

Western Straits Conservation Planning

Minutes of Meeting June 8, 2011

Crescent Grange, Joyce

9-11:30 am

Focus: (1) Review of scope of project; (2) review of stakeholder feedback received thus far; (3) review of habitat classification methods; (4) flow chart to determine Biologically Important Streams; (5) continued discussion of Large River Floodplains and how Mike Haggerty assigned habitat values.

Attendance: JC and Karolyn Burdick (Pysht landowners) , Don Hamerquist (Pysht landowner), Anne Shaffer (CWI), Eric Carlsen (NOPL), Sue Nattinger and Coleman Byrnes (Salt Creek landowner, conservation easement donor), Mike Haggerty (consultant), Michele d'Hemecourt (NOLT)

Discussion:

Michele d'Hemecourt provided a summary of the scope of project, the prioritization, and stakeholder feedback received thus far. She also reviewed how that feedback was being incorporated into the process. Anne Shaffer asked if we ever resolve the feeder bluff issue. She understands that uplands will not be incorporated, but what about feeder bluffs? Mike is still working on this.

Mike Haggerty reviewed the methods of Habitat Classification and the definitions used for Habitat Types. He then showed a flow chart used to filter/determine Biologically Important Streams (BIS). Mike showed maps of the Biologically Important Streams and the large river floodplain. 38% of all of the large river floodplain is in the Pysht. Don Hamerquist asked about Bowlby Creek and where it fits. Mike replied that it is a BIS of Small Size. Anne Shaffer asked about West Twin. Mike showed where they fit on the flow chart and explained that it's a BIS of Medium Size. Eric Carlsen requested that, for the final report, the maps use color that stands out more. Mike commented that the colors show up well on his screen, and he would probably not show the aerial on the final report. Anne Shaffer asked about the important tributaries of the West Twin that Mike McHenry hoped would be included in the SRFB proposal for riparian conservation. She suggested that we check with Mike McHenry on which streams those are. Michele will ask Mike McHenry.

Mike showed the slide for Biological Indicators, coho salmon redds per mile, and explained that he looked for the point on the chart where the line flattens out, and he has determined it's between 6 or 8%. Then he explained the development of the coho spawning scalar. This is available on the website. Mike then showed the coho spawning scalar, and a chart showing high

abundance time period vs low abundance time period. This chart takes the coho scalar data, and allows us to compare all stream segments where there are surveys. The chart suggests differential marine survival rates from east to west, and suggests that certain streams are important during times of both high and low abundance. Don Hamerquist asked for more information and was curious why Mike felt it indicated low marine survival. Mike has incorporated the smolt data, so it must be marine survival. Anne Shaffer suggested it would be interesting to look at Strait survival vs estuarine habitat. Don Hamerquist asked if the results might have something to do with the differential smolting rates in the Twins. Don Hamerquist also asked if he's working out a similar table for steelhead. Mike feels that all streams would already be included in this coho scalar. Don Hamerquist asked if Mike feels the surveys are comprehensive enough and Mike explained that a majority of the streams are surveyed and feels confident using the best available data. It is also just one factor that defines whether we include a stream as a BIS.

JC Burdick and Anne Shaffer asked about how the uplands would be included. These are critical for habitat process, and the habitat process units are only for nearshore. Mike agreed that we are missing the mark if that was the purpose of the assessment, but the purpose of this one is to identify important floodplain and conifer forest. These could be included, but they would rank low on the list.

Anne verified that wetlands are part of the definition of floodplain.

Don Hamerquist asked about Mossy Rock, which is not included. It's been degraded, but could be further degraded. Mike commented that these could be added to the plan, but they will not rank high because we are trying to protect the best of the best intact, functioning habitat. Michele added that this would not exclude it from consideration for an easement, but it will not rank well with the limited scope of this plan.

Floodplain Riparian Feature Types – Sub-Features. Mike explained how he assigned habitat values.

- Streams. Mike talked about the example of Trailer Creek. It's a dependent feature type because I still has habitat value, but it depends on whether it lives on the floodplain.
- Wetlands
- Forested Areas
- Non-Forested Areas

Clallam River Example –Floodplain BIS and Floodplain Feature Types intersected with parcel data. Mike showed a table with the habitat values shown within that screen based on parcel data. Mike explained that there could be different ways of prioritizing the data. Anne suggested that we not lump the data together because there are other variables that come into play. Mike agrees with leaving the data intact so the data can be manipulated in the future.

Nearshore - Mike asked Anne for feedback on the items listed on his slide. Anne provided some feedback, but is interested in seeing the write-up and polygons. Anne asked questions about the data used and PSNERP's definitions. Anne cautioned him to assign a 200 meter buffer to nearshore without zones. Mike doesn't think he would be able to prioritize without zones, though he could use a 200 meter buffer.

JC sees that Mike has done a lot of good work, and he's now understanding how it all comes together.

Michele announced that the next meeting will be July 28th, location TBD.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30.