

**CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP  
HABITAT WORK GROUP  
Lewis County Conservation District Office  
1554 Bishop Road  
Chehalis, WA  
March 11, 2011  
9:30 AM**

**Draft Meeting Summary**

**PRESENT:**

Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County  
Bob Burkle, WA Department of Fish Wildlife (WDFW)  
Miranda Plumb, US Fish & Wildlife Service

Bob Amrine, Lewis County Conservation District  
Chanele Holbrook-Shaw, Citizen, Thurston County  
Craig Swanson, Lewis County  
Janel Spaulding, CBP/Grays Harbor College  
Mark Swartout, Thurston County  
Bob Thomas, US Army Corps of Engineers  
John Kleim, Creative Community Solutions  
Lonnie Crumley, StreamWorks Consulting  
Nelson Majano, The Evergreen State College

Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services  
Chris Conklin, Quinault Indian Nation  
Bruce Treichler, Northwest Steelhead & Salmon  
Conservation Society  
Don Loft, The Evergreen State College  
Jamie Glasgow, Wild Fish Conservancy  
Janet Strong, Chehalis River Basin Land Trust  
Kathryn Moore, RCO  
Mike Kuttle Jr., Thurston Conservation District  
Debbie Holden, Creative Community Solutions  
Bertie Davenport, Department of Natural Resources  
(DNR)

**Welcome & Introductions**

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

Members discussed a future meeting location because of a potential meeting time conflict. Craig Swanson and Janel Spaulding offered to check on other locations. Bertie Davenport offered a meeting room at her work location.

**Update and Discussion related to the 2011 SRFB Grant Cycle**

Ms. Napier reminded project sponsors early applications are due in PRISM by April 1. She encouraged members to sign up for access to PRISM. This year will likely be the last year for soliciting projects as the intent is moving forward on conceptual projects and using the Habitat Work Schedule to help organize the SRFB grant cycle.

Manual 18 has been released and the electronic link has been forwarded to the mailing list. Confirmed review team members at this time include Mark Swartout, Bruce Treichler, Bob Burkle, Chris Conklin, Miranda Plumb, Julie Balmelli-Powe, Chris Stearns, Bonnie Canaday has volunteered to be an alternate, Terry Harris or Patrick Wiltzius will represent the City of Chehalis, Mike Kuttel, Rob Schanz, and Tom Gow. A request has been submitted for the SRFB review panel for Michele Cramer. Kat Moore said that during a staff meeting on SRFB review panels, there was a question about having sufficient funds for the review team. It appears the dates will work for Ms. Cramer as well as for her. Ms. Napier reported she has not asked Mr. Schanz to serve and will follow up with him about participating on the review team.

Ms. Napier reviewed vehicle arrangements. Miranda Plumb volunteered a vehicle for the field trips.

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary**

**March 11, 2011**

**Page 2 of 10**

Don Loft reported his group is securing its 501(c) 3 status. The group is proposing a feasibility study for Coffee Creek. He asked about receiving funds for the project upfront instead of receiving reimbursement at the conclusion of the project. Ms. Moore said the SRFB process is a reimbursement-based grant. There are advance possibilities but with stipulations, such as the category of the organization. The organization is required to expend its advance within 30 day and reconcile the advance within 30 days. The rules are strict for advances. If the rules are not followed there are some severe consequences.

Mr. Loft said much of the work includes field surveys and technicians for GIS and auto-cad drafting. Mr. Moore outlined eligible expenses for an advance. She recommended reviewing Manual 18 and other manuals governing reimbursement. Ms. Napier referred to Manual 7 and Manual 8, which covers reimbursement. All the manuals are available online. Ms. Moore admitted that it's difficult as she previously was a project sponsor with Capitol Land Trust and understands the challenges. However, advances are the exception. Ms. Moore said for younger organizations, submittal of invoices, timesheets, volunteer logs, and mileage logs, etc. will be required.

Ms. Moore noted that there are new checklists in Manual 18 that outline what RCO needs in terms of documentation after the end of the grant. There are checklists for each different project type. For project sponsors considering acquisitions, a new acquisition manual includes new policies on acquisitions (Manual 3).

Ms. Strong said she represents a small non-profit organization that is pursuing an acquisition. The organization is working with Cascade Land Conservancy and has a number assigned in PRISM. However, this is the first project the organization has pursued independently. She asked about the possibility of receiving funds for the acquisition because of the high cost. Ms. Moore said the RCO can arrange for escrow deposits to a title company of the grant share. The process is complicated as well and requires a certain amount of paperwork.

Mr. Amrine reported on a PL-566 (Small Watershed Program) process with National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) involving a watershed management scoping process that was recently initiated. The project entails identifying a central location and collecting all data ever publicized on the Chehalis basin. He recently met with the Timberland Regional Library director who has agreed to spearhead the effort. The library director is asking all agencies and organizations to submit documents of studies every completed on the Chehalis basin. The documents will be scanned, cataloged, and stored electronically.

Ms. Napier reported the Salmon Conference sponsored by RCO is focused on building better projects and will be held April 26-27 at the Great Wolf Lodge in Grand Mound. Several members expressed interest in attending. The cost of the conference is \$90. Ms. Napier offered to sponsor the cost of the conference for project sponsors. Bertie Davenport and Lonnie Crumley are presenters. Ms. Moore reported the first day of the conference is on SRFB projects and includes lessons learned from previously funded projects for five different tracks. Ms. Napier said the tracks include floodplain connection, restoration, acquisitions, small dam and fish passage, riparian restoration, and recent fish utilization studies on salmon habitat and travel. Ms. Moore said the second day includes sessions of different topic areas.

Mr. Treichler asked about reduced registration fees for smaller non-profits. Ms. Napier offered to pay for his registration. Ms. Moore said each Lead Entity's funding cap is \$500 for registration fees.

**Update, Review and Discuss Grays Harbor Juvenile Fish Usage Project**

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary**

**March 11, 2011**

**Page 3 of 10**

Jamie Glasgow asked for feedback on the study design for the Grays Harbor Juvenile Fish Use Assessment. The study design was also submitted to the SRFB technical panel. The panel provided feedback and approved moving forward with the study design as presented. Sampling is scheduled to begin next week. The committee will have ongoing opportunities to ask questions and offer feedback. The pilot study will develop and refine the study design to begin answering fundamental questions about fish use and fish habitat preferences in Grays Harbor. Feedback from the SRFB included suggestions on additional sources of juvenile fish use data in addition to the references provided as well as encouragement to treat this element as the first of a multi-phased study. The overall objective is identifying and prioritizing habitat restoration projects in Grays Harbor estuary. The SRFB wanted to ensure there is no expectation projects might be identified with only one year of sampling.

Chris Conklin asked whether any sample locations were changed after the literature search. Mr. Glasgow said no sites were proposed until after the review of information, which drove the selection of regions to sample as well as locations within the regions. The objective is stratifying and sampling the estuary based on eco-region habitat types, which entailed a desktop exercise. As sampling occurs, sampling sites may change dependent upon what's encountered. He invited members to visit and observe the sampling.

Ms. Spaulding asked whether many volunteers offered to help. Mr. Glasgow said several qualified individuals volunteered.

Ms. Davenport asked about the possibility of sampling other sites that haven't been identified. Ms. Glasgow acknowledged it might be possible when shifts occur to the original plan. He offered to have Micah Wait, the project manager, contact her.

Mark Swartout referred to the sampling permits and the listing of bull trout. He asked about the listing of green sturgeon. Ms. Davenport said the listing of green sturgeon is under the oversight of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). Mr. Burkle commented that eulachon is the more likely one to be concerned about. Green Sturgeon will be big and in deep water. Juvenile sturgeon use is completely unknown in this area as they spawn in the Sacramento River. Ms. Glasgow acknowledged that in the process of reviewing the project with NOAA, it likely was addressed.

Ms. Plumb commented that the goal of the project is selecting and prioritizing future habitat restoration projects. Sampling will likely include coded wire tagged (CWT) hatchery fish. She asked if every basin has hatchery fish CWTs and whether that might bias the study. There may not be clear examples of fish from every basin. Mr. Glasgow acknowledged that it wouldn't be representative of wild fish. He offered to follow up on the question with Mr. Wait.

Mr. Burkle said it's likely CWT fish may be encountered outside the basin. Mr. Conklin said that issue was addressed when members questioned whether to look at origin. The intent is to look at a species composition presence and absence and not where they are coming from. Mr. Swartout suggested it might be important for future projects to know where the fish are coming from. Mr. Conklin said it may be possible to develop in future sampling efforts, but not necessarily this sampling because of the difficulty in identifying the origin of the fish. Overall, it likely wouldn't drive restoration projects.

Mr. Burkle commented that it's an interesting question. A large number of tagged juveniles are released from the Humptulips and Bingham Hatcheries. A good question is determining if there is differences in the way those fish distribute themselves throughout the estuary. No one has really looked at that question. Additionally, there are numbers of wild fish from the upper Chehalis that have been tagged but not clipped that will likely be in the estuary.

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary**

**March 11, 2011**

**Page 4 of 10**

Mr. Amrine said the district has several RSIs (Riffle Stability Index) in the area. He asked if it's possible to catch tagged fish from those areas. Mr. Burkle said those fish are not tagged. If they are hatchery fish they should be fin clipped. The only way to determine tagged fish is by using the standard wading technique to detect tags.

Mr. Glasgow said the crews will wade all fish during the sampling. After this year, more information will be known about origin. Lonnie Crumley suggested contacting hatcheries because many unmarked fish come in tagged. Mr. Burkle said it's because of the double-blind process where fish are code wire tagged but not clipped. Theoretically, they are released to provide information on the differential on mortality rates between marked and unmarked tagged fish.

Mr. Swartout asked whether the results of the study resulting in specific hypothesis will be carried forward in future studies. Mr. Glasgow that intent apparently wasn't clear in the study design according to the technical review panel. Not all hypotheses will be addressed with the first year's worth of data. The first year of data will drive subsequent efforts. Mr. Swartout asked if sampling includes determining regional use by fish from other areas of the coast. Mr. Glasgow agreed it could be added as a specific hypothesis.

Mr. Swartout asked whether funding is sufficient to retain samples of fish tissue for DNA analysis to determine origin at sometime in the future. Ms. Plumb commented that she reviewed that question with Mr. Wait and Mr. Glasgow. The issue is not knowing the baseline from the subbasin. Mr. Swartout said it would be the next level of testing. Ms. Plumb suggested it's necessary to establish a baseline first by sampling the subbasin. A baseline from the headwaters as well as the estuary is needed. Mr. Glasgow said it may be an element proposed through the US Fish and Wildlife Service grant program. Mr. Swartout offered that it might be possible to obtain tissue samples for future analysis. Ms. Plumb explained the complexities involved in obtaining tissue samples and that there may not be sufficient funds and time included in the study. Mr. Glasgow said Wild Conservancy has been involved in similar studies in different locations. In most projects, fin clips are collected on a subsample of select species. In this phase, the proposal doesn't include capturing fins. However, he offered to discuss the option with the project manager.

### **Habitat Work Schedule Conceptual Project Drive**

Mr. Kleim provided an update the work to date of the subcommittee to help develop a process for developing conceptual projects. Committee members include Mr. Amrine, Ms. Plumb, and Mr. Burkle. He asked for feedback to continue refining the process for conceptual projects.

Mr. Kleim described conceptual projects as ranging from the idea stage to fully scoped projects. Projects in this category are not for proposed status because of the lack of a project sponsor, financial support, insufficient project information, or not ready for implementation. The purpose of this category is to capture these ideas and use the energies and resources of the group to turn them into fundable projects whether through SRFB or other funding opportunities.

Ms. Holden said the Habitat Work Schedule (HWS) is a database for entering projects, such as acquisition, restoration, and other types of projects. The conceptual process is another way of entering projects that are not fully funded.

Mr. Kleim said that most importantly, that process could improve projects before they go to the SRFB. The project conceptual schedule provides an opportunity to bring the expertise of the group to help work

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary**

**March 11, 2011**

**Page 5 of 10**

with the project sponsor. Many conceptual projects may be very large and may require more than one project sponsor to complete. For example in South Sound, there have been Devils Head and the Nisqually projects. The size of those projects required time and focus from many groups as well as many different resources. Another potential outcome is identifying potential project sponsors. There may be ideas that don't necessarily have a project sponsor that could benefit the WRIA but would take time to recruit the right project sponsor.

Mr. Swartout added that it also helps to strategically focus restoration and protection efforts that are too large for one group to manage. It allows groups, such as HWG, to determine where the focus should be in the long-term.

Mr. Kleim said that concept is actually a criterion that was considered as well. Additionally, in identifying projects it may be important to prioritize them. The conceptual project list provides an opportunity to look at a list of prioritized projects to determine which ones should be developed over the next five years or whatever the time period may be. Prioritization helps the group in the long term to evaluate projects in light of criteria. Prioritization is also an opportunity to look at the project early on to determine the good points and where it may need some work. Project sponsors who submit a project on the conceptual project list will receive a review and a ranking of the project during that review. It provides the project sponsor with an opportunity to focus on those areas needing more work that eventually will increase the project's competitiveness.

Mr. Burkle said that prioritization could just be a matter of including projects at different tiers based on the value of the watershed, number of species, and the type of project.

Mr. Kleim reported the subcommittee met to discuss some of the criteria to consider. One of the ideas is using limiting factors and how the project might render the greatest benefits to fish in light of addressing current limiting factors of sediment, fish passage, riparian, large woody debris (LWD), water quality, and water quantity. Another idea offered was protection, such as how intact the area is and identifying the benefits to salmon. Another consideration is the immediacy of the threat of development as well as the appropriate level of protection that could be offered by the project.

Habitat complexity also was addressed in terms of the distribution and abundance of habitat types for salmon. Potential measures could focus on the simplification and fragmentation of the system. Habitat complexity is essentially a snapshot as to where the system is at any moment and it provides some targets to focus on for improving.

Education was also addressed and whether the project contained education and outreach elements. The Kennedy Creek example was mentioned, as it's important to gain support of salmon recovery and sustainability in the region.

Climate change is another important consideration such as contribution to improve the resiliency to changing conditions and whether the project actually accounts for climate change. That could include ensuring there is adequate riparian added to the project to ensure the long-term water quality of the system. Another is whether the project prompts people to consider climate change and respond to it by doing things differently to reduce the impacts of climate change.

The cost of the project is another factor, such as how expensive is the project to a similar project completed in the past, and how expensive is the project in relationship to providing benefits to salmon.

## Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

March 11, 2011

Page 6 of 10

Another important aspect is matching the project to the Lead Entity strategy and whether the project addresses Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 actions in the strategy.

Location and tenure are other considerations and whether the location of the project delivers significant benefit to salmon and is the area a location where many systems depend on juvenile salmon or adults returning to spawn. Another issue is whether ownership of the land makes a difference and is it in the area that may experience impacts from future land uses.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw said one of her concerns is that much of the information is focused on salmon, which is the goal. However, activities underway regionally concern hydraulic soils and protecting groundwater. That may benefit fish if a connection can be demonstrated between the groundwater and the system. For a land acquisition, if there is no direct connection to the main stem or a highly functioning tributary, it's difficult to bridge the protection to groundwater. She asked how she can develop a relationship proving that protecting a significant groundwater or hydraulic soil area would, in the long-term, protect the river system or water quality or quantity over time. Mr. Burkle replied that the model that USGS is currently working on could help demonstrate that the protected aquifer is directly linked to an important area in Scatter Creek where spawning is occurring. Using the USGS model and working with Nadine Romero and her hydrology model could help develop justification. He said he's witnessed areas where all chum spawning was occurring in one spring and if the source of that spring was ever interrupted, the rest of the spring was useless. That concept is valid and could be documented biologically.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw said it might be difficult but that she lives in an area where that is very important.

Mr. Swartout added that the area at the headwaters of a stream has instream flow problems during the summer. It is easy to make the connection if a project is slowing an area that was ditched to enable groundwater recharge in an area that will help maintain stream flows. Holding water back in the upper watershed will benefit the hydrology of the system during low flow periods. That should be an easy connection to make.

Mr. Kleim said the project is a good example of why it should be included on the conceptual project list, as it appears to be a valid and important project but might be too difficult for one project sponsor. The expertise represented on the HWG could assist in developing the project over a year or several years. The process helps to address some of those complex issues that haven't been done in the past.

Bob Thomas commented that ecosystems are complex things and that the conceptual project list is the mechanism to help bridge different interest groups to secure funding from different sources to fix the common problems.

Mr. Loft added that stormwater management also protects water and habitat. Low impact development techniques help actively recharge aquifers and reduce storm surges.

Ms. Holden reviewed the seven projects submitted to date:

- Cedar Creek Tributary Culvert - *Lonnie Crumley said the culvert is the last in that particular system. It would open four miles of upland stream. The culvert is a four-foot pipe with a three-foot drop at the outfall.*
- Chehalis Water Type Assessment – *Mr. Glasgow said the project is an expansion of Phase 1 work.*

## Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary

March 11, 2011

Page 7 of 10

- Chehalis Basin Culvert Top 100 – *Project could involve four major projects in different areas.*
- Elliott Slough Acquisition – *Ms. Strong said the proposal is an acquisition that may involve restoration work in later phases. The project is located on the east and south of other protected lands. The property enhances the value of those lands. The property contributes to the connectivity of river and stream courses. It provides more space for fish and wildlife. It also buffers protected areas as well as controlling future land uses, as it is currently zoned for industrial uses and is adjacent to a highly intense industrial area, which is considering expansion. The land fits into different categories of floodplain, estuary, or main stem because it's adjacent to where the Chehalis River enters the harbor. Mr. Burkle asked whether some of that acquisition includes the abandoned portion of the industrial water line and another abandoned water line that was installed illegally. Ms. Strong said the Seaport Authority, the present owner, is attempting to have the water line abandoned because it's not accessible and the pipe has collapsed. The Seaport Authority is working with the Aberdeen City Attorney to abandon the pipe. Mr. Burkle advised that one of the conditions of the hydraulic project approval for the installation of the new line was removal of the old one, which the owner refused to do.*
- Johns River Estuary - *conversion of a naturally functioning tidal marsh habitat to a 185-acre wetland. The first phase has already restored over 300 acres of wetland habitat through a Coastal Wetlands grant. A levee and tide gate system will be breached restoring tidal influences to 185 acres of estuarine wetland. Restored habitats will be managed to perpetuity.*
- McDonald Creek Restoration – *the project removes barrier culvert identified in the basin-wide barrier assessment ranking. It involves landowners through riparian fencing projects and students and community in riparian plantings and litter clean-up.*
- Wildcat Drainage Assessment – *Mr. Glasgow described the project. Mr. Burkle said the project has been previously submitted as a SRFB project. Mr. Kleim said the project is a good example to include on a conceptual list because within a year or several years it could entail developing a very good project. As a last minute project, it might not succeed in receiving funding.*

Ms. Davenport suggested as a group, members should address the main stem, riparian plantings, and LWD. That hasn't occurred because of private property issues.

Mr. Burkle referred to 35 projects that are at the 10% conceptual level, one of which falls under that category. They are projects that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers hired Tetra Tech to design. Most of them do not have landowner willingness or the landowner may not be aware of the project. Thirty-five properties could be included in conjunction with working with the Corps. Ms. Holden advised that there have been some discussions with Bob Thomas concerning those projects.

*Bertie Davenport left the meeting.*

Mr. Kleim said the conceptual project list could be an opportunity to organize within the HWG. There may not be any initiative by landowners along the main stem but the HWG could spearhead a committee around a series of conceptual projects to move them forward.

Mr. Kleim displayed a three-year list from WRIA 10/12. A similar process was initiated where individuals and groups were invited to submit projects that were prioritized. The process assigns a maximum of 66 points for each project with criteria including: benefit to salmon, certainty of success, and fit to strategy. They used that process to sort projects in the different tiers. Mr. Burkle added that the group, which is the equivalent to the HWG, often schedules site visits with the project sponsors to review

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary**

**March 11, 2011**

**Page 8 of 10**

the projects for ranking while affording an opportunity for sponsors to improve ranking. Mr. Swartout said the same process works very well for the Nisqually basin as well.

Mr. Kleim said the first step is requests to everyone to submit conceptual projects ideas. There are more than the seven submitted. The Corps has some problems, but there will a period before the Corps is comfortable releasing the list. Mr. Thomas said the Corps has a list of sites and a fair amount is known about each site, but there is some sensitivities involving landowners, which needs to be recognized. It may be possible to identify some general areas. The Corps is working on its strategy for filling data gaps on some potential impacts of the proposed Corps project as well as the critical areas and potential mitigation sites. As the data gaps are filled, the Corps can assist in populating the conceptual project list. Mr. Thomas said he supports the concept because it provides a strategy for a systematic approach.

Mr. Burkle offered that three of the sites could be included. Two are located on WDFW land. The third involving the Dillenbaugh restoration could also be included. The City of Chehalis submitted the project to another grant program. Mr. Burkle described the Dillenbaugh project.

Mr. Thomas offered to follow up with Mr. Kleim to list the three projects.

Bruce Treichler shared that he's been involved in the Corps process concerning mitigation projects. It's important to include the projects on the conceptual project list partly because it will enable a better process with landowners when local groups are involved in the process. Landowners automatically respond negatively when the Corps contacts them. However, if those individuals who live in the basin and are impacted by the projects contact those landowners, the dynamic changes and increases more willingness by those property owners to consider the project and possible benefits to them.

Mr. Kleim encouraged members to consider submitting conceptual ideas on the list.

Ms. Strong suggested a project involving oxbows in the Chehalis River valley to reconnect to the river. Many are located on farms and some are managed and some are not. One oxbow located at Mox-Chehalis is significantly impacted.

Mr. Kleim said the next step is working with the subcommittee to develop a list of criteria.

Mr. Conklin commented that most potential projects he's identified are located on private timber land. They are outside of RMAP issues. He asked about a potential way of including the projects on the list and suggested the possibility of developing a form for a potential habitat improvement project that a landowner could allow for submission on the Habitat Work Schedule as a conceptual project to seek for funding. That would prevent landowners discovering after the fact that projects are targeted on their property. Mr. Burkle said Tier 1 is the general layer that lists all types of projects in any location. Tier 2 projects could be projects where landowners have been informed and authorize the listing. Mr. Conklin said many of the timber companies are willing to supply equipment and support as well as cost share.

Members discussed the issue of identifying projects on private land and including them within the conceptual project list if the landowner has not been informed. That can lead to repercussions if the landowner discovers a project and is not amenable to anyone working on the land. Mr. Thomas suggested there is value in "dots on a map" where people can identify potential projects with contact information for more information. There are also benefits for having an overall strategy.

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary**

**March 11, 2011**

**Page 9 of 10**

Mr. Swartout commented about the initial resistance by members of WRIA 10 regarding a similar process with them finally realizing after several years, that it saved time from having members at the beginning of the SRFB process trying to find projects. It's a valuable tool and he's encouraged that HWG members are supportive of the concept because of the pushback WRIA 10 experienced from its members.

Mr. Kleim said the process will also improve projects prior to submittal to the SRFB process.

Mr. Conklin asked whether there will be a screening tool or some type of landowner acknowledgement but not necessarily an agreement by the landowner that provides information to the landowner that the project may be listed in a database. Mr. Kleim said the subcommittee is still working on details. Some organizational issues need to be addressed as well. Ms. Napier added that she can enter projects but she doesn't publish them for everyone to access. There are some security level issues to resolve.

Mr. Swartout described the analogy of the listing process within a jurisdiction's six-year capital facilities plan that includes forecasted conceptual projects that don't particularly identify properties, but become more specific as the project moves closer to consideration. Mr. Conklin said he wouldn't list a conceptual project unless the landowner has been notified. Mr. Burkle added that most of the issue involves potential real estate transactions. It's usually necessary when completing a project on private land to have the conversation with the property owner. Within HWS there is a secure area for those conceptual projects that are encountering potential real estate issues with the landowner. Mr. Conklin said he's aware of many projects and hasn't submitted them because he hasn't talked to any of the landowners. Ms. Moore said if there are concerns it's a signal that it might be important to follow up with the landowner.

Mr. Treichler pointed out that if a project has a willing owner, that project has more weight than others that are uncertain. Approaching owners is also a way of involving them in the opportunity to participate and have some ownership in the project.

Mr. Glasgow agreed that the multiple tier approach might be the effective approach with the first tier including broad restoration ideas that are not site-specific and a second tier that is site specific. The committee should avoid creating a list populated with projects where landowners are not willing to participate.

Mr. Burkle said the tier approach has been used effectively.

Mr. Conklin asked whether the intent is to identify the 100 culverts on the map as part of the Chehalis Basin Culvert Top 100 project. It could assist when he meets with timber representatives who complain about having to replace culverts because of the requirements of RMAPs and asks what's being done in other areas. It's a tool that he can use to show landowners what projects are occurring in the basin as well.

Mr. Thomas recommended the subcommittee should draft business rules on how to populate the conceptual project list.

Ms. Napier reported she previously distributed a copy of another area's business rules to the subcommittee. At that time it was difficult to discuss without some experiences to compare.

Ms. Strong said her concern is with opportunities that might arise that are not included in the plan and ensuring those projects are considered as well. Mr. Burkle said WRIA 10 adopted a rule that projects should be included on the three-year list. However, if another project overrides another project in terms

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Habitat Work Group Meeting Summary**

**March 11, 2011**

**Page 10 of 10**

of importance, it is placed on the list. No worthwhile projects are overlooked because they may not have been included on the list.

The subcommittee will work on defining the rules.

Mr. Kleim asked members to respond to a concept paper that will be electronically forwarded.

Mr. Amrine shared that the district is on the list for Centennial funding for planting of 4.5 miles along the upper Chehalis River. It is the highest of four sites on the TMDL list.

Ms. Strong announced the Chehalis River Basin Land Trust is holding its annual meeting and dinner on Saturday, March 19, at 6:00 p.m. the Carpenters Union Hall in Centralia. Everyone is invited to attend and bring a dish for the potluck dinner. Student speakers will discuss their rain garden they installed at Centralia High School.

### **Next Meeting Agenda**

Ms. Napier reviewed the April agenda:

- Review SRFB projects
- Continued discussion on work plan for Conceptual Project List

### **Adjournment**

With there being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:11 p.m.

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