

**CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP**  
**Chehalis Tribe “Lucky Eagle” Casino**  
**Rochester, Washington**  
**March 26, 2010**

**Meeting Summary**

**MEMBERS, ALTERNATES & GUESTS PRESENT**

Bonnie Canaday, Chair, Mayor Pro Tem, City of Centralia  
Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County (Alternate)  
Kahle Jennings, City of Centralia (Alternate)  
Julie Balmelli-Powe, Lewis County Farm Bureau  
Janel Spaulding, Grays Harbor College  
Terry Harris, City of Chehalis  
Spencer Eaton, ESA Adolfson  
Chris Hempleman, Department of Ecology (DOE)  
Tom Bougher, Veterans Conservation Corps  
Sue Kennedy, Lewis County Public Health & Social Services  
Bob Burkle, Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW)

Lyle Hojem, Citizen, Lewis County  
Patrick Wiltzius, City of Chehalis (Alternate)  
Bill Schulte, Lewis County  
Mark White, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation  
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services  
Jim Hill, Citizen, Lewis County  
Amy Iverson, WDFW  
Chanele Holbrook-Shaw, Citizen, Thurston County  
Mark Swartout, Thurston County  
Bruce Treichler, Trout Unlimited  
Glen Connolly, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation  
Chris Stearns, Thurston Public Utilities District

**SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS:**

**Approval of Meeting Summary**

Approved February 26, 2010 meeting summary as amended.

**Organizational Restructuring**

Members agreed to continue moving forward to form a non-profit foundation.

- **Articles of Incorporation**

Members agreed language changes in the first two paragraphs under Article 4.

- **Board of Directors**

Members agreed to form a recruitment committee to solicit board of directors and founding directors. Ms. Spaulding will coordinate first meeting.

- **Registered Agent**

Members assigned Ms. Spaulding as the Registered Agent for the non-profit foundation.

- **Organizational Working Group**

Working Group to continue working on articles of incorporation and review by attorney, review of bylaws, and drafting a letter to founding members.

**Chehalis Basin Ecosystem and Restoration and Flood Risk Management Project**

Ms. Napier will convey the Partnership's concerns about the PMP at the meeting with the Corps and will present the PMP at the April meeting for further discussion and possible approval. Members agreed with the concept that the interlocal agreement is a communication piece between the Flood Authority and the CBP.

**GENERAL PARTNERSHIP BUSINESS**

### **Welcome, Introductions, and Roundtable Comments**

Chair Bonnie Canaday called the March 26, 2010, meeting of the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) to order at 9:35 a.m. Everyone present provided self-introductions.

### **Discuss and Adopt February 26, 2010 Meeting Summary**

A correction was requested to the minutes of February 26, 2010 correcting Mark Cline's name on page 7. The February 26, 2010, meeting summary was accepted by members as amended.

## **SPECIAL PROJECTS AND PRESENTATIONS**

### **Presentation – Doty-Dryad Hydrological Assessment – Sue Kennedy**

Ms. Napier introduced Sue Kennedy, Lewis County Public Health and Social Services, who briefed members on the hydrogeological assessment conducted on the aquifer underlying the Doty/Dryad area after the 2007 flood event.

*Lyle Hojem arrived at the meeting.*

Ms. Kennedy described her professional experience with Lewis County and experiences she encountered as an employee of the county's Health Department during numerous flood events. She described phone calls from citizens seeking assistance during floods in 1996, 2006, 2007, and 2009. Every flood is different and jurisdictions and citizens can plan and prepare, but are never totally ready for each flood. Each of those floods impacted people, groundwater, and wells differently. The Health Department had to respond differently to each flood. She explained how she monitors the Chehalis River on her way to work each day and that her mantra is "WTH" - "Warning, Teaching, Help."

*Bill Schulte arrived at the meeting.*

The department is responsible to warn citizens about the potential impacts on their water supply during a flood event. The department teaches citizens how to sterilize well water, repair wells, and identify potential problems. Because of the number of flood events, the department has prepared an informational piece on five easy steps for inspecting and disinfecting wells. During the flood of 2007, the department condensed the information from the Washington State Department of Health's four-page document to one page and a picture. When people are experiencing a flood, it's not possible to read a four-page document.

The last piece is "Help." Citizens must ask for help. During the flood of 2007, the department and citizens needed help desperately because they did not have the expertise and the background to respond to all the issues associated with the emergency.

Ms. Kennedy displayed a map of the Doty-Dryad area. During the flood of 2007, the entire Boistfort valley was under water as well as the water supply serving 2,000 people. Water lines were severed as well as the intakes with reservoirs losing water at a rapid rate. By the second day of the flood, residents were advised about compromised water and the need to boil and conserve where possible. They were directed to the availability of water at water stations. Community meetings were held to teach people how to sterilize wells. In the Boistfort valley, help was readily available through the movement of 1,280,750 gallons of water in fire tankers over a 12-day period to refill the reservoirs for the Boistfort Valley Water System so that homes could flush toilets because of public health reasons and to put water into the lines to test for breaks in the system. For 12 days, 11 fire districts ran tankers with volunteers and delivered over one million gallons of donated water from the City of Chehalis to refill the reservoirs.

In the Doty-Dryad area, there was no public water supply or reservoirs, but there were numerous single family residential wells. The department educated residents, warned residents, and sought help from others resources. Help came in the form of a Milky Way Dairy Gold Truck, which deployed three cells into the Doty-Dryad valley. Those cells were located in the downtown area and at the fire station providing short-term water to the community.

However, all wells were still showing positive for bacteria even though residents were trained on how to disinfect their wells. Because of the lack of a knowledge base about the area, well depths, and the impact of surface flooding, the bacteria issue couldn't be addressed immediately. By the end of February after the flooding in December, over 100 wells were still contaminated. Over 432 samples were processed at no charge at a cost of over \$10,000 to Lewis County without fixing the problem in over 100 homes. The county needed help.

Ms. Kennedy displayed photos of some of the devastation caused by the flood. One well at six feet high was overtopped with floodwater. Some of the wells experienced floodwaters of over 37.9 feet. When the water receded, it should have cleaned up. In the meantime, the Dairy Gold Truck fabricated spickets and people used bottles to obtain water. Additionally, hand washing stations and a shower unit were supplied to the community for over two months. The entire community was without potable water. Other local vendors donated water tanks and refilled the tanks during the emergency. Help is out there, but it's a matter of who to ask and a willingness to ask for help.

The 432 samples were narrowed down to the Doty-Dryad area and sampling continued to show contaminated wells. Some of those wells were deep, which was very troubling because the deep aquifer could have been impacted by the flood. At that point, Ms. Kennedy said she determined more help was needed. A grant application was submitted to the State Department of Health (DOH). DOH awarded funds for the hydrogeological analysis of the Doty-Dryad area to determine if there was a solution for the residents, if the deep aquifer was clean, and whether there were still unidentified problems. After sampling and analyzing the samples, a field visit was required for visual inspection. In each case, the deep aquifer was not impacted because of the flood. The wells were contaminated because of inadequate construction. In other cases, it wasn't the well, but storage tanks with open orifices. The wells could be disinfected, they could be repaired, and the deep aquifer wasn't contaminated, which was important information because the next piece of information wasn't positive.

Within the Doty-Dryad area there are small lots with wells that were contaminated by the flood and remained contaminated after the flood. However, it wasn't known if the wells were contaminated before the flood. Based on the analysis it was determined that the wells were contaminated before the flood. The data determined that the shallow water table underlying the Doty-Dryad area is contaminated with bacteria impacting wells six to ten feet deep. Disinfecting shallows wells will only result in recontamination. The issue involved what options were available to those families. The study looked at the deep aquifer and where it was located to determine a source of clean water. Funds were identified through the USDA Rural Grant Program. The program provides loans at less than 1% interest for qualifying applicants over a 30-year period allowing families to pay \$10 to \$15 a month on a loan for a new well to remove them from the shallow wells in the Doty-Dryad area.

Ms. Kennedy displayed a topographic map of the hydrogeology of the Doty-Dryad valley. Clean water is located deep in the aquifer at 275 to 375 deep. There was an answer and a choice families could make to have clean water. Residents were provided with the tools to determine the direction they wanted to take.

Ms. Kennedy commented about actions that will happen in the next flood and potential long-term community and emergency solutions. The community cannot always rely on Milky Way to provide cells

of water to a community. Now that the source of good water has been identified, there may be an opportunity to develop an emergency public water supply or even a public utility so that the next time it happens, the community can respond. Three possible solutions were considered of developing a public utility, development of a production well, or development of an emergency water supply. The public utility option is problematic because of parcel sizes. Miles of pipe would be required for only one connection, which doesn't make sense because of underlying zoning and the distance in property ownership to bring a public utility to that type of situation.

Based on the analysis, the next question is whether there is a location in the aquifer where a production well could be established as well as a location for a test well. The study ran two profiles of the area and identified two potential locations for production wells. However there was a problem as both locations were on private land and the landowners were not interested. Although the aquifer is safe, it's not a suitable producing aquifer. The highest flow from any of the wells based on well logs is 25 gallons per minute, which is inadequate for a public utility.

The result is a community with large parcels and low population, sandstone formation with low yield, and the best potential sites for well development are in private ownership. It's not a viable option at this time for that community to consider a public utility.

For public health, there is a safe aquifer but with low production. Ms. Kennedy said the county is still working on an option for an emergency well.

Bill Schulte said there has been some development for the water supply system for Rainbow Falls State Park that could be a potential emergency source for potable water.

Ms. Kennedy said she has spoken with the local church in the Dryad community that is considering the development of a new well and is interested in a partnership with the fire district. Those negotiations are ongoing. The Health Department is still looking for an emergency water supply because when the event occurred, it was not possible to reach the community for several days. Not having a viable and safe water supply is a major issue.

Ms. Kennedy asked members to provide feedback on the presentation and potential ways to improve the presentation.

Lyle Hojem asked about information available for combining several wells to provide an adequate amount of water. Ms. Kennedy affirmed it's possible to form a wellfield, which is not uncommon where several wells are drilled and combined with a reservoir system to meet demand. At this time the impetus is not there in that community and they are not interested in a public utility. However, if the community wanted to pursue a public utility that would be a viable option the county would consider.

Kahle Jennings said the City of Centralia uses the same approach by relying on three wells and reservoirs.

Chanele Holbrook-Shaw commented on the devastating impact the flood caused to the community. The county provided a good example of the support provided to the community. Ms. Kennedy credited the support of the Lewis County Commissioners during the flood event. The county submitted a grant application to the Department of Health to repair the Boistfort Valley Water System. The Doty-Dryad hydrogeology study was paid by the Washington State Department of Health. The entire process was a group effort by many agencies and individuals.

Mr. Schulte reported four schools were impacted by loss of water from the Boistfort Valley Water System for three and half months.

Mark Swartout asked whether any science is available on the timeline for contamination remaining in the shallow perched water table. Ms. Kennedy said bacteria are constantly re-fed to the water table. If hand dug wells are located next to sewer drain fields, contamination will occur. That situation has not changed in that community as many wells are shallow hand dug and contaminated with coliform bacteria. Based on the hydrogeology analysis, those wells will not clean up because they are constantly re-fed by surface activities.

Ms. Kennedy commented on the options that were provided to the community and how it basically comes down to personal choices. Mr. Schulte said the community overwhelmingly rejected a public utility after the county offered assistance.

Discussion followed on the status of the state considering rainwater catchment and storage as an alternative, costs associated with providing a public utility in a rural area because of the miles of waterlines, and the availability of USDA loans. Ms. Kennedy said she's unsure if any of the residents took advantage of the loan program. The properties were visited and wells were inspected. Eighteen letters were sent out with 16 owners permitting entry to inspect and test wells. The county followed up on all the wells that were inspected and owners were provided with directions on how to repair wells.

Mr. Hojem shared information on a recent trip to another area where catchment tanks were used by homeowners. Over 50% of the tanks were not covered, which likely wouldn't work for this area. They appeared to be very efficient. Ms. Kennedy said the issue with catchment systems will be treatment. The technology is available it's just a matter of making it economically available for single family residents.

Chair Canady shared that many companies in the local area donated pallets of bottled water.

The meeting was recessed from 10:19 a.m. to 10:36 a.m.

Lee Napier commented on the recent death of Pete Holm with the Chehalis River Council who was an active volunteer of the community and heavily involved in the Chehalis River basin. A memorial service will be held in Rochester on Saturday, March 27 at 2:00 p.m.

#### **Status Report and Discussion Regarding Organizational Restructuring – Janel Spaulding**

Janel Spaulding reported the Organizational Working Group met on March 4 and discussed forming a non-profit organization. She distributed a copy of the meeting summary of the meeting. Members discussed how the transition process will occur and establishing the basic structure. The working group discussed the articles of incorporation and including more specificity about the function of the organization and some of the actions the non-profit would perform in support of the Partnership. The working group recommends the non-profit should be established primarily as a fundraiser for the Partnership, and that its goals should be consistent in supporting the Partnership's mission statement and projects already identified in the Watershed Management Plan and the Detailed Implementation Plan.

There were some concerns about how specific the articles of incorporation should be. Mr. Jennings followed up with the Secretary of State on the requirements. The articles must meet the state's minimum requirements and beyond that it's up to the Partnership as to how specific the articles should be.

The working group suggested naming the non-profit the Chehalis Basin Foundation. A registered agent is required for the articles of incorporation. There were also some concerns about two organizations

maintained separately. Mr. Penberth used the analogy of creating a two-headed monster. The working group discussed that aspect and agreed it would be preferable for both organizations to function separately while the non-profit would receive direction from the Partnership for fundraising.

More discussion should occur on other roles the non-profit may play. There were some concerns with overlapping between the foundation and Partnership members with a suggestion that foundation members should be required to join the Partnership.

For the board of directors and the articles of incorporation, three founding members are required. The working group suggested some categories of boardmembers, such as accountants, experience in fundraising, and/or marketing/PR experience.

Ms. Spaulding provided a copy of the current operating budget and expenditures. It's likely a fiscal agent would be required, especially if government grants are received. The working group suggested Grays Harbor could continue filling that role.

Ms. Spaulding distributed and reviewed the current draft of the articles of incorporation with proposed changes by the working group.

Ms. Spaulding asked for feedback on the name of the organization. Mr. Harris commented that missing from Partnership's documents is "river." For fundraising purposes, people know what a river is but not necessarily understand what a basin or watershed is. Mr. Schulte said the group discussed that issue. There are many other organizations that include Chehalis River within the title of the organizations. The working group agreed to shorten the name to avoid confusion with the other organizations. Mr. Harris referred to the Partnership's early documentation that included "river" within the title and not the Chehalis Basin Partnership. He recommended considering a way of incorporating "river" within the name.

Jim Hill suggested incorporating "river" within a motto or tag line. Bob Burkle commented that by including "river" it might appear to be exclusive of its size and the number of main tributaries.

Ms. Kennedy offered a suggestion of including a tag line below the logo and incorporating "river" in some fashion.

Ms. Spaulding reviewed proposed language in Article 4. Members discussed the first two paragraphs and offered opinions on the language and intent of the message. Members agreed to the following language for the first two paragraphs under Article 4:

*"The corporation is organized and shall be operated exclusively for fundraising in support of the Chehalis Basin Partnership's purposes within the meaning of Section 501(c)(3) of the United States Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and as it may be amended or supplemented.*

*The activities of the corporation shall be supportive of and consistent with the recommendations of the Chehalis Basin Watershed Management Plan and Detailed Implementation Plan and consistent with the Chehalis Basin Partnership's mission statement, as approved or amended by the Chehalis Basin Partnership, or as additional plans may be developed."*

Mr. Harris questioned the notification procedures in Article 5 and whether more specific information should be included as to who is notified regarding dissolution of the corporation. Mr. Schulte advised

that the articles will be reviewed by attorney Bob Schroeter. He will discuss language within that specific Article.

Ms. Spaulding reviewed Article 6 on the founding directors and requested direction from the Partnership.

Mr. Schulte shared that he was asked to become a boardmember of the Centralia Community College Foundation. He attended training and was asked if he understood his role and was informed it involves the “3 G’s” – Get Money, Give Money, or Get off the Board. That’s the role of members on foundations. The role of the foundation for boardmembers is to raise money for the foundation or give money to the foundation. It’s important to focus on those boardmembers who are willing to donate to the cause and find people who are willing to bring other associates to the board that are willing to donate or raise funds. Similar to naming rights on a football stadium, there is a cost associated with it. Those are the considerations that must be considered prior to selecting the first directors. The Partnership will need to recruit members. He suggested establishing a recruiting subcommittee or a naming subcommittee for the directors to develop a list of potential boardmembers to contact. Mr. Schulte reported he attended training on how to select boardmembers. It’s important to look for sponsors. He suggested potential members could include the Tribe, Cabela’s, Bass, Ducks Unlimited, or Trout Unlimited.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw recommended boardmembers who are selected should be located within close proximity to the basin for easier accessibility to board meetings. Mr. Schulte pointed out that the purpose of a boardmember is to write a check, not attend a board meeting. It’s a much different focus for the board as they can determine what constitutes a quorum and the minimum number of meetings to attend. The board meets to raise funds for the Partnership. The Partnership decides how the funds are spent.

Members exchanged opinions about the role of a boardmember.

Mark White agreed the Tribe should be a member of the board.

Volunteers for the recruitment committee included Jim Hill, Mark White, Nicole Hill (to be contacted), and a contact (Katie) from Trout Unlimited.

Members offered suggestions on potential boardmembers.

Ms. Spaulding requested input on determining the registered agent for the non-profit. Mr. Schulte recommended Ms. Spaulding. Members discussed an address to use and agreed to assign Ms. Spaulding as the registered agent using the college address.

Ms. Spaulding advised that Bob Schroeter will review the articles of incorporation. She invited members to have their respective jurisdiction attorney review the articles if desired.

Ms. Napier asked about sending a letter to the founding members of the Partnership advising them of the upcoming transition. Mr. Jennings suggested avoiding the use of “transitioning” as it appears to imply the Partnership is disappearing. The intent is to convey that a new organization will be added to benefit the Partnership.

Discussion followed on the identification of founding directors. Mr. Schulte recommended that the founding directors should be the same type of individual that the Partnership is seeking for the board of directors. They shouldn’t include political figures or representatives from government agencies. Founding members should be from private entities that are willing to donate to the cause of the Partnership. Ms. Holbrook-Shaw advocated for the Tribe to become a member of the board. Mr. White

described the compact with the state for the Tribe to donate funds to non-profits. By forming the non-profit, Mr. White said he can contact the Tribe for a potential donation.

Ms. Spaulding reviewed the next steps, which will include another meeting of the working group to review of the articles of incorporation with the attorney, continue review of bylaws, and a draft of the letter to founding members.

*Members concurred to continue moving forward on forming the non-profit foundation.*

**Chehalis Basin Ecosystem and Restoration and Flood Risk Management Project Update (Basin-wide GI) – Lee Napier**

*A meeting quorum was not attained at this point in the meeting.*

Ms. Napier reviewed the request to enter into an interlocal agreement between representatives of the Flood Authority, the Partnership, Grays Harbor County, and Lewis County. The Partnership will be asked to take action on the interlocal agreement at its April meeting.

Currently, the General Investigation (GI) Study with the Corps of Engineers is underway and is basin-wide and is focusing on ecosystem restoration and flood risk reduction. When participating with the Corps of Engineers some steps are necessary. Currently, the process is at the Project Management Plan (PMP) level. Over the last eight months, a committee level group has been working on the PMP. The PMP describes what occurs in the next phase, which is feasibility. The committee is meeting with the Corps of Engineers to discuss the PMP and move it from discussion to acceptance. Grays Harbor and the Corps of Engineers are responsible for accepting and approving the PMP.

Mr. Schulte stated that we still need to get consensus on whether to accept the Corps of Engineers new Project Management Plan. The discussion has been ongoing for over a year. One of the problems with the plan is the Corps is now indicating that the GI Study will take 12 years to complete and will cost \$18 million with a local sponsor match of \$9,347,181. House Bill 3375 indicates that the state can become the local sponsor for the PMP prior to construction. After the construction phase, the state will not participate. It's important to ensure the state is willing to be the local sponsor because the participating entities do not have the \$9 million for the match. That's the first issue. Normally, feasibility studies take two to three years based on the Corps regulations. The last issue involves the Colonel's comment that the PMP would consider dams. However, dams are not included in the PMP. He stressed the importance of the PMP including that specific terminology. He recapped his three concerns:

1. Timeframe
2. No sponsor
3. \$9 million in local match

Ms. Napier suggested delaying the PMP discussion with the Partnership. She acknowledged that the cost has increased. The cost went up because retention facilities were included in the PMP consisting of examination of two potential sites. Related to the timeline, the Corps of Engineers are also operating within its own resources in terms of staffing resources and funding. The question is whether the Corps would be able to shorten the timeline even if funding was available. That is a question that will be addressed at the meeting later in the day. If resources do become available, the timeline becomes shorter.

Ms. Napier requested feedback on the timeline and the local match.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw questioned the choice the Partnership has at this point. Ms. Napier described the management style of the Corps and how the process proceeds. Based on the inclusion of retention facilities and study of two areas, that is what is elevating the cost and the timeline. Ms. Holbrook-Shaw said it appears there is no choice. Mr. Schulte said there are alternatives within the Corps by working up through the chain of command and finally to the congressional delegation. The Partnership and the Flood Authority can indicate that the amount is unacceptable as well as the timeline. The study has been completed several times and includes data that haven't significantly changed. The Corps needs projects to justify its existence. If the entities do not agree to the project based on the unreasonable timeline and cost, then the entities can work through the chain of command involving the Region, Division, and Headquarters, and if necessary, put pressure on the congressional delegation.

Mr. Jennings said he tends to agree because there is pressure at the local level by several groups to shift focus away from levees to retention. If there is an agreement with the Corps to work over the next 8 to 12 years, there is a risk in losing creditability to the public. Mr. Schulte said allowing the Corps to extend the study to 12 years will likely entail two major events during that timeframe allowing the Corps to extend the study another 10 to 12 years. The problem is the cost and the time. At this point there is no agreement between the parties unless the state takes over as the local sponsor and pays \$9 million.

Mr. Harris commented on issue of the inflation factor if delays continue.

Ms. Napier said it appears the Partnership's reasons for denying is the unacceptable timeline and the amount. There has also been discussion about retention facilities. She asked how the PMP impacts projects of the Partnership, such as ecosystem restoration. Mr. Schulte said he doesn't want to wait 12 years and waste \$18 million when many of the projects can be accomplished within a year for less than \$1 million. The Corps has had published plans over the last 40 years where they evaluated and never implemented. The Corps now wants to start over and reevaluate.

Ms. Napier responded to questions about potential projects of the Partnership, such ecosystem restoration and habitat projects and a barrier assessment, which could involve working on public lands to correct barriers, there has been interest in reconnecting floodplains, and recently the Partnership received a presentation about the watershed characteristic project underway for the Twin Cities project involving a tool the Department of Ecology developed. The Partnership expressed interest in expanding the project basin-wide. That tool could be compromised as well.

Chris Hempleman pointed out that there may be a need for reevaluation by the Corps because of changes in land use and property ownership. Additionally, the value of the PMP is the interrelationship it has with the entire basin. Mr. Schulte commented on existing studies and the modeling already completed. The Corps has studied the river for 75 years and in each study, recommendations were developed. Some of those recommendations, such as dredging the river are not feasible. To start over again is unacceptable.

Mr. Schulte addressed questions from Chris Stearns about the Newaukum and Skookumchuck dams and the status of improvements Transalta proposed to the Corps, which is currently at a stalemate. There is storage capacity behind Skookumchuck Dam; the problem is the ability to drain before flooding.

Mr. Jennings said it appears the Corps wants to back up and take a top down look at the entire basin. He asked if a delay would prevent the Partnership from continuing to implement projects. Ms. Napier said the Partnership will continue implementing the watershed plan. However, the Partnership will not have federal funding unless the Partnership participates with the Corps. It appears the Partnership will advise against having Grays Harbor sign the PMP, which is different than the Flood Authority discussion last month. At that time the Flood Authority was willing to enter into an interlocal agreement.

Bruce Mackey and Spencer Easton drafted an interlocal agreement and presented it to the Flood Authority that addressed the PMP and the match for the feasibility cost sharing agreement. It requires stakeholders to sign through an interlocal agreement that provides funding to help meet the cost sharing agreement. At this point, the Flood Authority needs to communicate with the Partnership. There needs to be communication between the two entities. The basic premise of the interlocal agreement is that the Flood Authority and the Partnership agree to communicate and that Grays Harbor is the local sponsor. That was the direction of the interlocal agreement last week. To keep the PMP adoption timeline in place by May and executed by Grays Harbor County, it's important for the interlocal agreement to be in place. Ms. Napier said she would like the Partnership to defer the interlocal agreement to the Steering Technical Committee to review the agreement to ensure it's acceptable.

Mr. Swartout questioned the decision-making process. He asked about the signatory for the PMP. Ms. Napier said Grays Harbor will sign the PMP. Mr. Swartout asked if the PMP will be signed prior to the interlocal. Ms. Napier said it's possible. However, it's difficult to track signatures and she would prefer Lewis County presenting a signed interlocal agreement to Grays Harbor on the same date the PMP is signed to solidify the relationship with Lewis County. Mr. Swartout said depending on the meeting later in the day, it will have to go back to the Flood Authority and the Partnership until there is agreement by all the parties. The meeting later in the day will entail a discussion with the Corps.

Mr. Hojem questioned whether the CBP is meeting with the Corps and providing a presentation as well as the Authority providing a presentation to the Corps. He asked who is talking to the Corps. Mr. Schulte said the Corps is discussing the PMP with everyone later in the day.

Mr. Jennings commented that Grays Harbor County is going to sign a contract with the Corps and the county is a member of the Flood Control Authority along with Lewis County, Thurston County, Chehalis, Centralia, and the Tribe. He asked whether the process is overcomplicated by having the Partnership as part of the approval process. Ms. Napier advised that Grays Harbor is not going to enter into an interlocal agreement with the Flood Authority until the Partnership has indicated approval. It is a formality in terms of accessing the funds that the Flood Authority has access too. Mr. Schulte said the Flood Authority can't obligate any funds. The Partnership obligates funds through Grays Harbor. Both groups are needed.

Ms. Napier said she will convey the Partnership's concerns about the PMP at the meeting with the Corps.

Mr. Hojem commented that Ms. Napier will attend and listen to the Corps. Ms. Napier said there is no listening and that it will entail a discussion. Mr. Schulte said the last time in November during the discussion with the Corps when they were informed that some members were unhappy with some of the premises, the Corps became upset and cancelled the next two meetings and indicated they would draft the PMP and share it when it's completed. That's what the upcoming meeting is about. The Corps is not interested in participation.

Ms. Napier acknowledged the direction of the PMP and indicated she will present it next month for additional discussion or approval dependent on the outcome of the meeting with the Corps. She asked members about the interlocal agreement and having the purpose of the agreement as a communication piece between the Flood Authority and the Partnership. There were no objections.

Mr. Hojem asked Ms. Napier who she will be speaking for during the meeting with the Corps. Ms. Napier said she will share the concerns she has heard from people who are not in attendance. She said she will be speaking from Grays Harbor County's perspective and if there is a point that was made during this meeting; she will try to bring it up. Mr. Schulte said Ms. Napier represents both groups in the

meeting. Mr. Hojem commented that wants to know what Ms. Napier is going to say if she is going to represent the Partnership. Ms. Napier said the points raised during the meeting indicate that 12 years is too long and \$18 million it too much. Mr. Hojem said he wants to know what she will say. Ms. Napier said there will be a discussion about it and then she will bring it back to the Partnership. Mr. Hojem said okay but he doesn't necessarily agree with that because he wants to know what she will say and how it will be presented because she is representing the Partnership. Ms. Napier said she can't share how she will present it because she doesn't know who will be there and what their objections might be. Mr. Schulte invited Mr. Hojem to attend the meeting at the Thurston County Courthouse at 1:00 p.m.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Agenda Items for April 23, 2010 Meeting**

- Action for authorizing Grays Harbor County as the Lead Entity to accept the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership Bylaws
- Consider a recommendation to Grays Harbor County to appoint representatives to the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership
- Update on GI Study
- Continued review of bylaws

### **May Meeting Date**

Members agreed to reschedule the May meeting from May 28 to May 21. Mr. Harris offered to chair the meeting in the absence of Chair Canady. *Please note that this meeting will not be at the Lucky Eagle Casino. The meeting room is unavailable on May 21.*

## **ADJOURNMENT**

With there being no further business, Chair Canaday adjourned the meeting at 12:14 p.m.