

**CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP**  
**Chehalis Tribe “Lucky Eagle” Casino**  
**Rochester, Washington**  
**February 23, 2007**  
**9:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.**

**Approved Meeting Summary**

<p><b>MEMBERS &amp; ALTERNATES PRESENT</b>          Bonnie Canaday, Chair, Mayor Pro-Tem, City of Centralia          Terry Willis, Citizen, Grays Harbor          Steve Craig, Department of Ecology          Lyle Hojem, Citizen, Lewis County          Jim Hill, Lewis County Citizen (Alternate)          Bob Beerbower, Grays Harbor          Ann Wick, WA Department of Agriculture          Ron Schillinger, City of Montesano          Ron Mael, Lewis County Farm Bureau</p>	<p>Mark Swartout, Thurston County (Alternate)          Bob Macleod, Thurston County          Mark White, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis (Alternate)          Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County (Alternate)          Kahle Jennings, City of Centralia (Alternate)          Kernen Lien, Lewis County (Alternate)</p>
<p><b>OTHERS PRESENT</b>          Randy Lehr, Grays Harbor College          Bruce Jones, Quinault Indian Nation          Glen Connelly, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis          J Roach, Thurston County Citizen          Harry Pickernell, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis          Christine Corrigan, Department of Ecology (DOE)          John Penberth, Citizen          Neal King, Grays Harbor County</p>	<p>Kim Schmanke, DOE          Tom Loranger, DOE          Jerry Louthain, Thurston County Water Conservancy Board          Petra Shenk, UCSB          Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary, Puget Sound Meeting Services</p>

**GENERAL PARTNERSHIP BUSINESS**

**Welcome, Introductions and Roundtable Comments**

Chair Canaday called the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m.

**Discuss and Adopt Draft Meeting Summaries for January 26, 2007 Meeting**

*The Partnership approved the minutes of the January 26, 2007 by consensus.*

**SPECIAL PROJECTS**

**Presentation and Discussion Regarding Interruptible Water Rights in the Chehalis Basin**

Mr. Bruce Jones reported that approximately eight months ago, the Quinault Indian Nation became concerned about river flows within the Chehalis and the valley. The Partnership has within its work plan the management of instream flows. The Quinault Indian Nation discussed with the Department of Ecology (DOE) the establishment of a program for educating junior water rights holders about their water right and the need to manage their water to meet the minimum state instream flows. DOE began working on a process to identify junior water rights holders with interruptible flows within the watershed.

It's a good opportunity for the Partnership to step up and help water rights holders with interruptible flows on how they can secure the water they will need for crops and other needs. The Partnership also

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary**

**February 23, 2007**

**Page 2 of 12**

needs to consider how it as a partnership volunteer group can help water rights holders. The Partnership is heading in the right direction in terms of looking at flows and what flows mean to fisheries and to water rights holders within the watershed. It may lead to looking at how interruptible flows are interrupted and why they are interrupted within the watershed.

Tom Loranger, Manager, Water Resources Program Southwest Washington, DOE, briefed the Partnership on interruptible water rights within the Chehalis Basin and water rights changes. DOE hasn't worked on water rights changes in several years in the basin and is working to catch up. Routinely, DOE shifts from basin to basin within the southwest region. DOE has also been aware of the interruptible water rights issue.

In 1976, the Instream Resource Protection Program was established for the Chehalis Basin with the establishment of minimum flows for the river for different months and minimum flows within tributaries. The number one priority for the Instream Resource Protection Program is protecting existing water rights. The second priority is protecting flows for fish. The third priority is to provide for domestic uses. The fourth priority is providing for other uses.

Post 1976, there were water rights issues both for groundwater and surface water rights. Surface water rights issued after 1976 include a provision that when flows are not met, the water right is interruptible and the holder must stop using the water right. DOE has not enforced the requirement since 1976. Currently, over 100 water rights have the interruptible provision.

The primary reason for enforcement today is because there is more interest in DOE managing water now than there was 30 years ago. There are many watershed planning groups across the state and all indicate the agency should step up and implement a higher level compliance plan for managing water within the basin. Droughts occurred in 2001 and 2005 and the issues of water have been questioned as well as technological advances. Beginning next month, DOE's website will include more information about minimum instream flows for the Chehalis Basin and real time flows. There is a greater transparency of what is occurring and what the flows are and whether the minimum flows are being achieved.

Mr. Loranger said DOE will be advising water rights holders about the interruptible provisions by notifying them by mail with a copy of their water rights certificate reminding them that they have a water right that is interruptible for certain portions of the year. DOE will provide them with tools to help them manage the issue when flows are low in the basin.

Mr. Loranger introduced Vicki Cline, DOE Compliance Officer, and Kim Schmanke and Christine Corrigan, DOE Public Information Officers, who assisted in strategizing and communicating the issue as well as preparing for public workshops. Mr. Loranger referred to a map of the basin and the locations of interruptible surface water rights that have been identified. Based on the locations, workshop locations have been identified to be held in March to help inform affected citizens, discuss the situation with them and how often they might be affected.

Ms. Cline reported DOE has identified approximately 100 water rights holders in the upper and lower Chehalis Basin. DOE has reviewed county assessor records to identify the current owners of the properties that have attached water rights. DOE is preparing to send a letter to the holders in the next week and will provide a copy of the water rights and the process as well as identifying the workshop locations. She said she is working with the DOE telecommunications group to provide 1-800 information

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary**

**February 23, 2007**

**Page 3 of 12**

for water rights holders to call once river flows begin dropping. DOE will track flows throughout the process. Information line will be updated daily.

Commissioner Macleod asked about the percentage range of the reduction and potential impacts. Mr. Loranger said of the thousands of water rights and claims within the Chehalis Basin, a subset of 100 water rights holders have interruptible provisions. When flows are not met, the water right can no longer be used. According to data, three years out of the last 15 years reveals that there were several weeks when water rights could not be used.

Ms. Terry Willis cited information from a previous discussion about DOE's efforts to identify the water rights holder and use of the water right and how much water would be returned. She asked whether DOE has current data. Mr. Loranger verified DOE has identified water rights holders and that the majority of the water rights are being used. However, at this time, DOE does not know how many are actually being used or how many are basing their use on the season that could be interrupted. DOE estimates that many holders don't know they have interruptible conditions. After the mailing and the public workshops, DOE should have a better idea of what the impact will be. DOE has tabulated how much water would be used if all interruptible water rights were being used. Of the 100 water rights, the instantaneous use is 55 cubic feet of water per second. The assumption is that all the water rights are used fully. However, it also unlikely all rights are fully utilized.

Mr. Kernan Lien asked whether DOE will enforce the provision during the summer if instream flows are too low. Mr. Loranger reported DOE is sending the letters in time to give people time for planning. If needed, DOE will implement enforcement during the summer.

Mr. Loranger addressed questions about historic lows and whether enforcement of interruptible rights will contribute significantly to the recovery of low instream flows. The goal is not to meet the minimum flow but rather that there is water available for out-of-stream use. Enforcement will not interrupt domestic household use or stock water. He referred members to DOE's website for more information on the RCW and answered questions about how the provision might affect water right transfers. The provisions specify that the location of the gauge is tied to the certificate. Mr. Kahle Jennings clarified that if a situation occurs in the Satsop River where the gauge falls below minimum flows, those interruptible water rights within the Satsop River linked to that gauge would no longer be allowed to withdraw water until the flows in the Satsop increase.

Mr. Loranger addressed questions about penalties for violators. DOE could issue penalties. However, penalties would be the last resort. The first step is to work with the holder. DOE could issue orders to cease diverting, which would likely be the last resort.

Mr. John Penberth commented that there is much animosity in Pacific County with DOE. He commented on DOE's reliance on local partnerships to support enforcement. He suggested DOE should enforce the provision without the assistance of local planning boards. Mr. Loranger said DOE is working with the Chehalis Basin Partnership and that the Partnership has asked DOE to take a higher profile for compliance with water laws and water rights.

Mr. Jerry Louthain, Thurston County Water Conservancy Board, provided additional information about the provisions attached to water rights when interruption may be enforced.

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary**

**February 23, 2007**

**Page 4 of 12**

Ms. Willis asked whether illegal water use is occurring within the Chehalis Basin. Ms. Cline said she hasn't received any formal environmental complaints within the Chehalis Basin for several years. Usually a neighbor will file a complaint of illegal water use. Usually offenders will cease the illegal use after DOE contacts and works with the offender.

Mr. Jim Hill commented about the role of the Partnership and that as a group that meets and discusses water, interruptible water rights is an important issue. However, to imply that the Partnership is an arm of enforcement is incorrect. The Partnership is receiving a briefing by DOE about interruptible water rights and it's each member's job to be informed, seek solutions, and assist DOE to the extent possible.

Commissioner Beerbower asked about the availability of water rights before someone drills a well. Mr. Loranger reported property owners are allowed to drill wells for their homes. DOE receives notification of those wells and maintains a database. Ms. Willis added that an irrigation well requires a water right. Mr. Loranger reported new water rights in the Chehalis Basin are difficult to secure. DOE is working with the City of Napavine on application changes.

Mr. Mauel said the Farm Bureau is finding that most of the farms closer to cities are within the urban growth areas. Many of the larger farms are reducing acreage and splitting off and creating smaller farms. Part of the problem is that many of the existing water rights are not being moved to the smaller farms.

J Roach asked about a large company obtaining water rights and how it impacts the basin. Mr. Loranger cited Cardinal Glass as the company. DOE spent time with the company conducting analysis for the company's water right. The amount of work required to mitigate the impact to groundwater and surface water was substantial. Mr. Mauel reported the previous water right was relinquished and Cardinal Glass was unable to obtain the water right. The previous owner, a farmer, did not use the water right for a minimum of five years.

Ms. Willis inquired about the tools available to landowners. Mr. Loranger said DOE is working on the backup of water rights to ascertain whether water rights can be exchanged or whether other rights are available as a stopgap during a temporary period of interruptible water rights.

Mr. Hill asked whether DOE has an alternate plan to ensure minimum flows are maintained. Mr. Loranger said DOE is depending upon the planning groups to develop targets and ways to increase flows. Mr. Hill acknowledged the Partnership is important in terms of developing multiple ideas or strategies to increase instream flows.

Mr. Jennings asked whether a holder of interruptible water rights can have the right modified for the temporary storage of water during higher instream flows. Mr. Loranger said water is available within the Chehalis Basin in winter and spring. However, the logistics of permitting a reservoir could be challenging; however not impossible.

Mr. Penberth expressed appreciation for the briefing and the issues surrounding water rights throughout the Chehalis Basin. Napavine is experiencing issues with water rights within its urban growth area. He noted his municipality is also experiencing the same situation where the urban growth area has been expanded and eminent domain is being used to secure water from farmers. It is now a legal issue within the court. Municipalities can use eminent domain to acquire water rights. It's an important part of the issue. He noted there is a major fight over water and everyone wants to protect their water rights. There is much growth in the upper Chehalis Basin region. In the Winlock area, a study concluded the

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary**

**February 23, 2007**

**Page 5 of 12**

municipality will run out of water in 2014, which is why they are working under imminent domain within the urban growth area to confiscate water to support growth. This will result in major impacts as the Quinault Indian Nation wants to stop withdrawals. There is a major water battle brewing. Unfortunately, planning groups will be caught in the middle.

Mr. Loranger cited the case of the City of Olympia and the old Olympia Brewery where the City of Olympia employed imminent domain. There are other legal mechanisms outside of the water code for securing water rights under imminent domain. Mr. Swartout said the Olympia issue stemmed from the concern that water rights were not being used and that the cities were concerned that the five-year limitation would result in the relinquishment of the water rights.

Ms. Schmanke provided additional details about the three community workshops. She encouraged members to attend. The first workshop is scheduled for March 13 at the Sharon Grange in Porter from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m. The second workshop is on March 14 in Newaukum Grange and the March 15 workshop will be held in Brady at the Olympic View Grange. The goal of the workshop is to share information about interruptible water rights, share information about historic low flows on the river at various gauge points, and information about DOE's process and answer questions. The workshop will include brief presentations, maps and charts, and questions and answers by DOE staff followed by a roundtable discussion at the end of the meeting. DOE is pursuing media outreach to local newspapers.

Mr. Swartout said the issue has been addressed by the Steering Technical Committee (STC) for the last several months. The committee struggled with the issue of what its role is with respect to interruptible water rights. He noted the discussion has been helpful and the questions are coming from a good knowledge base. It reflects that the group is learning about the issue. The challenge is determining the Partnership's role with respect to interruptible water rights.

Mr. Hill reported he will attend the Newaukum meeting. Mr. Swartout indicated he will likely attend all the workshops, however; it's important to ascertain if the Partnership wants to be identified or just attend the meetings and provide a presence as a resource to holders of interruptible water rights.

Mr. Jennings noted the watershed plan includes an action of DOE enforcing existing regulations. DOE is implementing the plan's actions, which links the Partnership. The Partnership cannot sidestep its responsibility as it is one reason for why the group was formed.

Mr. Penberth commented that the group wasn't initially formed to support DOE. Legislation resulted from concerns surrounding water quality, water quantity, and fish habitat. The planning began to expand and involved local groups. He said it has always been his position not to be supportive of DOE enforcing the law as the agency is a government entity. It's not the Partnership's responsibility to stand next to DOE while they are enforcing the law. Anytime, there is a regulatory enforcement, it becomes a difficult situation. He expressed opposition of the Partnership as a support unit to DOE.

Mr. Swartout referred to the watershed plan and reviewed the issues statement, recommendation, and suggested actions related to water rights.

Mr. Craig shared information about his involvement within the environmental arena. He said he attended the first United Nations conference on the environment in 1972. What has transpired over the years is an indication of things to come. Interruptible water rights is a preview of coming attractions. It is occurring globally and it is occurring locally. Planning groups are extremely important from the standpoint of

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary**

**February 23, 2007**

**Page 6 of 12**

helping everyone shift from a feedback mode to a deep forward mode where issues are anticipated in advance and where groups prepare and plan and make necessary adjustments. In the Chehalis Basin, in particular, the watershed is not fed by a glacier but relies on precipitation. Storage will likely be the potential solution for the watershed.

Ms. Willis cautioned that as a group, it is important to recognize the Partnership's other allies, such as conservation districts. She said she testified before the House of Representatives for funding support for both watershed planning as well as conservation districts because of the cohesive relationship in working jointly on projects. During the process it's important not to alienate others that work closely with the Partnership. There is already a mechanism for enforcement, which is DOE and the laws currently adopted. It's important to understand the Partnership's goal as a larger group when encountering these gray areas.

Mr. Jones said he is appreciative of the comments about the Partnership changing its mode. The Partnership needs not to react to the issues because they are occurring quickly. The tribe's request for instream flow management ties into the treaty where it deems that fisheries belong to the tribe. The concern is how to plan for issues instead of reacting. The suggestion of storage is an option that should be considered in terms of long-term storage. The other issues the Partnership should consider is legislation that changed water rights in the basin giving cities senior water rights over all other water rights. In doing so, cities impact other water users in the basin. As cities develop, the question is how the Partnership is going to work with limited water resources within the basin. This is the issue the Partnership needs to consider for the future rather than addressing summertime low flows. The issue is long-term. Perhaps, cities can temporarily reduce withdrawals to reduce impacts to junior water users.

Mr. Schillinger noted that with respect to all water users, most of the water is returned to the system. For example, wastewater treatment plants return 95% to 95% of the water to the system.

Mr. Swartout encouraged members to attend the workshops to learn more about the issues as well as about the impacts and citizens that will be impacted. He asked members for feedback on the Partnership's role in the workshops. Mr. Lien said it's a good opportunity for outreach to the public. It will be important to let the public know about the plan and other issues within the basin. Ms. Napier offered to notify members electronically about the workshop dates. Chair Canaday suggested having a Partnership table at each of the workshops so that people can learn about the work of the Partnership. Ms. Schmanke offered to provide a table for the Partnership and some time for members to share information about the Partnership.

Ms. Willis asked whether the Partnership is mentioned in DOE's letter to water rights holders. At the STC meeting, members were adamant that the Partnership should remain separate and not included in DOE's letter. Ms. Schmanke assured members the Partnership is not reference or cited in the letter to water rights holders.

Mr. Swartout asked DOE staff to electronically send the final DOE letter as a PDF file to Ms. Napier.

Lyle Hojem commented that the majority of the comments from the public will involve losing water rights for household, irrigation, and stock water. It will be important to answer the concerns. Ms. Schmanke noted the letter will include a copy of the water right and the conditions.

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary**

**February 23, 2007**

**Page 7 of 12**

Discussion followed about public concerns and the importance of ensuring the public has the correct information.

### **Coordinated Water Quality Monitoring Program**

- *Present Draft Quality Assurance Program (QAPP)*
- *CBP Endorsement of QAPP*
- 

Randy Lehr referred to a copy of the Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) for establishing a long-term Coordinated Water Quality Monitoring Program in the Chehalis Basin. Mr. Lehr updated the Partnership on the status of the plan. Since September 2006, efforts have been underway by Grays Harbor College, DOE, and the Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis to use a grant from the DOE to collect and analyze water samples from a suite of 86 sites throughout the basin. The data will be used to establish a baseline of water quality conditions in the watershed. The partners have been working on developing the Quality Assurance Program Plan to document and lay out the project components and sample collection methodology.

The draft is at a point of finalization and the partners believe it meets the requirements for DOE collection and analysis regulations as well as the needs of the larger water quality monitoring efforts throughout the Chehalis Basin. The plan puts in place the goals and objectives that were outlined through work completed by the Partnership in the past.

Mr. Lehr requested approval for moving forward with the plan. The plan has been conditionally approved by DOE pending the Partnership's approval. The plan must be approved by the DOE, CBP, and Grays Harbor College (Randy Lehr).

Mr. Lehr described the sampling process to analyze basic water quality parameters. One of the grant deliverables is the compilation of all water quality data that previously existed that will be synthesized into a report. The report will provide information about water quality based on available data to date. The report will be reviewed with the CBP for input.

Mr. Swartout asked whether the validity of the data will be noted as well such as data collected by schools versus a sample collected by an agency. Mr. Lehr affirmed the report will provide an accurate description of the condition of the river. The data will be qualified as to its origination.

Ms. Willis asked whether the questions previously asked by David Rountry regarding TMDL compliance testing were addressed. Mr. Lehr said the samples will be collected above and below major tributary connection points throughout the basin. The sites will be overlaid in places where there are historical records. Compliance with TMDL is a much more rigorous process that requires separate analyses. To ascertain whether TMDL levels have been achieved, there is more intensive analysis required such as a more consistent and frequent timeframe testing rather than testing on a monthly basis under the QAPP. The QAPP is intended to be a starting point. Mr. Lehr said the partners are looking to develop other ways to separate the environmental variability of the watershed. Samples will be collected monthly at the sites.

Ms. Napier reported the Water Quality Committee received a similar presentation and recommends approval of the plan.

Ms. Napier updated members on her and Commissioner Beerbower's visit with legislators to pursue funding. They met with Representative Blake and Senators Hatfield, Hargrove, and Swecker to discuss

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary**

**February 23, 2007**

**Page 8 of 12**

Phase 4 implementation needs. The legislators were receptive. For the 2007 funding request, the funds requested are outlined in a brochure for the GIS Clearinghouse, funds to acquire data for the Ecosystem Diagnostic Treatment (EDT), administration of the EDT, the Coordinated Water Quality Monitoring Program, funds to analyze the connection between river flows and groundwater, and supplemental funds for operation of the planning unit.

*By consensus, the Partnership approved the Quality Assurance Project Program (QAPP).*

Mr. Lehr provided an update on the status of establishing a GIS Clearinghouse. An individual has been hired at Grays Harbor College to integrate and establish a GIS Clearinghouse for natural resources to include water quality information in the Chehalis Basin. The individual has a PhD from Michigan State University. Mr. Lehr said he is very impressed with his level of knowledge. The goal is to develop a web-based interactive platform accessed through the internet based on access protocols.

Several members offered comments on the importance of the projects that will move the watershed forward. Connecting stakeholder interests through the series of the projects as well as the GIS Clearinghouse helps everyone to understand the processes that are occurring in the watershed.

Mr. Craig mentioned DOE is moving forward with development of a publication addressing what constitutes a healthy watershed. Pierce County is working to identify the key indicators of a healthy watershed related to water, land, and air. Mr. Hill said the efforts equate to a marathon for the watershed that will be ongoing. Mr. Schillinger said it's encouraging to see implementation of some of the projects included in the watershed plan. He expressed appreciation to Grays Harbor County, the City of Centralia, and the tribes. Mr. Roach commented on how much has been accomplished since his absence of almost 18 months.

### **CBP May Meeting Date**

Members discussed the meeting date for May and agreed to change the regular meeting date of May 25 to May 18, 2007. Chair Canaday indicated she will be unable to attend the May 18 meeting.

### **STC Report Regarding DIP Revision to Address the Quinault Indian Nation's letter.**

Ms. Napier reported the Partnership recognized there were some comments by the Quinault Indian Nation on the Watershed Plan that could be addressed through an amendment. The Partnership directed the STC to work with the Quinault Indian Nation and determine how to address the comments. An amendment to the Detailed Implementation Plan is the recommended action to address the concerns. However, a recommendation is not ready as the STC will continue working on the recommendation at its March meeting.

Ms. Napier referred members to a page from the Detailed Implementation Plan and described the proposal to add language under interim milestones that the STC has developed as a starting point. The STC will review the language at its March meeting with a goal to bring a recommendation to the CBP in March, which may not result in an amendment to the DIP at that point. The STC proposes to review the recommendation in terms of format, host a workshop sometime in April to receive further information, and then determine implementation assignments.

Mr. Swartout reported the inclusion of an interim milestone within the DIP is an important step. At its last meeting, the CBP conveyed a preference to not continue only planning but wanted some implementation action under the current DIP. The STC has followed the CBP's direction.

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary**

**February 23, 2007**

**Page 9 of 12**

Ms. Napier said the next meeting of the STC is March 1 in Olympia at the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife office at 600 Capitol Way North. STC members have identified a list of people to invite to the workshop. She asked for suggestions for inviting others.

### **STC Follow up Regarding Alternate B as Identified in the January DIP Workshop**

Ms. Napier provided members with a copy of decision rules, definitions, and range. She explained that the results of the January workshop called for continued work on implementing the DIP to include the five strategies and associated tasks. The STC discussed developing a work plan for implementing the DIP as well as for the STC. During the discussions, members referred to a set of decision rules as a means to prioritize watershed management plan actions. She explained how the ranking was determined. Each decision rule was weighted differently resulting in six different ratings for decision rules. The STC looked at trends and set a trend. There are 18 objectives, which were divided into three tiers. The number of times the objective appears at the top five or six determined the top five objectives. The STC would like to use the same process to prioritize tasks within the DIP.

The Partnership asked that the STC look at prioritizing the work within the DIP and develop a work plan. She asked if the approach is something the CBP can support.

Mr. Swartout said using a decision rule process avoids people arguing about what benefits them the most. It's a more objective process.

Ms. Napier said the STC is willing to use the tool to achieve the outcomes. The STC will review whether the decision rules are still applicable to the actions that are under consideration. Any changes to the decision rules will be presented to the CBP. She invited members to participate in the work of prioritization as well as the work of the STC.

### **Draft Proposal to Assess Chehalis Basin Water Resources**

- *Draft SOW from USGS*

Mr. Jennings provided a copy of his PowerPoint presentation to members. Mr. Swartout provided an explanation of the briefing. The CBP lacks information about the water within the basin – both groundwater and its influence on surface water and vice versa. The issue is how to obtain the information in a manner that can be used as a planning tool for managing water in the basin.

Mr. Jennings provided background on accessing the Chehalis Basin water resources. Strategy 1 within the DIP is a recommendation to the state that the state should make it clear to water rights applicants that there are flexible strategies for moving water rights given the hydraulic continuity is an issue.

Under DIP Strategy 1, Interim Milestone 1.2 is measuring to manage water quality. There are two tasks associated with the milestone of conducting a groundwater study that provides information necessary to address hydraulic continuity issues that will provide specific information about the character of groundwater basin-wide and individual water right application impact stream flows, and 2) whether a groundwater pumping schedule can be developed that would delay the effect on river flows until the high flow period. Task two is to scope out what questions should be answered and determine what has already been completed.

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary**

**February 23, 2007**

**Page 10 of 12**

The STC, with assistance from DOE, is working on understanding the underlying issues that are a necessary part of the task and begin formulating a recommendation to the CBP.

The STC received three draft scopes of work to include the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and two scopes of work from HDR Engineering, a water consultant company. The second scope was unsolicited from HDR Engineering that goes beyond the initial scope of work. .

Mr. Jennings reviewed the three proposals. The USGS scope of work is a proposal for a basin-wide water resource assessment that includes a model to answer questions. Phase one includes collecting and compiling data that characterizes the groundwater flow system. Phase 2 builds a groundwater flow model that could eventually be turned over to local governments. USGS performs similar work throughout the nation. It was noted that USGS has a funding match program.

Mr. Jennings reviewed the two proposals from HDR Engineering and the tasks. The first proposal is to develop an understanding of groundwater and surface water hydrology and then by aquifer interaction between surface and groundwater, which is similar to goals included in the proposal by the USGS. The primary differences between the two scopes of work is looking at the technological aspect of the data and science while the other is looking beyond and applying it in a model to answer questions. HDR's proposal includes building a model within task 1. HDR's task 2 looks at consumptive use requirements for instream flows as well as estimating future growth and land use changes within the basin and developing models to evaluate the consumptive water use under future water alternatives.

Mr. Jennings advised members that the decision will either involve a large project in a short timeframe or a series of smaller projects over a longer period.

Mr. Jennings said the information provides an overview to members of what the STC is reviewing and why. The tasks are not simple but are fundamental in managing the resource by understanding the relationship between the aquifer and groundwater and surface water.

Mr. Jennings addressed questions and said the Partnership will need to rely on other people to do the work. The proposals are two different approaches for answering the question. Mr. Swartout emphasized that if the Partnership is serious about managing water in the basin, a model is a requirement. He cited the cities of Olympia, Lacey, and Yelm, and the Nisqually Tribe concerning a new wellfield the City of Olympia wants to utilize. The use of the model is impressive. Without the information, DOE will require mitigation of the entire water right application. A model may mean mitigation of only a portion of the water right. Mr. Jennings added that responsible management decisions require information.

Mr. Swartout said the decision for the CBP to consider is the cost for a model so that that the budget request can be refined the next time members meet with legislators. The first decision is for everyone to agree on what model will be used. After the model has been determined, the perimeters can be defined so that municipalities can input and have data modeled resulting in a refined model over time that benefits all users.

Mr. Jones recommended moving forward and exploring the costs. He recommended pursuing the project in two phases – develop the model first and then pursue the management study. Mr. Hill said it's important to have an idea of the management phase because it defines the model.

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary**

**February 23, 2007**

**Page 11 of 12**

Mr. Craig inquired about the timeframe for a decision and the need to develop a cost estimate and funding sources. He indicated that it is likely state funding would be pursued or perhaps through USGS, which provides a cost basis option. USGS needs notice in advance to include the funding in the federal budget.

Mr. Swartout noted there is an inequity in the process for applying for a water right. Large municipalities have utility rates available to pay for the information while an agriculture user applying for a new water right does not have the resources. The model could become a public asset for any user in the basin that is applying or transferring water rights.

### **Proposal and Update for the 2007 Chehalis Basin Watershed Festival**

Ms. Napier reported there have been requests for volunteers to help coordinate the festival. Kathy Jacobson from the Chehalis Basin Education Consortium has volunteered to coordinate the festival this year. Ms. Napier referred to Ms. Jacobson's proposal and budget. Ms. Jacobson is a coordinator for the Chehalis Basin Education Consortium and is experienced in organizing events.

The proposal this year includes a festival in the lower basin. Ms. Napier reviewed three locations for consideration – Morrison River Front Park and Rotary Log Pavilion; Vance Creek Country Park; and Friends Landing. Ms. Jacobson contacted the Historical Seaport to learn of any other events occurring at the same time. On October 13, the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Grays Harbor Historical Seaport will be held, which presents an opportunity to partner. At this time, the location under consideration is Morrison Park on October 13 from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Ms. Napier reviewed the intended audience, program description, and proposed budget. Facility rental is \$900. A request was sent to the City of Aberdeen requesting the City consider becoming a cosponsor by paying for the facility. The total budget is approximately \$11,500.

Ms. Napier asked for input about the date, location, and contracting with Ms. Jacobson through the consortium.

Mr. Hill commented that it's a workable plan and months ahead of the planning for last year's festival. He expressed interest in moving forward with the proposal.

***The Partnership agreed to authorize a contract with the Chehalis Basin Education Consortium to organize the 2007 festival to be held on October 13, 2007 at Morrison River Front Park in Aberdeen.***

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Ms. Napier provided an update on the Salmon Recovery Funding Board's request to all lead entities within regions to begin working together. The Chehalis Basin is part of the Coast Region. The lead entities have begun working together as a region and have had some discussions about the process of becoming a region. The IAC has provided funding and a company has been contracted to help facilitate the discussions. Grays Harbor County is the fiscal agent on behalf of the Coast Region. The region includes WRIs 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24. A planning team and information team have been established. Ms. Napier said she and Mr. Roach are members of the planning team, which held its first meeting in Forks. Members spent most of the time discussing the ground rules. There are some issues as the three lead entities are very well organized with one lead entity having some issues. The next meeting is March 21 in the Aberdeen area. Everyone is invited to attend.

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary**

**February 23, 2007**

**Page 12 of 12**

Mr. Craig reported on natural gas drilling scheduled for the summer in the Chehalis Basin. The drilling will double the size of the underground natural gas storage located east of Interstate 5 near the existing gas pipeline in Lewis County. He asked if the CBP is interested in receiving a briefing from the Department of Natural Resources about the project. Members expressed an interest in receiving a briefing.

### **Adjournment**

**There being no further business, Chair Canaday adjourned the meeting at 12:28 p.m.**

Prepared by Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary  
Puget Sound Meeting Services