

## **Chehalis Basin Lead Entity**

### **Habitat Work Group Meeting**

**January 13, 2017**

**9:30 am – 1:00 pm**

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

#### **In attendance:**

Brandon Carman, *Grays Harbor CD*  
Brett DeMond, *Streamworks*  
Cade Roler, *WDFW*  
Colleen Suter, *Chehalis Tribe*  
Garrett Dalan, *The Nature Conservancy*  
Darcey Hughes, *Forterra*  
Dave Price, *WDFW*  
Jamie Glasgow, *Wild Fish Conservancy*  
Janet Strong, *Chehalis River Basin Land Trust*  
Jason Gillie, *Chehalis Tribe*  
JB McCrummen, *Citizen, Thurston Co.*  
Jessica Helsley, *Coast Salmon Partnership*

Kirsten Harma, *Lead Entity Coordinator*  
Kim Smith, *Grays Harbor CD*  
Lonnie Crumley, *Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force*  
Luke Kelly, *Trout Unlimited*  
Maria Hunter, *WDFW*  
Miranda Plumb, *USFWS*  
Mitch Redfern, *Mason Conservation District*  
Omroa Bhagwandin, *Citizen, Lewis Co.*  
Rich Osborne, *Coast Salmon Partnership*  
Steve Hallstrom, *Citizen, Grays Harbor*  
Thom Woodruff, *Capitol Land Trust*

### **Meeting Summary**

#### **1. Welcome and Introductions.**

Vice Chair Brett Demond convened the meeting. Everyone provided self-introductions.

The group honored the passing of Brian Abbott, who contributed greatly to salmon recovery in Washington and will be greatly missed.

#### **2. Review of minutes from December 2016**

Lonnie moved to accept the minutes, Janet seconded. All in favor.

#### **3. Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB)**

##### **a) Review of Draft 2017 Schedule**

The group reviewed the schedule. Miranda noted that field days usually occur earlier in May, so suggested moving the dates to May 12-13. All in favor of the schedule with the proposed changes.

#### **b) Allocation Committee**

This committee was convened by the Salmon Recovery Funding Board to re-examine the formula used to allocate project funding around the state. Jess provided an update on the committee's discussions. The group decided to use the same equation as before, but the weight given to each metric may change. The group has not yet discussed capacity funding in their meetings. Capacity funds may have to come out of project funds in the future. The group may ask for further meetings to make decisions on capacity funding.

#### **c) Salmon Recovery Conference**

The deadline for abstracts has been extended to January 27<sup>th</sup>

#### **4. Culvert Subcommittee**

Cade Roler, WDFW, reported on the progress of the Culvert Subcommittee. Reasons for doing the update include new surveys showing new passability since 2008, changes in habitat condition since the 2007 and 2009 floods, and the need for a new formula that captures more factors such as habitat quality, or habitat potential using IP. Cade does not know when the new ranked list coming out of this process will be ready. The committee next meets January 18<sup>th</sup> at the Lewis County Conservation District. All are welcome.

Cade also provided an update on the Fish Barrier Removal Board. \$19.7 million were included in the Governor's Budget, which was much lower than the FBRB request, but Cade suggested this is still a success given that this is a new program. The budget would allow for funding the 13 top projects. One of those is in the Newaukum subbasin.

There will soon be an RFP for projects in the "coordinated pathway" approach coming from the state for the next round of FBRB funding. Project application forms will look more like those for SRFB. The RFP will come out after they know how much funding will be available for the program, likely after July 2017.

Jan Strong suggested that everyone compile and distribute information on "good news" stories about culverts corrected since 2007. This should help gain political support for more projects like this being funded in the future.

## 5. Bylaw Subcommittee - Policy Discussion #1

Kirsten presented the outcomes of discussions among the Bylaw Subcommittee. The subcommittee's recommendation was to lead the larger group through policy discussions, and then use the discussion outcomes to write new draft bylaws.

Kirsten's slides covered the RCW establishing Lead Entities, and the role of Grays Harbor County and role of a citizen's committee. Only one "citizen's committee" is required by the RCW. Kirsten presented the resolution that established the role of Grays Harbor County in the Lead Entity process. It was signed in 2000. The subcommittee suggested that this may need to be updated to reflect that changes that have happened since then.

Subcommittee recommendations Re: Role of Grays Harbor County: That GHC continue serving in fiscal role responsible for the capacity funding grant through RCO. That GHC appoint the HWG as the Citizen's Committee (to match language of RCW). That GHC not hold responsibility to approve the project list – but rather delegate that responsibility to HWG. That GHC approve list of individual members on the Habitat Work Group- organizations and agencies to appoint their own representatives. This would mean defining a number of voting seats on the HWG and ensuring that there is someone to fill all voting seats.

Discussion: *Do you agree or disagree with the recommendations?*

-Q) What's the motivation for making changes?

A) Part of that is that the Grays Harbor County Commissioners aren't engaged in the discussion about the projects

-Goal of updating the resolution would be to mention HWG in there. Make the resolution better align with RCW and better reflect current conditions.

-Q) If GHC doesn't approve project list, what would happen with the project list?

A) The HWG could forward the list to the Coast Region, whose roles is to submit the recommended list to SRFB.

-Q) What is the risk of not having the County do project list approval?

A) Risk might be that this group would be subject to the Open Meetings Act if becomes the official voting body that bypasses GHC. Subcommittee should look into fiscal responsibility role of GHC – they only hold responsibility over capacity funding, not project funding, which is the "list" that is the subject of the conversation here. JB suggested that the Bylaw Subcommittee look in to these issues further. Garrett suggested that RCO provide guidance. Rich said that the North Pacific Coast Lead Entity has had lawyers review their bylaws and they comply with the Open Meetings Act.

-Re: Membership: If the HWG is going to be the Citizen's Committee, all seats will need to be filled and there will need to be clarity about who can vote and who can't. There are currently vacancies from Cities, Ports, and Business. Chehalis Basin Partnership used to send participants that fill these roles to review projects and vote on list, but over time it's been

hard to get their participation. In other Lead Entity groups, staff from cities and counties are often the representatives.

-If the Chehalis Basin Partnership is in the resolution, maybe they should designate the HWG to serve this role. Put in writing that we are doing the role for them – but if so, the HWG would have to have equivalent county, city involvement – essentially recreating the CBP.

-Maybe need to look at “Establishment Clauses” – if we do things differently, do we have to contact all involved entities again? WCSSP did this, and it took about 6 months.

-Recommendation: If the Commissioners appoint HWG members, include current list of members in that appointment.

-Next Steps: Bylaw subcommittee will work through these issues further

-Kirsten mentioned that if the group doesn’t get all of this figured out this before this upcoming SRFB grant round, we’ll have to operate as we did in the past.

## **6. Aquatic Species Restoration Plan**

Kirsten provided a summary of the most recent ASRP Steering Committee meeting, the first she had participated in. The Committee will meet the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> week of the month. The timing of the meeting allows for Kirsten to provide updates to the Habitat Work Group, which meets the 2<sup>nd</sup> week of the month, and then transmit feedback the following week. The Committee will be discussing the criteria and process for “HRP round 2” for when and if that funding becomes available. There might be funding specifically for “barriers” since legislation requires focus on near-term successes and barrier correction meets that criteria. At the next meeting, Kirsten will share how the group solicited and ranked projects for the “HRP” funding in 2015, and present that as a model for the next round. Maria elaborated that the “philosophical approach” for that funding source is still being discussed. HWG members reiterated the need for criteria for that funding to be available to project sponsors as soon as possible.

## **7. Discussion on HRP return funds**

Dave Price had asked the Habitat Work Group for recommendations on how to reallocate returned funds from the 2015-2017 HRP funds at a previous meeting. A small subcommittee of HWG members who reviewed the projects last year convened to discuss options. The committee recommended not taking the path of going down the list of previously proposed projects. The rationale was that those low scoring projects were not high value projects ready to implement. So, the committee recommended sending out a new call for proposals. Kirsten developed a draft call for proposals by cutting and pasting from old call for proposals with input from Alice on likely constraints on return funds – e.g., agreements have to be in place by June 30<sup>th</sup> 2017. The group reviewed the draft call for proposals. The overall need for expenditure of these funds is that they go to projects that can be developed

and implemented quickly. If sponsors can be notified by April 15<sup>th</sup> this should be possible.

#### **8. Early Action Reach Update**

Maria provided an update. Site visits are complete. The Steering Committee has not decided on next steps yet.

Q) What are you trying to achieve with early action reaches?

A) To build momentum and show we can achieve reach restoration and so that there is continued interest in funding.

Q) Do you know how much funding will be available yet?

A) The Governor's budget included \$10 million for restoration work from the state, with the clause of potentially getting \$10 million in Federal funds. Maria mentioned that it will be harder to upscale than downscale, so they might assume that \$20 million will be available and plan from there.

Suggestion – Rank the proposals/reaches that are already available. It is hard to know how much each would cost to implement as a project at this point, so just develop a ranked list that you can work your way down as funding becomes available. Start with a conceptual design for the top projects. Move ahead on design of as many as possible.

Suggestion - You'll have to consider landowner willingness as a key variable. Where can we really get landowners to follow-through? Only takes a few landowners dropping out to blow up a project. We don't have luxury of failure this biennium.

#### **Other Business & Announcements**

Mitch Redfern put out an invitation for technical committee members to participate on the Mason Conservation District's Lead Entity group.

After the meeting, the group received a presentation on EDT from Larry Lestelle and Chip McConnaha.

**Next HWG meeting: February 10, 2017**