

Chehalis Basin Lead Entity— Habitat Work Group

Meeting Notes for Monday, October 1, 2018

**Chehalis Tribe Community Center – Gathering Room
461 Seneca Road, Oakville, WA**

In attendance:

Alissa Ferrell, RCO
Amy Spoon, WDFW Region 6 Habitat Bio.
Bob Amrine, Lewis Cons. Dist.
Cade Roler, WDFW Habitat
Caprice Fasano, Quinault Indian Nation
Charissa Waters, Thurston County
Chris Dwight, WDFW Habitat
Colleen Suter, Chehalis Tribe DNR
Emelie McKain, WDFW/ASRP
Hope Riedan, Chehalis Tribe Fisheries
Janet Strong, Audubon

Jamie Glasgow, Wild Fish Conservancy
Jason Gillie, Chehalis Tribe
Kirsten Harma, Watershed Coordinator
Kelly Verd, Lewis Cons. District
Nicholas Carr, Forterra
Rich Osbourne, Coast Salmon Partnership
Rick Rouse, Port of Chehalis
Rickie Marion, Chehalis Tribe DNR
Sarah Watkins, GH College, notetaker
Thom Woodruff, Capitol Land Trust
Tom Kollasch, Grays Harbor Cons. Dist.

1. Welcome, Introductions

2. Organizational Business

a. Review minutes from September 2018

Miranda clarified to Kirsten that they had not offered LCD match. Minutes for September 2018 approved as amended.

b. Updates

Kirsten: CB Partnership meeting was on Friday, 9/28. The facilitator put up ground rules at the beginning. One I appreciated was “no side conversations”, and that everyone enforces that. It would be helpful to do that with this group.

Subcommittees: Newaukum Subcommittee met last month.

c. Education Contract

Kathy Jacobson will help with some of the LE outreach tasks. One will be using the “river table” as an educational tool. HWG members were encouraged to keep an eye out for venues where that would be useful, and contact Kirsten with any ideas for that or any other education tasks.

3. Salmon Recovery Funding Board

a. State Review Panel Comments— Projects of Concern (POCs) and Needs

Alissa: Review Panel comments came out Friday. There were a couple of POCs for this group. Regional meetings are scheduled for October 23 at the NRB.

Kirsten: That time conflicts with the Coast Salmon Partnership Board Meeting.

Holm Farm

Alissa: Holm Farm project was POC'ed on the basis of cost-benefit, primarily due to concerns about buffer widths. There wasn't a lot of discussion about what comprised the upland area and why that piece was beneficial. The Review Panel also wanted to see more match. There is concern about still having use of the agriculture close to one side of the ditch.

Thom: I plan on meeting with the landowner this week to see if we can get a wider buffer. She hasn't expressed interest in selling this 27-acre piece. Can buying the non-habitat land be considered a benefit to fish?

Kirsten: The ag land is a threat to the stream, so doing something different with the ag land is a threat reduction benefit.

Thom: Is a 100-ft buffer the gold standard for SRFB? Do we take into account relief and topography or is it just a number? What is the benefit based on the number?

Comment: You're going to get a different answer from different agencies.

Alissa: WDFW are updating the riparian volumes in the Priority Habitat and Species guidelines. They said they had a tool to land on a single number. They're mainly basing buffers on zones of influence.

Thom: Capitol Land Trust will talk to the owner about increasing the buffer and opportunities to have some kind of acquisition for the ag field. We'll develop a response to the significance of the wetland/forest for the benefit of the salmon.

Frase Creek

Alissa: The POC on Frase Creek was concerned with the design on the streambed mix, which doesn't meet the conditions of the watershed. It should be a mixed bed structure that maintains the flow and isn't porous. They wanted to see more analysis.

Caprice: She was looking at what's in the creek now? The culvert has been stopping the material, so that material is not what will be in there after the barrier is removed. When I looked at the designs before, I thought they looked fine. I didn't look at the percentages of fine material to cobbles. Another reason to upsize the rock is to help stabilize the bank, otherwise it's going to regrade and start cutting into the field.

Comment: Scott Brenner has already permitted it. He said they increased the sediment size on the banks.

Kirsten: We'll work with Ann and see if she needs to come to the Review Panel meeting.

b. Newaukum Trio Cost Increase Request (Bob Amrine)

Bob: This is three projects. Originally, we were going to put in three culverts. After we received the grant, the engineer from the design process decided he wanted to put in two bridges instead of two of the culverts. The costs are substantially higher. The main expense we encountered was

utilities. The original estimate had been about \$2,000 per site for utilities. We ended up with around \$17,000 in costs we didn't anticipate. All three projects are done. We're about \$11,000 short for paying our current bills, and we're asking for \$12,000 as a cushion so we can do the state inspections, possible tree planting, and the final report.

Alissa: This funding is available in RCO's cost increase pot.

Motion to approve the cost increase for the Newaukum project. Motion passed.

4. **Conceptual project presentation— Headwater Streams project (Tom Kollasch)**

Proposal: We're trying to pull together a proposal for the Satsop and Wynoochee in cooperation with Natural Systems Design that will fund our ability to build a toolbox that will delineate those types of streams where we think we can work with large wood installations. The "Toolbox" is a set of steps we would need to take to decide where we want to do in-water work that would improve water quality, quantity, and habitat, from prioritization to design. Using that document, a practitioner could walk through the document and come up with a good concept of what they might do in a particular place. We'd also like to use tools like John Winkowski (WDFW) did using temperature modeling to try to target where we would work.

We would work with NSD to do large wood installations in headwater streams— nothing larger than 25-30 feet across—in areas where we could throw wood in and, if large enough, would mainly stay. We are thinking further downstream where we could work with simplified jam designs, but not into the bigger water where you would need site-specific, engineered designs.

Almost the entirety of the upper watersheds is owned by industrial timber. We want to see how we can incentivize this work for the timber companies. We've engaged tentatively with Green Diamond to find a way to use their land, look at their harvest timing, and pair up projects in high priority areas since they'll have machinery that might be used to get those high volumes of wood in cost effectively and fund some of those pilot projects.

Comment: I think it's a great idea to do pilot projects and use temperature modeling and finding the right places to do that. I would recommend doing stream temperature monitoring.

Large wood: We trying to do the basic designing ahead of time, based on the type of stream. For example, at Ellsworth, we had a basic set of hand-sketched designs and we had a purpose for each area. After 5 or 6 different designs, we kept repeating them. So we would try to provide generalized designs.

Comment: You could come up with ideas on designs of logjams with guidelines, but ultimately you'll likely need a PGE stamp it because someone has to liable for that wood. One way or another, the designs will need to be reviewed by an engineer.

Riparian Managements Zones (RMZ): We're not closed to the idea of thinning in the RMZ and using the wood in the stream. Further down the road, how would we incentivize timber companies doing this on their own is some kind of financial incentive? Could they be allowed to sell more timber from the RMZ if they're putting enough wood in the particular streams?

Comment: Those riparian buffer widths were hard fought compromises. I would be reluctant to try to benefit the timber companies by allowing them to reduce the buffer widths or composition. There must be some other way to incentivize cooperation.

Comment: Weyerhaeuser routinely uses their DFCs template based on the stream size and the basal area within the RMZ, and they have different no-cuts based on the basal area, and they use that as much as they can.

Funding and sponsorship: Q: How does this work in terms of sponsorship? Does the CDs jurisdiction extend to private forest land? A: Yes. We work with Weyerhaeuser on fish passage and other stuff and could extend those relationships to this type of project.

5. Aquatic Species Restoration Plan (ASRP) & Chehalis Strategy

ASRP update

“Design Teams”/Reach Scale River Restoration Projects update (Kirsten and CDs)

Grays Harbor (Tom) We finished our conceptual designs and met with landowners in the Satsop and Wynoochee rivers in the four Early Action Reaches. We did presentations to help the landowners understand what’s going on, what kinds of erosion and flooding problems will be ongoing, and setting up a restoration corridor concept. We also presented broad-brush prescription proposals. Three out of four landowners are eager to work collaboratively, though we haven’t signed any papers yet. The Science Review Team liked the design ideas, so the next step is to take it to the Steering Committee. We’ve tentatively selected two out of the four reaches we’d like to move forward with.

Comment: Discussing acquisition is putting the “cart before the horse”.

Tom: We’ve put together a spreadsheet of all the possibilities, and we’ll work with Forterra to tie budget numbers to those. The acquisition and easement component could be a huge cost, and we have to know more to know what we need to ask from the legislature.

Lewis (Bob) We originally had two reaches in the South Fork Newaukum and the South Fork Chehalis. We threw out the SF Newaukum, which had a lot of landowners and a lot of erosion. My reaches have expanded, and some of the landowners outside the original reach of the SF Newaukum weren’t as receptive. SF Chehalis reach likely won’t be selected. We’re going into the Stillman Creek basin for our Early Action Reach. We have a lot of CREP on that reach, so we already have 180 ft buffers. Landowners are concerned they’ll lose money from the federal government if they do fish restoration, so we’re getting FSA involved early on. If it does affect them, hopefully Forterra will come up with some ideas of compensation to offset that. We’re hoping to meet with landowners the last two weeks of October to come up with specifics.

Discussion on landowner willingness (Tom): There’s a difference between the level of cooperation in the Satsop and Wynoochee and your watershed. Fear is a motivating tool in our area. The Satsop is a huge river. Landowners are motivated by high rates of erosion. If we don’t have those kinds of erosion rates, people will question what the benefits of cooperating are.

Bob: I think that of things are done correctly, and ten years from now the salmon start coming back, I think the property values will go up. There are different ways to incentivize people. Once they see things on the ground, it will be like a domino effect.

Skookumchuck

Kirsten: One of the things the landowners want is planting trees in the oak prairie uplands. Isn't that what CNLM does? So why not plug a partner in like that?

i. Science Review Team Update (Emelie & Hope)

Emelie: The Early Action Reaches are progressing well. The Science Review Team have done their field trips throughout the basin and compiled a lot of the scientific research we talked about at the symposium last week. We've created these boards [on display] as part of the prioritization effort for different ecological diversity regions throughout the basin. The Science Review Team wanted to look at each distinct region by itself to understand the ecological processes, and to compare them to each other. We are looking to see what the Review Team has come up with and making sure we have everyone's input and feedback to inform the prioritization effort.

Hope: We had preliminary results for EDT, just for coho, and had a good discussion on food webs. Last week Gary Morishima did a presentation on uncertainty and how to communicate that, especially with landowners who don't want to think in numbers.

Cade: When will we be able to expect another culvert grant round? Is it once a biennium?

Emelie: There is no set date. It depends on the funding that we get.

Kirsten: The budget is on the agenda for the next Chehalis Basin Board meeting. Right now the Early Action project construction is the top priority. If they can ask for extra, they'll do more culverts.

Cade: When is the earliest anticipated construction date on these Early Action Reaches?

Bob: We were hoping to do stuff in 2019, but it won't have anything ready to go. We're shooting for 2020.

Kirsten: Anyone who has comments on timelines and what it takes to get to construction should talk to Maggie McKoewen (WDFW liaison).

Chehalis Science Symposium (All)

Kirsten: What did people think of the significance of the Science Symposium?

- I learned how important Grays Harbor is to juvenile chinook, and how they are spending more time there. Those together made me think that we should be focusing more on projects in the Harbor, like eel grass restoration.
- WDFW did a great job at the symposium. The part I got lost in was the presentations on genetics. I was really interested, but I just didn't get it. I'd like to talk to someone about that.
- I loved the focus on non-salmonids. There's more to restoring the ecology than just salmon.
- The stream temperature and fish usage work that John Winkowski doing is interesting. This foundational information helps us understand that in the East Satsop, we already have the

salmon there, we can help them with habitat, but we have a summer temperature issue we're not going to solve by working on site.

- What stood out to me was the estimation of redds, showing 95% of the redds were spring chinook in the inundation zone. I have so many questions, such as what the impacts of the proposed dam are for the basin?
- I was happy to see information on the other native fish populations that use warmer waters.

Emelie: The focus of the symposium was not intended to be the dam and the EIS, but on ASRP and restoration. The study of the spring chinook was one that we wanted to share because it has implications for restoration and prioritization.

Emelie: We'll have all the presentations available on line. We'll have audio files as well.

Bob: On the ASRP, this is our second biennium developing this plan. We were told the EDT would be meshed together with a model NOAA had. I thought that would come out at the symposium, but it didn't.

Emelie: EDT is chugging along, and the NOAA life cycle model Tim Beechie is heading up is behind schedule. It's being worked on this fall and will be checked by experts.

Other Chehalis Strategy Updates

Kirsten: Would the Habitat Work Group like to write a comment letter on the EIS scoping?

Discussion: A letter is fine that lists the types of research, alternatives and mitigation options that should be reviewed in the EIS. We created a letter for the PEIS and this document could have many of the same points.

Agreement on doing the group letter for the HWG.

b. Activity

The group reviewed boards of the different ecological diversity regions in the Chehalis Basin created by the Science Review Team.

6. Other (Janet Strong)

October 10 at Centralia Middle School, the Chehalis River Basin Land Trust is sponsoring a presentation by the Lewis County Public Works Director Eric Martin to talk about the dam and related topics.