

# *Chehalis Basin Partnership*

---

## Meeting Summary – July 28, 2006

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

#### *Introductions*

Chair Bonnie Canaday welcomed everyone and opened the meeting. She asked everyone to introduce themselves. Twelve of the Partnership's twenty-eight member organizations had a representative or an alternate at the meeting. Nine additional citizens, alternates, or visitors were at the meeting. See attendance list on the last page of this summary.

Napier asked the group if they would consider recording the meetings. She was contacted by Petra Shenk, a linguistic anthropologist doing research on how people make decisions in a variety of social and interactional contexts. Petra purchased a digital voice recorder to compile the data if Napier will record the various meetings of the Partnership and its committees. We may keep the recorded once the research is complete. Napier may use the recorder to help with meeting summaries. Occasionally, she finds it difficult to interact with the group and summarize the outcome.

A comment was made that recording the group discussions may compromise the typically free flowing discussions. Members of the group shared that many of their discussions are typically recorded. Another comment related to respecting individuals privacy during the research. Napier will follow up with Petra regarding distribution of the research data. *Response from Petra- ... "In terms of privacy, my research has to be approved by the UC Committee for Human Subjects. Approval is contingent on my ability to demonstrate that I can and will protect the identities of all participants..."*

The group agreed to allow recording of their meetings for the purpose of data collection.

#### *Chehalis Basin Watershed Festival*

Napier reported that Ginger Burrier, Inside Source Event Management spent time contacting vendors and/or festival participants during June and July. She put together a vendor invite letter and plans to send that out to 30 potential vendors at the end of July. Ginger plans to confirm the final schedule, prepare and distribute press releases, contact the school, and develop crisis management and communication plans during the month of August.

Kahle asked if vendors included groups intending to sell their merchandise. If they are, then they may need a business license from the city.

Kahle added that the City of Centralia plans to dedicate the Chehalis River Discovery Trail that same day. The City will have their trolley available to transport people from the festival to the trail. At the trail, people can walk the 1 mile riparian buffer planted by the Chehalis Basin Education Consortium.

The working committee plans to meet August 4<sup>th</sup> at 9am at the Riverside Park in Centralia.

The group again discussed requesting the member organizations to proclaim September 18<sup>th</sup> as Chehalis Watershed Week. Napier volunteered to contact or meet with the counties and/or cities, but due to conflicting meeting dates, she requested some help. She will draft a sample proclamation for circulation.

#### *Monthly River Flow Report*

Jennings reviewed the flow charts he created for this month's report. The graphs describe real time data from the USGS gage sites at the Newaukum River near Chehalis, Skookumchuck near Bucoda, Chehalis River near Grand Mound, Chehalis at Porter, Satsop River near Satsop, Wynoochee River above Save Creek near Aberdeen, and Humptulips River below Highway 10 near Humptulips. The graphs show the regulatory flow, the actual flow, and the median flows for the 15<sup>th</sup> day of the month, measured the flow in cubic feet and described discharge.

This month, the Satsop site is the only site not meeting minimum flows.

Jim Hill asked for the graph included in this month's report. The graph shows a groundwater well in the Scatter Creek area. The graph depicts a steady decline in flow. The data source for this graph is the USGS website for station #465033122570202.

A question was asked if temperature rises with low flows? Generally yes, but we are not monitoring for temperatures.

Someone also asked Kahle to produce a daily flow report for the month. He will attempt to produce an easy to ready format for the group.

Bruce told the group that the Quinault Indian Nation initiated discussions with Department of Ecology regarding how they will manage flows. The discussion should include input from the CBP. Steve Craig invited Tom Loranger to meet with the STC on August 3<sup>rd</sup>.

## **B. SPECIAL PROJECTS**

#### *Watershed Planning-Phase IV*

Napier distributed copies of the revised Draft 2007-2008 Detailed Implementation Plan, Version 2. She reviewed the changed for the group since the last meetings of the CBP and STC.

- The title was changed to reflect an adaptive management approach, which is described on page 8.
- Figures 1 and 2 and Table 1 were added to show how the DIP coordinates with the watershed plan and the flow for develop, review, and adoption process.
- The group was asked to review the introductory paragraphs for the 5 DIP strategies located on pages 12, 16, 21, 27 and 37.
- The text for Interim Milestone 1.1 was altered by the STC.
- During their review, the STC noted a need for coordination between interim milestones. When applicable a special note was added at the end of each interim milestone.
- The text for Interim Milestone 2.3 was altered by the STC.
- The text for Interim Milestone 3.2 was altered by the STC. They also added four tasks.

The next step(s) will include one more edit by the STC. The group will discuss the document during the August 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting.

Comments from the group:

- Can John put together a summary table to highlight who agreed to be an Interim Milestone Participant? This would help to show who's on point for each milestone.
- Did the report identify the costs associated with each task? No, most projects were not developed to that level of detail. Some interim milestones include development of a scope of work which could include a cost estimate.
- What is the adoption process? The CBP can adopt the DIP.
- Will this DIP be amended in the near future? The STC discussed this at their last meeting and suggested included an adaptive management approach, found on page 7. The STC also thought DIP updates would fit nicely with the annual plan of work.

The Draft DIP is available electronically from Lee. She will circulate copies to the STC after the meeting. She will also circulate copies to the workshop participants and invitees.

The CBP will receive the final draft at the August meeting. The goal is to adopt the DIP on September 22<sup>nd</sup>. In the interim, CBP members are expected to brief their constituents between now and the September meeting.

#### *Watershed Council Grant*

Napier reported for Lee Daneker that the project is going well and will be completed with a final report in September.

The STC will have drafts of the two deliverables to look over the STC meeting on Aug 3<sup>rd</sup>. Deliverable 1, the table of water systems with surplus and deficit rights estimated and Deliverable 2, options concerning surplus rights and instream flows.

Deliverable 1 -- the table -- will cover about 40 systems – those that have submitted Water System Plans. This covers all the larger systems (about 10 with over 1000 connections) and some of the smaller systems. The project looked at about 110 systems but the smaller systems generally do not have to submit plans. NOTE: the table is the required deliverable. The data sheets were extras that Lee Daneker thought would be useful in doing outreach to the providers.

Deliverable 2 – the options. Daneker advised the CBP to not expect much can be done to benefit streamflows. The CBP really doesn't have much leverage on surplus rights.

Napier reminded the Partnership that they asked the STC to review a draft letter for the purpose of sending it to the 40 systems identified by Daneker. The letter asked the water system operators to verify the accuracy of their rights information and offers them the opportunity to provide any additional information that will help the Partnership to understand their particular situation. The letter must go out right after the STC meeting on the 3<sup>rd</sup> in order to give them a chance to respond and to give Daneker a chance to incorporate their information. If the Partnership agrees, then Napier will send out the letters after the STC meeting. The group received a copy of the draft letter.

Comments from the group:

- If the data sheets contain erroneous information will it be corrected? The information came from the WRATS or water system plans. If it is wrong it would be up to the purveyor. The letter will reflect this concern.
- Primary purpose to let us know if the information is correct? If that's the situation, then the current text should be moved to the front of the letter.
- If there is conflict between WRATS and WSP, which is included in the data summary? Generally WRATS is more current. The demand projections are from WSP. Water right information is from WRATS.
- Should be examining actual use and projected water demand verses water rights; however, the law requires us to examine the inchoate water rights.

Daneker will brief the Partnership on the project at their August meeting. Napier reminded the group that they were scheduled to approval the SRFB regional habitat project list and the DIP at the September meeting.

*Salmon Recovery*

Napier announced that the Coastal Region lead entity coordinators continued meeting to discuss funding allocations from the SRFB, the intraregional distribution of the funds, and a scope of work to build capacity for the region to continue regional discussions.

The current proposal for distribution of the SRFB regional allocation includes two options with a weighting scheme for the criteria. The criteria includes number of WRIAs, stream and nearshore/estuary miles, SaSI stock status, historical funding, and ESA listings. Under either scenario, the Chehalis will receive between \$500,000 and \$550,000 in funding.

Currently the Chehalis list includes the next three projects from the 2005 SRFB project list. The projects are Rabbit and Peterson Creek Barrier Corrections and the Decker Creek Acquisition. The total project cost is over a million dollars. Unless Napier can acquire additional money from the other coastal lead entities, the Peterson Creek project will be dropped from the list.

Napier discussed a draft letter she is preparing with input from the other lead entity coordinators. The SRFB encouraged the two regions, not currently under the umbrella of a regional organization, to develop a request for capacity funding from the SRFB. The coast proposal includes hiring a facilitator to convene meetings and to help stakeholder develop a vision for operation of the coasts salmon recovery/sustainability program. The proposal would include funds to cover the cost associated with the lead entity coordinator participation in regional activities. The funding from WDFW would be reserved for the lead entity functions which are primarily the development of a habitat project list for SRFB.

*Supplemental Funding Requests*

Napier stated that the group needed to finalize a scope of work for the \$75,000 appropriated by the legislators. The money became available July 1. During several STC meetings, the group discussed ways to use the money. Options included money for outreach, project management and watershed plan implementation.

Last month, Napier mentioned one watershed plan implementation option, development of a Coordinated Water Quality Monitoring program. She presented a scope developed by Randy Lehr

of Grays Harbor College. There is some interest in pursuing this program because in recent months, Napier received several calls from various parties asking for opportunities to implement projects. The individuals were looking for projects as a way to settle a fine or lawsuit primarily related to water quality impairments. If a coordinated water quality monitoring program were established, mitigation penalties might be a way to fund the program while also implementing the action of the watershed plan and the DIP for the TMDL.

Since last month, an opportunity for funding was presented and awarded by Department of Ecology. Reacting to the very small window of opportunity, Steve Craig put together a proposal for funding this water quality coordination piece. Ecology awarded \$112,000 to the program. The money is available in August and must be spent by June 30, 2007. The College is still interested in assuming the lead for water quality coordination in the basin. A working group, convened by Napier and Craig, met twice to further flesh out the parameters for this program. The group includes representatives of both tribes, Centralia, Lewis Conservation District, and Ecology.

Napier still needs input to develop a scope of work for the legislative appropriation. To date many possible components for this funding were covered by unanticipated "windfalls" of money. She still suggests a portion for outreach (\$10k), staff support for the CBP (\$20k), and the balance \$45K for project implementation. One implementation task might include Phase III of the Municipal Water Rights Analysis project previously mentioned. This additional phase would include a review of the results of the Municipal Water Rights analysis project (Draft DIP page 14) and other available information to identify priority areas where a hydraulic continuity study(ies) would have the greatest potential to provide information that might lead to instream flow augmentation. In connection with this, do a search to identify what if any hydraulic continuity studies have been done in the basin in connection with specific projects or water rights. This project will have a GIS component and potentially a role for the GIS Clearinghouse Coordinator.

Patrick announced that the City of Chehalis settled a recent water quality dispute. Part of that resolution included contributing \$32,500 towards the basin water quality monitoring program.

#### *2003 Revisions to the Water Quality Standards Regulations*

Napier announced that EPA disapproved parts of Ecology's water quality standards because they do not go far enough under the Clean Water Act to protect salmon. The state has the opportunity to fix the deficiencies by adopting revisions to its standards. Ecology is proposing a new set of rules to address the use designation and temperature issues needed to gain EPA approval. Some of the changes include:

Ecology scheduled hearings for the proposed rule changes. On August 7<sup>th</sup> Napier intends to attend the Olympia workshop. Ecology staff agreed to meet with the Water Quality Committee on August 10<sup>th</sup> in Montesano.

#### *Presentation-Chehalis River Council (CRC) Volunteer Water Quality Monitoring Program*

Volunteers with the CRC have been monitoring streams in the upper Chehalis Basin since 2002. Their objectives are to increase understanding of water quality and ecological conditions in rural streams in the Chehalis Basin, and to provide educational opportunities for volunteers. The program is closely tied to monitoring by schools in the basin and was partially funded by a grant from the Department of Ecology.

Monitoring sites included Elk Creek near Doty, the South Fork Chehalis River near Boistfort, the South Fork Newaukum River upstream of Onalaska, and the Middle Fork Newaukum River. These sites represent a range of rural land uses and riparian conditions. Each year they sampled once during a winter storm, once between storms, and once in the late summer/early fall. Professional methods to measure water temperature, dissolved oxygen, conductivity, pH, fecal coliform, streamflow, benthic macroinvertebrates, sediment characteristics, and riparian tree canopy.

A copy of Rob's presentation is attached to this summary.

**C. Open Comment-None**

**The next meeting of the Chehalis Basin Partnership will be held on August 25, 2006 and begins at 9:30 AM at the Lucky Eagle Casino near Oakville.**

**Decisions**

- **Agreed to allow Napier to record the meetings for the purpose of data collection.**
- **Concurrence to continue working on all five topics mentioned under Special Projects.**

Chehalis Basin Partnership Attendance Record	
Lee Napier	Grays Harbor County
Mark Swartout	Thurston County
Bob Fink	Mason County
Kernen Lien	Lewis County
Terry Harris	City of Chehalis
Patrick Wiltzius	City of Chehalis
Kahle Jennings	City of Centralia
Bonnie Canaday	City of Centralia
Mark White	Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation
Art Lehman	Port of Centralia
Terry Willis	Grays Harbor County CAC member
Chanele Holbrook-Shaw	Lewis County CAC member
Ann Wick	Department of Agriculture
Steve Craig	Department of Ecology
Annette Grainger	Weyerhaeuser
Bruce Jones	Quinalt Indian Nation
Rob Schanz	Chehalis River Council
Margaret Rader	Chehalis River Council
Brian Peck	USFWS
Jerry Louthain	HDR
Lew Pumphrey	Vidette