

**CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP
HABITAT WORK GROUP
Lewis County Conservation District Office
1554 Bishop Road
Chehalis, WA
June 10, 2011
9:30 AM**

Draft Meeting Summary

PRESENT:

Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County	Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Bob Amrine, Lewis County Conservation District	Chris Conklin, Quinault Indian Nation
Janel Spaulding, CBP/Grays Harbor College	Mike Kuttle Jr., Thurston Conservation District
Chanele Holbrook-Shaw, Citizen, Thurston County	Janet Strong, Chehalis River Basin Land Trust
Bob Thomas, US Army Corps of Engineers	Debbie Holden, Creative Community Solutions
John Kleim, Creative Community Solutions	Rod Lakey, Lewis County Public Works
Miles Batchelder, Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership	

Welcome & Introductions

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

Lee Napier reviewed the agenda.

Discussion Regarding Upcoming Project Review on July 8

Project Sponsors – Final Input on Project Proposals

Ms. Napier advised that two sets of comments were forwarded to project sponsors. One is a summary of comments shared during the May 13 meeting and the other is comments from the review panel. The review panel created a template of three levels of review. Sponsors should focus on the first several pages. As the project moves forward, more information will be provided. As the packet is prepared for the SRFB review team, the information will be forwarded to others.

Janet Strong announced that after careful thought, the Chehalis River Council has agreed to delay the Elliot Slough wetland acquisition proposal for a year partially to address comments by the review teams. Ms. Napier noted the Habitat Work Schedule (HWS) will retain the project. Ms. Strong asked about the status of project data within PRISM. Ms. Napier advised the data remains and can be accessed for next year's funding round. A new project number is assigned and the information is transferred from the existing file.

Mr. Conklin asked if there is any intent to seek a match from the Quinault Indian Nation. Ms. Strong advised that it's a conversation to continue pursuing with the tribe. Mr. Conklin recommended continuing contacts with the tribe to maintain momentum for project funding next year.

Janel Spaulding referred to the McDonald Creek project. She reviewed the review panel's comments and is working to ensure documents within PRISM are updated as well as submitting the barrier evaluation form that was recommended by the review panel. She is using Mason Conservation District's barrier ranking. She questioned whether she should use Lewis County Conservation District's information.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

June 10, 2011

Page 2 of 11

Discussion followed on the uncertainty of whether the site was surveyed by the Lewis County Conservation District or Mason Conservation District. Mr. Conklin advised that Gavin Glore forwarded some information on McDonald Creek. Bob Amrine pointed out that it's possible through an equation to determine how many miles of stream is opened which is then compared to where it fits within the ranking. Ms. Spaulding said she has information identified on McDonald Creek by Mr. Glore that includes the score, rank, and the percentile. Ms. Napier referred to Lonnie Crumley's application and explained how he addressed the same issue. The objective is explaining how the project ranks and fits within the strategy.

Ms. Napier referred to a large map of management units overlaid with Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 barriers. The source is from the Mason Conservation District barrier assessment. Mr. Conklin asked whether RMAP data are also available. The map is a snapshot of the barrier assessments. Mr. Conklin commented that there are other data from RMAP on the work that is underway for fish passage. It appears that many RMAPs will be completed by 2016. Ms. Napier said she was able to obtain the spreadsheet data and can sort by management unit and ranking of projects. However, the dataset is not tied to a stream name, which would have been helpful to identify the location of barriers.

Chanele Holbrook-Shaw arrived.

Mr. Amrine suggested it might be helpful to involve the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). Before retiring, Roger attended many of the HWG meetings and since then his replacement hasn't attended many HWG meetings. Many of the culverts on private forest land are not included in any of the surveys. Mr. Conklin noted that some are included, which is why all the information was forwarded to Mr. Glore on Olympic and RMAPs to add within the layer. It would be helpful visually if all those barriers could be displayed. During the strategy discussion there were conversations about other work that had been done to document barrier locations. It may be worthwhile to consider how many projects have been completed upstream of the barriers to help increase its ranking. Data are there, but not consolidated in any one source. RMAP data are tied to watershed numbers. DNR is also scheduled to release RMAP information online.

Lucas Creek 4.3 Barrier Design-Permitting, Lucas Creek 4.2 Barrier Design-Permitting, and Frase Creek Barrier Design-Permitting were submitted by Lewis County Public Works. Rod Lakey explained that Craig Swanson took another position and the information for the field visit was not conveyed. The county intends to apply for design only for the Lucas Creek and Frase Creek projects. He asked several questions of the committee. He asked about the reasonable cost for A&E for a culvert replacement project.

Mr. Amrine replied that the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) allows up to 30% for A&E. Mr. Lakey said that comments received about the project indicate A&E is too high. He asked about the committee's definition of "too high." Ms. Napier said it may have related to the committee believing that both projects together could represent a cost savings. Mr. Conklin said the committee had commented that since the projects are side-by-side there should be shared costs in A&E. Mr. Lakey asked whether his assumption that the projects are beyond the feasibility stage could be indicative that the project is for 30% design for the project submission. There is a sketch of the design and a 10-year old preliminary design.

Mr. Amrine commented that the HWG has never received an application for a design only project.

Mr. Lakey said there were several questions by the review teams and most of the questions are straightforward in terms of supplying answers. However, the comment that the general costs are too high

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

June 10, 2011

Page 3 of 11

is difficult to address. There is a difference in roads versus culverts on forest service roads or when pavement repair and guardrails are involved. Generally, there is more cost for public roads. All of the roads are dead-end roads and it would be difficult to close them because of emergency response to homes as well as access to homes. Although not impossible, it would be difficult to house property owners during the construction period. Additionally, there is also the possibility of an emergency occurring to the structure. Ms. Napier said the comments were generated because other projects include the closure of roads during the construction. She suggested providing an explanation to address the question. Other projects on dead-end roads include a detour either adjacent to or at another public route. Mr. Conklin asked about the possibility of using a temporary single lane bridge to enable construction work on the culvert. Mr. Lakey said during the design those issues will be addressed in terms of the type of culvert and how to stage access to the construction site.

Mr. Lakey asked whether there is something specific the review panel is considering in terms of A&E being too high. Ms. Napier said the review was from 2010 and comments are based on the team's experience with similar projects. She said she's unable to account for a difference in this project versus other similar projects. She asked whether the county is providing an administrative match. Mr. Lakey replied that the county is providing a 20% match for engineering. Ms. Napier added that the project was reviewed last year for A&E of the construction project rather than the design project. The design project wasn't considered this year because no one was available to present the project proposal. The comments are based on a construction project submitted last year. Mr. Lakey said engineering costs are typically 20% of the construction costs. He clarified that his questions pertain to last year's comments by the review team.

Ms. Napier reviewed a comment from the review panel on the Lucas Creek 4.3 barrier project from July 27, 2010 stating, "The A&E costs are high for this project since this is not a complex road crossing and culvert design. At this site visit, it was mentioned some of the survey, drafting, and design work has been done. This work would lower the A&E costs. In addition, Lucas Creek 4.2 project is nearby so there should be a cost savings for mobilization, construction, inspection, and design given the proximity of these two projects. The costs for permits are high for a project of this scale and there should be some cost savings given the proximity of Lucas Creek 4.2."

Ms. Napier said the project is eligible for funding for 30% or final design through the SRFB. Mr. Conklin said several factors to consider are the appropriate size and length for strength simulation and gradient as well as the amount of upstream habitat receiving benefit.

Mr. Amrine suggested contacting RCO to address some questions on design. Mr. Lakey said he would like feedback on whether the application should be for 30% or final design. Mr. Conklin asked about the difference between 30% and 90%. Mr. Amrine said 30% design is similar to a permit application and provides a cost estimate sufficient to submit for a permit. Mr. Conklin commented that many times, similar projects have encountered problems because the proposal did not include any site visit with an area habitat biologist from the permitting agency or associated tribe. If that's included in 30% that might be beneficial, such as him visiting the site and agreeing on the size and then documenting that information.

Miles Batchelder commented that having been involved in and observing the process for several years, there are some questions about the value of SRFB dollars for these types of projects where there is a minimal amount of habitat upstream as well as the high expense of the project. A proposal that includes 30% design is likely adequate because 90% may result in a great design but may encounter the same type

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

June 10, 2011

Page 4 of 11

of questions from the team. Going to 90% design might not be warranted. It may entail completing 30% design and convincing everyone that for this amount of money, it's a good project.

Mr. Amrine agreed with the comments because extra money is not spent on something that might not receive funding. Mr. Batchelder commented that the project is competing against many other valuable projects.

Mr. Amrine said that generally, a 30% design is sufficient for NOAA funding grants or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Mr. Batchelder said he's viewed a number of design-only projects over the last several years. They have generally proceeded to 90% design. Mr. Conklin added that a site visit will not incur any cost to ensure the project is sited appropriately.

Mr. Batchelder said it appears there is stronger support for the Frase Creek project and it might be beneficial to consider a 90% design for that project.

Mr. Lakey said he is sensing from the committee that the Lucas Creek projects are both beyond the feasibility stage. Members agreed with the assessment.

Ms. Napier reviewed comments for the Frase Creek project, which are similar. There is also a request for information on how the project ranks. It's important to emphasize within the application why the county is selecting those three projects to submit over other projects in Lewis County. Mr. Lakey commented that the sponsor is Lewis County Public Works, which is bound by its specific boarders. Ms. Napier advised that there are higher ranking barrier projects located in Lewis County's jurisdiction that rank higher. It's important to explain why in the application. Mr. Amrine shared that Craig Swanson had indicated the Lucas Creek projects were the last two barrier projects within that basin to complete. Ms. Napier referred to another comment on the LWD budget, which appeared to be too high. Another comment from 2007 pertained to a project realignment to reduce the cost of the project and the reviewer asked for an explanation as to why a different alignment wasn't recommended.

Ms. Napier reminded project sponsors that the deadline for final project submittal in PRISM is on June 24. Hard copies of the application packet are also forwarded to her so she can distribute the application to the review team. The review team meets on July 8 to review projects and develop a ranking.

Mr. Amrine provided an update on the Bunker Creek project. The district's engineer recently resigned who was assisting in survey. Another engineer has agreed to look at the site. The district is encountering some problems this year and may wait for another year to submit.

Mr. Conklin asked whether any chum are located in Bunker Creek. Mr. Amrine said people have indicated chum are present in the stream. He has never seen any chum in the stream. Chum are sensitive to sediment and the stream is sediment heavy so it's likely there are no chum.

Ms. Napier reported she was contacted by Noel Ferguson who indicated the company may withdraw the Coffee Creek feasibility study from consideration during this funding round. Additionally, Jamie Glasgow asked whether there are any additional comments on the water typing assessment. Prior comments included a request to explain the funding strategy for the program, whether the most important places to restore are included in the water type assessment, and how can the information collected through the assessment be used to identify future projects. Additionally, the SRFB review team flagged the Grays Harbor Juvenile Fish Assessment. Normally, she wouldn't be concerned, as the project has been previously flagged. All flagged projects receive a full panel discussion that is scheduled on July 6, two

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

June 10, 2011

Page 5 of 11

days before the HWG ranks its projects, which may create a problem. Kat Moore is aware of the potential conflict.

Ms. Strong asked about the process for sharing review team comments. Ms. Napier advised that she forwards comments that are collected from the HWG review team, which may include some of the comments from the SRFB review team members. A second set of comments is forwarded from the SRFB review team. Pertaining to the fish assessment project, the project will receive another set of comments from the full SRFB review team. The SRFB review panel obtains information by listening to others during the site visits as well as information contained in PRISM. The SRFB review team also considers input from other technical peers.

Discussion followed on Mr. Glasgow's Beaver Creek project. The HWG provided direction on the selection of the site. Mr. Conklin commented that Wild Fish Conservancy is undergoing some serious critique by some of the tribes. It's important that the work that is funded is transposed correctly onto DNR's watertype layer that is used by all jurisdictions for critical areas regulations. Wild Conservancy has been working in South Puget Sound and there have been some questions and concerns as to how that work was delivered to DNR and entered. DNR is currently 90 days out from transposing updated information on the layers. DNR has also lost data and there is some doubt in expending the funds on those efforts if the deliverable is not updating the DNR layer. It's important for Wild Fish Conservancy to work closely with DNR because of the process and potential of mistakes to occur.

Ms. Napier suggested that Mr. Glasgow should work with DNR to receive some commitment from DNR to ensure the data is updated. Mr. Conklin said it's important the data are received and entered accurately. It's important to ensure the information is transposed correctly and timely. DNR is charged with watertyping and has limited resources to keep up with records statewide. Data from a forest practice application has timelines. He explained the layers and how the information is typed. Ms. Napier asked about the source other than the Wild Fish Conservancy that is generating credible data and stream modifications. Mr. Conklin said all modifications are peer reviewed by the tribes and local area habitat biologists. Currently, there is no WAC requiring any changes. An area under a Forest Practices Application can be visited and ground-truthed to verify the presence of fish. If fish are found, there is nothing in state law requiring a change in the layer. DNR only updates the layer through the submittal of a separate watertype modification form, which is what Wild Fish Conservancy is submitting. Watertyping is a huge issue and drives many decisions.

Update on Habitat Work Schedule

John Kleim presented a draft document on expanding the HWS to include conceptual projects. The subcommittee is recommending a process for moving forward on working on conceptual projects. Conceptual projects can range from a broad idea to a detailed project that may lack a sponsor, funding, or needs additional information. It may not entail a proposed project, such as projects recommended in the current funding round for SRFB funds or an active project that is funded and is underway.

Debbie Holden reported the subcommittee met several times. The subcommittee agreed it's important to have a hierarchy of projects to easily locate projects within the subbasins. The hierarchy is a geographic subbasin management of 13 subbasins within the Chehalis basin. Outreach was pursued to all HWG committee members on individuals who should be contacted for possible listing of projects. Everyone on the list was contacted by an email and asked for a project submission for the conceptual list. To date, 13 to 16 projects have been submitted.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

June 10, 2011

Page 6 of 11

Mr. Kleim shared that he was disappointed in the response and acknowledged it may take time for the system to become better utilized. He expected up to 60 projects. However, it was difficult to convince people to add projects to the list. Over time, the list should increase.

Ms. Strong asked whether her suggestion for reconnecting oxbow channels along the Chehalis River was included. Ms. Holden advised that the information was not formally submitted. Mr. Conklin said Bob Burkle mentioned during the same meeting the possibility of including many of the Corps projects. Mr. Kleim advised that the Corps did not provide permission to enter the projects. Mr. Conklin suggested it should be possible to include the oxbows without the Corps' permission.

Ms. Holden provided a live online demonstration of the HWS.

Ms. Napier said the Department of Fish and Wildlife initiated the HWS as a tool for the Lead Entities. Legislation requires a HWS for tracking projects completed and projects to be completed. With 26 lead entities, there were 26 different methods and no consistent accountability.

Mr. Conklin asked whether the top 100 culverts were included on the list. Mr. Kleim explained that within the hierarchy, the culverts are listed as fish passage. The intent is to take each culvert and include them within the hierarchy. The difficulty is the lack of specific names of streams and coordinates. However, with additional work, there should be a way to list each culvert individually within the hierarchy.

Bob Thomas offered to follow up on the listing of the Corps projects.

Ms. Holden reviewed current conceptual projects that have been submitted:

- Chehalis Basin-wide education outreach efforts
- Black River Conservation Initiative – Water Rights
- Chehalis Mainstream Shoreline Restoration
- China Creek Headwater Retention
- China Creek Interpretive Park
- Dunnagan Creek Fish Passage at Gate Road
- Eaton Creek Fish Passage Barrier Correction
- Fin the Fiberglass Fish
- Fish Passage List of 100 culverts
- Frase Creek Barrier Removal
- Johns River Estuary Restoration
- Land acquisitions
- Lucas Creek Barrier Removal Project Mayor Kmet 4.2
- McDonald Creek Restoration Project
- Sampson Wetland Enhancement Project Phase 1
- Wildcat Creek Drainage

The subcommittee initially selected four conceptual projects to mentor towards proposed status:

- McDonald Creek, sponsored by Jarred and the Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force – consists of a phased project with first phase submitted for SRFB funding. Mr. Conklin asked about the second phase of the project. Mr. Kleim said the intent of the mentoring process is to provide

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

June 10, 2011

Page 7 of 11

assistance for positioning the project to receive funding from the SRFB. In the case of the McDonald project, the subcommittee could meet with Jarred to help improve it and prepare the project for submittal in the next funding round.

- FIN the Fiberglass Fish, sponsored by the City of Centralia – current funds raised to date include \$13,000 of the \$20,000 needed.
- Johns River Estuary Restoration, sponsored by WDFW
- Chehalis Mainstem Shoreline Restoration with the suggestion that county conservation districts be contacted to see if they would be interested in forming an alliance as sponsors.

Mr. Kleim provided additional clarification on the subcommittee's mentoring and guidance process in response to questions from Mr. Conklin. The subcommittee plans to meet from September to February to provide project sponsors with assistance. The subcommittee views the process as a resource and not as a gatekeeper in terms of ranking conceptual projects. The subcommittee will begin the process with field visits to project sites.

Mr. Conklin shared that the intent of the process appears worthwhile but acting as a devil's advocate, his concern is for those citizens involved in the HWG they may feel that their project may not be advanced because the group has decided to focus on other projects. Ms. Holden said the intent of the conceptual list is to list all potential SRFB projects. The objective is replacing the annual call for projects for the funding round. Ms. Napier commented on how helpful it would be to the process to know about large project several years in advance so that the Lead Entity could begin planning on when to seek funding to avoid projects competing against one another. The projects will still go before the HWG technical review team and are subject to site visits.

Discussion ensued on the objective of the process. Mr. Kleim added that the process is evolving and will likely change to better meet HWG needs. Members of the subcommittee volunteered to serve because of the limited time on the monthly meeting agenda. Mr. Conklin said he would like to become a member of the subcommittee or have the HWG entirely involved. Ms. Napier said she prefers involvement by the HWG but doesn't believe it's realistic because of limited time.

Mr. Amrine asked about future access to enter conceptual projects in the HWS. Ms. Napier said that question hasn't been addressed because there hasn't been that much interest up to this point. A staff member at Wild Fish Conservancy has access to enter updates to the organization's projects. Mr. Kleim said it's necessary to complete training on the HWS. Ms. Holden has completed the training but he hasn't had the opportunity.

Ms. Holden displayed the Lead Entity webpage that includes a HWS link. Mr. Kleim commented on the amount of information available within the Lead Entity website. Ms. Holden encouraged members to visit the link and become familiar with the content.

Chanele Holbrook-Shaw referred to those projects that may involve a landowner who may need to be convinced that a project is warranted and that if those types of projects require several years, it is likely the landowners will no longer want to participant. She asked if it's possible to expedite those types of projects. Mr. Kleim responded that putting it on the conceptual project list may not mean it's a good SRFB project but it may be a good project for other funding programs. As long as it's included on the list the project receives exposure and encouragement by others to pursue other funding mechanisms. It's a way of receiving the assistance of many instead of dealing with it independently.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

June 10, 2011

Page 8 of 11

Discussion followed on whether there is timing associated for a call for projects on the conceptual list. Mr. Kleim said he foresees the process as projects entered as they are identified rather than at specific times of entry. Mr. Batchelder said some individuals and groups resist three-year lists in other WRIs in the Coast Region because if the project is not listed, it's not considered. Ms. Napier pointed out that the WRIs have good projects on three-year lists and can afford that process. Mr. Batchelder suggested the practice may be shutting the door on good projects that may not be identified in advance. Ms. Napier said her goal is shutting the door on people who don't plan appropriately for their projects. Mr. Kleim added that it's unlikely any project proposal would be submitted a week before the SRFB application is due. Mr. Batchelder offered the example of a flood event that occurred over the winter that created some situation that is now a good project and wasn't on the list because it didn't exist prior to the flood event. The question is whether that project would be accepted by the Lead Entity as a viable application for SRFB funding without having been previously identified. Mr. Kleim said there has been no discussion that a project must be on the conceptual list for any period of time. Project sponsors can add projects to the list at any time.

Mr. Thomas commented that he's been somewhat distracted with many flooding incidents occurring in eastern Washington, Montana, and Idaho. As he's listened to the conversation and other than for the dynamics of the group and business rules, projects need a proponent, a willing landowner, and funding. There are two Corps projects where there may be some coordination opportunities that include the levee project and the Chehalis Basin General Investigation Study. Currently, there are some funds available through the end of the fiscal year. The Corps is struggling with landowners who will allow access to verify wetland impacts. There should be a process to talk to landowners about the proposed mitigation opportunities available. Since February, the Corps has received permission from one private landowner to look at potential wetland impacts on their property. Some assistance would be helpful as funding is only available until October 1. He asked for assistance in approaching landowners to gain permission for access.

Mr. Kleim suggested placing a general description of the projects on the conceptual list as it may interest other members in the area because it involves similar stakeholder interests. Ms. Holbrook-Shaw asked whether the Corps can accept general information that can be provided by a member. Mr. Thomas said it depends on the information and some information requires verification by the Corps. The Corps is looking for some introduction to property owners. Mr. Conklin asked about a defined area of focus. Mr. Thomas said it involves the mitigation sites. Mr. Amrine commented that relationships with landowners vary dramatically. Much of it pertains to the perception from the landowner and if the effort is helping them. Some landowners won't allow him any access to property. Lewis County is somewhat different from other areas. Sometimes it's a matter of time and generational perceptions.

Mr. Thomas welcomed any suggestions and indicated he will be in Idaho next week. Mr. Amrine suggested providing a list of landowners to review to begin making contacts.

Mr. Amrine pointed out that some of the management units have missing information and may have been missed in the initial review of the strategy. For example, some barrier culverts are not listed as a concern. He cited the south fork of the Boistfort management unit as an example.

Mr. Kleim distributed information pertaining to the issue of not all tributaries listed on the strategy. Mr. Kleim said the issue was addressed at the request of Lonnie Crumley in 2009 pertaining to Davis Creek and Preachers Slough. With more projects focusing on tributaries, the strategy is not addressing those creeks and the issue is how to address those projects in relationship to the strategy. One solution is a stop-gap measure until major revisions could be completed to the strategy. Earlier work included

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

June 10, 2011

Page 9 of 11

developing some guidelines for barrier projects and working with invasive species. One issue that was also identified and discussed but not addressed was guidelines for small tributaries. He asked members to consider the draft he developed on how to develop guidelines to address those tributaries that could result in a good project but is not mentioned in the strategy.

Members discussed future meeting agendas, expanding meeting time, or possibly referring the matter to the subcommittee for additional review. Mr. Kleim suggested the committee could refine the draft during a two-hour meeting.

Mr. Amrine questioned the first guideline stating, "The project improves habitat used by a priority stock." Originally, the only priority stock listed in the Salmonid Stock Inventory (SaSI) was steelhead in the Skookumchuck. Mr. Kleim said that new information in the regional plan could be used. Ms. Napier questioned Mr. Crumley's previous question pertaining to priority species versus priority stock and his source of reference for priority species. Members agreed that priority species is different from priority stock. Mr. Conklin said stock is specific while species is general. He suggested replacing priority stock with salmon or anadromous fish. Mr. Batchelder referred to the SRFB's fit to strategy, which pertains to the project sponsor considering where the work needs to be done to benefit the stocks that need it the most. A guideline that indicates it benefits salmon, as a top priority is too vague. Priority stocks are identified as depressed under SaSI. Mr. Kleim said the guideline is not exclusive and is only one factor out of many that are considered.

Several members commented on the lack of documentation and/or recognition pertaining to depressed species in some systems, such as the lack of chum in some creeks.

Mr. Kleim offered that each year, the committee might consider prioritizing things within the strategy and focusing one year on a section that speaks to stock status. Each year, the strategy needs to be updated and improved. Ms. Napier said the last minor update was in 2010 with the next update scheduled this year. The last major update was in 2007.

Mr. Conklin suggested that by using SaSI, ESA, stocks, or species it appears that those sideboards may not be accurate to use. Ms. Napier pointed to the example of Mr. Crumley's project and his project justification that chum populations historically existed and that the project would benefit that population. The HWG considered that information as credible. Even though a project is not listed on the conceptual project list, the sponsor may have the knowledge. It's important to maintain a guideline to discourage people who can't make that argument. Projects with good stories will secure funding.

Mr. Kleim said the guidelines are from the list of limiting factors. Mr. Amrine commented that the guidelines do not appear to address protection. It was noted that acquisitions can entail protection.

Discussion followed on changes to the guidelines. Suggested changes included:

1. The project protects key properties of riparian habitat used by salmonids.
6. The project addresses improving existing instream channel complexity beneficial to a priority stock.

Mr. Kleim reported he will make changes to the guidelines and forward to Ms. Napier for distribution to the HWG.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

June 10, 2011

Page 10 of 11

Proposed Regional Funding Allocation

Ms. Napier referred to materials previously forwarded with the meeting agenda email on a tentative sub-allocation agreement by the WCSSP Board. No feedback was received from HWG members. She asked for feedback from members to share with the WCSSP Board. The WCSSP Board is considering weighting and the criteria are included in the material. Mr. Batchelder referred to Table 2 and indicated the Board of Directors made some changes in May. The Board added ESA listed stocks and included a proposed weighting.

Mr. Conklin said speaking for the technical committee; the intent was not to weight the criteria. Mr. Batchelder said the Board is recommending that habitat metrics for freshwater and estuarine are weighted at 25%, the diversity list weighted at 45%, and ESA listed stocks at 5%. ESA listed stocks for WRIA 20 include bull trout and Lake Ozette sockeye and WRIAs 21, 22 & 23, bull trout is listed. The listing of ESA listed stocks is essentially a policy decision because funding is from the Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund, which according to many is directed to listed fish, even though it might not be the case. It's important to consider listed fish in how monies are applied.

Mr. Batchelder reported another provision the Board added is an even split of the first million dollars with each WRIA receiving a base of \$200,000 with the remaining funds of \$620,000 split based on the weighted formula, which would equate to \$614,000 for the Chehalis basin.

Ms. Napier asked for any feedback or concerns on the proposal.

Members commented on the good working relationship between the lead entities within the Coast Region.

Ms. Spaulding asked how previous funding was allocated within the Coast Region. Ms. Napier advised that a similar process of a weighted formula was used previously.

Mr. Conklin said the intent of the formula was using equal metrics between the WRIAs of fish and habitat. A major change from previous processes was a better representation of the area rather than by stream miles. A width factor was also included to increase accuracy.

Mr. Amrine asked whether the technical committee continues to meet. Mr. Batchelder affirmed the technical committee is active and meets in Montesano. The lead entity appoints a representative to the committee. Mr. Amrine expressed interest in participating on the committee.

Members discussed the revised 2011 SRFB sub allocation totals.

Mr. Amrine acknowledged the importance of ESA listed species but prefers not expending funds on ESA if it is not improving a specific species. Mr. Conklin said the technical committee discussed the same issue and it's why it wasn't included in the recommendation to the Board. The Board elected to include it within the formula as a policy decision.

Mr. Amrine commented on the Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation Salzer Creek Subbasin Restoration project and how the tribe is determining how the project will benefit some species.

WCSSP Coast Regional Plan

Ms. Napier reported the plan has been released for review. However, timing is problematic for the HWG. Mr. Batchelder offered to provide accessibility of the plan to members through email. Ms. Napier said she will forward the email. Mr. Batchelder said the goal for completion of the internal review is

Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

June 10, 2011

Page 11 of 11

August/September for public review in October/November. Ms. Napier advised that the review is internal by the Lead Entity and likely would be outside the normal HWG meeting. She asked members to send her any comments on the plan. She will also forward deadline dates.

Next Meeting Agenda

Ms. Napier reviewed the July agenda:

- Review Team review of SRFB projects

Ms. Napier advised that for various reasons, several of the citizen review team members canceled and did not participate in the field site visits. She extended an invitation to them to attend the July review meeting.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Prepared by Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary/President
Puget Sound Meeting Services, psmsoly@earthlink.net