



Chehalis Basin Partnership

Meeting Summary – May 20, 2005

A. GENERAL PARTNERSHIP BUSINESS

Introduction

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

Jim Haslett asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Committee Reports

Steering Technical Committee

Mark Swartout reported that the STC met once during the month and focused on developing the presentation for the Phase IV discussion later in the meeting. They also spent time revising the work plan for Action 54.

This group generally meets from 10 until 3 on the first Thursday of each month. For June, the group will change the meeting time to 9am and try to finish around noon.

Water Quality

Terry Willis reported that the group met this month and discussed the Coordinated Water Quality Monitoring Program. Kahle Jennings presented new information related to this project. He will attend the next meeting and share the revisions with the group. The group hopes to have the document ready for presentation, and eventually consideration, by the CBP in July.

This group meets monthly on the second Thursday from 9:30 to 12:00 at the County's Forestry Building in Montesano.

Citizen Advisory Report

Chanele Holbrook Shaw reported that she spent time meeting with Taylor Pittman, USFWS, Steve Craig, Department of Ecology, Lee Napier, and Margaret Radar, Chehalis River Council, to discuss possible outreach opportunities and tools. She plans to continue to work with Taylor to develop the tools. Then present this work to the CAC for feedback. She hopes that members of the CAC can attend public forums and use the new "tools" as part of an education outreach campaign for the watershed and the work of the CBP.

Annual Plan of Work

Lee Napier announced that the membership list and operating procedures manuals are now posted on Grays Harbor County's website http://www.co.grays-harbor.wa.us/info/pub_svcs/ChehalisBasin/Index.html

She also updated the group regarding upcoming tasks from the annual plan of work. Under the special project section, the schedule shows entering tasks by the STC and Water Quality Committee as complete by the end of June. The group may not make this deadline, but should remain close to the schedule because most of the work is done in draft form. The work plan tasks still need the consent of the CBP. The schedule also shows implementation planning beginning in July. The schedule for this task appears to be on time because of the work done to date by the STC.

The Lead Entity schedule for salmon recovery is not accurate. Anyone working with this program should contact Lee for a revised schedule that correlates with the SRFB schedule recently released.

Regarding membership, Lee contacted the Council of Governments (COG) to ask Vicki Cummings if she could help to facilitate discussions between members of the COG and CBP. She would talk with her board members on May 26. Vicki could potentially provide some type of representation for many cities in Grays Harbor County, but the details would need to be worked out after the COG hears the information and makes a decision. Other inactive or vacant CBP positions include a business and a forestry representative, and several CAC positions.

B. SPECIAL PROJECTS

Phase IV Continued Discussion

Mark Swartout led this discussion which included a power point presentation. His presentation included the following points related to implementation options for the CBP to consider.

1. No Implementation

- Falls to state to manage the resources
- Original Partnership

2. Implementation with out Phase IV

- No state funding
- No Lead Agency (Grays Harbor County)
- No fiscal agent
- Demonstrate implementation
- Needs commitment to:
 - Organizational structure (facilitator, project manager, fiscal agent.
 - Provide administrative support for the CBP
 - Develop implementation plan
 - Funding to implement specific tasks
- Identify resources to implement the plan

3. Implementation with Phase IV

- Operating under the requirements of RCW 90.82
 - The requirements will be captured in the Statement of Work (SOW) grant contract
- Up to 5-years financial support. \$125,000 for three years and \$62,500 for two years.
- Detailed Implementation Plan within one year
- Lead Agency
 - Administrative Support
 - Fiscal Agent
- Obligation to implement

- Obligation only extends to a jurisdiction that agrees to the obligation.
- Depends on availability of funding
- Provides best structure for success
- GMA , WSP, other legal planning requirements are influenced by the Plan

At the end of the presentation he asked the group to answer the following questions:

- Are the benefits of local involvement in water resource management significant enough to implement this Plan? Yes or no
- Which option (with or without Phase IV) provides the best structure to successfully implement the Plan? Yes or no
- What do you want to see included in the SOW?

The group answered yes to the first two questions. Lee distributed a draft SOW and the group provided some input and then referred this on to the STC. The STC will present a revised SOW to the CBP in June.

Members of the group stressed the importance of attending next month's meeting since the group is considering a SOW for a grant contract. They asked members to call absent members and ask them to attend. Lee will put notes on the agenda to remind members to attend the next meeting.

Plan 2 Fund Update

Lee updated the group regarding the progress made on the work plans since the last meeting. The STC spent time revising the work plan for Action 54. This work plan is probably the most "polished" plan because the group has reviewed it several times. She distributed copies to the members. She asked for feedback regarding the two work plans included in the monthly meeting packet (Actions 1 and 36).

She briefly reviewed the history of the work plan concept for the group. The work plans represent the cumulative work of the STC to develop implementation plans for the actions contained in the watershed plan. In summary the steps taken by the STC include: classifying the actions from the watershed plan as either an objective or task; grouping the goals from the watershed plan with objectives (formerly actions); grouping tasks/actions with objectives; and creating tasks or borrowing language from the watershed plan supplement. When complete, the work plans will place each of the 56 accepted actions within an implementation work plan.

She asked the group to remember that the numbers associated with the tasks are not a ranking. The numbers are for reference sake only. She also added that this would not be the only opportunity for the Partnership to provide feedback. The STC will begin to more formally present the work plans to the Partnership during upcoming meetings.

The group directed the STC to continue their work towards developing draft implementation work plans.

Ecosystem Restoration Project

Lori Morris introduced her replacement, Laura Orr, who will take over as project manager after Lori leaves next month. The upcoming scope of work for this project includes awarding a contract to Tetra Tech who will help with the existing conditions report and the selection and review of restoration projects. The contractor will be working with the committee for this project. Guy McMinds commented that this project, as well as other restoration type projects, should integrate flood control with storage. He encouraged the group to consider innovative projects to harvest water for instream and out of stream use.

Flood Damage Control Project

Beth Coffey reported that the feasibility report is under review for budget consideration by the President. Design agreements are under development between the Corps and Lewis County.

C. Open Comment

Lori Morris thanked everyone for their support of her project over the years. The group wished her well.

It was suggested that the agenda include a time allowance for roundtable discussions to end the meeting. This was a component of earlier agenda and was removed to save time during busy meeting days. The group agreed it should be added to the agenda and encouraged members to share information related to projects or concerns from their areas.

The next meeting of the Chehalis Basin Partnership will be held on June 24, 2005 from 9:30 to 12:00 a.m. at the Lucky Eagle Casino near Oakville.

Decisions

- The CBP supported the STC developing a draft Scope of Work for a Phase IV grant contract.
- The CBP supported the STC continuing work to develop the work plans.
- The CBP supported adding time on the agenda for roundtable discussions by the members.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Attendance Record	
Lee Napier	Grays Harbor County
Commissioner Macleod & Mark Swartout	Thurston County
Mark White	Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis
Art Lehman	Port of Centralia
Kahle Jennings	City of Centralia
Patrick Wiltzius	City of Chehalis
Ron Schillinger	City of Montesano
Jim Haslett	City of Napavine
Terry Willis	Grays Harbor CAC member
Chanele Holbrook Shaw	Thurston County CAC member
Lyle Hojem and Jim Hill	Lewis County CAC member
Ann Wick	WA ST Department of Agriculture
Chad Stussy	Department of Fish and Wildlife
Lonnie Crumley	Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force
Bruce Jones	Quinault Indian Nation
Jim Jacobson	US ACE
Laura Orr	US ACE
Lori Morris	US ACE
Joe Caldwell	Quinault Indian Nation
Paula Ehlers	Department of Ecology
Samantha Fleischner	
Guy McMinds	Quinault Indian Nation