

**CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP
HABITAT WORK GROUP
Lewis County Conservation District Office
1554 Bishop Road
Chehalis, WA
April 9, 2010
9:30 AM**

Meeting Summary

PRESENT:

Bob Amrine, Lewis County Conservation District	Jason Lundgren, WA State Recreation & Conservation Office
Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County	Kathy Jacobson, Chehalis Basin Education Consortium
Bob Burkle Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW)	Lonnie Crumley, StreamWorks Consulting
Brett DeMond, Stream Works Consulting	Jamie Glasgow, Wildlife Fish Conservancy
Gavin Glore, Mason Conservation District	Don Loft, The Evergreen State College
Chris Conklin, Quinault Indian Tribe	

Welcome & Introductions

Bob Amrine welcomed everyone to the meeting. The group provided self introductions

Basinwide Barrier Assessment-GIS application

Don Loft presented to the group, the updated GIS layer for barriers identified by the field work of Lewis and Mason Conservation Districts. The updated work included the RMAP layer as requested previously from the group.

Comments and questions from the group included:

- How will barriers corrected through the Lead Entity program or other programs be incorporated?
- Is DNR aware of this project? If not, then they should consider it as a tool to track RMAP corrections.
- Bob Amrine has a table that Mr. Loft can incorporate that includes known corrections to barriers.
- Include a ranking of barrier corrections within a subbasin.
- Is this tool available to anyone who wants it?
- This project should be incorporated in the NetMap data set.
- Some RMAP corrections include removal of the culvert and abandonment of the road. Is this documented?

Early Application Reviews

Grays Harbor Juvenile Fish Usage Assessment

Ms. DeMond asked how tidal fluctuations are factored when sampling occurs. Mr. Glasgow said it involves documenting where sampling occurs. Data collection at each site includes several parameters, such as salinity, depth, and velocity. In some studies it has been built into the study design to maintain consistency. Mr. Glasgow said with the proposed budget, the project will entail 16 different sites sampled twice a month between February and September based on experience in other areas. The effort represents full-time work.

Mr. Glasgow advised the final report for the West Whidbey Nearshore Fisheries Assessment has been added to PRISM, which a good report to review for similarity with the project.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

April 9, 2010

Page 2 of 7

East Fork Satsop Reach Assessment & Project Development

Mr. Glasgow reported the project, a reach assessment, will entail identification, prioritization, and design of instream and riparian restoration opportunities for a five-mile reach of the East Fork Satsop. He displayed a map of the reach. The five-mile long area covers approximately 19 acres of floodplain cells. On-the-ground work entails sediment-distribution modeling, comparison of aerial photos to historical photos to analyze channel migration patterns, topography data for long profiles and cross sections across the reach, and stream flow discharge analysis and modeling. Data will be modeled to provide physical template information for the entire reach that will be supplemented with biological data from a series of snorkel surveys along the length of the reach.

Washington State Parks inquired about interest in assisting the state with designing some restoration projects within Schafer State Park. The project presents a great opportunity to incorporate the parks assessment into the five-mile assessment and identify some opportunities for bank hardening. Additionally, the organization was approached by Friends of Schafer Park, which is very supportive of process restoration especially when it's founded in a scientific assessment of the entire reach. All data collected will be baseline data so that monitoring can be undertaken to determine how the channel responds to built environmental improvements.

Letters of support will be provided by State Parks and Friends of Schafer Park.

The length of the reach was based on a reasonable scale for the data collection over the time period of the contract. The resulting template could be applied to other reaches within Satsop or other waters. Examples of other products from other reach assessments can be added to PRISM as well.

Mr. Glasgow said the tour will likely entail standing on the banks of Schafer State Park, which will provide a good perspective of the site. He emphasized that the site was selected because it is a designated priority in the watershed plan as well as State Parks' willingness to participate and allow the work.

Members discussed the site and tour areas.

Ms. Napier asked members to provide feedback on the benefits for selecting this particular site. Comments included that the area is somewhat more confined than other areas of the system, it's located downstream of the hatchery, and it's located between Schafer Park and the mouth where some problem areas exist that could provide some future opportunities. Mr. Burkle commented that when FEMA regulations are standardized statewide in areas of listed species, there could be changes in rules for setbacks of residential uses that could open up possibilities for additional restoration.

Lonnie Crumley asked about the interaction with Friends of Schafer State Park. Mr. Glasgow replied that the group also received a similar presentation and overall the group is very positive about the proposed project.

Discussion followed on the desire of State Parks to protect the parking lot. Mr. Burkle reported Schafer State Park was included on the short list for surplus. He questioned whether the voluntary \$5 license tab fee will help save state parks. Kathy Jacobson said the park's listing on the short list was the impetus leading to the Friends of Schafer Park supporting the project. Schafer State Park was the site for eight years of water quality training conducted by the consortium in September.

Jason Lundgren asked about tie-in with the assessment downstream versus the park project. Mr. Glasgow said the intent is identifying and prioritizing restoration actions within the entire reach with a willing

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

April 9, 2010

Page 3 of 7

landowner involving State Parks. Some data will be high resolution within the state park. But to ensure a science driven design in the park, it's important to know what is coming downstream as well as the potential impact below. Mr. Lundgren suggested contacting the upstream owner because it may involve HCP ground under adaptive management.

Mill Creek Fish Passage

Bob Amrine reported the culvert replacement project is on Mill Creek, a direct tributary to Chehalis River. It is located 2.43 miles upstream on Mill Creek. The project was submitted under two alternatives of either installing a new driveway and abandoning the current crossing location or installing a concrete bridge. Originally at the site, there is a pipe with concrete surrounding the pipe under a bridge. The landowner agreed that if an alternative could be funded he would allow removal of the pipe with another driveway built in another location to enable abandonment of the site. The project application was submitted under both alternatives as Miranda Plumb indicated it may not be possible to fund a new driveway. Mr. Burkle commented that US Fish and Wildlife Service could possibly fund removal of the barrier with SRFB funding the driveway to enable abandonment of the creek crossing.

Mr. Amrine said the project is a Tier 1 project. In the basin's original ranking of culverts, the site is the 6th priority project. There are six culverts on the basin's prioritized list. One project was completed making this project number five. One of the other top five projects is owned by a bank and several are owned by Lewis County. One may be on DNR land.

Mr. Amrine distributed photographs of the project site. One sheet reflects the original assessment data and as a barrier because of the outfall drop. The landowner originally wasn't interested. The second page reflects priority index work completed for the site. All of the information will be documented in the application. The third page is a photograph of the culvert site, current access to the house, and the proposed driveway. The driveway provides access to several residences. However, the landowner is the only property that has access across the creek. The landowner is agreeable to having the bridge removed because it requires nearly a 90 degree turn to access the property after crossing the bridge. Mr. Amrine reviewed several photographs of the site. In the summertime, there is a 60% blockage with no passage for juveniles below the outfall.

Discussion followed on whether Mr. Amrine should revise the application and drop out the replacement bridge. From a fisheries standpoint the bridge option is undesirable. Mr. Lundgren asked whether the new location of the driveway has been reviewed with the landowner. Mr. Amrine replied that the landowner and the utility providers have been contacted. Utilities will need to be rerouted along the new driveway and the cost is included within the project cost estimate.

Mr. Burkle asked about the possibility of any channel migration or other issues. Mr. Amrine referred to several photos and indicated the stream is located along the tree line and is approximately 150 feet from the roadway. Mr. Burkle asked whether channel migration is evident in the stream. Mr. Amrine said it's not evident.

Members recommended revising the project application to reflect the driveway option rather than a bridge replacement.

Mr. Amrine acknowledged the assistance of Mr. Lundgren for assisting with data entry into PRISM.

Mr. Lundgren recommended checking with Ms. Plumb on whether a match is required for removal of the barrier, and if so, SRFB funding could serve as the match for the driveway construction.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

April 9, 2010

Page 4 of 7

Ms. Napier asked about access to the site for the tour. Mr. Amrine indicated there shouldn't be a problem with access.

Chehalis Basin Invasives and Education Restoration

Ms. Jacobson reported the project is in collaboration with The Nature Conservancy. April Boe was unable to attend because of illness and will present the Conservancy's element at a future meeting. Ms. Jacobson distributed copies of the letter of intent. The Chehalis Basin Education Consortium (CBEC) and the Pacific Education Institute have partnered with The Nature Conservancy on other projects. The CBEC and the Institute focus on educational programs and activities for local school children in grades 4 through 12 involving the Chehalis watershed and reviewing requirements for salmon, as well as introducing students to invasive and non-invasive plant species. This year, CBEC has focused on several methods and through a new program, "Worst Weeds in Washington," students research invasive plant species and share information with peer classes. The students then participate in hands-on restoration. This is the educational piece of the proposal.

This year, CBEC began working with Let Us Farm in Oakville. The farm is located on the main stem of the Chehalis River midway between Oakville and Elma. The farm is approximately 80 acres and the owner is working with WDFW in establishing some wildlife corridors. The farm is one of the proposed sites of the project proposal. The second site is an ongoing project site on the Chehalis River Discovery Trail, which will continue prior funded efforts along the main stem of the Chehalis River between Chehalis and Grand Mound. To date, nearly 6,000 native trees and shrubs have been planted. The area has been hit hard with flooding and the summer drought. The site is near the Centralia wastewater treatment plant.

Mr. Lundgren inquired about previous SRFB funding involving the site. Ms. Napier advised that previously there was a riparian component through the Chehalis Land Trust. Through Ms. Jacobson's work, the students participated in plantings. She asked if that work could continue with SRFB funding. Mr. Lundgren said the SRFB is specific in terms of not allowing stand-alone maintenance or educational projects. Ms. Jacobson said the project would entail new plantings in different sections and isn't a maintenance project. Mr. Lundgren said the area that was devastated by the flooding will be replanted by Centralia as part of the wastewater plant responsibility. Ms. Jacobson said the effort will continue the riparian plantings beyond the willows planted near the wastewater plant.

Mr. Lundgren inquired about ownership on the opposite side of the river. Ms. Jacobson said the land is in a conservation easement. Mr. Lundgren commented that it's one of the most beautiful sections along the river. Ms. Jacobson said the site is used as a reference site by the students in their field studies. The area includes the last intact stand of cottonwood trees along the Chehalis watershed.

Discussion followed on the possible location of a levee at the project site location. Ms. Napier suggested the application should clearly state the site is at a level that is below any levee project proposal. Chris Conklin noted that the location represents a pinch point in the river and if the levee project was constructed it would have an impact on the area.

Mr. Amrine said from his understanding a levee project wouldn't be constructed in that vicinity at least at this point. However, there is a pinch point at the Mellon Street Bridge that is substantial and if removed would represent a huge impact downstream.

Ms. Jacobson said in the work involving students and water quality monitoring, the Discovery Trail is the best place to access the Chehalis River. It's the one public access area that supports a great experience for students. Ms. Napier suggested becoming familiar with the levee alignment and any potential concerns.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

April 9, 2010

Page 5 of 7

Mr. Burkle commented that there are many issues still unresolved such as the hydraulic model showing potential rise downstream, completion of 35% design not anticipated until September, and issues both upstream and downstream where the alignment could be changed affecting a pheasant farm.

Ms. Napier suggested Ms. Jacobson should contact Kahle Jennings regarding potential impacts.

Ms. Jacobson said Ms. Boe will review the knotweed removal component of the project.

Mr. Lundgren advised that the educational component must be secondary to the restoration component, and is interested in learning about the balance between work on-the-ground versus the school program. Ms. Napier suggested providing a budget breakdown for the different project components. She asked about visiting the site as part of the tour. Ms. Jacobson suggested a presentation would likely be the best forum because of the size of the site. She noted the educational element of the project represents less than 25% of the project budget. Much of the educational element involves the restoration work through plantings. Another phase of the education element is students applying what they have learned to other landscapes.

Ms. Napier recommended the application should be clear in terms of reflecting the educational components as secondary. Mr. Lundgren recommended including aerial photos of the areas to be planted.

Davis Creek Fish Passage Correction

Ms. Napier distributed copies of the letter of intent for the project. Mr. Crumley reported the project is in partnership and involves the Chehalis Tribe project involving the removal of a dike on WDFW property near the mouth of Davis Creek. A five-foot pipe is supposed to be within the dike, but it hasn't been located. Upstream there is a four-foot pipe on WDFW property. The Longborg property has another four-foot pipe from the house across Davis Creek that is elevated dependent upon the time of year. The only barrier remaining on Davis Creek is on the county road. There are several other barriers upstream but they are located off side tributaries. WDFW's Family Forest Fish Passage Program (FFFP) identified a landowner who wanted to replace a culvert upstream of the county road. Mr. Crumley said he evaluated the culvert but it was washed out shortly after visiting the site. It is now no longer a barrier. During that field visit, he walked downstream and found the Longborg barrier next to the owner's house and then traveled across the dike that is blocking flows across the creek.

Mr. Lundgren asked whether it's in the same location as the Tribe's Wickett project. Mr. Crumley affirmed it's in the same location. The Wickett project involves removal of the dike.

Mr. Crumley reported the proposed correction is a bottomless arch culvert 32 feet wide, 11 feet high, and 85 feet long to provide unimpeded fish passage to an estimated 12 miles of anadromous salmonid habitat based on a WDFW assessment. There is currently juvenile passage during lows flows. During high flows and flooding, the culvert can't handle the flows and strands fish.

Mr. Lundgren asked why a bridge wasn't considered. Mr. Crumley said mainly because of cost and the necessity for pilings and the angling of the road.

Mr. Crumley said the creek can accommodate four species of salmonids and is rated as 33% passable at level B during the summer. Downstream habitat is very well established. He reviewed the project with Ms. Plumb who indicated it's a worthwhile project because it's the last barrier on the watershed. He also applied for a US Fish and Wildlife Services grant that has been funded. Mr. Burkle advised that it was the highest ranked project as well for that particular grant cycle. Mr. Crumley reported he applied for a Coastal Counties Restoration Initiative (CCRI) federal grant. He was informed that the application was

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

April 9, 2010

Page 6 of 7

accepted. Grays Harbor is contributing \$50,000 as well as the \$40,000 from US Fish and Wildlife Service, both of which will serve as the match. If the CCRI grant is received, another \$50,000 will added to the match.

Mr. Lundgren said it's likely the ranking for the project is high. Ms. Napier said the project is a Tier 1 action, which should be included in the application. Mr. Crumley said overall for the basin its ranked 23rd of over 2,000 barriers. Members discussed the apparent low ranking of the barrier.

Mr. Crumley was asked about the presence of fish species. He said he's unsure whether WDFW included information during its assessment on the presence of fish species. Initial observations identified the presence of cutthroat but no Coho.

Mr. Lundgren asked about the availability of photographs of the barrier during high flows. Mr. Crumley advised that he can provide some photos with the application.

Ms. Conklin asked whether the railroad trestle will be problematic for the project. Mr. Crumley advised that there will be no impacts to the trestle. Mr. Conklin asked whether there are assurances the Wickett project will be completed downstream. Mr. Crumley said the project will be completed this year. Mr. Crumley said he submitted a design-build proposal for the Wickett project to the Chehalis Tribe.

Ms. Napier distributed a list of the projects submitted by the deadline. Project sponsors were notified of the deadline for project submittals and some project sponsors failed to submit their applications by the deadline. Approximately four project proposals were not accepted for consideration for funding during this funding round. There were various reasons for the not meeting the deadline including delaying entry into PRISM, personal issues, or incomplete applications. The Lead Entity's process leads to well developed projects. The amount of the funding is still unknown at this point for the 12 projects submitted totaling \$2 million.

Ms. Napier reviewed the list of projects for determining site visits or a presentation:

- Frase Creek Barrier Removal, Lucas Creek MP 4.2 Barrier Removal, and Lucas Creek MP 4.3 Barrier Removal projects are all returning project proposals – site visit not determined
- Mill Creek Fish Passage – confirmed for site visit
- Davis Creek Fish Passage Correction – confirmed for site visit
- Mills Property Acquisition - presentation as the proposal is a repeat application
- Humptulips Knotweed Project – presentation and photos
- Chehalis Basin Invasives and Education Restoration – Presentation
- East Fork Satsop Reach Assessment and Project Development – site visit
- Grays Harbor Juvenile Fish Usage Assessment - presentation

Ms. Napier reviewed the project sites for the tour on May 13 and presentations on May 14. The local review team includes Amy Iverson, Andy Olson, Bob Burkle, Bruce Treichler (not confirmed), Chris Conklin, Mark Swartout, Mike Kuttel, Miranda Plumb, and Nicole Hill. Miles Batchelder will join the review team as well as Jason Lundgren. State team members include Michelle Cramer and Kelly Jorgenson. Ms. Napier said she is also trying to recruit Theresa Marquardt from Grays Harbor Conservation District to join the local review team. Brett DeMond and Lee Napier serve as staff and driver resources.

Mr. Lundgren encouraged applicants to include photos of project sites.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

April 9, 2010

Page 7 of 7

Ms. Jacobson shared information on a mapping project of local farms in the Chehalis basin watershed.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Ms. Napier adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.

Prepared by Valerie L. Gow, Recording Secretary/President
Puget Sound Meeting Services