

CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP
Chehalis Tribe “Lucky Eagle” Casino
Rochester, Washington
May 18, 2007
9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Approved Meeting Summary

MEMBERS & ALTERNATES PRESENT

Terry Willis, Citizen, Grays Harbor
Steve Craig, Department of Ecology (DOE)
Bob Beerbower, Grays Harbor
Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County
Mark Swartout, Thurston County (Alternate)
Bob Macleod, Thurston County

Chanele Holbrook-Shaw, Citizen, Thurston
County
Kahle Jennings, City of Centralia (Alternate)
Terry Harris, City of Chehalis
Dave Vasilauskas, City of Chehalis (Alternate)
Mark White, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis
Reservation

OTHERS PRESENT

Ann Wick, WA Department of Agriculture
Randy Lehr, Grays Harbor College
Carolyn West, The Evergreen State College
Kathy Jacobson, Chehalis Basin Education Consortium
Mark Mobbs, Quinault Indian Nation (QIN)
Chad Stussy, Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife
(WDFW)
Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary, Puget Sound Meeting
Services
Narendran Kodandapani, Grays Harbor College
Caroline West, Student Evergreen State College
Tiffany Justice, Student Evergreen State College
Petra Shenk Univ. California Santa Barbara

Cassie Deitz, Washington Elementary
Jerry Louthain, HDR
Jeff Sowers, East Grays Harbor High School
Justin MacMillian East Grays Harbor High
School
Lonnie Evans, East Grays Harbor High School
Madyln Palmer, East Grays Harbor High School
Paule Beck, East Grays Harbor High School
Austin Hensler, East Grays Harbor High School
Nathaniel Brewer, East Grays Harbor High
School

GENERAL PARTNERSHIP BUSINESS

Welcome, Introductions and Roundtable Comments

Mark White called the meeting to order at 9:45 a.m. Everyone present provided self-introductions.

Discuss and Adopt Draft Meeting Summaries for April 27, 2007

A correction was requested to reflect that Terry Willis was not in attendance at the meeting.

The Partnership approved the minutes of the April 27, 2007 as amended by consensus.

SPECIAL PROJECTS AND PRESENTATIONS

Follow Up Discussion Regarding the May 22nd Workshop

Kahle Jennings provided an overview of the May 22, 2007 workshop. The workshop will follow-up a workshop held on April 24, 2007 for instream flows and Detailed Implementation (DIP) Strategy #18 –

Chehalis Basin Partnership Draft Minutes

May 18, 2007

Page 2 of 9

“A workgroup representing basin wide interests will convene to oversee the current and future scientific studies and develop and oversee the public process to recommend instream flow levels for the Chehalis Basin.” Action #54 from the Watershed Management Plan is one of the 70 actions from the plan that is included in the DIP under the Phase 4 grant. However, the action was not prioritized as an initial action for the first implementation effort. The Quinault Indian Tribes expressed concerns, which the Partnership agreed to consider and reevaluate. There was general agreement to implement DIP Strategy #18 through DIP Strategy #3. DIP Strategy #3 states, “Identify tools available to meet water quantity goals.”

The April 24 workshop was facilitated by John Kliem. Participants agreed that rather than splitting Strategy #18 into two strategies of developing a workgroup and looking at instream flows, it would be implemented as a separate interim milestone under DIP Strategy #3. DIP Strategy #17 and #18 are recommended to be moved to DIP Strategy #3 and add them as separate interim milestones.

The April workshop was the initial effort in addressing DIP Strategy #18 of convening a workgroup and evaluating instream flows.

The next workshop will be held at the Department of Ecology from 9 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. and is scheduled as a longer meeting to complete the work. The meeting will involve laying out the process to accomplish Strategy #18 that involves prioritizing, identifying parties responsible, timelines, and budget.

The Steering Technical Committee (STC) also discussed the concerns and the strategies at its May 3 meeting and recommends some additional suggestions to include developing a work plan for the DIP strategy with decision points on how to address flow issues to include goals, objectives, and tasks, as well as, identifying who, what, when, and how to fund it and who will be responsible for the task and the timeframe. The committee discussed focusing on two different tracts because DIP Strategy #17 indicates that the retention of the existing instream flows is the goal. DIP Strategy #18 involves considering existing flows and evaluating whether new flows are necessary and, if so, establish a process to pursue the goal. As STC members discussed the issue it became apparent that there are likely two different tracks – 1) review existing flows and potentially revise them (study task) and 2) work towards adding more water in the river rather than restoring flows (implementation task). There was also a suggestion to ensure that it is not implied that looking at flows is indicative of a decision and the only outcome is changing existing instream flows. There may be consideration for adjusting flows seasonally to allow more flexibility. It doesn't necessarily have to result in a recommendation to change actual flows levels from 1976 flows.

Additional STC follow-up included a meeting with Tom Loranger, Water Resources Program Manager, Southwest Regional Office, DOE, to discuss the CBP's actions regarding instream flows and water quantity. The meeting was held on May 8 with Mark Swartout, Steve Craig, and Kahle Jennings in attendance. There was recognition for sharing information and a closer coordination on an ongoing basis. DIP Strategies #17 and 18# were reviewed as well.

As a result of the process, there is acknowledgement that a better process is needed to track budgets because of the varied sources of funding. Mr. Jennings said he was tasked to develop a work plan for DIP Strategy #17 and lead the water quantity effort. The basic elements of the work plan includes assembling the workgroup, which should evolve from the work from the two workshops, assess existing information and data, identify data gaps, determine and design studies to fill gaps, establish time periods, identify responsible parties, and develop budget and funding sources.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Draft Minutes

May 18, 2007

Page 3 of 9

Mark Swartout complimented Mr. Jennings on his leadership. Originally, when the watershed plan was developed and instream flows were considered, the idea appeared to be changing the flows in the rules. However, as the work has proceeded more information was developed providing other options, such as, retaining the flows but consider modernizing the rule so that it addresses present day conditions as well as reviewing other rules adopted elsewhere in the state versus back in the 1980s when the rule was originally adopted. Another discussion point was the work plan pertaining to the instream flow rule and establishing critical decision points on whether to continue moving forward or stopping. That option will engage the Partnership in a meaningful way because many resources will be expended getting to critical decision points. It will also allow the Partnership to consider work that may not be appropriate to pursue.

Terry Willis indicated the committee's perspective will likely change as members become better educated. Even the instream rule is complicated. Instream flows pertain not only to fish but also to recreation and aesthetics for example. The issue begs the question of whether base flows and instream flows are equal or are they the same thing. In some water rights certificates, base flows are stated while instream flow is stated in others. During the committee meeting, members offered different answers.

Ms. Napier inquired about the work product to be presented at the workshop. Mr. Jennings said he anticipates the workshop to provide direction on how to implement the work plan.

Mr. Swartout reported he was unable to attend the first workshop. There were approximately 22 participants in the workshop. The issue is a sensitive and complex issue. It will be beneficial for the product to have as many individuals who have the expertise involved. The committee will have the benefit of some individuals who have worked on instream flow rules around the state who have learned lessons, which will be beneficial to the effort.

Ms. Napier advised that after the workshop on May 22, the information will be compiled into a report for a review by the STC with a goal to provide a recommendation to the Partnership to amend the DIP at the July meeting.

GIS Clearinghouse Update Welcome and Project Overview

Randy Lehr and Narendran Kodandapani, Grays Harbor College, provided an update on the status of the GIS Clearinghouse. The presentation involved a number of different maps integrating different themes across the basin.

Mr. Kodandapani reported data source documents were provided by the DOE creating a number of different data layers. He displayed a map showing major rivers and tributaries. The technology allows mapping various streams and flow directions. The files are in PDF format that can be distributed by e-mail. Mr. Kodandapani displayed maps showing precipitation in the watershed and water quality categories in the watershed. Other maps included distribution by fish species that can be layered with different fish species by location. Mr. Lehr explained that the data supplied by DOE involves only areas in the basin where the TMDL process is in testing or has been targeted for testing and are included on the 303(d) List.

Mr. Kodandapani reviewed future data to be collected to assist in rendering different predictions for the entire watershed.

Mr. Lehr asked members to consider what combination of data layers would be most useful.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Draft Minutes

May 18, 2007

Page 4 of 9

Mr. Swartout asked about designating city and county boundaries. Mr. Kodandapani replied that the capability already exists. Mr. Lehr said the goal is to house data on an ArcGIS server housed at Grays Harbor College. The information will be available on a much broader scale through the web.

Mr. Swartout inquired about data pertaining to Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) projects. Mr. Lehr acknowledged that it would be helpful to include the data.

Ms. Willis asked whether DOE's data for interruptible water rights on tributaries and streams that did not meet instream flows over the years could be included. Mr. Lehr said the information can be incorporated if DOE agrees to release the data.

Mr. Lehr updated members on progress of water quality monitoring throughout the basin as well as organizing and synthesizing existing data. After all data are accumulated into one database, it will be possible to begin analyzing and determining relationships between land uses, buffers, and water quality and whether there has been changes in land use and landcover over time, and have there been changes in instream flows, maximum flows, and minimum flows. Additional data will be supplied by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and other parties involved in gathering different data layers. Efforts are also underway to obtain more data from Grays Harbor County and other sources.

Mr. Swartout suggested other information to include is floodplains and floodways designations and landcover, such as forestry and agriculture. Mr. Lehr acknowledged the desire to obtain updated aerial photos and satellite images, which can be integrated.

Mr. Jennings commented on the Phase 4 work plan and a pilot project on water rights. He stressed the importance of ensuring data obtained through various projects are in a useable form for the clearinghouse. Mr. Swartout referred to DOE's work to map water rights in the basin. He suggested transferring the data to the clearinghouse.

Ms. Willis asked about the limitations associated with the clearinghouse. Initially, the efforts are focused primarily on water quality. She asked if it is possible to move beyond water quality issues. Mr. Lehr said it's important to ensure that all water quantity and water quality data layers are in place followed by other data layers that might be useful that can be integrated into the process. Ms. Willis advised that the conservation districts completed a report on impassable culverts. Approximately eight percent of culverts are located on private land. A majority of the culverts are located on state, county, and federal lands. Mr. Lehr acknowledged the information should be included.

Mr. Craig commented on potentially including LIDAR technology that provides a three dimensional view of the landscape. Mr. Lehr acknowledged the suggestion. Currently, Grays Harbor has elevation models at the 10 and 30 meter scale throughout the Chehalis Basin. Another student is working on a project to create a map to be distributed to schools based on a three-dimensional model, which highlights many of the watershed issues. He confirmed three-dimensional capacity currently exists. Mr. Craig suggested scheduling a demonstration on LIDAR at a future meeting. In Thurston County for example, some of the maps show the movement of the glacier over time. It's possible to see the exact topography of how the landscape was formed and molded by the movement of the glaciers.

Mr. Craig suggested obtaining some digital imagery of the landscape to include some of the sampling sites or SRFB project sites to begin associating what is occurring on the landscape. Mr. Lehr replied that

Chehalis Basin Partnership Draft Minutes

May 18, 2007

Page 5 of 9

DOE and others are putting together a continual cycle to update aerial and other types of photos that cover the entire state updated on a six-year cycle. In early fall, the college will have access to the photos.

Mr. Craig said his suggestion pertains more to on-the-ground digital photography. Ms. Napier suggested photos of SRFB projects would be helpful. Mr. White described a software/website program that works with a digital camera or camera phone and a GPS unit for photographing specific sites.

Mr. Craig distributed a copy of a map of the Nisqually watershed and noted the map includes insets of economic drivers in the watershed as well as other information. A similar map could be produced for the Chehalis Basin.

Ms. Willis inquired about publicity for the clearinghouse. Mr. Lehr said outreach will occur through a number of different venues. The college is currently involved with many educational groups. He said he has been contacted by representatives from the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Department of Natural Resources who have expressed interest in utilizing the data. There have been informalized outreach efforts occurring.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw commented on the possibility of including information on a laptop during the Watershed Festival in Aberdeen.

Progress Report on Planning for 2007 Watershed Festival

Kathy Jacobson, Festival Coordinator, updated members on planning efforts for the 2007 Watershed Festival scheduled for October 13, 2007 at Morrison Riverfront Park in Aberdeen. The planning committee meeting was dynamic with active participation. The committee prefers to extend the festival throughout the week by focusing on a number of different activities leading up to the festival. A kick-off activity includes a farm tour in Grays Harbor. Committee members are also contacting libraries and other groups that might be interested in sponsoring activities.

Ms. Jacobson reported the City of Aberdeen agreed to pay the rental cost of the facility. Additionally, a large tent will be rented for the day. The Quinault Indian Tribe is participating by providing entertainment and a salmon bake.

Ms. Jacobson referred to an individual with the Grays Harbor Historical Seaport. The gentleman expressed interest in some partnerships. The Grays Harbor Chamber of Commerce has agreed to help publicize the festival. The City of Aberdeen will include information about the festival on the City's electronic reader board.

Ms. Jacobson noted that during the recent Shorebird Festival, many entities were represented that indicated interest in attending and participating in the festival.

The committee's next meeting is on Wednesday, May 23. Committee members will provide a list of individuals to invite to the festival. Both a paper and electronic postcard will be sent asking teachers if they are interested in receiving a packet of activities scheduled prior to the festival.

Ms. Willis offered the suggestion of contacting the Lewis County Conservation District to obtain a walk through display.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Draft Minutes

May 18, 2007

Page 6 of 9

Mr. Jennings inquired about water access at the pavilion. Ms. Jacobson said a boat launch is available near the site.

Presentation by Student Representatives from the Chehalis Basin Educational Consortium

Ms. Jacobson provided introductory remarks about student participation in the Chehalis Basin Education Consortium. This year, the consortium strengthened existing partnerships and established new partnerships. The program is targeted to students from fourth grade through high school. Several third grade classes are involved as well. The program begins with water quality training for teachers. During the water quality monitoring window, students monitor water quality throughout the watershed at 25 different sites by collecting data. An event called "River of Words" is an opportunity for students to explore the outdoors. The initiative is promoted by the US Forest Service, US Fish and Wildlife, and local agencies. A workshop is sponsored each year at the Wild Thyme Farm in Oakville. This year more than 700 students entered the "River of Words" international contest. Washington State entries are on display at DOE. DOE sponsored an awards ceremony to coincide with Earth Day. A career fair was held at Grays Harbor College with over 170 students participating from 11 schools. Tree planting occurred with the Chehalis River Basin Land Trust and the Chehalis River Basin Fisheries Task Force. A student congress was also held at Grays Harbor College. The events demonstrate the range of student activity involvement. During the next two weeks, approximately 350 students will participate in a tour of the Chehalis River Discovery Trail.

Ms. Jacobson introduced students and teachers from two schools representing East Grays Harbor High School in Elma and Washington Elementary School in Centralia. Fourth grade and high school students shared their respective experiences in water testing, water quality monitoring, and other environmental projects in several areas of the basin. Several high schools students commented about environmental problems associated with an old logging road and bridge and efforts to secure a gate to prevent access to the area to improve environmental conditions. There is an ongoing dispute regarding ownership of the road between Grays Harbor County and Weyerhaeuser.

Mr. Craig offered a suggestion for the students to provide before and after photos of the gate project.

Mr. Mobbs suggested having the high school provide the student's PowerPoint presentation to the committee. He encouraged students to pursue an education in environmental studies and noted the expanse of job opportunities available within the environmental field.

Status Report – Watershed Plan Implementation Phase 4

- **Scope of Work for Year 2 Contract – Review Task 7**
- **Background for June Meeting/Workshop regarding discussion of CBP Future Organizational Makeup**

Ms. Napier distributed a Scope of Work for WRIA 22-23 Phase 4 Implementation for Year 2. She noted some members expressed concerns about Task 7 at the last meeting. The scope of work includes revised language pertaining to Task 7. Additionally, for the June meeting/workshop, the materials in preparation for the meeting have been delayed.

Ms. Napier reported for Phase 4 Implementation, the contract has been amended for Year 1 to extend the timeline to allow expenditure of the first year grant. Tasks 2 and 3 are part of Year 1 but they have been completed but because of the amendment to the contract the tasks will be included. Task 4 is project coordination and involves a majority of work accomplished by Ms. Napier in support of the Partnership.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Draft Minutes

May 18, 2007

Page 7 of 9

Task 5 is the continuation of work last year in the development of the DIP and updates. Tasks 6 and 7 include information only based on subsequent amendments and funding.

Ms. Napier referred to Task 6 – Public outreach and reviewed previous outreach efforts, such as offering educational presentations to the Partnership and other standing committees, the Watershed Festival, and other efforts. Public outreach efforts however, are not sufficient and the Partnership needs to continue pursuing outreach efforts. Task 6 is from the DIP and was developed based on discussions through the watershed planning process. It is now time to begin implementing the task. The concept behind the task is to produce something eye-catching and easy to distribute or an easy way to share visual information. Jim Hill volunteered to develop a DVD on the story of the Chehalis Basin. With that suggestion, the STC began developing the task based on background information from other plans. At the STC May meeting, members discussed whether the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) was properly equipped to handle the task and perhaps the focus should be on dedicating resources to marketing and outreach efforts. No decisions occurred from the lengthy conversation. Based on the conversation, the task may be refined to develop efforts to more appropriately address how to pursue outreach and education. Ms. Napier invited comments from members.

Mr. Lehr referred to GIS efforts and the maps that will be distributed to schools. One feature of the map is the opportunity to include a virtual fly through of the basin by using three dimensional modeling. The effort could be a component of public outreach.

Ms. Napier reported STC's discussion included the need for someone to market the work of the Partnership and for some support to the CAC. Currently, no staff support is dedicated to the committee. Ms. Holbrook-Shaw pointed out that there is a difference between outreach and education throughout the basin and citizen participation. The focuses are different and both need some attention. It has been difficult to secure participation and one common theme is the inability of members to attend meetings during the day because of job commitments. Night meetings have also been scheduled and have not been successful as well. She said she is shifting focus on where efforts should be concentrated for citizen participation. The outreach and education component is essential and it's important to solicit other participation to share information and help citizens understand the Partnership, decisions rendered, and ongoing discussions on water issues. Additionally, many people do not use a computer and there must be other ways to reach out to those people.

Ms. Willis commented that Ms. Holbrook-Shaw as Chair of the CAC has worked tirelessly to involve citizens. There was discussion about citizen participation and whether a review of the bylaws is warranted to determine how citizens were selected and their respective area of representation. Four citizens were selected for each county with only one citizen having a voting right. There are issues in terms of how the citizens represent the county, whether they have a vote, and their personal interests that may be represented. She noted Nisqually has a very active and successful CAC. It may be appropriate to review the bylaws and reexamine the focus and membership.

Mr. Swartout said the Nisqually CAC also has the benefit of full-time staff that helped establish the CAC over several years. He suggested reviewing sources of funds to ascertain whether excess funds may be available to help fund some resources to support the CAC.

Ms. Napier said the Partnership at its June meeting will discuss the organization and its organizational needs. To date, many resources have been provided to the Partnership and the Partnership continues to advance. Since the organization was established, it has developed a plan and project lists, implemented

Chehalis Basin Partnership Draft Minutes

May 18, 2007

Page 8 of 9

on-the-ground projects, begun data collection efforts, and is in the process of developing a GIS Clearinghouse. However it is time to examine the organizational structure and review the organization's future needs.

Ms. Napier referred to Task 7. Language was used from the DIP to develop Task 7, which created some concerns with some members. Based on input by several members, the task was revised. Within Task 7, tasks a, b, and c were revised to include: a) Implementing a pilot water right mapping project for an area to be designated within the Chehalis Basin, b) Mapping will include point of diversion or point of withdrawal, quantity, and type of use, and c) Develop a scope of work for an assessment of water right claims in the Chehalis Basin.

Ms. Napier said the issue of water rights is controversial and pertains to the issue of state, local, and other organizational control.

Mr. Jennings inquired about the budget figures for fiscal year 2007. Ms. Napier said the budget for Year 2 is \$125,000. The direction from the Partnership and the STC was to cover the administrative costs associated with the organization that covers Task 1, 4, and 5. The STC determined \$14,000 to \$15,000 was needed for the outreach component leaving a balance of approximately \$22,000, which is insufficient to completely cover the costs associated with Task 7. There are deliverables associated with the task required by DOE.

It was noted that the scope of work did not include all estimated costs for the tasks and some information was missing in terms of the budget amounts.

Mr. Jennings referred to Task 7 and reported he submitted a water rights application to DOE for the Skookumchuck River. The City of Centralia has spent a significant amount of money over the last several years modeling the use of the reservoir to mitigate and augment flows. The City of Centralia is moving forward on the permit. As part of the project, the City will likely consider mapping water rights in the Skookumchuck Basin. If the Partnership wants to consider designating the work as the pilot project, Mr. Jennings said the City will contribute matching funds to accomplish the task. The timeframe for mapping is anticipated to be completed before the end of the year.

Ms. Napier advised that the budget of \$125,000 requires a match of 10%. She noted the match includes volunteer time by Partnership members billed at a rate of \$15 an hour.

Ms. Napier referred to information for the June meeting. The Partnership is changing and there has been much discussion about the future organization of the Partnership. Currently, the Partnership is a planning unit formed through interlocal agreements with Grays Harbor County as its fiscal agent. There has been discussion about whether the plan is progressive and includes actions that the Partnership wants to pursue and the mechanisms to accomplish the projects. With the development of the DIP, there is much work to complete. It is becoming more apparent that the organizational make-up should be reexamined.

Ms. Napier reported Bill Jarocki, Environmental Finance Center, Boise State University, provided information about the Plan to Fund database software and has shared some of his personal experiences with watershed planning and other groups working on implementation actions. Several members suggested inviting Mr. Jarocki to attend the June meeting and share information. The June meeting will be a workshop primarily focused on discussing the future of the Partnership. Ms. Napier asked members to consider the needs of the group and provide some suggestions. She shared that she has begun working

Chehalis Basin Partnership Draft Minutes

May 18, 2007

Page 9 of 9

on a similar list and encouraged members to undertake the same effort. Mr. Swartout asked her to share the list at the next STC meeting.

Ms. Napier reported Grays Harbor County is willing to serve as the fiscal agent. However, other suggestions are welcome. She indicated she cannot continue to support the Partnership to the same extent and that direction is needed for hiring extra staff.

Mr. Swartout said the discussion was generated based on the results of legislative visits for funding requests and the realization that the Legislature will eventually not provide funding for implementing the watershed plan. The group needs an established revenue source to help leverage grant funds. Currently, the Partnership is funded through the Legislature and grant funds. Other sources of funding will be needed to sustain efforts.

Mr. Swartout requested receiving information from Mr. Jarocki to help prepare for the June workshop.

Other Business

Mr. Craig commented on the potential to develop a GIS project involving global warming. The film, "Inconvenient Truth" included scenarios on sea level rise. Of particular value to Grays Harbor is developing some visual images depicting the consequences of sea level rise in a video format. He suggested it could be a component of educational outreach to show citizens how planning is underway in the watershed to deal with the consequences of sea level rise. Mr. Lehr commented on some climate modeling underway that uses a regional adopted model that can model projected extremes.

Future Meetings

May 22, 2007 STC Workshop at DOE

May 23, 2007 Watershed Festival Planning Meeting 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. at Chehalis Basin Educational Consortium

June 7, 2007 STC Meeting 9:30 a.m. at WDFW, Capitol Way, Olympia

June 8, 2007 Habitat Work Group, 9:30 a.m. at Lewis County Conservation District

June 14, 2007 Water Quality Committee, 9:30 a.m. at Grays Harbor Forestry Building

June 22, 2007, CPB, 9:30 a.m. at Lucky Eagle Casino

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. White adjourned the meeting at 11:58 a.m.

Prepared by Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services