

**CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP
HABITAT WORK GROUP
Lewis County Conservation District Office
1554 Bishop Road
Chehalis, WA
April 8, 2011
9:30 AM**

Draft Meeting Summary

PRESENT:

Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County
John Kleim, Creative Community Solutions
Theresa Marquardt, Grays Harbor Conservation District
Bob Amrine, Lewis County Conservation District
Miles Batchelder, Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership
Debbie Holden, Creative Community Solutions
Janel Spaulding, CBP/Grays Harbor College
Mark Swartout, Thurston County
Bob Thomas, US Army Corps of Engineers

Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Chris Conklin, Quinault Indian Nation
Mike Kuttle Jr., Thurston Conservation District
Don Loft, The Evergreen State College/BASES
Chris Holcomb, BASES Environmental Consulting
Nelson Majano, BASES Environmental Consulting
Jim Hill, Citizen, Lewis County
Noel Ferguson, BASES Environmental Consulting

Welcome & Introductions

Bob Amrine convened the meeting at 9:39 a.m. of the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) Habitat Work Group (HWG).

SRFB Grant Cycle Review and Discussion of Projects Submitted During the Early Application Period

Lee Napier reported the deadline for submittal of projects was April 1. For this year's funding round, the Grays Harbor Lead Entity received 13 applications. Ms. Napier encouraged project sponsors to share information on why they selected the project and how it aligns with the basin's strategy. Submitted projects include:

- Lucas Creek 4.3 Barrier Design-Permitting
- Lucas Creek 4.2 Barrier Design-Permitting
- Frase Creek Barrier Design-Permitting
- Cedar Creek Barrier Correction
- Salzer Creek Subbasin Restoration
- Grisdale Legacy RR Fish Passage Restoration
- McDonald Creek Restoration
- Chehalis Watertype Assessment – Phase 2
- Bunker Creek Fish Passage Project
- Elliot Slough Wetland Acquisition
- Coffee Creek Habitat Restoration
- Tributary to Stevens Creek Fish Passage Improvement
- Grays Harbor Juvenile Fish Use Assessment 2011

Mark Swartout asked about the timeline for receiving information on the lead entity funding amount. Ms. Napier said the Coast Region should know the region's allocation by May or June and will likely release

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

April 8, 2011

Page 2 of 11

lead entity allocation amounts sometime in July. It's likely the lead entity will receive approximately \$500,000. Next year, if the three-year work plan is in place, an early application process will be unnecessary. A call for conceptual projects to include on the three-year work plan was issued and some projects have been submitted.

John Kleim added that the benefit of the three-year plan is reviewing project proposals prior to submittal to improve the quality of the project proposal and to ensure they are solid projects submitted to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) for funding.

Chris Conklin said larger projects requiring substantial funds could eventually have the opportunity to seek funding from other lead entities. Ms. Napier said if the region knows in advance that a project needs a specific amount of funds each year, it might be possible to include some guarantees that sponsors could rely on as part of the three-year work plan. The current process offers no such guarantee because the region never knows what projects will be submitted. Having a work plan assists in scheduling long-term and larger-type projects.

Ms. Napier reported the SRFB review team is confirmed as well as the local review team. Local team members include Mark Swartout, Bruce Treichler, Julie Balmelli-Powe, Patrick Wiltzius/Terry Harris, Tom Gow, Bob Burkle, Chris Conklin, Mike Kuttel, Miranda Plumb, Miles Batchelder, and possibly Rob Schanz. Kat Moore is participating as a member of the SRFB review team. Transportation is provided.

Project sponsors reviewed their respective project proposal:

- 1. Bunker Creek Fish Passage Project submitted by Lewis County Conservation District.** Mr. Amrine said the project was identified several years ago during culvert assessment work as a high priority. He spoke with the original landowner numerous times who was very uncooperative. The owner lost the property to the bank. The property was subsequently purchased by someone else approximately six months ago who is very excited about the project and is supportive of programs benefitting fish. The owner is now considering working with the Conservation Resource Enhancement Program (CREP). The owner is also environmentally conscious and supportive of the project. The project is a Tier 1 project in the Habitat Plan and is the third ranked project on the prioritization list and the top private culvert on the list. Fish benefitted include Coho, steelhead, and cutthroat trout. A priority index was completed for the site with a high score of 33.83. The project opens up 16 miles of habitat including 3,573 square meters of quality spawning habitat and 51,933 square meters of rearing habitat upstream of the blockage. The match is federal funds. The design and cost estimate is scheduled for completion in time for the site visit.

Mr. Conklin asked about the size of the pipe. Mr. Amrine said the existing pipe is very large but too small for the system as well as partially washed out.

Mr. Swartout asked about the percentage of barrier. Mr. Amrine indicated it is approximately 67% blocked or 33% passable. The culvert can pass adult fish. However, the system is full of fish with the presence of many coho.

Mr. Conklin asked about the presence of chum. Mr. Amrine said historically, there is some documentation about the presence of chum. A local landowner indicated that he's viewed chum but he's never contacted the district when chum are present to verify the presence within the system. Mr. Amrine said he's never personally seen or been able to document the presence of

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

April 8, 2011

Page 3 of 11

chum. The only documented chum are within Scatter Creek. Mr. Conklin said more information is needed to document the presence of chum distribution as some run up Black River and Minor Creek. WDFW indicates there is no presence of chum.

Mr. Swartout asked about the type of bridge. Mr. Amrine said several options are under consideration of either a concrete, steel or possibly a railcar. The landowner has agreed to use a railcar if the bridge can handle a U80 load. It would be less expensive. A decision is anticipated in the next several weeks. He anticipates the submittal will include either steel or a concrete bridge. Mr. Swartout asked why a railcar is not the first choice. Mr. Amrine replied that railcars are difficult to locate and installation requires another engineer to complete the site work to meet the load capacity. Many railcars do not meet sufficient capacity.

Mr. Conklin asked if the structure is in danger of collapsing or failing if the project isn't initiated soon. Mr. Amrine said he first encountered the structure approximately eight years ago and anticipated that it would be washed out at this point. Driving over the structure will likely cause it to collapse, which is why the landowner wants to put gravel on it. The location of the crossing will change to a field crossing instead of a crossing on a curve. It is only used as a field crossing. Approximately two-thirds of the landowner's property is located on the other side of the creek and he needs access to farm. The previous landowner let the field overgrow with swamp crabapple and hawthorn, which is why the project includes some enhancement of between 35 to 180 feet into the CREP area, leaving limited ag land. The crossing provides access to ag land on the opposite side. The new landowner is constructing a shop for a temporary housing location. He is very environmentally aware and not interested in pursuing any methods that could detrimentally affect the environment.

Mr. Swartout asked about the possibility of submitting a CREP application to fund the riparian buffer. Mr. Amrine advised that an initial map has been completed to review with the landowner. After the review is completed, a Conservation Plan of Operations will be developed outlining the work, which is approved by the district. That effort is financially supported by the Farm Service Agency.

Mr. Conklin said he prefers the riparian area rather than a passage because the stream is limited and has encountered problems. Mr. Amrine said upstream there are two large CREP projects. The goal is to add more projects. The site has many trees and shrubs, but can be enhanced with better vegetation to protect the stream system.

Mr. Amrine described access to the site for the field visit.

- 2. Grisdale Legacy RR Fish Passage Restoration submitted by Grays Harbor Conservation District.** Theresa Marquardt reported Blue Diamond contacted her about the project. The project builds on other barrier removal projects and is located south of the Wynoochee Dam along an old abandoned railroad bed that is an orphan road for Green Diamond. There is no regulatory requirement for Green Diamond to improve the barrier under Department of Natural Resources Road Maintenance & Abandonment Plan (RMAP). However, because the company has a reputation for stewardship, it believes the project is a good candidate for a fish barrier removal project. The project has five different variables. It's located along the old Grisdale railroad grade and adjacent to US Forest Service Grisdale Road. Other barrier removal projects along Grisdale Road were completed in 2010.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

April 8, 2011

Page 4 of 11

Mr. Conklin asked whether Grisdale Road is a county or US Forestry road. Ms. Napier said she believes the county assumed ownership of the last segment of the road late last year.

Ms. Marquardt said the project addresses fish passage as a Tier 1 project to increase fish habitat below the Wynoochee Dam and improve water quality and sediment delivery. If all five barriers are removed, it provides 11.6 stream miles of inaccessible habitat as well as 76 acres of wetland. Large woody debris (LWD) will be placed in the stream. Matching funds were secured for Save Creek, Neil Creek, and Schmeling Creek located upstream of the project. Two barriers below include Pigpen Creek and South Fork Wye Creek that have more fill and require more funds than the first three barriers, which were included in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife grant. Green Diamond is completing the engineering, design, and review of the project as it's completed. Green Diamond has general Hydraulic Project Approval (HPA) for crossings. A survey will be conducted prior to the first winter after project completion and three years after completion as required under the general HPA.

Mr. Swartout asked how much of the road grade will be removed. Ms. Marquardt replied that the road prism is removed and restored to its natural grade. Mr. Conklin added that in previous RMAP projects, Green Diamond has done a good job. Mr. Swartout asked why the barrier is not a RMAP requirement. Ms. Marquardt said the railroad grade is an orphaned grade that wasn't used historically for log hauling. In the 1980s, Green Diamond pulled out all railroad ties and rails with some grades remaining intact. Mr. Conklin added that Green Diamond isn't required to conform to RMAP requirements because the area is on habitat conservation ground. If it hasn't been used for log haul forest practices since 1973, then it's considered orphaned and there is no requirement. There is a requirement under the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) to replace the projects, but there is no stringent timeline.

Mr. Amrine asked about the match requirements for timber companies. Ms. Marquardt said Green Diamond is required to provide a 35% match. Mr. Amrine commented on the cost and whether it's possible to phase the projects. Ms. Marquardt said the first three barriers are less expensive at approximately \$90,000 with the major cost associated with Pigpen and South Fork Wye Creek because of the removal of 20,000 cubic yards of dirt removal at one site and 38,000 cubic yards at the other site, which increases costs substantially. The first three projects are part of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife grant at a cost of \$90,000. Mr. Amrine agreed it makes sense to include all five because if the first three are completed it might not appear to be as cost effective for the remaining two projects.

Ms. Napier said the site is located 25 miles from Montesano. She asked whether all five locations need to be visited or would the review be better served through a presentation. It will take some time to visit the sites. Pigpen Creek and South Fork Wye Creek are the larger fill projects and located further south. Mr. Conklin said he's familiar with the top three sites but would need to review additional data for the other two sites. Mr. Swartout asked about the availability of recent aerial photography of the sites in lieu of a field visit. Mr. Conklin offered to provide some photos of the sites as well. Ms. Napier noted that during a previous site visit, team members Bob Burkle, Miranda Plumb, and Bruce Treichler also participated in the site visit. Ms. Napier suggested scheduling a presentation in lieu of a field trip.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

April 8, 2011

Page 5 of 11

- 3. Coffee Creek Restoration Assessment submitted by BASES Environmental Consulting.**
Don Loft reported Coffee Creek is located north of Centralia and is a tributary to Skookumchuck. Coffee Creek has been relocated and essentially is a long ditch running north to south. It runs through the property of Growing Places Energy Farm beginning in Thurston County and into Lewis County. The project site is the area north of Lewis County in Thurston County encumbered with a number of invasive species to include reed canary grass that has choked off the ditch in one area. During rain storms the ditch tends to pond north near the bridge. Some farms are located on the east side of the channel with farm animals having access close to the stream. There may be some problems associated with fecal coliform. The focus of the project is establishing some baseline water quality parameters and conducting some sampling for a minimum of 18 months to develop baseline data for dissolved oxygen, turbidity, temperature, pH, and fecal coliform. The objective is developing a plan to restore some sinuosity to the system and reestablish wetland buffers.

Mr. Loft introduced Noel Ferguson, Chris Holcomb, and Nelson Majano as his business partners who have established a new consulting company, BASES (Bio-network Assessment and Sustainable Environmental Solutions) Environmental Consulting. The intent is to begin working on projects and Coffee Creek is the first project for the new company.

Mr. Swartout commented that the Nisqually planning unit completed a similar project on Ohop Creek. The project was very expensive and involved moving the channel during the construction phase to maintain water flows through the existing channel while the new construction of the new channel was completed. The new channel was planted and established before rerouting the flow. Additionally, it required property owner engagement because it was a major construction project. He asked whether the group has obtained property owner engagement at this point. Mr. Loft said the proposal is for a feasibility study with no construction planned at this point. The intent is contacting property owners to obtain permission to access properties to complete the surveys. There are several steps the group wants to pursue to determine whether it's a feasible project. Mr. Holcomb said in addition to contacting property owners; the goal is for property owner involvement to include sharing any concerns about the area to learn what landowners would like to see improved in the area. Mr. Swartout said during the Ohop project, Thurston Conservation District approached landowners during another grant program and was able to ascertain whether there would be property owner support before embarking on a feasibility study. He asked whether it's possible prior to the final submittal of the project to contact property owners to gauge willingness to participate. Mr. Loft and Mr. Majano affirmed that the group will make contact with local property owners. Mr. Swartout suggested the group should contact Jeanette Dorner, Salmon Recovery Coordinator, Nisqually Indian Tribe, for more information on the Ohop project.

Mr. Conklin asked about the scope of area for the project. It was noted the project proposal identifies the proposed site as a 1.25 mile stretch of Coffee Creek. Mr. Conklin asked about the purpose for collecting water quality data. Mr. Loft replied that there is a need to establish some baseline data to determine if future treatment might be required. Pre and post-treatment water quality data could document any improvements.

Mr. Amrine asked how water quality monitoring will be undertaken. Mr. Loft said part of the monitoring effort will be flow data collection during storm events and at other times. He has access to a flow meter. Access to probes is tentative at this point pending additional conversations with the college because of issues associated with the group forming a business.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

April 8, 2011

Page 6 of 11

Several members of the group will be completing internships and thesis projects that may qualify for using the probe. Mr. Amrine suggested contacting the Chehalis Tribe because of its monitoring program. Mr. Loft acknowledged he's been in contact with Glen Connelly about the possibility of working together as well as Patrick Wiltzius with the City of Chehalis. There are several options for obtaining water quality samples.

Several members suggested contacting the Department of Ecology and Thurston County to determine whether any ongoing monitoring is underway by those agencies. Mark Swartout suggested working with Jeanette at the Nisqually Indian Tribe and determine during the design phase of the project the kind of data to collect to help in the design phase. Mr. Conklin added that it may be more important to have physical stream metrics than water quality parameters. His concern is expending great sums of money collecting water quality parameters. The data typically doesn't drive any projects or cause any positive outcome. Mr. Loft said the intent is to determine if the system is healthy to support salmon. Mr. Swartout said part of that effort may entail examining fish usage. Mr. Amrine said that historically, it's a dike and drainage district and is why it's been channelized. Contacting landowners will be very important. The district has data available on culvert surveys in the area. However, after the 2007 event, there are some sites where large rocks were pushed to fill the drop pools eliminating outfall drops. Mr. Conklin indicated that it's important to learn what information should be collected to help with the project. Water quality shouldn't consume a majority of the project. Mr. Amrine said some of the parameters will be important to help determine what may be necessary to improve the system for rearing.

Mr. Swartout shared that one of the selling points of the Ohop Creek project was the importance of the creek in the life history of salmon. Those are the elements to consider when applying for grants. That is the type of information funding agencies want to know. The Ohop Creek project was designed and implemented in three phases. Mr. Loft said there is consideration to consider the project as a three-phased effort. Mr. Swartout suggested visiting the Ohop Creek site.

Ms. Napier queried members on whether the site should be included as a site visit or reviewed through a presentation. Some projects are best served through a presentation. She recommended a presentation for this project proposal. Mr. Loft agreed and indicated he will provide many pictures of the area. Mr. Conklin suggested overlaying a parcel map to show how many landowners are in the area. Mr. Swartout suggested also considering the purchase of conservation easements for the site, which might engage property owners. Mr. Loft said the group is considering incentives to offer to landowners.

Ms. Napier reviewed the presentation format and advised that any input provided by the review team should be considered and incorporated within the final proposal. All final documentation must be entered into PRISM by the end of June with a copy of the entire package forwarded to her. The presentations are scheduled for May 12 or 13. The final schedule hasn't been finalized at this point.

- 4. McDonald Creek Restoration submitted by Janel Spaulding, CBP Watershed Coordinator.** Ms. Spaulding reported Jarred-Figlar Barnes, a student at Elma High School, contacted the Grays Harbor County Stream Team to garner support for his restoration project on McDonald Creek. Ms. Spaulding contacted Lonnie Crumley, President of the Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force to serve as the grant sponsor. This is the first project submitted for funding of a three-phased project on McDonald Creek with over 40 projects identified. The student's goal is completing all

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

April 8, 2011

Page 7 of 11

the projects by the end of his senior year. The project will remove a shot gun culvert located on a private farm access road. The property owner is Ron Spaulding, who has expressed a preference for a concrete bridge structure rather than a wood structure to reduce maintenance requirements. The bridge span is approximately 40 feet. The culvert has a possibility rate of 33%. A barrier assessment was completed in February. McDonald Creek currently supports coho and cutthroat trout. No coho has been identified in the creek in the last five years. However, Jarred added 20 spawning pairs in different areas of the creek last year. The creek is 5.6 miles long and is a tributary to Vance Creek connecting to the Chehalis River.

Mr. Conklin said the pairs spawned and up to eight fish were counted. That effort will continue because Jarred is working with the hatchery over the next several years. With the new hospital scheduled for construction in Elma, a portion of the stream will be relocated, which will extend the length and sinuosity as well adding LWD and riparian plantings. Hospital administration is working with Jarred's goals to match up with a goal to restore the entire system. Fish were observed with a spawning pair at the outlet of a culvert near the hospital site with another spawning pair located near the road.

Ms. Spaulding said that directly upstream of the barrier is another culvert owned by the county. A small grant was received from DOE to retrofit the culvert. The project will include the addition of gravel and LWD.

Mr. Conklin described the location of the new hospital. McDonald Creek was relocated approximately 85 to 100 years ago. It's not feasible to reroute the creek to its original location and it's being relocated further west on the hospital property. The upper portion of the project site will remain in its existing location and includes enhancements of LWD and plantings. A mature stand of trees will be preserved. The new routing is through a field. On the hospital side, a planted riparian buffer will be maintained. On the west side, a riparian buffer of 100 to 150 feet will be planted. Some sections of stream include trees. A helicopter pad is located close to the road and ingress and egress is needed preventing the planting of tall conifers close to the road. The project combined with Jarred's intent of restoring adult passage along with improving habitat for all life stages is the ultimate goal. He is working with some of the small landowners downstream to reestablish riparian functions. Ms. Spaulding added that in June, a small riparian planting will be completed.

Mr. Conklin said another issue further downstream is a permitted pipe that has become a barrier. WDFW is working with the landowner on that barrier. Ms. Spaulding said a church is under construction on the site and church officials have some interest in donating heavy equipment for restoration work.

Mr. Swartout asked about the raw score of 6.53 and whether it relates to the priority index. Ms. Spaulding said the score was from Mr. Glore's culvert ranking. Mr. Swartout suggested clarifying the definition of a raw score. Ms. Spaulding said the ranking was 451 out of over 2,000. Mr. Loft clarified that the tiers were broken into percentiles. Ms. Spaulding was asked to clarify the information.

Mr. Conklin said the biggest factor for the project is the amount of upstream work and providing continuity for adult fish. Juveniles are able to migrate out but not return as adults.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

April 8, 2011

Page 8 of 11

Ms. Napier reported an invitation has been extended to view monitoring of the Grays Harbor Fish Assessment during the field site visits. Mr. Conklin suggested the field team could videotape some of the activity for presentation to the HWG.

Ms. Napier reported other projects include Lucas Creek and Frase Creek, which are permitting design projects. The sites have been visited several times during previous funding rounds. A copy of the early application for Frase Creek and the Lucas Creek projects were distributed to the committee. Previous comments on the two Lucas Creek projects indicated engineering costs were too high. The projects are close to one another and there is a cost savings in completing the projects jointly. One of the reviewer comments in 2010 indicated the costs for permits are too high for a project of this scale and there should be some cost savings given the proximity of the two projects. It doesn't appear the cost of the project has changed, but that the county is phasing the project to avoid requesting the full amount. The county wasn't asked to provide design documents for the three projects. Another comment in 2010 indicated that the proposal is to design a culvert using the no-slope option. The stream simulation option is another alternative to use for the design of the culvert but is mostly used and is based on best available science for passage. Culvert design using the stream simulation method more closely mimics natural stream processes than no-slope options. The stream simulation approach is often used for restoring natural stream processes through a culvert and should be used for culvert replacement projects with a focus on restoration funded by the SRFB. Justification for using the no-slope option over stream simulation option must be provided. The sponsor is continuing to pursue a no-slope option for the Lucas Creek projects. Ms. Napier said she asked the sponsor to revisit the application materials because the project description is unclear.

Mr. Conklin asked whether costs have changed if the feedback last year indicated the costs were too high. Ms. Napier said she doesn't believe the cost changed. The early application for one of the projects indicates the engineering cost estimate is \$250,000 with 20% of that for design, surveying, and permitting.

Members discussed the application documentation. Mr. Swartout suggested the county needs to clarify the project proposal. Ms. Napier said she has conveyed that message. Ms. Napier asked for feedback from the committee on how to proceed.

Mr. Conklin said the Frase Creek project proposal is possible. However, the proposals for Lucas Creek reflects no changes in engineering costs and includes the no-slope option and likely shouldn't move forward. Ms. Napier commented that since the process has been ongoing for 10 years, the site visits with the SRFB review teams should only reflect those projects that not only present well but also make sense. The question is whether the projects should be presented during the May field trip as projects that will be considered in July. In July, the top projects are selected to move forward. All other projects entered into PRISM convert to a dead status.

Discussion followed on any willingness by Weyerhaeuser to participate and closure of the road and possible relocation of the residents during a week of construction. Mr. Hill shared that those questions were asked four years ago. Mr. Swartout said if the county could close the road, costs would be substantially less. There is only one property owner involved.

Mr. Conklin added there could be the potential of an alternate route through Weyerhaeuser property. On the other project, the county built a bypass, which is expensive. The other project was also funded through SRFB. Ms. Napier said that at that time, most of the projects were

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

April 8, 2011

Page 9 of 11

forwarded to the SRFB. At that time there were other barriers on the list and the project was likely comparable to other projects. Mr. Conklin asked whether the engineering and upfront work from the prior projects could be used for the Lucas projects. Ms. Napier said the application appears to reflect that efforts are beginning from scratch. Mr. Conklin said the prior project is above the Lucas projects and is very similar. It appears that some of the same design work could be used.

Mr. Hill said the Lucas and Frase projects have always been surpassed by other better projects. The county continually resubmits the same project regardless of the feedback received. Mr. Swartout suggested the HWG should condition its response. One issue is whether the letter of intent meets the minimum requirements. The project descriptions are unclear. Ms. Napier said she reviewed the early application and suggested a few changes, such as double checking the attachments to delete some of last year's attachments, which the sponsor corrected as well as other minor suggestions.

Mr. Kleim commented on an option for a lead entity to create a rule when a project hasn't substantially changed over the course of two submittals, to have it added to the three-year list until more work is completed to improve the project. Ms. Napier advised it's the main reason she wants to implement a three-year list. One reason is to avoid the same project year after year that's never improved.

Ms. Napier said the project will remain on the list and the review team will receive a presentation.

Habitat Work Schedule Update and Discussion

Debbie Holden referred to the Lead Entity website to access early application SRFB information, Habitat Work Schedule (HWS) information, and grant information. She provided an overview on how to create projects in the HWS database to assist everyone in understanding multi-level hierarchies:

New Project Requirements:

- The goal is to move from standard projects to multi-hierarchy level projects for organizational purposes
- Multi-level hierarchy templates can be created by the region to fit the region's needs.
- Multi-level hierarchy entries are a way of organizing projects not a way of prioritizing projects.

There are 4 choices of Project Categories:

- Acquisition Projects
- Acquisition/Restoration (Combination)
- Non-Capital Projects
- Restoration Projects

An important note to keep in mind is that all Level 3 Projects are considered the lowest level on-the-ground projects, such as a culvert removal, riparian planting, dike removal, in-class lesson or outreach activity, etc. Once a Standard Project has been created it cannot be changed to a Level 2 or Level 1 Project, but it can be connected to another level. It can only be attached to a Level 2 Project, which converts the standard project to a Level 3 project and places it in the multi-level hierarchy.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

April 8, 2011

Page 10 of 11

Level 1 Categories include habitat protections and restorations, outreach and education, etc. and are the basis of the organizational structure where Level 1, 2, or 3 Projects reside. A Level 1 Category can be created that is specific/unique to the lead entity's database, giving the lead entity the ability to name a specific category that meets the dynamics of the watershed area and organizational needs.

The subcommittee reviewed two HWS hierarchy models currently used in Washington State:

- WRIA 20 Model
- Upper Columbia Model

Multi-level hierarchy examples of the models include:

WRIA 20	Upper Columbia
Level 1: Geographic Basin/Watershed	Level 1: Geographic Sub-Basin/Management Unit
Level 2: Project Type	Level 2: Project Type
Level 3: Actual Project	Level 3: Actions/Projects

The subcommittee proposed WRIA 22/23 Hierarchy includes:

Level 1: Geographic Sub-Basin/Management Unit (the Chehalis has 11 sub-basins)

Level 2: Project type, Stream Name, River Miles, Stream Catalog 4-digit #

Level 3: Actions/Projects

Mr. Kleim commented on the complexity of the template and described an alternative process for ease in submittal of data. Mr. Amrine said the goal is to simplify the process while recognizing that at the sub-basin level it can be difficult.

Mr. Kleim and Ms. Holden reviewed a draft of the Habitat Work Schedule Guidance on Data Input Requirements. Ms. Holden advised that there is access to webinars on different topics related to HWS.

Miles Batchelder said the goal is providing accessibility to project sponsors to enter projects in the HWS. The hierarchy has value when considering the tracking of implementation over time. It allows focus on a particular stream to see what has been accomplished for a particular basin over time. The approach allows the opportunity to assess the effectiveness of implementing the plan.

Mr. Kleim said one of his concerns is some private landowners who might have projects where there may be an issue in terms of confidentiality and do not want projects identified as a Level 3 project. Discussion followed on possible options to work around those types of issues. Mr. Kleim said it may be possible to include some confidentiality. However, the main intent is creating a template that is easy for entering data.

Mike Kuttle suggested providing a graphic of the folder structure to help everyone visualize the process.

Ms. Holden displayed some examples of WRIA 8 hierarchy projects entered into HWS. Mr. Kleim said many of the other WRIs are significantly smaller than the Chehalis and can afford a different structure.

Mr. Kuttle displayed WRIA 13 data entered into HWS. He explained that the data is similar to a folder structure found in computer directories. The objective is determining how to organize all data. The

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

April 8, 2011

Page 11 of 11

multi-layer data approach is valuable because all the data can be rolled up and it's possible to track what's been done in specific areas.

It was noted that approximately 60 to 70 projects entered into PRISM have been transferred to the HWS but are not assigned to any specific folder at this time until the multi-level hierarchy model proposal is adopted.

Mr. Kleim asked for feedback on the proposal. Mr. Swartout expressed support of the proposal. The basin has experienced 10 years of projects using a shot-gun approach. To develop a structure that puts all the information by river basin and sub-basin together would be helpful. The reason for a three-year work program is to ascertain whether the work is being completed in the right place and perhaps it will also point out where it might be beneficial to seek project proponents in areas that have been previously missed.

Mr. Kuttel said every project is mapped once it's entered into the system with a location. It is also possible to upload GIS data files.

Mr. Kleim said the second issue the subcommittee discussed was how to approach using the conceptual project idea. The subcommittee anticipates the HWG would have a committee that would work with conceptual projects. The subcommittee would meet after the SRFB process from September through March. The subcommittee applies a series of questions (developed by the subcommittee) to assist in selecting three to five projects that the group would like to mentor by working with the project applicant and providing advice and assistance to build the project to the point where it's a viable project proposal for grant opportunities. During the course of the review, there could be circumstances of adding and deleting projects. The process is envisioned to reduce the timeline and enable more complex project proposals to move forward quicker.

Mr. Kleim reminded everyone that more conceptual projects need to be added. Next steps include entering conceptual projects. For those projects that are at the idea stage and may involve a private landowner, the project can be entered but protected from public view. Ms. Napier suggested discussing how the process works when that type of project is presented to see how it can be represented in the HWS.

Mr. Kleim said by June, the multi-level hierarchy will be established on the HWS as well as a booklet for users. Mr. Amrine suggested entering some data and having the subcommittee review the input before the June meeting.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

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