantity. The intent is to develop some type of even measurement for different types of projects. The matrix was developed to represent an equivalent way to compare projects and then break down categories specific to the project type. It's to assist in a qualitative way of comparing different types of projects.

Ms. Napier recommended project sponsors should include within the project's budget the minimum matching funds necessary to meet the SRFB's requirements. However, if the project received more than the minimum in matching funds, the sponsor should describe the additional funds within the application to receive credit from the SRFB for creating partnerships but not include it within the budget to avoid having to track the funds.

Mr. Lehr reported the exercise generated a ranking matrix that looks at fish stocks, habitat, and then the tangential components of a project, such as how likely will it be successful and how likely will it impact or be impacted by other projects in the region. The weighting is in line with the strategy of the CBP to give preference to depressed stocks and habitat projects that will encapsulate the largest number of stream miles and/or the largest amount of acreage directly benefitting stream systems.

Mr. Stussy asked whether assessment projects will fall under the criteria for habitat. Mr. Lehr reviewed the general guiding considerations reviewers will use to evaluate the project as far as assessment, feasibility, and design of projects. The project will be ranked by taking a qualitative assessment of the assessment design of the project based on the criteria and using that number to fill in the habitat component.

Ms. Napier advised project sponsors to clearly document in the application how the project meets the criteria to ensure projects receive full credit.

Ms. Napier confirmed that after the committee endorses the recommended criteria, she will send the information to all project sponsors electronically.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw asked how to include an approximation of an acquisition if it benefits another property. Mr. Lehr said that aspect would be captured in the partnership contributions element. Ms. Holbrook-Shaw asked if it's considered an in-kind contribution if the landowner is selling the land below its market value. Mr. Lehr confirmed it would be included within the match component. Ms. Napier reminded everyone that

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group
Meeting Summary
June 13, 2008 Page 4 of 10

landowner consent forms must be submitted with final applications in August for projects requiring landowner approval, such as easement access, acquisitions, and other related projects requiring a landowner's consent.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw asked how to include letters of support with the application. Ms. Napier advised that reports, letters of support, and other documentation that can strengthen the application can be attached in PRISM. Additionally, hard copies of the application and accompanying materials are then provided to Ms. Napier, who will mail the copies to the review panel.

Jamie Glasgow asked whether a project's total score is set in stone or whether it's a guide for the discussion. Mr. Lehr said the score guides the discussion of the reviewers on which projects best meet the strategy that has been developed for the Chehalis basin. Ms. Napier outlined the review process of the committee to include ranking each project, developing a list of projects for reviewers to consider, and ascertaining whether there are any issues or surprises pertinent to any of the projects. The list is a ranking of projects that is forwarded to the Partnership that will become the approved list of projects to forward to the SRFB for the Chehalis basin.

Ms. Napier referred to volunteer participation and noted there was a financial incentive coming from the SRFB to have veterans involved in volunteer participation, which didn't materialize. Last year, sponsors worked hard to secure veteran participation in habitat restoration work. However, it hasn't been successful for sponsors. She suggested it's important to have volunteers in the process and recommended including language of whether the project includes volunteer participation whether they are veterans, local groups, or young people.

Members discussed criteria for acquisition projects in terms of whether the property is considered high density. Ms. Holbrook-Shaw referred to the Mills property she is working to acquire and indicated the scoring will be less for that property because it's not considered high density. Mr. Stussy noted the criteria are starting points for the committee's discussion. If there is justification to revise it, the committee should discuss it. He cautioned against catering the criteria to a specific project. Mr. Devlin asked about the definition of "high density." Mr. Stussy said counties define low, high, and medium density. The committee can also develop a description of high density. Mr. Devlin said cities describe high density as property located in urban growth areas. Janet Strong cited an example of a five-acre parcel that has been degraded because of small farming operation. Ms. Holbrook-Shaw said there are also additional impacts to water because of livestock. Another issue is the high land value associated with high-density land. Obtaining funds through a grant is difficult when land has high-density potential. Mr. Stussy said even if the land is high density or has a high level of threat, the land still needs to be of high quality to be a high ranked project. The ranking is based on the quality of the habitat and level of threat, not the overall project itself. Ms. Napier suggested using county definitions as a starting point and then working from there because the SRFB will cite regulations in place to protect properties through growth management.

Mr. Lehr reported on the effort to account for all projects throughout the Chehalis basin and consolidate the information into a viewable format to enable access to project data as well as sorting projects based on different criteria. Currently, that effort includes databases that can be accessed of the different projects. He displayed an example and described data layers on several sample project sites. It's a way of looking at projects in a graphical format. Some of the sites do not have complete location coordinates. The spreadsheet was distributed for proofing, however not much feedback has been received.

Members discussed ways to verify or add missing information. Mr. Stussy questioned the percentage of incomplete information. Mr. Lehr said for almost all projects, the habitat-type designation is missing, such as instream, riparian, or estuarine, as well as the legislative district designation.

**Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group
Meeting Summary
June 13, 2008 Page 5 of 10**

Mr. Lehr said the online server system is operational. However, the ArcGIS server does not converse well with Access databases without an intermediate software program for transitioning between Access and the server program. The intent is to have the information available on the web; however, the database program is not communicating with the web program until another software component is added.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw inquired about the status of the database after Mr. Lehr leaves for his job in the Midwest. Mr. Lehr said the data will continue to be added by Don Loft, a student who is working on the Water Quality Program. Mr. Loft is beginning a masters degree program at The Evergreen State College and will work on the project as part of his masters program. Ms. Holbrook-Shaw asked that Mr. Loft attend future meetings. Mr. Lehr confirmed the request.

Mr. Glasgow reported his organization is proposing the development of an interactive web-based map. The information would be easy to add to the map. Mr. Lehr said the ArcGIS server system is intended to access primary data, which can be both a positive and a drawback in many ways. The software that the Wild Fish Conservancy is using is more user-friendly, enables quick access, and is easier to navigate by non-GIS users. The goal of the web program is to overlap different types of parameters, such as comparing water quality and habitat and comparing land use and habitat. Typically, other agencies and organizations have different storage data formats and none are directly compatible with one another. In a perfect world, anyone would be able to access the information online. However, that technology does not exist, and the college is serving as the intermediate by translating and hosting the information in one location.

Ms. Napier said Mr. Glasgow is referring to the habitat work schedule. There has been discussion about importing completed projects. However, the focus of the habitat work schedule is to identify where work should be undertaken. The analogy is a salmon-world version of a capital facilities plan. Through the Lead Entity Program that information is to be populated. She said she is working with an individual on the projects that have been proposed through the SRFB to be entered into the habitat work schedule as a pilot project. As projects are proposed they will be added.

Mr. Lehr described the status and availability of data. A free reader program, ArcReader, is a free, easy-to-use desktop mapping application that allows users to view, explore, and print maps.

Ms. Napier asked about obtaining an accurate map on the projects. Mr. Stussy suggested obtaining a list of all project sponsors whose projects have missing data and scheduling a work group meeting to fill in the gaps. Mr. Lehr said the data is populated in the Access software program, which reflects which projects are populated with data and which ones lack data.

Address Comments from SRFB

Ms. Napier distributed copies of individual comments to the early applications by the 2008 SRFB review panel. In May, the committee's review panel and the SRFB review panel visited project sites. The written comments are from the SRFB review panel. Some difference between the process last year and this year is that the panel is not calling out projects of concern. The comments are recommendations to improve the projects. Ms. Napier said she encouraged project sponsors to attend the meeting to review and provide feedback on the comments.

Members reviewed the following projects, provided suggestions on the projects, and responded to feedback from the SRFB panel reviewers:

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group

Meeting Summary

June 13, 2008 Page 6 of 10

Sam's Canal Enhancement – involves several actions to improve stream and riparian conditions along 1,200 feet of a small tributary to Wildcat Creek located in the City of McCleary.

The review panel requested more information on fish passage conditions in the long culvert under the City . There was much discussion on site about the fish rack and whether modifications were possible. Todd Baun said he hasn't had an opportunity to contact WDFW about the design of the fish rack. Mr. Stussy offered to schedule a site visit with Bob Bernard.

Ms Napier said the review panel recommended focusing on revegetation to provide a source of long-term wood recruitment and shade, with the use of willows and alders. The native shrubs will not shade out reed canary grass and blackberries. Mr. Baun said he indicated cutting back the grass and blackberries, but not removing it because last year he wanted to remove it and the SRFB said more sedimentation would result. Ms. Holbrook-Shaw asked whether the plan is to spray the area as shading will take 20 years. Mr. Stussy disagreed and referred to a project at the University of Washington that only took six years to shade out canary grass using willows. Applying several years of herbicide applications around each planting is a technique that works well and has been utilized at several sites.

Mr. Baun referred to the recommendation to terrace the banks at some locations to provide floodplain area and reduce bank erosion and indicated he is working with City engineers on the option. He said he will likely need some assistance. Mr. Stussy advised the issue can be discussed during the site visit with Mr. Bernard.

Mr. Baun referred to current activity involving the City's aquifer. The application of herbicide is not recommended because of the controversy. Citizens are also banned from using certain herbicides within city limits. Ms. Napier suggested including information in the application about concerns with the aquifer and why that particular approach was selected.

Ms. Napier suggested revising the trail component and consider applying for Community Salmon Fund funding. Community Salmon Fund is converting to a regional funding approach to ensure funding cycles are consistent. Each lead entity will receive a specific amount of funds regardless of the region, which will be allocated within the region. The main change pertains to timing.

Chehalis Water Type Assessment – assess accuracy of water typing in the field on 40 miles of stream in the Wildcat, Black, and Scatter Creek basins.

Mr. Glasgow said the comment pertains to the assessment focusing on smaller streams and how it would be helpful to know how changes in the water typing system influence streams with anadromous fish versus resident fish. Mr. Glasgow questioned the possibility of contacting the reviewer because regulations are no different for anadromous fish than for resident fish. The issue is the presence of fish, which drives the buffer width requirement. Ms. Napier suggested articulating the request in an e-mail to Jason Lundgren. Mr. Lehr said he believes the focus of the comment pertained to whether the work will focus on salmon bearing streams because that is the focus of the SRFB. If the work is on streams without the presence of salmon, those projects are of less priority. He suggested including information on fish distribution documents that suggest a stream is occupied by salmon. Including that information will help address the question. Mr. Glasgow commented that protecting upstream reaches also has huge implications downstream where salmon is located. He indicated he will include that information as well.

Janet Strong commented that it's been her experience that there are often surprises. Coho salmon can access nooks and crannies and DNR and others often find streams with salmon. Mr. Glasgow said it's one reason for

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group
Meeting Summary
June 13, 2008 Page 7 of 10

the pursuing the surveys. Joel Green said if the stream has cutthroat trout and has a barrier, it demonstrates the capability of supporting salmonids to some degree. It appears relevant if the barrier is removed and salmon can access the stream.

Mr. Glasgow departed from the meeting.

McCormick Creek Fish Passage – not reviewed.

Black River Conservation Initiative – acquire water rights to protect 350-acre feet of water to increase flows in the Black River.

Review panel comments include establishing the true benefit to salmon and the volume of water returned to the system.

Mr. Devlin said the comments pertain to three areas – understanding groundwater to surface water flow and how protecting groundwater rights impacts flow, species of fish to benefit from increased flow, and how the project supports the broader strategy.

Mr. Devlin reported Pacific Groundwater is a company that has completed much work in the Black River area and much of it in terms of the asphalt plant. Washington Rivers Conservancy has been working with the company. It's possible to respond to the question and communicate the tie between protecting water rights and increasing flows. Reports from WDFW substantiate the presence of fish species. Regarding the broader strategy question, Mr. Devlin said the application didn't sufficiently communicate the strategy appropriately, which can be improved.

Mr. Lehr referred to a new project, Salmon 2100, which is a project documenting the state of salmon fishery in the Northwest. The report is authored by several well-known fishery scientists from the Environmental Protection Agency in Corvallis, Oregon. The report addresses reframing the discussion on what the priorities are for restoring wild salmon. There are many factors that would apply to this project. He suggested the project sponsor should read the report and reference some of the key points within the report.

Ms. DeMond suggested the project summary should include information on evaluating the current practice of when irrigation occurs and that the water may be increasing flows in the Black River during the summer because of more surface flow into the river. However, it depends on how the practice impacts groundwater as well as knowing the depth of the well. Mr. Green added that it would also be influenced by the type of irrigation. Spray irrigation tends to evaporate while flooded irrigation tends to infiltrate soil.

Mr. Olson asked about the proximity of the well to Mima Creek as it may be a closer link than the Black River. Mr. Devlin said the well is located between Mima Creek and the Black River.

Mr. Devlin addressed questions on the organization's priorities. The organization has prioritized the lower Chehalis River and the Satsop River as a priority for involvement. Whether rights acquisition is the most critical strategy is unclear because of insufficient information. The Black River is over-allocated. However, what is unknown is all the unregulated wells in the watershed and what the affect is on groundwater and whether there is a way to work with water rights and influence unregulated well withdrawals to have an affect on flows. The project is somewhat like a cart in front of the horse; however, the project is assumed to be an important strategy.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group
Meeting Summary
June 13, 2008 Page 8 of 10

Lonnie Crumley commented that the project should include information on the direct link of benefitting fish and habitat in the river and prove that wells located 3,000 feet away are really going to affect the river, especially since Weyerhaeuser abuts the property.

Preacher's Slough Fish Passage – remove road fill across the slough with high quality habitat and replace crossing with a bridge to improve hydrologic connectivity and fish passage.

The review panel commented on the need for more preliminary engineering design work to determine the size and type of bridge, the size of the opening, and the budget.

Ms. Napier commented that the project sponsor does not have much access to funds for engineering assistance. Birdie Davenport affirmed she doesn't have the funds to complete the engineering work until she receives the grant. There was a suggestion to apply for an engineering grant. She said she was able to obtain some cost-share funds from the county for some survey work. She noted the county commissioners agreed to undertake the research and write up a quick claim deed of Preacher's Slough. It will take approximately four months to complete. She said she will work to complete as much of the engineering as possible to satisfy the review panel. She asked about possibly receiving assistance from Mr. Bernard. Mr. Stussy confirmed he can assist in coordinating some assistance from Mr. Bernard.

Ms. Davenport acknowledged the reviewers comment on emphasizing the benefits to fish, such as the improvement in habitat quality, habitat quantity, and fish accessibility from restoring the hydrologic connectivity.

Mr. Stussy said another area of concern discussed was that a bridge structure would flood.

Ms. Napier asked about the financial assistance received to date for the project. Ms. Davenport indicated no funds have been received for the project. However, there have been some commitments of funding. Ms. Napier inquired as to the possibility of using some of the funds for the engineering work. Ms. Davenport said she is proposing to use existing biennium funding that has been earmarked for other projects.

Mr. Crumley commented on the possibility of working with an individual on preliminary drawings.

Hoquiam Surge Plain Habitat Acquisition – acquire 1,152 acres of prime surge plain habitat in the lower Hoquiam River.

The reviewer recommends the application should highlight the potential development risks and any long-term protection plans for the lower Hoquiam River area and discuss community support for such substantial acquisitions.

Ms. Strong said she was pleased with the reviewers' acceptance of other project requirements. She indicated she is planning to talk with local entities. It's difficult to ascertain the threat of development because of the unknown certainties associated with market forces. She said she will investigate possible development proposals but is aware of a pontoon project located at the mouth of the river. The Hoquiam River is rated as Class B waters, which is not good. The project would prevent the continued degradation of the river at the very least while the water quality problem is addressed. The expense of the project tends to raise some alarms. The property has fabulous habitat and has the criteria for many miles of riparian on both side of the rivers. She invited feedback on additional information to provide within the application.

**Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group
Meeting Summary
June 13, 2008 Page 9 of 10**

Mr. Lehr said degraded water quality parameters in the Hoquiam River pertain to temperature and possibility turbidity.

Mr. Green said Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) is required to mitigate for the loss of wetlands caused by the pontoon project. He suggested WSDOT might financially support the project as a part of the department's mitigation. Ms. Strong said there have been some discussions with WSDOT representatives during a boat tour of the area. That avenue has been pursued even though funding from the state can't be claimed as a match. The department began with 60 mitigation candidates and has narrowed it to 12 projects, one of which is the surge plain project. Mr. Green said the final decision is by WSDOT in coordination with a stakeholders group to include the Quinault Indian Nation. WSDOT is holding meetings to rate the potential mitigation sites. Mr. Green said he's one of the Quinault Indian Nation stakeholders.

Ms. Napier said an issue is that the project cost is well over the entire amount of the SRFB regional funding allocation. Ms. Strong said there is willingness to phase the project because of the cost and to satisfy the landowner.

Ms. Napier asked about match requirements. Ms. Strong advised that other attempts for funding include the federal Coastal Wetlands Program for much more than the request to the SRFB. Additionally, there is a potential for a private funding source as well as in-kind matches. Ms. Napier suggested contacting Mr. Lundgren on how to include the match information within the application.

Ms. Davenport asked whether an RCO application has been submitted for the project. Ms. Strong replied that none of the three partners are eligible to apply for Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) funding. She said she would like to address the issue as it penalizes nonprofit organizations that have been in existence for years and have a proven track record. The projects partners include nonprofits involving Cascade Land Conservancy, Chehalis River Basin Land Trust, and Grays Harbor Audubon Society.

Discussion followed on possible contributions by the City of Hoquiam or Grays Harbor County. Mr. Devlin said the questions and discussion regarding Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) is a critically important one because if any agency could be partnered, the agency could apply on behalf of the project. Ms. Strong said WDFW is offering in-kind contributions to the project. Mr. Devlin recommended working earlier with RCO in the process to obtain buy-in on projects a year or two in advance. Ms. Strong said the impetus for the project was the landowner's sudden decision to sell the property. She indicated the owner owners practiced forestry on the uplands and left the wetlands in good shape. However, it is now up for sale. She would have preferred to plan three years in advance, but the sale of the land was unanticipated. Mr. Devlin said it might be possible nonprofits will become eligible at some point. The Nature Conservancy has lobbied extensively for eligibility.

Mr. Olson left the meeting

Members discussed the current zoning designation of the land and plans to reapply for open space designation if the land is purchased. Ms. Napier indicated the application should reflect that the acquisition will not impact county revenue in terms of loss tax revenue.

Discussion ensued on property tax designations, assessments, and fee in lieu of taxes.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group

Meeting Summary

June 13, 2008 Page 10 of 10

Sampson Wetland Enhancement Phase I – design for \$40,000 to create full spanning large woody debris (LWD) structure to backwater and create 10 acres of wetland habitat within an existing straightened and ditched stream.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw reported Mr. Stussy and Mr. Bernard walked the project to determine the best approach to the project. Mr. Bernard recommended blocking off the main channel and reasoned that at this point, an engineer's design probably wouldn't be the best approach. Downstream, several beaver dams had been pulled apart in the area where she said she planned to construct an engineered dam. The proposal is to place LWD in the main stem as well as fill in some side ditches to reconnect wetland continuity. Once the root wads are anchored in the main channel, beavers will begin jamming smaller spaces between root wads and side banks. Because it was a design application and not an enhancement application, it raised a question. Mr. Bernard questioned whether the design application could be used for topographical measurements of the entire valley floor because of other abutting property foundations. Much work has been completed upstream and readings of the valley floor would be helpful to ascertain current conditions. A starting point could be established for the status of the projects and then at some future time, a comparison could be undertaken to see how beavers affected stream flows. Next year, the intent is to apply for funding for implementation of LWD and riparian plantings.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw questioned whether the application can be changed based on the suggestions offered since the original project was reviewed by the panel. She asked how to proceed. The design of the project will change. Mr. Sussy said one of the main issues pointed out by Mr. Bernard is ensuring the identification of all the different ditches and mapping them. Ms. Holbrook-Shaw said that will entail hiring someone to map the valley floor. The project design has shifted from creating a physical blockage to mapping the area and incorporating LDW and then having the beavers complete the work.

Discussion followed on the removal of the beaver dams on DNR property and possible reasons for their removal. She said she made some follow-up calls and no one appears to know why it happened. Another concern that there appears to be no new beaver activity or new trails or wood. It's possible the beavers were trapped and removed.

Ms. Napier advised that it's possible to redesign the project as it was early in the application process and there have been previous project revisions submitted by other project sponsors.

Next Meeting Agenda

Members agreed to cancel the July meeting because of the conflict with the SRFB meeting. Ms. Napier reported applications must be entered into PRISM by August 1, 2008. She advised project sponsors of their responsibility to provide copies of the application and materials so she can forward the applications/materials to SRFB. Members will receive a copy of the project criteria after it has been reviewed and refined based on the committee's discussion.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Mr. Stussy adjourned the meeting at 11:44 a.m.