

**CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP**  
**Chehalis Tribe “Lucky Eagle” Casino**  
**Rochester, Washington**  
**October 27, 2006**  
**9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**

**Approved Meeting Summary**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Bonnie Canaday, Chair, City of Centralia  
Bob Beerbower, Grays Harbor County  
Ellie McMillian, Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force  
Ron Schillinger, City of Montesano  
Terry Willis, Citizen, Grays Harbor  
Mark White, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis

Steve Craig, Department of Ecology  
Bob Macleod, Thurston County  
Kernen Lien, Lewis County  
Lyle Hojem, Citizen Lewis County  
Chanele Holbrook-Shaw, Thurston County  
Ron Mauer, Lewis County Farm Bureau  
Bob Fink, Mason County

**ALTERNATE MEMBERS AND OTHERS PRESENT**

Kahle Jennings, City of Centralia  
Steve Kalinowski, Department of Fish & Wildlife  
Chad Stussy, Department of Fish & Wildlife  
Mark Swartout, Thurston County  
Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County  
Dave Burnett, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis  
Guy L. Capoeman, Quinault Indian Nation  
Bruce Jones, Quinault Indian Nation

Ann Wick, Department of Agriculture  
Ron Secena, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis  
Rick Anderson, HDR  
Petra Shenk, UCSB  
Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary, Puget Sound Meeting Services  
Brian Peck, US Fish & Wildlife Service  
Taylor Pittman, USFWS

**GENERAL PARTNERSHIP BUSINESS**

**Welcome, Introductions and Roundtable Comments**

Chair Canaday called the meeting to order at 9:33 a.m. Everyone present provided self-introductions.

**Identify Special Issues of Concern and Adjust Agenda**

Ms. Napier added a discussion about the Steering Technical Committee’s (STC) work with Charles Pitz from the Department of Ecology (DOE) on hydraulic continuity between groundwater and surface water.

**PRESENTATIONS**

**Salmon Escapement in the Chehalis Basin – A Brief Overview**

Ms. Napier referred to a request from the Partnership for periodic fish management reports. She introduced Curt Holt, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), who presented an overview of fish runs in the Chehalis Basin. The review involved Coho, Chum, and Chinook salmon.

Mr. Holt described the survey methods for estimating fish population, partners involved in surveying, identifying marks on fish to determine sex and species, how surveyors search for spawning grounds, spawning behaviors of each species, and amount and timing of spawning activity. Surveying considers population of both hatchery and wild fish. Spring, summer, and fall Chinook are determined by designating breakpoints through timing, geographic area, or condition of the fish.

**Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**October 27, 2006 Page 2 of 10**

Mr. Holt described the surveying process involving surveyors working every seven to ten days during the season and difficulties they encounter with weather, visibility and flow regimes.

Mr. Holt reviewed several handouts distributed during the review. The information covered, "2005 Chehalis Spring/Summer Chinook Escapement Estimate" and information by species on adult salmonid river entry and spawning timing from Raft River south to the upper Chehalis watersheds.

Mr. Holt welcomed members to attend survey training at Schaffer Park along the east fork of the Satsop River on November 16 at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Jennings asked how the escapement goal of 1,400 fish was established. Mr. Holt said the number was established by counting the number of females per mile. It is based on research studies of 30 to 35 fish per mile depending upon the habitat. Mr. Jennings asked if the number is sufficient to sustain the species. Mr. Jennings affirmed that is.

Mr. Schillinger inquired about the status of Coho salmon. Mr. Holt advised Coho runs are doing well and have done well over the last several years.

Mr. Holt addressed several questions about the validity of the survey methods by species and how fish population is dependent upon good habitat.

Mr. Jones asked whether there is bull trout in the upper watershed. He noted the fish are located in the lower end. Mr. Holt said he is not aware of any in the upper watershed. The department conducted a 15-year study on the West Hoquiam and tracked all fish that came through. There likely are populations of different species to some degree.

Ms. Willis asked whether there is a percentage of accuracy and nonaccuracy of the data collected. Mr. Holt replied that the surveys are completed each year in each index area. For example, if 10 streams are designated for a survey and only three are surveyed, a determination will be made on whether the fish is expanded to the streams that were not surveyed.

## **SPECIAL PROJECTS**

### **Watershed Plan Implementation – Phase IV**

- *Continue Discussion Regarding the Final Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP)*
- *Action by the CBP*

Ms. Napier updated members on the status of the DIP since the last meeting. The intent was to approve the DIP at the last meeting because of the contractual obligation to have the DIP completed and forwarded to the DOE. Because the DIP was not approved, an extension was requested from DOE until the end of December 2006. There were several comments from the Partnership as well as some letters from several members not in attendance. Members agreed to delay action on the DIP for one or two months, send a letter responding to the Quinault Indian Nation from the Chair, and possibly meet with the Quinault Indian Nation to discuss the issues addressed in the letter.

Guy Capoeman, Vice Chair, Quinault Indian Nation, reported the Quinault Indian Nation would like to present some issues and solutions to some of the questions raised in the letter regarding the DIP. The Quinault Indian Nation is a federally protected treaty right on the Chehalis Basin. In 1855, the tribe's

**Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**October 27, 2006 Page 3 of 10**

ancestors preserved the right to keep fishing. The treaty guaranteed the fishing right and because of the treaty, the Quinault Indian Nation has a water right that is senior to all other rights within the basin. The Quinault Indian Nation believes treaty rights are in jeopardy within the basin and that the withdrawals occurring within the basin are creating flows that are not healthy for fish. The citizens of the state would also be impacted as well.

As the plan acknowledges, there is insufficient water currently to meet both the needs of fish and existing water rights. The Quinault Indian Nation believes that by taking no action now, the problem will grow in the future. Development is likely to continue in the area and if the necessary steps are not taken to protect the resource in the long-term, it will affect everyone. Everyone has a responsibility to ensure that seven future generations have the resource and opportunity to fish and live. The DIP, as presently drafted, does not protect the resource.

Mr. Capoeman advised that the Quinault Indian Nation is recommending four solutions in the plan:

1. Recommend new instream flows that are based on credible science to protect fish.
2. Condition or mitigate all new withdrawals to meet scientifically-based flows and include a commitment to fish habitat restoration.
3. Petition DOE to adjudicate water rights within the basin.
4. Include measurable objectives, timelines, and a budget.

Mr. Capoeman stressed the Quinault Indian Nation's desire to work with the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) on the issues.

Mr. Swartout reported that as the Chair of the Steering Technical Committee (STC), he appreciates the participation by Mr. Jones, representing Quinault Indian Nation, at the STC meetings.

Mr. Swartout said when the watershed plan was adopted; there were a number of actions that leads to what is being requested of the Partnership. When the Phase IV grant was received for completing the DIP, the Partnership realized that not all the actions could be accomplished within one year. Consequently, an exercise was undertaken to prioritize the actions. The top five actions were selected for completion in this year's DIP with the understanding that after the DIP was adopted, the Partnership will apply for the next year's grant followed by completion of identified actions. Those actions include the instream flow work that is included within the watershed plan. The Quinault Indian Nation's additional solutions as previously stated will be covered in the next DIP.

The other issue of mitigating all new water withdrawals is already underway because the basin is closed and DOE currently requires mitigation for all new water rights issued in the basin.

Mr. Swartout referred to several funding sources to help fund the commitment to fish habitat restoration.

The adjudication of water rights is a huge issue, which is also an action item within the plan. The issue however, is listed at a lower priority due to the enormity and complexity of the issue and difficulty in attaining a consensus of the CBP. Some elements of adjudication will be based on what the state legislature passes regarding adjudication. Currently, the only way to convert a claim to a water right is through adjudication. There are many issues to resolve both within the Partnership for a consensus to move forward, as well as legislatively to change laws. Once these issues can be resolved, it is likely a more valuable discussion can occur on whether the CBP wants to promote the suggestions for the Chehalis Basin.

**Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**October 27, 2006 Page 4 of 10**

Mr. Swartout expressed appreciation to Mr. Capoeman for attending the meeting.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw reported there was some discussion at the STC meeting recognizing instream flows as a huge issue that should be addressed and resolved thoughtfully. The concept was addressed about focusing on the issue next year or rather than addressing five items the focus could be on two items to include instream flows. The issue relates more to timing rather than a forgotten priority.

Mr. Swartout advised that the STC is working to frame instream flows issues and met with DOE hydrologist Charles Pitz to help the committee model the basin to better understand the interaction between groundwater and surface water. The issue of addressing a number of priorities or one priority at a time has not been discussed with the Partnership.

Ms. Willis emphasized that the basin is a multi-faceted basin. Community issues - both city and rural, as well as, water and fish issues and how they all interact are all involved in the process. Changes to any of these factors will impact instream flows, wildlife, and communities. Everything is intermingled and decisions will affect everyone. The task is huge and the committees are working together to build a foundation to carry the process forward into instream flows and other issues. Unfortunately, it takes time, energy, and input from all parties, which often slows the process.

Mr. Schillinger echoed similar comments about the value of the Quinault Indian Nation's participation and input. The City of Montesano is concerned about the same issues within the basin, which is why the City is participating. There is a general consensus that a better job of understanding and working together is required to protect the resources. The monthly stream flow reports are very helpful to the Partnership.

Mr. Schillinger added that he often hikes and referred to rivers that are dependent upon glacier water. The Chehalis Basin does not depend on glacier water. At some point in the future, glacier water will no longer feed rivers and that everyone should be appreciative of the basin as a natural resource that needs to be properly managed.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw reported one of the side ventures the Partnership is working on as well is grant funding for projects based on habitat. One big issue acknowledged by the Partnership is that it is critical to protect the resource and that waiting while further degradation occurs is not prudent. The basin is in relatively good shape and it's important to focus on preservation instead of restoration. There are key correlations between water and instream flows. If more areas are protected in its current state, that will help in the long-term to protect habitat as well as water and water resources.

Mr. Craig expressed appreciation for the Quinault Indian Nation's participation. Everyone recognizes that the bottom line is to protect and enhance a whole range of natural resources within the watershed. By working together cooperatively, it will be possible to do a better job than working independently or separately. The synergy created thus far is beneficial. He said he hopes the synergy will expand and enhance as the process moves forward.

Mr. Craig reported the DOE has government-to-government relations with the 29 tribes in the state. A meeting is scheduled next week with the Quinault Indian Nation. DOE is also working with the Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis. There are a significant number of interruptible water rights within the Chehalis Basin. The DOE is currently reviewing the water rights and is interested in establishing a management team/action plan to manage instream flows more aggressively. The DOE will be working with the Partnership and the tribes. Additionally, DOE stands ready to adjudicate and approach the Legislature to

**Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**October 27, 2006 Page 5 of 10**

seek funding if there is general support in pursuing action. There are concerns that have been voiced and the department wants to ensure a cooperative effort when moving forward to seek funding.

Mr. Craig commented on the fish count benchmarks and indicated it may be possible to increase fish numbers and that more efforts should be made to increase fish within the system. However, it must occur hand-in-hand with habitat. The carrying capacity for a larger population of fish directly relates to the capacity of the habitat to accommodate the population. The U.S. Corps of Engineers has indicated some interest in pursuing some watershed restoration. There have been some discussions. The DOE has also had conversations with the United States Geological Survey (USGS) relative to the department's work in performing some front-end analysis on the dynamic involved in the relationship between groundwater and surface water and what the entire hydraulic regime is within the basin.

Mr. Hojem referred to the discussion and inquired about the next steps. Ms. Napier commented on what the plan inherently includes. Everyone has contributed time and efforts in developing the document, which is not perfect. There was a goal to solicit more participation in implementing the plan and having more people at the table involved in the effort. Although the plan is not perfect, it is a few steps closer than it was a year ago. With respect to the tribe's comments, Ms. Napier said the request for adjudication is already included in the plan. She noted the plan addresses the Quinault Indian Nation's concerns and recommendations. The Partnership is a planning unit. The unit, to be successful, is dependent upon implementing partners. The college is assisting the Partnership in implementing projects.

Mr. Capoeman responded that consensus by the Partnership could not be attained for adjudication. The plan currently identifies it as a discussion and planning item. To the Quinault Indian Nation, that generally reflects only "lip service." The tribe's goal is to pursue and implement. Ms. Napier said adjudication is identified in the DIP. The issue is how to move forward. Mr. Swartout commented on what's involved in the planning process. However adjudication is important and discussion on the issue is a positive move forward as there may be some resolution in the future. However, consensus is still pending. Some issues surrounding adjudication must be resolved by the state before the Partnership can move forward on the adjudication discussion.

Mr. Jones advised that the tribe's request regarding adjudication is for the tribe to meet with DOE and develop options of adjudication and additional approaches to deal with instream flow setting. The Quinault Indian Nation is volunteering to lead the effort on adjudication.

Discussion followed about what the recommendations entail in terms of modifying the DIP and revising the timelines. Ms. Napier shared information on previous efforts involving workshops, identifying tasks and the budgets, and the difficulties in delegating specific tasks because of the lack of understanding the scope of the tasks. She asked about the Partnership's willingness to change milestones and implementation dates.

Mr. Jones replied that discussions during the development of the DIP at the STC meetings acknowledged that change in terminology was required due to the lack of a full commitment. The power to implement tasks is possible. He suggested developing an implementation plan, assign the job, and begin efforts during the next 12 months and then provide an update to the Partnership. The Quinault Indian Nation is committed to pursuing the task under the timeline established by the Partnership. Additionally, moving forward shows the Legislature, that the Partnership is serious about managing the watershed on a voluntary basis. The Quinault Indian Nation wants to move the process forward. He suggested reviewing the entire DIP and ensure that there are measurable goals and objectives, assignments of tasks, and timelines. He requested that objective #17 – instream flows, should be included within the DIP. He recommended taking the DIP and developing it further before tackling any more objectives.

**Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**October 27, 2006 Page 6 of 10**

Mr. Swartout commented on funding cycle requirements and that funding for next year cannot be obtained until the DIP is adopted. Postponing the adoption of the DIP means no additional funding. Conditions will likely be placed on each year's grant. He noted that after adoption of the DIP, the Partnership should step back and consider whether the approach is appropriate and whether the actions and interim milestones are to the degree that they are meaningful. If not, the question is how to do it better. The Partnership should assess the first DIP under Phase IV and whether to change it before proceeding.

Commissioner Macleod cautioned that delaying the process by reassessing the DIP will delay the Partnership's ability to seek legislative funding. Mr. Swartout asked whether the current structure of the Partnership is able to implement the plan. He questioned whether the model needs to be changed to initiate the implementation plan that includes objectives, milestones, and accountability for completion of the tasks.

Mr. Capoeman said if objective #17 is included in the plan as well as timelines and assignments for various parties within the Partnership; it would address the Quinault Indian Nation's concerns.

Mr. White commented that the objectives were prioritized. Ms. Napier said each objective was weighed against the criteria and assigned a point value. There are 18 objectives in ranked order.

Discussion ensued on whether the prioritization exercise was a waste of time. Chair Canaday commented that the plan is a living document subject to change.

Ms. Napier reviewed the Quinault Indian Nation's four requests and the Partnership's efforts related to each recommendation to date. She noted she is unsure of the placement of new instream flows based on credible science and suggested it could be attached to objective #17.

Mr. Jennings referred to *Interim Milestone 3.1: Clarifying Water Rights and Uses*. Task 2 is to develop strategy to co-manage water resources of the state and tribes. He suggested addressing the tribe's recommendations by including some language addressing instream flows or flushing out the tasks to address the issues raised by the Quinault Indian Nation. Ms. Napier said there are 18 objectives. When the process was started of Phase 4 work, it was recognized that not all 18 objectives could be accomplished within a year. Consequently, five objectives were selected. As the first five workshops were completed, the STC recognized the time entailed and the limited workshop attendance. It was also recognized that continuing to implement tasks might entail reevaluating whether to continue working on the next five or whether efforts should be expended on the first five priorities. It may mean accepting the DIP as drafted and start implementing tasks within the DIP by making assignments and moving forward. She asked for feedback from members.

Mr. Swartout replied it may be one of the options after adoption of the DIP. As a Partnership, it might mean a facilitated discussion about what is to be done next and whether it entails refining the DIP or selecting another objective. That is the question the Partnership needs to answer. He said he is hopeful that the Partnership will adopt the DIP as presented and move to secure more funding.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw added when the prioritization exercise was undertaken there was no decision that only five would be selected, but that the effort was to prioritize the 18 objectives to enable the Partnership to begin moving forward on the tasks. As part of the prioritization process, instream flows was listed as priority 6. She asked about the tribe's intent if the Partnership adopts the DIP as presented. Mr. Capoeman responded that it is critical that priority 6 (objective #17) is included in the DIP prior to adoption. If that

**Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**October 27, 2006 Page 7 of 10**

does not occur, the Quinault Indian Nation has internal strategies that the tribe has been working on to address the concerns. He added that objective timelines should also be included.

Mr. Fink acknowledged that there are some complex issues to address. He suggested developing some alternate language for consideration to ascertain how the recommendations play out in the plan and what the commitment is. He noted he will need to brief his commissioners on the proposed changes. He conveyed optimism that language can be developed by working with the Quinault Indian Nation.

Mr. Macleod said his concern is delaying any state funding by postponing approval of the plan. He suggested resolving the issues within the next 30 days to ensure the Partnership is prepared to ask the Legislature for funding.

Ms. Napier advised that each year, there is a meeting with both the House and the Senate, which is generally the time new issues are presented to the legislators. Currently, the joint meeting is scheduled for December 1.

Ms. Willis asked whether the Quinault Indian Nation is also asking to change instream flows. Mr. Capoeman said the key point is whatever the science reveals; it should be adopted within the plan. Mr. Jones reiterated that changing instream flows would only occur if the science reveals the flows are not set correctly. The DOE is indicating the first six flows need to be increased. The minimum flows that were set by politicians in 1976 were not based on science. The request is to recheck the watershed flows to ensure they are established at the appropriate level for fish and instream habitat. Mr. Swartout added the STC is working with Mr. Pitz on hydrology modeling.

Mr. Craig reported on an internal meeting at the DOE about the Columbia River. During the last session of the Legislature, over \$100 million was appropriated to address the many issues of managing water in eastern Washington. It is the largest watershed in the state as it includes other states as well. However, the largest watershed contiguous within the boundaries of the state is the Chehalis Basin. There is a good chance of receiving attention from the state. He noted the issues will be addressed. There are two issues – ongoing source of funding and the need to pursue implementation measures and directing the STC to review objective #17 in more detail. The Partnership is committed to adaptive management and adjustments can occur as the process is pursued. Time is of the essence.

Mr. Capoeman said he appreciates the comments and the opportunity to develop the language. He asked members to consider delaying the adoption for 30 days to enable each member to review the changes with their respective jurisdiction. The tribe can provide language for the Partnership's consideration. He agreed with Mr. Macleod's recommendation.

Ms. Napier reviewed December meeting dates. Members commented on timing for their respective approval processes. Several members commented on the infeasibility of delaying the adoption of the DIP because of the timing factor. Commissioner Beerbower said he is hopeful the Quinault Indian Nation understands the timing issue and that the Partnership acknowledges the need to continue working on the recommendations. The plan must be approved to receive ongoing funding. Mr. Fink agreed timing is a consideration. He offered a suggestion to move forward on approving the plan and consider a separate recommendation to direct the STC to work with the Quinault Indian Nation to draft an amendment to the plan for review by the Partnership in early 2007. Mr. Craig echoed similar comments and recommended Mr. Capoeman convey to the Quinault Indian Nation Tribal Council, a commitment by the Partnership to address on a priority basis, the issues presented by the Quinault Indian Nation. Ms. Willis agreed time and effort is preferable to address the tribe's concerns.

**Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting  
Meeting Summary  
October 27, 2006 Page 8 of 10**

Chair Canady offered a suggestion to approve the DIP as presented with a commitment to present any amendments by March 31, 2007.

*Mark Swartout and Bob Macleod departed from the meeting.*

Mr. Capoean expressed agreement with the recommendation and indicated the tribe could support the recommendation and appreciates the Partnership's support.

Members discussed possible action.

*Mr. White called for a consensus vote on approving the DIP as presented.*

Members offered various viewpoints on whether to include an amendment to the DIP within the call for consensus to approve the DIP.

**Roll call vote:**

**Jurisdictions and Tribe:**

Grays Harbor County (Beerbower) – Yes  
Lewis County (Lien) – Yes  
Mason County (Fink) – Yes  
Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis (White) – Yes  
City of Centralia (Canady) – Yes  
City of Montesano (Schillinger) – Yes

**Citizen Members:**

Grays Harbor County (Willis) – Yes  
Lewis County (Hojem) – Yes  
Thurston County (Holbrook-Shaw) – Yes, with reservations to discuss an amendment

**State Agencies:**

AG, DOE, DNR, WDFW (Craig) – Yes

**Stakeholder Groups:**

Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force (McMillan) – Yes  
Lewis County Farm Bureau (Mauel) – Yes

*Ms. Holbrook-Shaw called for a consensus vote to amend the previous action to work with the Quinault Indian Nation for a potential amendment to the DIP to address the tribe's concerns through normal committee processes by March 31, 2007.*

**Roll call vote:**

**Jurisdictions and Tribe:**

Grays Harbor County (Beerbower) – Yes  
Lewis County (Lien) – Yes  
Mason County (Fink) – Yes  
Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis (White) – Yes  
City of Centralia (Canady) – Yes  
City of Montesano (Schillinger) – Yes

**Citizen Members:**

**Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**October 27, 2006 Page 9 of 10**

Grays Harbor County (Willis) – Yes

Lewis County (Hojem) – Yes

Thurston County (Holbrook-Shaw) – Yes, with reservations to discuss an amendment

**State Agencies:**

AG, DOE, DNR, WDFW (Craig) – Yes

**Stakeholder Groups:**

Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force (McMillan) – Yes

Lewis County Farm Bureau (Mauel) – Yes

Mr. Jennings commented on the difficulties of moving forward with a volunteer group at a rapid pace and offered the suggestion that the Partnership should consider hiring an executive director.

Mr. Capoeman thanked the Partnership for considering the tribe's concerns. He introduced Quinault Indian Nation Tribal Secretary Gina James.

Ms. Willis reported the regional meeting of the Conservation Districts was held in Grays Harbor County. The district's budget includes funds for on-the-ground projects. She indicated she has requested a copy of the district's planned activities for the next two years. Outside of the Partnership, there is much work undertaken by the districts for improving habitat, which ties into the goals of the Partnership.

**Targeted Watershed Grant Proposal to Continue to Expand the Coordinated Water Quality Monitoring Program – Letter of Support**

Ms. Napier provided members with a copy of the draft letter for consideration.

Mr. Lehr, Grays Harbor College, briefed members on the grant opportunity for watersheds around the country. Of particular interest are collaborative groups who have worked together to develop plans to address water quality and need financial assistance to pursue implementation of projects. Due to the nature of the Partnership, the grant provides a good opportunity to initiate some of the tasks developed by the Partnership. A proposal is under development to the United States Environmental Protection Agency on behalf of the Partnership. The college will assist in coordinating efforts. The application requires endorsement by a Tribal Chair or a state government. The Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis and the Quinault Indian Nation have both agreed to endorse the application. Endorsement from the Governor has also been requested. Having a diversity of endorsements strengthens chances of securing funding.

Mr. Lehr described some sample projects to be funded by the grant. The application will be reviewed by the Water Quality Committee on November 9, 2006. After its review and any changes, the application will be submitted on November 15, 2006 for consideration. In addition to the formal endorsements, a number of letters of support have been received from a wide variety of stakeholders.

Mr. Mauel asked about the geographical area of the grant. Mr. Lehr said the grant applies to the entire Chehalis Basin.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw thanked Mr. Lehr's for his efforts.

Mr. Lehr provided an update on the status of the GIS clearinghouse position. The individual selected for hiring decided to pursue another employment opportunity. The position has been readvertized and closes on November 1. An applicant should be selected soon to begin moving forward with GIS coordination.

**Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**October 27, 2006 Page 10 of 10**

*Commissioner Beerbower called for a consensus vote to approve the letter of support. Members agreed to authorize the letter of support.*

**MONTHLY PARTNERSHIP REPORTS**

**Monthly Flow Report**

Mr. Jennings provided a review of watershed flows. With the exception of the Skookumchuck River, which is regulated by the reservoir and dam, all watersheds are far below the minimum flows for this time of year as well as below the median flows for this time of year. It has been a very dry fall.

**Watershed Festival Highlights – Slide Show by Jim Hill.**

Ms. Napier briefly reviewed highlights of the Watershed Festival. She commented on the work undertaken by the City of Centralia on the festival and indicated a letter has been drafted thanking the City of Centralia for their support of the first Chehalis Basin Watershed Festival on September 23, 2006. She offered to provide members with a copy of the slide show developed by Jim Hill.

**Open Comments**

Ms. Napier reported the STC has been meeting with Charles Pitz from the DOE. Mr. Pitz is a hydro-geologist who is assisting in the implementation of the watershed plan. His area of expertise is the Hydraulic Continuity Study. She encouraged members to attend future STC meetings. The pilot project constitutes a large implementation step. She distributed a handout of questions formulated by the STC for Mr. Pitz to address. She asked members to review the questions and attend the next STC meeting at the DOE on Thursday, November 2, from 9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Mauel indicated he is unable to attend but requested a question to ask of Mr. Pitz about the location of areas within the basin for water storage. Mr. Jennings noted as a part of some preliminary work for the watershed plan, a storage assessment was completed. He asked if the study is available on the Grays Harbor County website. Ms. Napier confirmed the information is available through the website.

Ms. Napier noted she is working on arrangements for the joint meeting with the House and Senate on December 1, 2006. One issue moving forward that is ready for implementation is the work Mr. Lehr is undertaking for obtaining more funding for water quality coordination. She asked members to forward any suggestions. She asked for the identification of members planning to attend the legislative meeting on December 1 because of limited space in the meeting room. Members planning to attend acknowledged their attendance.

**Adjournment**

**There being no further business, Chair Canaday adjourned the meeting at 12:07 p.m.**

Prepared by Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary  
Puget Sound Meeting Services