

CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP
Chehalis Tribe “Lucky Eagle” Casino
Rochester, Washington
January 25, 2008
9:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

Meeting Summary

MEMBERS & ALTERNATES PRESENT

Bonnie Canaday, Chair, Mayor Pro-Tem, City of Centralia
Chanele Holbrook-Shaw, Citizen, Thurston County
Bob Macleod, Thurston County
Debbie Carneveli, Department of Fish and Wildlife (Alternate)
Kahle Jennings, City of Centralia (Alternate)
Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County (Alternate)
Terry Harris, City of Chehalis
Richard Graham, Lewis County

Ann Wick, Department of Agriculture
Ron Schillinger, City of Montesano
Mark White, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis
Reservation (Alternate)
Bill Schulte, Farm Bureau
Bob Beerbower, Grays Harbor
Chris Hempleman, Department of Ecology
Mark Swartout, Thurston County

OTHERS PRESENT

Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Randy Lehr, Grays Harbor Community College
Joel Massman, Quinault Indian Nation
Ron Maul, Farm Bureau
Patrick Wiltzius, City of Chehalis
Dave Rounry, Department of Ecology (DOE)
Sherman Vernon III, Citizen
Samuel Iwenofu, Quinault Indian Tribe (11:35 a.m.)

John Penberth, Citizen
J Roach, Citizen, Thurston County
Corinne Tobeck, Lewis County
Theresa Julius, Grays Harbor Council of
Governments
Jerry Louthain, HDR
Steve Hallstrom, Citizen
Nadine Romero, Thurston County
Brett DeMond, LWC Consulting

GENERAL PARTNERSHIP BUSINESS

Welcome, Introductions and Roundtable Comments

Chair Canaday called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m. Everyone present provided self-introductions.

Discuss and adopt draft-meeting summaries for November 16, 2007 and December 21, 2007

The Chehalis Basin Partnership approved the minutes of the November 16, 2007 and December 21, 2007 meetings.

SPECIAL PROJECTS AND PRESENTATIONS

Hydrogeology Analysis by Joel Massman for the Quinault Indian Nation

Ms. Napier introduced Joel Massman, presented a Quinault Indian Nation (QIN) project. Mr. Massman has completed some work for the Tribe on analyzing water quantity. The presentation is one of three the Partnership has received for assisting members in understanding the continuity issue between groundwater and surface water. Ms. Nadine Romeo, Thurston County, provided the first presentation on Hydrology 101 followed by Matt Ely, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), who presented information on the work completed by USGS to date for the Partnership and the possibility of future work.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary

January 25, 2008

Page 2 of 11

Mr. Massman reported he completed a study for the QIN to estimate the impacts of groundwater extraction from wells on stream flows. The study included the development of a sophisticated computer model examining flows over the subbasins of focus to quantitatively describe the impact of wells on streams. The study identified wells in the focus area, how much water is pumped from the wells, when the wells might affect stream flow, and whether the amount of water pumped from the wells compared to the stream flow is significant or insignificant. Some limitations were also identified that could be addressed by the USGS in their proposed study.

The study centered on identifying the groundwater flow system of the upper Chehalis. Many features of the system are unique and likely played a role in the recent flooding in December. The system involves relatively small aquifers residing inside small bedrock valleys. There is little storage capacity in the system resulting in the system filling up quickly when high precipitation occurs causing flooding as well as stream levels lowering when little precipitation occurs and the amount of pumping is high. Conversely, the system is particularly sensitive to water input and water output.

Mr. Massman displayed a schematic illustration of the basin from the eastern bedrock to the ocean. The schematic shows the features of the Chehalis with bedrock outcrops to the east where more precipitation occurs. The water flows and feeds rivers and streams and wetlands and eventually discharges into the ocean. The water as it falls upon the bedrock to the east and as it flows to the west part of it goes very deep and feeds these large-scale regional systems. That water might go hundreds of feet deep, and eventually discharge into the ocean. Another component is the smaller systems where the water can go down to approximately hundred feet deep and then comes back up and feed wetlands and streams. This is the water system of the most concern, because it supports the streams and rivers during the summer months.

Mr. Massman reviewed gaining and losing streams. Most of the streams in the watershed are gaining streams. Another type of stream not seen much in the Chehalis is a losing stream, where the water is flowing out of the stream and into the aquifer. The more normal case – in the Chehalis - are streams that pick up groundwater as it flows through the system. The question is how much wells capture from gaining streams. There are three things to consider - where's the well, how deep is the well, and what is the geology in the vicinity of the well. Many people believe that the impact of wells to water is a reduction of water from the stream. However, in most cases that doesn't occur. What occurs under most scenarios is the reduction in the amount of water that is going into the stream. The stream may be gaining water as it moves down lower elevations, but it is gaining less water because of the presence of wells. There are very few instances where wells are responsible for pulling water out of the stream. Because the stream is gaining, it's difficult to ascertain how much the wells are pulling from the streams. The only way to quantify the impact is through modeling. In most cases it's very difficult and it only works in extreme cases where the stream flow can be measured to ascertain the impact of a well. There are just too many other variables occurring, such as rainfall and other effects.

Initially, when turning on a well, the water is coming directly from the aquifer surrounding the well. As the well continues to pump, it is water that would have eventually flowed into the stream. The question is how long it takes before it impacts the stream flow. Variables include the location of the well, how far from the stream, depth of the well, and the geology of the area. In extreme cases where there might be a well located 500 feet from a stream that is 50 feet deep, the impact may occur within several weeks. In other cases, where the well is located thousands of feet from a stream and the depth is hundreds of feet, the impact may not occur for several months or several years. It's important to consider the different factors to determine the effect and the degree of the effect.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary

January 25, 2008

Page 3 of 11

Mr. Massman said field work involved identifying all the wells, an estimate of the well usage, pumping amount, and how much recharge is from precipitation. In the study, six subbasins were studied.

Mr. Massman displayed a graph depicting the average stream flow on a monthly basis for each of the subbasins. Subbasins 1 – 4 are upstream of the area of focus. The study focused on what occurs during the dry years, a year where the flow is less than the value of the average flow over 10 years. During the summer months the average flows and the one in ten flows are not much different. That's because most of the variability in flows occurs during the winter months and not in the summer months.

Mr. Massman explained how the various factors were fed into the model from inputting all streams of various sizes, adding precipitation, and factoring areas where groundwater can leave the system. One important fact about the Chehalis system is that no inflow occurs from the east. All the water that leaves the system comes from precipitation. There are no deep aquifers feeding the Chehalis system.

The model calculates the precipitation and how much is lost through plants and evaporation. The model calculates how fast water moves down and how fast it moves laterally to the streams and what the water levels are in the aquifer. The modeling exercise is based on no wells. Calculations are made based on no wells pumping in the system. The next step includes adding existing pumping wells. There are approximately 270 wells with water rights in the basin. Another piece is wells without water rights, or exempt wells. There are approximately 4,000 in the basin. Those wells are located and then an estimate is added to the model reflecting how much water the wells pump. In many cases, many of the wells are clustered around streams because in many locations there is bedrock that produces very little water. The valleys are filled with gravel and are where the productive aquifers are located.

Mr. Massman reviewed different types of wells and their usage. Two municipal wells include the City of Centralia and the Town of Bucoda. The distance of all wells ranges from several hundred feet to several thousand feet. Most are clustered around the main stem of the Chehalis River. Mr. Massman reviewed the water rights associated with the municipal wells.

Other wells include wells for fish propagation, agriculture, commercial, and domestic uses. Most of the wells are not used to the maximum value throughout the year.

Exempt wells were examined as well as the streams that might be most impacted by exempt wells. Exempt wells are limited to pumping 5,000 gallons a day and they require no water rights. Some of the watersheds have 50 to 60 exempt wells per square mile. The small streams located higher in the watershed where there is a high concentration of exempt wells appear to have the most relevance.

Mr. Massman answered questions on how the figure for exempt wells was obtained. Another contractor for the Tribe used population estimates throughout the watershed as well as customer lists showing areas served by public water systems. He noted that some people may obtain their water from public water systems but have smaller wells for other applications, which are not factored in the model. In terms of impact there are exempt wells high in the watershed that may be relevant and there are larger municipal water rights in the lower part of the basin that may be relevant. Exempt wells located in the lower part of the basin near the Chehalis are likely not relevant because of the amount of stream flow.

Mr. Massman said the model calculated the amount of water usage during various times of the year and how much of the water is consumptive use. The model calculated 80% of the municipal wells as

Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary

January 25, 2008

Page 4 of 11

consumptive uses. The modeling shows that the cumulative decrease in stream flows in cubic feet per second (cfs) range from a few tenths cfs to tens of cfs for the larger systems. The impact on stream flows during the wetter months is less than a percent while the impact is approximately 10% during July, August, and September. During a dry year, which occurs once every 10 years, shutting off all wells in the system would result in an increase in stream flows by 10%.

Mr. Massman commented that the model is not entirely technically defensible because the field work did not include measuring water levels throughout the system and then comparing the modeling predictions to what was observed. There were insufficient resources to undertake that work. The study included using as much data that was available and running the model based on best guesses and not on observed water levels. The USGS effort would include that observation factor. The USGS model will be calibrated and predications will be more reliable. However the effort is far more expensive that that undertaken by the Tribe. However, the effort reveals a good understanding of how much water is coming out of the groundwater system.

Commissioner Macleod asked about the potential impact in terms of the relationship between population and availability of water. Mr. Massman said in terms of the impact on flows, adding a number of exempt wells per square miles will reduce flows to a larger percentage.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw commented that the Town of Bucoda previously had a large water right but relinquished some of the water rights. Mr. Massman said the figures only included groundwater rights and not surface water rights. The Town of Bucoda has a surface water right as well.

Ms. Romero commented on some trend analysis she has undertaken on the Grand Mound gauge. The trend analysis of the USGS Scatter Creek well reveals that levels are rising despite heavier development. Mr. Jennings asked whether data exists on the number of acres of irrigated agriculture in the past versus the present. There may be a significant change, which might be an explanation for the increase. When the Nisqually quake occurred in 2001, the water level in Centralia's municipal well increased by eight feet. He suggested there might be changes in the geology effecting how water flows.

Post Flood Update/Feedback – Role of the CBP with Respect to Flooding

Mr. Swartout reported at the last meeting, members shared stories and information about the December flood. Some members questioned the possible role of the Partnership regarding the flood event. The Steering Technical Committee (STC) discussed the issue as well as members agreeing it's an important discussion for the Partnership to consider. In terms of history, the Partnership loosely organized after the 1996 flood, before watershed planning and salmon recovery acts were passed. The initial group provided a forum for discussion of water resource issues that all jurisdictions in the basin shared in common. At the onset, the role of the Partnership was a place to become informed about what was occurring in another setting such as the US Army Corps of Engineers and other jurisdictions that were preparing proposals to mitigate the impacts of I-5 flooding.

Mr. Swartout said it's important for the Partnership to discuss the role of the Partnership in the future.

Mr. Schulte said he's considered the role of the CBP as his home flooded with over seven feet of water. He recommended the CBP develop a proposal because every group that was affected by the flood is developing proposals and plans on how to deal with flood mitigation. If the Partnership wants to participate rather than criticize and lose creditability later on, then the Partnership will benefit from making some recommendations because it will be helpful to the overall response to flood mitigation.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary

January 25, 2008

Page 5 of 11

Mr. Penberth said the comments by Mr. Swartout are incorrect because when the Partnership was first formed, it involved local leaders, department heads, and elected officials who could make decisions. At the first meeting, the former Mayor of the City of Centralia proposed construction of a dam and flooding the Town of Pe Ell. He said that was a terrible thing to say and that he opposed the suggestion from the beginning. At the first meeting, the Partnership was represented by county commissioners and mayors who were responsible for making decisions. Today, the Partnership is represented by staff, which cannot make decisions. To even imply or suggest that the group not participate in flood prevention is a mistake.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw commented on the importance of collecting data. There have been some members who have begun collecting data on what occurred. At a minimum, the Partnership should follow up on data collection efforts and ensure data is consolidated to provide a snapshot of the event to ensure factual information is used in making future decisions. There are many members that have technical expertise who can assist the Partnership. It's important not to lose sight of that.

Chair Canaday said she's been attending Partnership meetings for quite awhile and doesn't believe any member would not want to become involved and continue to be out front on the issue

Mr. Schillinger said the Partnership is not a revenue-generating body or a permitting body. The Partnership also doesn't have the authority to create regulations. There are members within the Partnership that have certain authorities. The concerns, issues, and heartbreak associated with flooding are the reasons the City of Montesano joined the Partnership. What occurs upstream impacts downstream municipalities. Previous flooding events have required substantial funding and permits, which is why he was glad to see the involvement of the US Army Corps of Engineers. The Corps looked at developing a study of all the alternatives to resolve and solve the flooding problems. He said he believes the study has been completed. From a Partnership perspective, the Partnership was not involved in the funding or the policy in determining which alternative would be implemented. He said he's unsure where the information is but that it does exist.

Mr. Jennings said as a staff person reporting to the City Manager who reports to Mayor Canaday, he has some insight because of the number of meetings recently attended on transportation and flooding. He said he's immersed in the local flooding situation in Centralia, Chehalis, and Lewis County. The challenge is keeping up-to-date on all the meetings and activities involving the flood. The Governor has directed the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED) to take the lead on solving flood problems in the Lewis County area related to I-5 and protecting the community. The question is how the Partnership participates in the process given the participants in place. He suggested it will be a challenge because even at the local level, it's been a challenge to keep up with everything that has occurred.

Mr. Penberth complimented Mr. Schillinger for his comments regarding his comments about the Corps. He suggested the Partnership is a group of people who don't have much horsepower to do many things. In the past, he's recommended abolishing the Partnership after the county commissioners signed the watershed plan because there is nothing to carry it forward and there are no teeth in moving forward. It's a good group to meet to spend salmon recovery funds. At this point, it's a futile attempt. The Partnership is a good group to meet monthly and share information. He suggested taking the Partnership to Olympia legislators and let them know that the Partnership has played its hand out and give it back to the local jurisdictions. The picture has changed – it's gone from local jurisdictions trying to handle the flooding to WSDOT and CTED that lead the effort. The Partnership doesn't know what WSDOT's plan will be.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary

January 25, 2008

Page 6 of 11

During the previous work, the Corps experienced internal conflicts on what the proper flood control measures should be.

Mr. Jennings clarified that WSDOT and CTED are only involved in that portion of the flood issue related to I-5 and protecting the communities of Chehalis and Centralia.

Mr. Harris said first and foremost that just because everyone is in the same room, not everyone will agree on the same solution. The fact that members meet, communicate, and share information about what's occurring in other cities and towns is important. The plans that CTED and WSDOT may develop may not agree with what the communities believe are best. The City of Chehalis will consider its neighbors and how any outcome may impact local jurisdictions. It's important to note that all members want to ensure their own community is protected, but at the same time, no member is ignorant or blind to the other communities that may be negatively or positively impacted. Just because CTED and WSDOT are going to take over the I-5 corridor and determine a remedy for I-5 flooding doesn't mean the cities of Centralia and Chehalis are not going to prevent any mitigation measures that are destructive to the cities just to save the freeway. It's important for the Partnership to be at any table regardless of where it's at and who's at the table. As individuals, members will be proactive. There are ways to mitigate the impacts and it's important for everyone to be at the table. As the Partnership, Mr. Harris suggested flood planners should be attending CBP meetings because most of the region's players are at the table. Those officials who haven't attended are welcome to attend and have been invited. The Partnership should be the place for those meetings. Mr. Harris said it's disturbing that the Partnership hasn't been more of a focus of the situation. It appears the Governor is more concerned about keeping I-5 open. Much of the focus should come through the organization by inviting them to attend Partnership meetings.

Mr. Schulte agreed and suggested the CBP could give a conceptual proposal on what should be done for the flooding in the basin and why because the Partnership represents the basin. The problem is that a small group of people can disrupt and stop the progress. It takes everybody working together to determine measures that benefit all communities. The group covers the area and a sufficient cross section of the basin to conceptually develop some steps to mitigate flooding. It will be easier for the counties and cities to develop flood control plans knowing they have support across the basin.

Mr. Hallstrom said it appears that King County is applying political pressure in terms of I-5. The closure of I-5 is a real problem for the rich, urbanized areas and politicians will become involved. It's the people in the basin that must be considered. It's important to ensure the government is aware that something must be done.

Mr. Schillinger supported the idea of flood reduction impact and capturing more water in the aquifers for use and dispersal during times of low flows. The storage idea that the Corps developed is something that should be explored. He commented that building homes and businesses in the basin could be compared to building in a sink. There are choices that people make that don't appear to be impacted regardless of the consequences.

Mr. Schulte said many people build homes near fault lines or volcanoes or other areas. He said he built his home 20 feet above and 500 feet away from the high water mark from the 1996 flood. It's not possible to predict the next event. The only thing people can do is to consider the risk analysis and take steps to best deal with it. There are many people in the area that flooded out in the December flood who have never experienced a flood in recorded history. The "safe line" is unknown. People can make

Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary

January 25, 2008

Page 7 of 11

reasonable, logical choices. The goal is to develop a conceptual idea of the steps necessary to take and then implement that into a flood mitigation plan that everyone can agree with.

Mr. Harris said it will be a multi-pointed plan that somebody will dislike. But, officials will have to step up to the plate and acknowledge there will be some impacts but if no action is taken, the impacts will be greater during the next event.

Ms. DeMond said it will involve mitigating the impacts of the flood but it will also involve land use planning, such as prevention by altering the removal of timber. That's a prevention aspect that should be considered as well.

Chair Canaday said she owns several houses in the City of Centralia. Two flooded during the December flood. They have never flooded before. She said she has been involved in many of the previous floods but finds that each flood is very different. It depends on the river flow when the rain starts, amount of rainfall, where it rains, and when high tide occurs. It's important to be concerned about impacts to Pe Ell as well as to Grays Harbor. However, something must be done. She said she's attended many flood meetings and doesn't want to be attending flood meetings in 10 years discussing the same issues without any resolution. The problem with flooding is that the memory fades after everyone resolves their immediate issues. She cautioned against forgetting what happens and that action is necessary. She noted that because water had been drawn down behind the Skookumchuck Dam, the south part of Centralia did not flood like it did in 1996. She said she's asked whether the dam will be monitored during the winter to ensure the level is low during the winter when the rainfall hits to protect the City of Centralia. According to what she's been told the answer is yes.

Mr. Penberth reported one of the conditions that occurred in the upper Chehalis was the loss of 10 Weyerhaeuser bridges. It began with a major slide that plugged up one bridge, which caused its collapse causing pressure along the river and destruction of subsequent bridges causing water and debris to spread along the upper Chehalis. He offered an unlikely mitigation suggestion of installing draw bridges because once obstruction occurs; it causes water to back up creating pressure on the river.

Mr. White suggested there are two courses the Partnership can pursue. He asked why the Governor's Office and WSDOT has not attended one single community meeting. There is the defensive course and an offensive course. The Partnership should pursue an offensive course because it's impossible to beat the river. There's no way to dam it, dike it, dredge it, or any other action. The soils in the basin are not conducive to stabilizing the river. He suggested looking at building practices. Places like Amsterdam live in areas of major flooding. Amsterdam builds their houses on floats. Some of the houses are built on excavator tracks. Houses go up and down with the floods. Building in a floodplain creates the need for creativity in the way houses are built. The biggest concern during the flood for him was the leakage of gasoline. None of the tanks were contaminated with water.

Ms. DeMond contended that the slide caused the mud. Chair Canaday said it confirms her point that every flood is different.

Mr. White said the Partnership should set its own offensive. The counties and cities need to consider building practices. He an advocate for property owner rights, but if it affects his neighbor, then maybe the practice needs to be examined.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary

January 25, 2008

Page 8 of 11

Mr. Harris said it will require the jurisdictions to step up and make choices on what is best for the greater good, which will mean sacrifices on all parts. Using dikes, dams, gates, and science needs to be considered.

Ms. Hempleman said the Partnership is working on many important issues. She asked how the Partnership will take on an additional giant task structurally.

Ms. DeMond reported Representative Gary Alexander said during a Rochester flood relief meeting that funding would be available for staff to deal with flood issues. Mr. White suggested the CBP should approach the Legislature for funding. Chair Canaday said she doesn't have any problems with doing so.

Mr. Graham departed the meeting at 10:58 a.m.

Commissioner Macleod commented that out of respect for members, the CBP is one of the best kept secrets. With this being a major disaster in the last 10 years, the CBP has a reason to move in mass to both make an appointment with the Governor's Office or a legislative committee and move to a higher visibility because of the significance of the event. Some body of some mass needs to meet with state officials.

Chair Canaday said she's offered a solution for I-5 by adding a second story freeway for trucks to use during flood events. She's been advocating for that particular solution for the last six years.

Mr. Schillinger said the solution is not a one-dimensional solution based on the specifics of each subbasin's individual needs. He suggested the STC is the body to develop a recommendation for the CBP to consider.

Mr. Swartout said the STC tries to offer choices for the CBP's consideration.

Mr. Schillinger said it appears members are advocating for moving forth with some kind of action.

Commissioner Beerbower referred to the 1996 flood and his involvement after the flood to determine a solution. For years, the Corps worked on studies. He said he's been in office for 13 years and nothing has been done other than gathering information. The problem with the previous efforts was that the public was not involved. The CBP has public involvement, which is what he likes about the group. He said he was hoping that enough information was generated for the Partnership to examine the material to determine what's occurred in the past for moving forward to solve the problems. He disagreed with Mr. Penberth that the Partnership needs to disband. Communities need the river and exist because of it. Everyone needs to work with the river and try to solve some of the problems. He had hoped the previous effort would resolve some of the problems, however nobody wanted to be responsible and everyone was afraid of being sued. It doesn't do any good to attend all the meetings and not make some decisions. The Partnership needs to expand as well as involve more of the public.

Mr. Harris reiterated the need for everyone to give and take. It will mean people will have to give in on certain things. In 1990, there was no state or federal help. In 1996, there were no federal or state politicians helping. Today, there is help and there is funding offered. If anything, the CBP should be taking advantage of that by welcoming them and offering them the group to be welcomed into – not turning over the reins to somebody else who's only concerned about asphalt. The Partnership needs to

Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary

January 25, 2008

Page 9 of 11

figure out how to get those organizations into the Partnership. If it's in the basin he questioned why the groups are not at the Partnership table. He agreed with approaching them and inviting them to the table.

Mr. Louthain said he's been involved in flooding issues for years. The basin is similar to what occurred in Skagit County. Skagit County has a proposal to develop a plan with a group similar to the CBP based on a consensus format. He suggested the CBP needs to insert itself into the process. He said he's spoken with Keith Phillips from the Governor's Office about the flooding. Mr. Phillips understands the issues. The problem is that the state is starting at the point of the existing Corps project, which is the smaller project. Mr. Phillips is aware that it's a bigger issue and that he needs to consider the bigger picture. The Governor has offered funding as well as the authorization of the Corps project with funding, which has not been appropriated at this time. Skagit County has some funding at the local level and some Corps funding to resurrect an older study of over 20 years. Just like in the Chehalis Basin, there are many different opinions. Skagit County is moving forward in the process with many stakeholders.

Mr. Louthain said the flood was unique in that flood stage was not attained on the Skookumchuck. If flood stage had been reached, it would have been even more devastating. He suggested moving forward as a group and obtaining funding. The effort should move forward to expand the Corps project to the point where all stakeholders can agree. He suggested the Partnership should contact Skagit County because they are further ahead in the process with their proposal.

Mr. Roach commented on the camaraderie of the group and the number of people represented at the table. He agreed the CBP should move forward and become more involved.

Mr. Schulte reported on Monday, January 21, 2008, State Representatives DeBolt, Alexander, and Senator Dan Swecker, and a staff member from Representative Brian Baird's office attended a community at Adna High School. Approximately 150 citizens attended the meeting. There are many concerned citizens. Many ideas were offered.

Mr. Penberth reported many years ago a flood meeting was held in Pe Ell. Approximately 400 people attended the meeting on a presentation for creating a flood district for Lewis County. The flood plan was adopted by the Lewis County Commissioners. The plan was funded for \$350,000, which initiated the flood studies that occurred throughout the years. He said he's been told over \$10 million has been spent on flood studies.

Mr. Swartout said there appears to be general agreement on some concepts. What has been pointed out is the need to bring WSDOT and CTED to the table and have them inform the Partnership about what they are proposing. State agencies usually include some public outreach component of the proposal, which should be shared with the Partnership. Mr. Swartout said there are also concerns about the scale of the state's proposal pertaining to whether the focus is only protecting the I-5 corridor and the cities of Chehalis and Centralia or the entire watershed and downstream impacts. Thurston County's floodplain manager is concerned about what is occurring upstream and possible impacts to Thurston County. There is a shared concern among other jurisdictions as well. He agreed it's important to be aware of the CBP's capacity and taking on the role to become the consensus for everyone in the basin is a huge undertaking and is not something that he believes the Partnership has the capacity to do. While the issue is important and has floated to the top, there are many contracts underway and implementation of the watershed plan is underway.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary

January 25, 2008

Page 10 of 11

Mr. Louthain suggested contacting Keith Phillips from the Governor's Office. He suggested inviting him to the next meeting. Mr. Swartout offered a suggestion of both a letter and telephone call from Chair Canaday or Mark White as Co-chair and as a tribal employee. Mr. White offered to hand deliver a letter next week as he has a meeting scheduled with Mr. Phillips.

Members authorized Chair Canaday and Mr. White to develop the letter with Mr. White delivering the letter next week to Mr. Phillips.

Ms. Tobeck asked whether representatives from WSDOT or CTED have been invited to attend meetings. Mr. Swartout explained that during the early meetings, there was some attendance by representatives. Ms. Napier has recently called and left messages with the Corps Project Manager, but no one has returned her calls. Commissioner Beerbower said he is experiencing the same problem with calls not being returned.

Mr. Harris referred to the Partnership's capacity issue and suggested the more people that attend the meetings; it's an opportunity to bring some of the organizations to help facilitate some of the Partnership's tasks.

Mr. Swartout advised that if the state wants the Partnership to take on a role or a capacity, the state needs to provide some funds and capacity to assist the Partnership in the work.

Mr. White asked Mr. Lehr whether there is any additional capacity at the college that can be tapped. Mr. Lehr said he doesn't believe so but can check about the possibility.

Mr. Swartout said if the role of the CBP crosses over as a facilitator to help attain a consensus around the basin, it will be important to use a neutral third party, who is not involved in the basin.

Mr. Iwenofu arrived at 11:35 a.m.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw suggested publishing the CBP's meeting dates in local newspapers. Ms. Napier asked members to notify her of free advertising opportunities.

Commissioner Macleod underscored the timing of the effort as the basin is coming off one of the most dramatic events in western Washington. Media attention is still on the flood. However, on the other side, members must be realistic that the Governor's Office and the Legislature will move on. Putting too many details and taking too much time may mean the Legislature and the Governor are off on another area, especially in the area of the Governor's reelection bid. The work needs to proceed quickly before the next dramatic event occurs.

Mr. Jennings reported the US Army Corps of Engineers Reevaluation Report and Final Environmental Impact Statement are available on the Corps' website. It does not include all the information Pacific International Engineering completed through their contract with Lewis County.

Mr. Mauel reported on a meeting Thursday, January 31, 2008 at the Boistfort Grange. Local farmers were hit hard by the flood and there is much debris in the fields. The effort is to help save some of the farmers from going bankrupt. The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) has offered to remove woody debris from fields and streams. DNR will be the lead and they are hiring contractors to remove wood, dead animals, and other debris. The meeting will cover details of the effort. Commissioner of Public

Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Summary

January 25, 2008

Page 11 of 11

Lands Doug Sutherland is attending the meeting. The meeting starts at 6:30 p.m. DNR has stepped up to handle the issue. Some farmers will not survive and some will not be able to plant. The first concern is removing wood debris and restoring the soil.

Mr. White noted much of the debris is good stream restoration material. Ms. Holbrook-Shaw advised that large wood debris is a tax deduction if donated for restoration activities.

Ms. Napier thanked Ms. Carneveli for attending the meetings on behalf of Chad Stussy.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the CBP is February 22, 2008.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Chair Canaday adjourned the meeting at 11:45 a.m.

Prepared by Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary/President
Puget Sound Meeting Services