



Chehalis Basin Partnership

Meeting Summary – March 25, 2005

A. GENERAL PARTNERSHIP BUSINESS

Introduction

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

Jim Haslett asked the new people to introduce themselves. Jerry Louthain, Mike Rhubright and Samantha Fleischner introduced themselves.

Identify special issues of concern and adjust agenda

Guy McMinds would like to hear more discussion from the group regarding their concerns obligations. Swartout responded that the group should be discussing the Phase IV draft statement of work during the months of April, May and possibly June.

McMinds is concerned about trust water rights. Specifically he is concerned about capping Indian rights, while other rights may not be capped. The Quinault Indian Nation is discussing these issues with Ecology through government to government consultation. As the population grows, we need to plan for that growth, which would include biologically sound components such as storage. He thinks it's important to focus on population growth and the various uses that population would demand for water. He views the Plan 2 Fund as a tool to help resolve his concerns.

Haslett responded that he appreciated Guy's comments. He hopes that through this group we can continue to identify respective issues and discuss as a group possible solutions. Hill added that he thought Plan 2 Fund would allow the group to meet many obligations for Detailed Implementation Plan requirements of Phase IV.

McMinds is also concerned about user pays obligations. We need to carefully frame these types of issues with solutions. Haslett thinks they share the same concerns.

Bruce Jones added that we could, through the Partnership, have the opportunity to manage the watershed, but it would be through embracement of obligations that we impose upon ourselves.

John Mudge circulated a letter dated March 5, 2005 about this subject. He shared concerns with the group that this issue (water quantity) faces Lewis County. In his community, there is an urgency because the absence of water allocations to cover the demand. He thinks this issue needs to be address through implementation of watershed management plan actions. In particular he mentioned recommendation 2. The letter is attached.

Correction to meeting summary

Napier distributed a correct meeting summary for February. She was contacted by John Penberth, who pointed out errors in the summary. They included no reference to comments made by him opposing Phase IV and no mention of the Corps of Engineers report. Napier advised the group that the summaries were not verbatim. She is not able to present, participate, and record simultaneously. If someone would like some specifically stated for the record, they should preface their statement with that type of comment. She also asked the group to add additions or corrects as they deemed necessary to the meeting summary. Regarding the February summary, she noted that the Corps report was omitted from the first version. She also asked if the group wanted comments regarding Phase IV added. No one requested additions or further corrections.

Napier asked members to consider inviting Steve Craig to visit their communities and share one on one. This will help Steve to not only understand the issues facing the communities, but to also help him in provide guidance as a state agency liaison. Haslett asked Steve to visit Napavine.

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. They are working to develop language for tasks that he hopes will address McMind's concerns.

This group meets monthly on the first Thursday.

Water Quality Committee

Napier reported for Willis who was unable to attend the meeting. Napier reported that the committee met on March 10, 2005. They discussed the draft Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP). Members shared various concerns with the project. Some were concerned that because the document encouraged different levels of data collection standards it would send the wrong message. A suggestion was made to develop two separated QAPPS to avoid this confusion. The group then discussed the need to reconsider what elements would be in the QAPP. Rountry shared that this was meant to be more than a QAPP. It was meant to be a comprehensive guidance document to encourage a variety of monitoring activities. It was meant to encourage all levels of monitoring ranging from volunteers to the rigorous monitoring of agencies. At that point the group wondered if they had come full circle with respect to where they wanted to go from their starting point which was the December 2003 Tetra Tech report.

Napier and Rountry shared the group's comments with Kahle Jennings, the lead author. Jennings will try to revise the document and present it to the group at their next meeting. He will refocus the project by using the Tetra Tech report and then supplement that work with guidance for monitoring and less QAPP. The next meeting will be April 14, 2005.

Citizens' Advisory Committee

Chanele Holbrook reported that she is still trying to rejuvenate the CAC. A suggestion was made to hold a Saturday meeting. The members cannot attend during the day. She would like suggestion to keep people involved and informed. She would like to participate in local events. She would like help developing a visual add that she could present at events. This could be a display that would be manned or unmanned.

Other Business

Annual Plan of Work (APOW)-Membership

Napier reminded the group that the APOW, for the month of March, included review of membership and membership participation. Napier checked the membership attendance record and found three types of issues. There are some positions that are vacant (Hoquiam and Pe Ell), some group that have not attended, and one group (business) that has never had an appointment. Both Hoquiam and Pe Ell are trying to located replacements. The group asked Napier to contact the groups with frequent absences.

B. Special Presentation-Water Conservancy Boards from Thurston and Lewis Counties

Mike Rhubright reviewed the Thurston County Water Conservancy Boards composition and general operations. In 1997 the Legislature authorized creation of water conservancy boards under [Chapter 90.80 RCW \(Water Conservancy Boards\)](#) to enable the processing of water-right transfer and change applications at the local level. This legislation allows counties to establish water conservancy boards as independent units of local government through resolution of the county or counties that it serves and approval by the Department of Ecology (Ecology). All water conservancy board decisions are ultimately reviewed and affirmed, reversed, or modified by Ecology.

Water conservancy boards consist of three or five commissioners. Thurston County has a five commissioner board. All board commissioners must receive training from Ecology before participating in any decision on a water-right transfer application. A water conservancy board can serve a single watershed, multiple watersheds, a county, or multiple counties. In the Chehalis Basin, the board serves a county. There are currently 21 water conservancy boards operating in Washington.

The boards can reduce the review time because they are located in the community and have a reduce work load. The cost associated is \$1,450 which covers the costs associated with processing. Errors and omissions provisions are provided to the board to cover liability for their volunteers.

Ron Mauel shared Lewis County Water Conservancy Board operations. Lewis was one of the first boards in the state. The five members are appointed to 6-year terms. They can work on water right certificate transfers (change of withdrawal or transferring right to someone else), but cannot issue new water rights. They also do not work with tribal water rights. He shared a report of examination with the group.

They charge \$500 for application fees. The fees are used for the administrative costs of operating the board. The costs include documentation preparation and reproduction, publishing public notices, insurance, meeting space, and travel reimbursement. The board members serve without compensation.

Summary of questions from the group- Holbrook asked if a developer purchased agricultural land would they be required to acquire the water right or can they just drill six-pack wells? The water right generally stays with the land and the wells can be drilled, which leaves the right available for transfer. In Thurston County, the long term agriculture lands would not be developed and they no longer allow 6-pack wells.

Jennings asked if their decisions had to be consistent with watershed management plans. They need to be consistent with state law and consider watershed management plans.

Do you encourage conservation? Yes, but it's a double edge sword because if a farmer conserves water they may fall under the relinquishment program-5-years use it or lose it. This creates a conflict for property owners when they try to be a good steward of the land by changing their water usage to accommodate conditions such as drought. This type of individual needs some assurance to protect their interest while trying to be a good steward. The other option for conservation is to place an under used portion of the water right into trust.

How do you manage the data? If you are interested in a plat, then your source is the county, while the state maintains some data related to water rights.

For information about the Thurston County Board, you can get on an e-mail distribution list or check the website tcwcb.org.

How many applications do you have pending? 1 in Lewis County and 10-12 in Thurston County, but they are not all in the Chehalis Basin.

C. SPECIAL PROJECTS

Plan 2 Fund

Napier distributed two documents. A copy of the STC's draft list of proposed tasks completed during the March meeting. During the month of April, the STC will continue to refine this work with the intent of reporting back to the CBP during April and May. Considering the number of tasks associated with the seventeen objectives, the group was encouraged to review the list and attend an STC meeting or share comments with a committee member.

The STC asked Napier to begin consolidating the pieces of their work. This would include merging the goals, objectives, and tasks into one reporting format. She handed out an example to the group.

The group supported the STC continuing to work on this project. They expect to hear further reports on the progress of the Plan 2 Fund work and also a draft scope of work for Phase IV during April.

Salmon Recovery

Napier announced that the TAG would begin meeting monthly on the second Friday of each month. Bob Amrine agreed to be the chairman for the group. We will meet at 9:30 at the Conservation District Office, in Lewis County 1554 Bishop Road. The agenda for the next meeting will include sharing information about upcoming SRFB projects and timeline and a status report from Mason Conservation District related to the barrier assessment work.

Letters of Intent (LOI) are mandatory and due May 6 to the Lead Entity. The TAG will discuss the LOI during the May 13 monthly meeting.

Proposed changes to this SRFB round include submitting draft applications for review and input by the TAG. Beginning in June, sponsors will submit their draft applications to Napier electronically by June 3. The group will discuss during the monthly meeting and provide feedback to sponsors.

The second draft will be due to Napier June 30. The final application will be due to the lead entity at the end of August.

She is still looking for project sponsors. This commitment will include site visits the week of May 16. This is mandatory for project sponsors. The project review will take place during the second week of September. The CBP will review the list during the monthly meeting on September 23.

Chehalis Watershed Cross Program Team Roster

Craig distributed a Chehalis Watershed Cross Program Team roster, dated March 2005. He put this together to try and share program contacts and responsibilities for work in the Chehalis Basin watershed. He hopes this will help the CBP and the Department to understand who is working on what in the basin.

The next meeting of the Chehalis Basin Partnership will be held on April 22, 2005 from 9:30 to 12:00 a.m. at the Lucky Eagle Casino near Oakville.

Decisions

- The CBP asked Napier and Swartout to contact absent membership groups.
- The CBP supported the STC continuing work to develop tasks.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Attendance Record	
Commissioner Beerbower & Lee Napier	Grays Harbor County
Commissioner Graham & Craig Swanson	Lewis County
Mark Swartout	Thurston County
Charles Caldwell	Port of Grays Harbor
Kahle Jennings	City of Centralia
Lisa Scott	City of Aberdeen
Patrick Wiltzius	City of Chehalis
Robert Cross	City of Hoquiam
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
Chad Stussy	WDFD
Lonnie Crumley	Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force
Ron Mauel	Lewis County Farm Bureau
Bruce Jones	Quinalt Indian Nation
Mike Rhubright	Thurston County Conservancy Board
Jerry Louthain	Thurston County Conservancy Board
Mike McGinnis	Skillings, Connally, Inc.
Samantha Fleischner	Citizen
John Mudge	Citizen of Lewis County
Karl Johnson	Gray & Osborne Inc.