



## *Chehalis Basin Partnership*

---

### Meeting Summary – February 25, 2005

#### **A. GENERAL PARTNERSHIP BUSINESS**

##### **Introduction**

Vice Chair Jim Haslett welcomed everyone and opened the meeting. Sixteen of the Partnership's twenty-eight member organizations had a representative or alternate at the meeting. Four additional citizens, alternates, or visitors were at the meeting. (See attendance list on the last page of this summary).

Napier asked the group to consider several revisions to the agenda. The revisions included discussion of a letter of support and review of the status of the annual plan of work. The agenda was revised.

##### **Steering/Technical Advisory Committee**

Swartout reported that the Steering/Technical Committee met once during the month and worked on developing material that will be discussed later in this meeting. This group meets monthly on the first Thursday.

##### **Water Quality Committee**

Willis reported that the committee met on February 10, 2005. They discussed the draft Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP). The intent behind the QAPP is to develop, at a minimum, a template for water quality project sponsors. The group hopes this will lessen the workload for each water quality proposal by providing some guidance through the QAPP. The group provided some feedback to Jennings, who is the lead author. The group discussed how they would like to see project sponsors use this document. They are still discussing the possible uses for the document and will review the revisions by Jennings during the next meeting. The next meeting will be March 10, 2005.

Napier asked the group to consider authorizing the chair to sign a letter of support for Grays Harbor County's grant application to the Terry Husseman Account. The grant funds would be used to organize and implement an on-site sewage loan program in Grays Harbor County. The proposal would help to implement recommendations from both the Watershed Plan and the Detailed Implementation Plan. The group agreed to send a letter of support. *Note: The Shellfish Advisory Committee for the Shellfish Reserve Loan Program did not support the application, so it was not submitted.*

##### **Citizens' Advisory Committee**

Chanele Holbrook reported that she is still trying to rejuvenate the CAC. Brian Peck asked if she was still pursuing a presence at community events. She would like to, but needs more volunteers. Napier added that she would like to see Steve Craig help her with this project because of his experience with similar events.

Taylor Pittman, USFWS, introduced herself as the outreach coordinator for her organization. She plans to involve herself in many projects including the Chehalis Basin.

### **Other Business**

#### Ecology's new representative to the Partnership

Steve Craig was introduced by Kahle Jennings. He is currently serving as a watershed lead for the Nisqually Planning Unit. He has many years of experience working with local groups on watershed planning issues.

At this time, Ecology cannot fill the vacancy created by Jennings' departure. They can continue to distribute monthly meeting materials. They have assigned Steve Craig to serve as the interim watershed lead for the Chehalis Basin. But until the budget is determined, they are unable to commit in the same capacity.

To fill this void, Napier will need to cover more administrative functions for the Partnership. She will prepare meeting summaries, agenda, and collect the information for monthly distribution.

#### Annual Plan of Work (APOW)

Napier asked the group to consider adding to their agenda a report out on the progress of the APOW and notice of upcoming projects. The group agreed to add that to their agenda.

Napier reported that the APOW and the Operating Procedures Manuals still need to be posted on Grays Harbor County's website.

According to the APOW, during the month of March, the group's schedule shows review of membership and membership participation. Napier will check with membership entity regarding their designated representative and will review attendance.

Also during March, according to the APOW, the group should invite representatives from each water conservancy board to make a presentation. The Boards would be asked to discuss their membership composition and participation. Napier asked if the group wanted to address this issue as described by the APOW.

Lyle Hojem said he would like to see the Board(s) present to the Partnership. Ron Mauel could present for Lewis County Conservancy Board. The group would like background information, membership, local protocol, fees, scope of authority, expected role of watershed planning unit, and work load. Swartout will contact Thurston County Conservancy Board. Steve Craig will try to get an Ecology representative and will ask Don Davidson.

### **B. SPECIAL PROJECTS**

#### USFWS Presentation of the 2005 Chehalis Fisheries Restoration Program project list.

Brian Peck provided the group with an overview of the program. This is the eleventh year for the program. Each year, it receives funding to distribute to habitat restoration project sponsors. He is still waiting for this year's budget. Last year the program received \$190,000, he hopes for a similar figure.

This year's process included review of eleven projects that were scored and ranked. He summarized the projects for the group. See handout for more information.

Ron Mauel suggested the Chehalis Basin Educational Consortium consider including agriculture in the class room, which is a program funded by the Washington Farm Bureau.

Morris asked if the projects included monitoring. Peck replied yes. Presence of adult above the barrier and hydrology were the parameters for barrier correction. The CBEC monitor suggest through surveys which determine if the student's knowledge was expanded. The Brazilian Elodea Control revisits the site to determine if the weed is still present. DOW is difficult to monitor the audience. They tried surveys but the response was limited. The nutrient enhancement project is also difficult to monitor because the placement typically is part of another project, such as barrier removal.

### Watershed Plan Implementation

Napier distributed a revise copy of the "comparison" page mailed out with the monthly meeting packet.

Napier briefly reviewed the decision rules and the model to prioritize based on the application of the decision rules to each objective. She summarized comments, based on question asked by the CBP during the presenting of this information during the January meeting.

- The STC applied decision rules to the 18 objectives from the Watershed Plan.
- There are only 18 objectives because out of the 50+ actions from the Watershed Plan, only 18 were viewed as objectives. The remaining actions are tasks and will be applied at a later stage in this process.
- Each rule has a value and range of points that are applied independently to the objectives.
- Each rule can be weighted.
- The CBP suggested weighting the rules based on have to do verses like to do.
- Dual rankings for the like to do and the have to do.

She reviewed the two weighting scenarios presented to the group last month. In January, the group asked the STC to weight the rules based on the have to do and the like to do concept. This would be addressed in Rule 6.

During their first application of the model, the STC applied two weighting scenarios. The first scenario evenly weighted each rule, which meant 16-17% per rule. The results of this weighting are included in the handout. The second scenario placed a higher value on decision rules 1 and 2. Based on comments from the January meeting, the STC presented four additional weighting scenarios.

The STC application of the model with the revised weighting was summarized for the group.

- "Weight 3" places a value of zero for rules 3 and 5 because all objectives except one scored the same.
- "Weight 4" changes the percentage to favor rule 2 and place less emphasis on Rule 6.
- "Weight 5" again places a value of zero for rules 3 and 5, but places an emphasis on Rule 6.
- "Weight 6" places 100% of the value on whether or not an objective is a primary objective.

After review all the scenarios, the STC supported “Weight 5,” except for one dissension. That person felt that rule 6 should receive less weight because regulations would prevail when necessary.

The CBP supported the work of the STC and directed them to continue to develop language for tasks to implement the objectives.

#### Scope of Work for Unexpended Phase III grant funds

After completion of the watershed plan, grant funding remained as part of the retainage held by the Department of Ecology. Grays Harbor County continues to work with Ecology to revise the scope of work and use the remaining grant funds to pay for staff support for the Partnership. The proposed scope of work would focus on two tasks.

1. Translate the actions in the Chehalis Basin watershed plan into Plan 2 Fund. This activity would help the Partnership determine if Phase 4 (Implementation) grant funds are an appropriate way to proceed with implementation of the Plan. Using Plan 2 Fund, the Partnership could accomplish some of the work necessary to meet the Phase 4 requirements for developing a Detailed Implementation Plan during the first year of Phase 4 funding.
2. Prepare Phase 4 Grant Application and Scope of Work for consideration and action by the Partnership. This includes working with the Partnership and the STC to prepare a grant application and scope of work and a decision by the Partnership regarding whether or not to pursue application for Phase 4 grant funding.

While the Partnership supported Grays Harbor County moving forward with the request during the January meeting, some members voiced concerns about Phase IV and the obligation it may impose on their respective organizations. The STC will try to include, and if possible address, those concerns while developing the Scope of Work.

#### Salmon Recovery

Napier reported that circumstances would prevent the project from following the work plan presented during the January meeting. Now the revisions to the strategy will focus on addressing comments from the Salmon Recovery Funding Board’s technical panel. This will include assessing the stock status and determining local priorities, revisiting geographic boundaries, and reexamining the hierarchical strategy to prioritize projects.

#### US Army Corps of Engineers

**Centralia Project-** This project received approximately \$80,000 this fiscal year (FY). The Chiefs Report was forwarded to Head Quarters, but funding was not appropriated to continue the project into the Preliminary Engineering and Design Phase. This project is not currently in the President's budget for FY06. Flood Damage Reduction Projects for this area ranked low in a National Assessment used this year by the Corps to prioritize projects for funding - this is primarily due to the lower population base in the northwest.

**Ecosystem Project-** This project identifies habitat forming processes and functions that are diminished in the Basin, and then formulates methods to recover those areas. \$ 340,000 was awarded to the project last year and again this fiscal year. After “Savings and Slippage” (a process where projects called out as line items in the Presidents Budget are funded), left approximately \$270,000 for the study this fiscal year. The Corps Project Manager, Lori Morris, proposed to use the appropriated money via a contract to help with the Corps reporting requirements and to

continue to prioritize areas for restoration, and to identify activities that will achieve this restoration. This will keep the pot of money more secure because the Corps internal processes allow for projects to borrow from other projects for unsecured portions of their funding. Nationally this area ranked very well for ecosystem restoration and lower for flood damage reduction.

**The next meeting of the Chehalis Basin Partnership will be held on March 25, 2005 from 9:30 to 12:00 a.m. at the Lucky Eagle Casino near Oakville.**

**Decisions**

- The group agreed to send a letter of support for Grays Harbor County’s application to the Terry Husseman Account.
- The group agreed to add as a regular agenda item, progress reports regarding the Annual Plan of Work.
- The group supported the list of projects as presented by USFWS for the Chehalis Fisheries Restoration Program.
- The group supported the STC continuing to work to develop tasks associated with implementation of the objectives.
- or County moving forward with the request to amend the Phase III grant.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Attendance Record	
Commissioner Beerbower	Grays Harbor County
Lee Napier	Grays Harbor County
Craig Swanson	Lewis County
Mark Swartout	Thurston County
Mark White	Chehalis Tribe
Art Lehman	Ports
Charles Caldwell	Port of Grays Harbor
Kahle Jennings	City of Centralia
Lisa Scott	City of Aberdeen
John Penberth	Town of Pe Ell
Patrick Wiltzius	City of Chehalis
Jim Haslett	City of Napavine
Terry Willis	Grays Harbor CAC member
Chanele Holbrook Shaw	Thurston County CAC member
Lyle Hojum	Lewis County CAC member
Jim Hill	Lewis County CAC member
Ann Wick	WA ST Department of Agriculture
Steve Craig	Department of Ecology
Lonnie Crumley	Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force
Ron Mauel	Lewis County Farm Bureau
Bruce Jones	Quinault Indian Nation
Brian Peck	USFWS
Taylor Pittman	USFWS
Lori Morris	US ACE