



Chehalis Basin Partnership

Meeting Summary – January 28, 2005

A. GENERAL PARTNERSHIP BUSINESS

Introduction

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

Steering/Technical Advisory Committee

The Steering/Technical Committee met twice during the month and worked on developing material that will be discussed later in this meeting.

Water Quality Committee

The Water Quality Committee did not meet. The next meeting will be February 10, 2005.

Citizens' Advisory Committee

No report

Other Business

Ecology's new representative to the Partnership

Napier reported on a meeting with Paula Ehlers, Department of Ecology, regarding Ecology's replacement, for Kahle Jennings, to the Partnership. During the meeting, Swartout and Napier discussed concerns that Jennings departure created. Historically Ecology provided a considerable amount of administrative support to the Partnership. This included preparing meeting summaries, monthly meeting mailing, participation in Partnership meetings, and an advocate for Partnership issues at a state level. At this time, Ecology cannot fill the vacancy. 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. To help with this situation, recipients of Partnership meeting materials were asked to advise Napier if they wished to receive information. This request also asked if people would be willing to receive electronic copies. Beginning in February, more people will receive the meeting materials electronically. This will reduce the costs associated with copying and mailing.

Meeting location(s)

Napier reported that we will continue to use the Lucky Eagle, but if another group needs the Chehalis Room we will use the Events Hall. She will put up signs if the location is moved.

B. SPECIAL PROJECTS

Watershed Plan Implementation

Napier distributed handouts that included the decision rules, a model to prioritize the objectives, and three pages that describe the application of the model. Working with the Environmental Finance Center (EFC), the STC developed decision rules designed to help the group to prioritize objectives from the Watershed Management Plan. She reviewed the rules with the group.

Spahr asked why the range column had different values for each decision rule. Since each decision rule is applied independently, the STC assigned a separate value. In the application of the rules, the STC reviewed each objective and assigned a value from the range for each decision rule.

Wick asked about weighting the decision rules. The weighting would be used to determine the overall score for each objective and would allow the group to place a value on the rules if deemed applicable. Once the scores were tallied, the objectives would then be prioritized in ascending order based on a numerical score.

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. The results of this application are shown on the handout. The group noted that this application did alter the ranking slightly.

The group was asked to comment on the decision rules. Wick asked if public support was a component of the rules. Public support can be addressed by rule #2 that asks if the objective meets planning goals. The Plan has goals that encourage public support. Haslett added that Partnership members are either elected official or appointed to represent the public interests. The question was raised about public support for a localized project and how that would be reflected in the rules. The rules do not specifically address a localized effort, however, that can be addressed through the general goals or the public involvement goals.

The group supported the concept of decision rules and directed the STC to continue work with this set of rules.

The group was asked for comments regarding the weighting of the rules. Haslett suggested the STC weight the rules according to the have to do objectives (rule #5) verses the like to do objectives. Hill suggested a dual ranking for the have to do and the like to do objectives.

Swanson liked this model as a planning tool because it's a tool that the group can modify in the future as the group's needs change.

Wiltzius asked about the discrepancy between the number of planning components and the number of goals. We have four planning components-water quantity, water quality, habitat, and instream flow. At the time we developed our plan goals, our plan did not include instream flow. However, we did include general goals and public involvement goals in addition to water quantity, water quality, and habitat.

The group supported the STC continuing to work with this model and requested the STC explore alternative weighting schemes to the rules. The next STC meeting would be February 3, 2005.

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 would like 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.

The Partnership supported Grays Harbor County moving forward with the request to amend the Phase III grant.

Salmon Recovery

Napier presented a slide show to the Partnership describing the current Lead Entity program and proposal to update the local strategy.

The Chehalis Basin Lead Entity program for salmonids habitat restruction began in 2000. Since its inception, the program has helped many project receiving funding through the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB). As part of that program, the Conservation Commission developed the Limiting Factors Analysis (LFA). The LFA set the ground work to develop the local strategy, Chehalis Basin Salmon Habitat Restoration and Preservation Work Plan. The local strategy is used to identify and rank projects for consideration by SRFB and other habitat restoration programs.

She discussed the next steps for the local program which includes working with the Corps on the ecosystem restoration project, continue to develop projects for SRFB, continue to develop habitat restoration projects for other grant sources, and update the local strategy. Regarding the strategy update, she needs people willing to commit to attend multiple workshops (March –May), people available to provide the information necessary to understand the needs and ultimately the priorities of the Basin, and people willing to review and comment on the draft documents.

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

Decisions

- The group supported the STC continuing to work with the decision rules and the model and requested the STC explore alternative weighting schemes to the rules.
- The Partnership supported Grays Harbor 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
Harry Pickernell	Chehalis Tribe
Art Lehman	Ports
Bonnie Canaday	City of Centralia
Kahle Jennings	City of Centralia
Bob Spahr	City of Chehalis
Patrick Wiltzius	City of Chehalis
Bob Cross	City of Hoquiam
Jim Haslett	City of Napavine
Ron Schillinger	City of Montesano
Chanele Holbrook Shaw	Thurston County Citizen Advisory Committee member
Jim Hill	Lewis County Citizen Advisory Committee member
Chanele Holbrook-Shaw	Thurston County Citizen Advisory Committee member
Ann Wick	WA ST Department of Agriculture
Chad Stussy	WA ST Department of Fish and Wildlife
Lonnie Crumley	Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force
Bruce Jones	Quinault Indian Nation
John Mudge	Citizen, Lewis County
Mildred Lehman	Citizen