

**CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP
HABITAT WORK GROUP
Lewis County Conservation District Office
1554 Bishop Road
Chehalis, WA
February 12, 2010
9:30 AM**

Meeting Summary

PRESENT:

Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County	Brett DeMond, StreamWorks Consulting
Bob Burkle, WA Department of Fish Wildlife (WDFW)	Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
April Boe, The Nature Conservancy	Lonnie Crumley, StreamWorks Consulting
Bob Amrine, Lewis County Conservation District	Janet Strong, Chehalis River Basin Land Trust
Amy Iverson, WDFW	Miles Batchelder, WA Coast Sustainable
Janel Spaulding, Grays Harbor College/CBP	Salmon Partnership (WCSSP)
Craig Swanson, Lewis County	Gavin Glore, Mason Conservation District
Jamie Glasgow, Wildlife Fish Conservancy	Miranda Plumb, US Fish & Wildlife Services
Don Loft, The Evergreen State College	Birdie Davenport, WA State Department of Natural
Andy Olson, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation	Resources (DNR)

Welcome & Introductions

Bob Amrine convened the meeting at 9:34 a.m. and welcomed everyone to the February 12, 2010, meeting of the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) Habitat Work Group (HWG). Attendees provided self-introductions. The agenda was revised to include information on the Regional Salmon Plan and Regional Sub-Allocation Funding Process.

Regional Salmon Plan

Miles Batchelder provided an update on the status on the Regional Salmon Plan. Many members are already involved with the hope to include many more. Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (WCSSP) is utilizing the Conservation Action Planning (CAP) process in partnership with the Nature Conservancy. The process begins at the top by defining the project, project people, project scope and focal targets followed by developing strategies & measures, implementing strategies and measures, and lastly using the results to adapt and improve. Currently, the effort has completed the first element of the planning circle and is moving into developing strategies and measures. A workshop was held in early December 2009 to define focal targets, which created some controversy within the region. However, those issues are being worked through.

The scope of the project was defined by the region as all the watersheds drain directly into the Pacific Ocean. The committee developed a draft vision:

All watersheds in the Washington Coast Region contain healthy, diverse and self sustaining populations of salmonids maintained by healthy habitats and ecosystems, which also support ecological, cultural, social, and economic needs of human communities.

The vision is a work in progress and will be adjusted as necessary as more people become involved.

The scope of the project involves Water Inventory Resource Areas (WIRA) 22 through 24 with exclusion of a small portion of WRIA 22, which drains directly into the Columbia River.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

February 12, 2010

Page 2 of 10

The scope of the first workshop established the focal targets, which defines the extent of the project and selects the specific species and natural systems that the project will focus on as representative of the overall biodiversity of the project area.

After extensive debate, the group voted to select the following Focal Biological Targets:

Main Stems Tributaries Lakes Wetlands/Off-Channel
Uplands Estuaries Nearshore Marine Ocean

The Washington Forum on Monitoring Salmon Recovery and Watershed Health Forum was charged by the Legislature in 2008 to develop high level indicators to describe the recovery of salmon and watershed health. During the committee's process, the Monitoring Forum in December 2009, developed a list of watershed health indicators that will be incorporated into all regional planning efforts.

After much discussion and differences of opinion, the committee identified a set of Key Salmon Attributes (KSA) for each Focal Target to capture the interrelationship between salmon and each target with attributes, which are important to salmon species and life stages within each habitat within main stems:

- Spawning/incubation
- Juvenile Rearing/Foraging
- Juvenile Out-Migration
- Adult Foraging
- Adult Migration/Foraging

Bob Burkle commented that the plan encompasses every salmonid in the watershed, which includes Chinook, Coho, Chum, Sockeye, Steelhead, Bull Trout, and Cutthroat. Some of those species have fresh water life histories as adults.

Mr. Batchelder distributed information that lists each focal biological target, key salmon attributes, and key salmon species that relate to that habitat. The information is still in draft form at this point and more work will be needed. The information will work as a set of focal targets around which to describe the conditions of the salmon species in the coast and help establish the next step of the process.

The next step of the planning process is developing strategies and measures by looking at target viability, critical threats and analysis of those threats, and developing objectives and ways to measure those objectives. The group is soliciting additional help from individuals with technical expertise.

Mr. Batchelder displayed additional information on one of the next steps in the process. For example for main stems, for spawning and incubation under adult migration, the indicators and measures will include water quality, water quantity, and gravel. Those attributes will be assessed and rated throughout the region using a *poor, fair, good, and very good* rating scale. The challenge is taking all the attributes, determining the measures, and then rating them. It will entail a huge amount of work.

Mr. Batchelder reported Mr. Burkle took each focal target and identified key salmon attributes, key species for the attributes, indicators, and how to measure them. Mr. Batchelder distributed an example of the main stems to provide members with an idea of the work involved.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

February 12, 2010

Page 3 of 10

A workshop is scheduled on March 23 at the Quinault Valley Chapel in Neilton, WA. Invitations have been sent to approximately 50 people with technical expertise that have been involved in the planning. He invited members to attend the workshop.

Regional Sub-Allocation Funding Process

Mr. Batchelder reported Creative Community Solutions is facilitating several workshops to address how to allocate Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) funding allocations for the 2010 round. John Kleim, Creative Community Solutions, will be contacting individuals to schedule the workshops. The goal is to resolve the issue on how to fairly allocate SRFB funds for the 2010 round as well as looking forward to the Regional Salmon Plan and how that will inform decision-making when it comes to allocating the funds. The region's funding allocation will not be known until May.

Lee Napier said it's unknown how much the Coast Region will receive. At this point there has been no decision on the formula for the interregional allocations to each Lead Entity.

Mr. Batchelder indicated the Coast Region includes four Lead Entities located in five WRIAs. Chehalis is the largest WRIA.

Discussion followed on the potential funding amount and when SRFB will release the figures. Ms. Napier said previous allocations have been based on a variety of different ways involving formulas. Some of the criteria for the formula have included stream miles, number of fish, and stock based on WDFW Salmon & Steelhead Statistical Inventory (SASSI). Last year, it was stream miles with another formulation involving lake and estuary acreage and a bonus for Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed species. There's been an attempt to include science in the distribution of funds. However, the challenge for supporting science is that some Lead Entities don't have data while other Lead Entities have the data. The issue of using SASSI created some concerns as well, as many people do not agree with SASSI and contend the information is not reliable. Stream miles also became an issue because someone contended their region's stream miles were not included in the database. It's been a struggle to develop a process that is consistent for all regions. There have been discussions over the last several years, and the issue was addressed in July involving a long discussion about the science and what science could be used. The group at that point decided to pursue an option of watershed area. That was the last version of an option to consider.

Mr. Amrine asked why everyone wouldn't receive some allocation with the remaining amount competitive region-wide. Ms. Napier said the SRFB wants a regional list. There are some Lead Entities within the Coast Region that do not want projects competing against each other.

Mr. Batchelder added that it's a good question and that there has been some movement in that direction but it hasn't received substantial support. The Community Salmon Fund is a regional process that will include a regional technical review team to work on determining projects. Mr. Amrine said it's somewhat troubling to the Conservation District because of its distance from the ocean. Mr. Batchelder said competing regionally on which project is the best project requires each Lead Entity to use a different set of evaluation criteria. Getting consensus on those criteria has been the issue.

Mr. Burkle commented that the logical action is to retain the formula that was utilized during the last funding round and then work on changes after the Regional Salmon Plan is completed. There certainly will be more science in the plan because of the inclusion of NetMap and the improved ability of calculating productivity index of projects.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

February 12, 2010

Page 4 of 10

Ms. Napier added that when the group discusses the funding allocation again there may be a solution or it may be a venting session where members can share what they like or don't like about the process. There are two outcomes that could result. It's a sensitive subject and it doesn't need to overlap into the planning and technical workshops at this point. There is a clear agenda, which is why the discussion is occurring outside of the other meetings.

Craig Swanson asked if the plan will consider historical factors relating to different populations, such as the main stem and how things have changed over an historical period that is then factored into either an increase or decrease of population because of the formation of the Chehalis Basin Partnership and focus on habitat and stream restoration. Mr. Batchelder said those factors will be included to some degree. It's dependent upon on the group and the group's effort to decide what the plan will or will not do. There will be a review of the intrinsic potential as opposed to historical figures, which are not consistent across the region. The goal is to be as consistent across the region to the extent possible. The intrinsic potential of each basin will be considered in terms of analyzing what it could support under ideal circumstances. The current condition will likely remain the purview of the Lead Entity strategies. However those strategies at the Lead Entity level that will integrate to the plan have not been decided. It will be a critical point that will need to occur.

Lonnie Crumley asked if the plan will address what used to be supported or what could be supported today. Mr. Batchelder said intrinsic implies what it could support under ideal circumstances. Other watersheds have used the NetMap tool to compare actual historical numbers, such as in coastal Oregon with the intrinsic potential model. The result has been nearly identical. It does provide a good snapshot of historical conditions.

Mr. Burkle described the capabilities of NetMap, which is a GIS-based model. The model can be used to calculate stock presence. NetMap is a community based watershed science system comprised of uniform digital watershed (map) databases, analysis tools, and technical support materials. The state-of-the-art, desk-top analysis tools contain approximately 70 functions and 80 parameters and they address fluvial geomorphology, aquatic habitat development, erosion, watershed disturbance, road networks, wildfire, hydrology, and large wood in streams, among other processes and attributes. Mr. Batchelder said NetMap will incorporate recent LIDAR data from the south coastline from the mouth of the Columbia River to Taholah. US Geological Survey (USGS) is also looking at completing the rest of the coast but is seeking letters of support. US Forest Services is incorporating all federal forest lands in the Northwest into the NetMap tools, which reduces the cost for the planning effort. LIDAR data will not be available for federal lands at this time, but it will be added over time.

Birdie Davenport inquired about the process for submitting a letter of support. Mr. Batchelder reported the USGS work is to fly LIDAR from Queets up the coast to Cape Flattery. The south coast has been completed. LIDAR has been completed for Grays Harbor County, but is under review. He suggested contacting Tony Hartrich at the Quinault Indian Nation, who is spearheading the effort for the north coast. For access for Grays Harbor County data, Mr. Batchelder suggested contacting Miranda Wecker at Olympic Natural Resources Center. Ms. Napier suggested contacting Matt Hyatt at Lewis County GIS for any LIDAR data involving the Chehalis watershed. The Chehalis Flood Authority is collecting LIDAR data on WRIA 23 and partly into Grays Harbor County. FEMA picks up the rest of the main stem. The US Army Corps of Engineers is completing LIDAR for the Wynoochee because of the dam.

Mr. Batchelder reported Earth Systems Institute created the NetMap tool. Lee Benda is the contact.

Mason Conservation District Presentation – Barrier Assessment and Development of GIS Project

Gavin Glore reported that with the assistance of Don Loft, work is underway on the barrier ranking evaluation to ensure barrier projects are equally compared. A draft version was developed last year in time for the SRFB ranking. However, this year the goal is completing a more formalized version and amalgamating all data sources into one central database that will be maintained and updated. Mr. Loft expressed interest in assisting on the project and is working with many of the data sources representing over 30,000 sites to synthesize into one centralized database. As products are developed, the committee will receive updates during future meetings.

Mr. Loft described his prior involvement with the Chehalis Basin Water Quality Monitoring Program, which resulted in the creation of a GIS water quality map. Data was loaded in DOE's EIM system that is accessible through DOE. He said his participation on the barrier assessment project is through an internship as part of a fellowship to complete a salmon recovery project based on barrier assessment. Consolidating databases is an intensely challenging process. It has taken a full calendar quarter to line up data fields and format data properly. Another element of the work involves taking data and locations of culverts and developing a mapping system displaying barriers and adjacent land uses and other land marks. The base map has been developed, and as more information within the database is verified and corrected, that information will be available to include within the mapping system. By the next meeting, the intent is to provide an interactive map.

Mr. Glore said previously, the issue was the scale of the map. Mr. Loft worked on the issue and identified how to address the issue using Arch Reader, which is a free version of Archgis where a person can open a document that is scalable. There is relevant data available for WRIAs 22 and 23 that is scalable. It will be possible to scale to parcel level with landmarks labeled. The goal is to update any of the data. The data will be in an Access database with linked tables whereby a change made to one table updates all others, which will solve many of the data maintenance problems encountered in the past.

Mr. Glore shared current scalable platforms within the base map consisting of:

- Roads
- Streams
- Lakes
- Cities
- Main and Back Roads
- Barrier location

Mr. Glore asked for feedback on additional elements to include. Members discussed including specific information for each barrier. For instance, rankings for each barrier could be included or passage potential. Mr. Loft said he will be using a color scheme for the ranking of barriers based on passability.

Ms. Napier asked if the color scheme will tie into the ranking percentage of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3. Mr. Glore advised that the ranking percentage will be a field within the database enabling the user to sort the data through any of the fields and display the data on the map. The color scheme could be color-coded based on the tiers. There is flexibility in using the tool that also has the capability of changing over time.

Mr. Crumley asked about including logging roads. Mr. Glore said at this point data are sourced through public data through GIS, such as DNR's 24K Hydrography database.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

February 12, 2010

Page 6 of 10

Discussion followed on the tiers and how they should be reflected. Ms. DeMond pointed out that the tiers will likely change. Mr. Burkle suggested some standard percentages (0%-33%, 33%-67%, 67%-100%). He noted that the Regional Salmon Plan will include four categories.

Mr. Glore added that it will be possible for people to access the site and add another field or another level of detail on sites. At the next meeting, a more formal presentation will be provided.

2010 SRFB Grant Cycle Timeline

Ms. Napier provided members with several materials pertinent to the grant application process. The 2010 SRFB grant round has kicked off. She referred to the *Draft 2010 Manual 18 Update – Summary Sheet*. Manual 18 is a guidance document for SRFB project sponsors. The manual is currently under revision but likely will not entail many changes in the content. She suggested working off the draft summary sheet. One of the biggest changes is the due date of the projects, which is August 25, 2010. That's approximately two to four weeks sooner than in previous processes. For meeting the deadline, HWG will need to move its process in time for the CBP's review in July, which previously occurred in August. Subsequently, final applications are due by August 25.

Typically, the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) has sponsored by Lead Entity and by Region, an application workshop to review application materials. This year, workshops will not be scheduled but will be available upon request. Currently, no workshop is scheduled for the Grays Harbor County area unless members notify her of the need.

The SRFB will provide funding to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation for the Community Salmon Fund program. Consequently, it's not possible to match SRFB dollars to Community Salmon Fund dollars.

There will be an opportunity to interact with the review panel. There will be some changes to the process. The region's process will include at least two SRFB members meeting with the region's review panel at each project site. There is also an opportunity to meet with them as a region. The intent on the changes is to avoid the time period from October to November where the region is developing its final list for submission to the SRFB. Typically, there are some projects of concern, which becomes cumbersome and difficult to deal with. The goal is to flag projects earlier than at that point. In the past, flagging has been referred to as *preliminary projects of concern*. For some areas, that labeling wasn't preferred. This year, they are bringing it back as a flagging. When flagging occurs, there will be new instructions for the review panel along with a new format for the review and comment form for easier tracking of review comments.

Another change pertains to construction materials with provisions for pre-agreement costs. For example, some materials that may have been stockpiled may count as a match prior to project approval. There is also an updated landowner agreement, which relates to the cultural resources review (Section 106 provisions).

Ms. Napier advised that she will send an electronic link to Manual 18.

Ms. Napier addressed questions on the changes to the landowner agreement. The acknowledgement form is similar, but an attachment includes an agreement for complying with the Governor's Executive Order 05-05 pertaining to Archaeological and Culture Resources that states, "The grantee must have completed

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

February 12, 2010

Page 7 of 10

a cultural resources survey in response to any cultural resource concerns that might arise. Grantee will notify the landowner if a consultation is required. Required consultation must be completed before construction begins.” It appears to be a checkpoint for the sponsor to be aware of whether a cultural resources assessment may be necessary. Ms. Napier said she’s unsure if it is an eligible expense if a consultant needs to be hired. She said she can do some research and follow up with members.

Several members shared their respective experiences with projects involving historic resources. Mr. Swanson said if a project site is determined to be eligible for listing on the national historic register, the project can become very expensive. It’s also difficult to account for those dollars in an application. Ms. Napier said she will follow up on the reimbursement process as an eligible expense.

Ms. Napier advised that the current Letter of Intent will be used during the 2010 grant round. The Letter of Intent (early application) must be submitted to PRISM along with advising her of the application. The CBP will review the project list on July 23. The local review team, dependent upon volunteers, will technically review the project applications on July 9. At that time, the HWG will recommend projects to move forward for funding. The final draft of the application by project sponsors is due on June 25. During HWG meetings, members will spend time helping sponsors strengthen their project. Upon approval of the HWG of the proposed timeline, Ms. Napier said she will send out the official notice that the process is open to receiving project applications. The process will close March 31 for receiving Letters of Intent. She urged project sponsors to begin building the final application now rather than later. That should include the Letter of Intent (required), pictures, map, design documents, budgets, and other information. The final submission will not occur until the entire application is completed along with any supporting documentation.

HWG meetings on April 9, May 14, and June 11 will be dedicated to reviewing and strengthening applications. Ms. Napier urged HWG members to attend the meetings. She asked for volunteers for the review team. The team will review projects over two days with the dates established as soon as the volunteers are identified. She will confirm the availability of the SRFB panel as well. Ms. Napier described the review team process and that members need not necessarily be experienced. Nichole Hill has volunteered to serve on the team. Project sponsors are not allowed to participate on the team review with the exception of Mr. Crumley as a project sponsor and Ms. DeMond who will provide technical support.

April Boe offered tentatively to participate on the team review. Andy Olson, Bob Burkle/Amy Iverson, and Miranda Plumb volunteered. Janet Strong offered to participate tentatively at this point. Ms. Napier said she is also encouraging another member of one of the other Lead Entities to become involved in the process. Previously, Mike Johnson participated. Chris Conklin said he might participate as long as no barrier project is involved.

Ms. Napier reviewed the deadlines:

- Letters of Intent – March 31, 2010
- Final draft applications - June 25, 2010
- Final HWG Approval – July 9, 2010
- CBP Approval – July 23, 2010

Ms. Napier distributed copies of the *TAG Scoring Sheet and Ranking Criteria, 2009 and Appendix E – Benefits and Certainty Evaluation Definitions (from old Manual 18)*.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

February 12, 2010

Page 8 of 10

After last year’s process, a debrief of the criteria was conducted, which appeared to work well last year. Ms. Napier described the review process using the criteria and Appendix E to develop a ranking score. Appendix E applies only to *Benefit to Salmon* and *Certainty of Success* criteria. Ms. Napier described the process for scoring project applications:

Project Scoring Sheet and Ranking Criteria:

1. Benefit to Salmon (Appendix E)	Range	Score
High Benefit	8-10	
Medium Benefit	5-7	
Low Benefit	0	
2. Certainty of Success (Appendix E)	Range	Score
High Certainty	4-6	
Medium Certainty	1-3	
Low Certainty	0	
3. Fit to Strategy	Range	Score
Project addresses issue specifically identified as a high priority	8-10	
Project is consistent with a high priority	5-7	
Project not consistent with priority area or action, but would be high/medium benefit and certainty action	1-4	
Other activities	0	
TOTAL		

4. Partnerships/Outreach	Range	Score
Project includes education component related to watershed health and salmon recovery	0-3	
Project incorporates volunteer labor	0-3	
Project involves partnerships between public/private entities and/or multiple jurisdictions or agencies.	0-3	
Does project support known economic, social, cultural values in area?	0-3	
Does the project have greater than minimum match?	0-3	
TOTAL		

Ms. Napier reported on the status of updating the strategy and the issue of not including the work of the conservation districts and their barrier assessments. Several working groups have met to discuss barrier projects. There are some guidelines developed for inclusion in the strategy as well as more guidance for invasive species. The draft documents have been released to the working group for its review. The information will be incorporated into the strategy. After the strategy has been updated, Ms. Napier said the update will be posted on the website.

Ms. Napier encouraged members to visit the website and the library and asked members to advise her of any documents that should be included within the library. The website is www.chehalisbasinpartnership.org with the link on the left side.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

February 12, 2010

Page 9 of 10

Ms. Boe asked for feedback on any plans to apply for funding from Community Salmon Fund because she's considering applying for the Chehalis Basin Education Consortium and there's a limited amount of funds available. Janel Spaulding said she and Kim Ashmore from the City of Centralia may apply for some stream team projects. Mr. Batchelder advised that Pacific County may also be considering an application. Mr. Glore said he's considering the possibility of applying for the barrier assessment work. Mr. Batchelder said it's likely the application amount may be capped at \$50,000. He offered to survey interest and advise members of potential projects applying for the funds.

Ms. Davenport reported on a potential project she is considering for SRFB funding. The project is complicated because it's located on a forest road that goes through the Elk River, which includes roadway easements and private and public forest land owners. It involves a creek flowing into the Elk River from the west and it's located several hundred yards from the bridge. Fish are able to travel through the area, but not without difficulty. The culvert is ready to collapse. Several members suggested checking whether the culvert is on any lists scheduled for replacement. The project may be under the Forests and Fish Rule, but it could qualify as a SRFB project with a higher match. Ms. Napier noted that DNR as a state agency cannot submit a SRFB project. Ms. Davenport would need to secure a local partner. If the group would like to see the project move forward, a local partner would need to be identified.

Mr. Glore offered to work with Mr. Davenport off line to identify potential funding sources.

Members discussed the project and some of the inherent problems associated with a potential project because of land ownership. Ms. Napier suggested examining the land use and the road ownership and reviewing the information with Jason Lundgren at RCO to receive an interpretation. Ms. Davenport said she is undertaking the engineering because she may have sufficient funds. However, if not enough funds are available, she would like to consider the project for SRFB funding next year. Ms. Napier said it appears the project is complicated that requires early work because it takes awhile to properly articulate the project and for the group to understand it and endorse it.

Ms. Davenport shared information on the inherent problems associated with the culvert. Mr. Burkle shared additional information about the area as he rides his horse in the area and is familiar with the creek and the problems.

Ms. Napier said if a sufficient number of projects are not submitted for the two-day field review, she recommends using the additional time to visit completed project sites. Members agreed with the recommendation.

Other Business

Ms. DeMond asked about the scout project on Eaton Creek. Mr. Glore reported he has been working with the Boy Scouts and Weyerhaeuser and applied for American Rivers funding. They requested additional information, which has been provided. American Rivers is excited about the project and mentioned that the funding source was initially established to address dams. Weyerhaeuser is committed to providing a match after engineering and design are completed. It's anticipated that SRFB funding will be sought in the ensuing years that will be matched with federal funding. The American Rivers grant covers only engineering, design, and permitting. He described some of the project elements.

Ms. Napier invited everyone to a tree planting along the stream at the Straddleline ORV Park on February 20. Refreshments will be provided.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

February 12, 2010

Page 10 of 10

Mr. Amrine said the Conservation District is receiving mitigation funds for plantings along the Chehalis River. He asked for feedback on possible sites. The sites must be located within the Chehalis basin and preferably within Lewis County.

Miranda Plumb reported she received a request from Merri Martz, Tetra Tech, regarding the Twin Cities General Investigation Study (GI) for potential restoration sites for mitigation. She is seeking other potential sites. Ms. Strong advised that she has an acquisition and a restoration project in the center of the basin. Ms. Plumb asked for additional information. Ms. Strong described the areas.

Members discussed the sites and potential sites for the levee project. Mr. Burkle reported he and Ms. Plumb are members of an interagency work group that is working on the issue. Currently, site visits are scheduled on February 23 to concentrate on the levee alignment followed by other site visits on February 24 to potential project sites.

Ms. Strong advised that she will contact Ms. Martz.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

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