

**CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP
HABITAT WORK GROUP
Lewis Conservation District Office
1544 Bishop Road
Chehalis, WA
March 13, 2009
9:30 a.m.**

Meeting Summary

PRESENT:

Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County
Bob Amrine, Lewis County Conservation District
Mark Swartout, Thurston County
Frank Staller, Wild Fish Conservancy
Jim Hill, Citizen, Lewis County
Galvin Gore, Mason Conservation District
Lonnie Crumley, StreamWorks Consulting
April Boe, The Nature Conservancy
Mike Kuttel, Thurston Conservation District
Eric Delvin, The Nature Conservancy
Jason Lundgren, WA State Recreation & Conservation Office

Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Janet Strong, Chehalis Basin Land Trust
Janel Spaulding, Grays Harbor College
Rich Carlson, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Kathryn Moore, Capitol Land Trust
Brett DeMond, StreamWorks Consulting
Miranda Plumb, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Birdie Davenport, Department of Natural Resources
Chris Stearns, Thurston Public Utilities District
Amy Iverson, Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife

Welcome, Introductions, and Changes to the Agenda

Chair Bob Amrine called the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) Habitat Work Group (HWG) meeting to order at 9:26 a.m. Everyone present provided self-introductions.

Birdie Davenport arrived at the meeting.

Discussions on the federal stimulus program and the Chehalis Fisheries Restoration Program were added to the agenda.

Upcoming Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) Grant Round

Lee Napier reported she's received two letters of intent for the upcoming SRFB grant round. They include letters from Andy Olson for a floodplain connection barrier removal project and from the Wild Fish Conservancy. Additionally, Chanele Holbrook-Shaw, Kathy Jacobson, Cascade Land Conservancy, Capitol Land Trust, City of McCleary, and the Department of Natural Resources have indicated they are submitting project proposals.

Mark Swartout arrived at the meeting

Ms. Napier advised that letters of intent are due April 3, 2009 with basic project information entered into PRISM with the letter of intent and photos or maps attached as part of the early application process. It's important for project sponsors to be as clear as possible because the information initially submitted in PRISM is used as the background for the site visits on June 1-2 2009. Submission of an early application is a mandatory prerequisite to participate in the Chehalis SRFB grant cycle review.

April Boe arrived at the meeting.

Project sponsors will have opportunities between now and the end of July to receive feedback on the projects during Habitat Work Group meetings. The feedback is designed to help sponsors strengthen their final

applications. Final applications are due at the end of July. The local review committee will review and rank the applications at its August 14, 2009 meeting

Eric Delvin arrived at the meeting

The CBP will review the projects on August 28, 2009 with submittal to the SRFB on September 1, 2009. Project sponsors are responsible for entering all information in PRISM and completing the application in PRISM prior to the July deadline.

Janet Strong arrived at the meeting

Ms. Napier indicated she is unsure of the amount of the Grays Harbor Lead Entity's allocation during this grant round. Typically, the lead entity receives \$500,000 to \$700,000. The SRFB allocates 9% of the funding to each coast region. Within this coast region, there are four lead entities. Funding allocation is decided at the coast region level based on a set of criteria, such as river miles, number of stocks, depressed stock. Projects are put through a formula and then ranked. She suggested members should attend and participate in the regional discussions. Projects are ranked based on a funding level of \$500,000. Previously, the lead entity has been successful in obtaining more funds by securing funds from other lead entities that didn't utilize the full allocation. In other situations, project sponsors could be asked to take a reduced funding level. The goal is to retain and utilize all funds in the lead entity.

Kat Moore arrived at the meeting.

Ms. Napier said that after she receives the dates from the review panel she will send out the final schedule. The tentative date for project sponsors is to attend the committee meetings in April and May to review projects, with site visits scheduled for June 1-2, 2009. Technical assistance can be obtained during the most meetings. The committee will review the projects at its August 14, 2009 meeting.

Review Project Review Criteria

Brett DeMond distributed copies of the Technical Advisory Group's scoring sheet and ranking criteria and a copy of Appendix E – Benefits and Certainty Evaluation Definitions from the SRFB Manual. Ms. DeMond reported she, Bob Burkle, Bob Amrine, and Janel Spaulding met and reviewed examples from Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIAs) 10 and 12. The TAG meets and ranks the first three criteria with a citizens committee ranking the fourth criteria. The group is recommending the following project scoring sheet and ranking criteria:

1. Benefit to Salmon (From Appendix E)
2. Certainty of Success (From Appendix E)
3. Fit to Strategy (Used language from WRIAs 10 &12)
4. Partnerships/Outreach

Ms. DeMond reported *Fit to Strategy* will likely not be a good fit for the area and will need additional discussion by the HWG on how it relates the basin's strategy. Some thoughts by the group included tiers, depressed stocks, culvert ranking, and any other concerns in the strategy that need to be reflected in the ranking. The weighting was used from the other WRIAs, which can also be changed by the HWG to accurately reflect the area. She noted *Partnerships/Outreach* has a score of 30%; however, it would only move the project within the mean ranking within *Benefit to Salmon* up or down within the *High, Medium, or Low Benefit* range. The mean ranking is based on the first three criteria.

Ms. Napier commented that the SRFB asks about priority stocks. For the WRIA, priority stocks tend to be depressed stocks or a stock that is in decline if documented through a co-manager. The region's stock status is from the Salmon Stock Inventory (SASI). There are concerns, however, that SASI is not accurate. Some feel there is other documentation that can better describe what the current stock status is. Secondly, areas within the watershed are not necessarily prioritized. Consequently, the WRIA is comprised of many subbasins. As subbasins are not prioritized, the presence of stock should be considered as well as the actions within the watershed, which are tiered. Additional information should be added to address Tier 1 through Tier 3 or having the project scoring sheet and ranking criteria match with watershed strategy. Project sponsors should be reviewing the information when they develop the application. It's much easier to review and rank project applications when project sponsors know and understand the criteria.

Mr. Amrine said that issue was discussed by the group. Tier 1 is the highest priority. It could be addressed within the application as either Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3. However, for those projects with a Tier 2 or Tier 3, the project needs to score higher in other areas.

Chris Stearns arrived at the meeting

Members discussed how to reflect tiers within the criteria. Rich Carlson said his agency's review ranking includes criteria that is linked to other restoration projects or previous projects, which addresses working up the watershed systematically resulting in extra points if the project is reflective of a good systematic approach to the basin. Members suggested that criteria could fit under *Fit to Strategy*. It was agreed to revise *Fit to Strategy* to read:

- Tier 1
- Tier II
- Tier III
- Other activities

Members discussed *Partnerships/Outreach* criteria.

Ms. Napier described the TAG review, which is comprised of both technical and citizen members.

Mark Swartout questioned whether the criteria were previously used. Ms. Napier said Appendix E was used as well as some of the same criteria. For *Partnership/Outreach*, the criteria are based on a combination of language from WRIAs 10 and 12 as well as some previous successful projects. Mr. Swartout commented that if the project ranks high in the first three criteria, it will automatically receive maximum points for *Partnerships/Outreach* because the project will support known economic, social, or cultural values of the area. Ms. Napier suggested reviewing the set of criteria to ascertain whether to reduce the points. *Partnerships/Outreach* will only distinguish projects that are close in score. It won't elevate a project ranked #10 to #2. Mr. Swartout said his concern is with a set of criteria that receive the same maximum points.

Ms. Napier described previous review and ranking processes when Randy Lehr assisted.

Mr. Swartout suggested revising the fourth criterion under *Partnerships/Outreach* to read, "Does the project support significant economic, social, or cultural values in areas?"

Members discussed several project scenarios and how they would be ranked or whether the benefit could be ranked under the criteria as presented. Ms. Napier said it is incumbent upon project sponsors to look at the

work the conservations districts have completed to help tell the story about why their project makes sense now. It comes down to project sponsors writing good grant proposals.

Ms. Strong asked whether those factors are included in the questions during the review panel or when are they factored during the review process. Ms. Napier said a project proposal that tells a good story generally receives a good score because the reviewer doesn't have doubts about what the project is doing and the benefits it serves. It may not be articulated in the criteria, but more in telling the story. Mr. Swartout said the site visit also contributes to documenting the importance of a project. Mr. Hill said the site visit also provides different perspectives of the project, which can be incorporated within the final application.

Members agreed the maximum points for criterion 4 should range from 0 to 3 points.

Jason Lundgren arrived at the meeting.

Ms. Napier suggested testing the criteria by ranking some of the letters of intent against the criteria before finalizing the criteria.

Members shared differing opinions on the suggestion by Mr. Stearns for revision to criteria under *Partnerships/Outreach*. Mr. Crumley commented on the ability of agencies undertaking a public process while other project sponsors may not have access to a public process.

Ms. Napier reviewed the suggested changes:

3. Fit To Strategy	Range
Tier I	8-10
Tier II	5-7
Tier III	1-4
Other Activities	0
4. Partnerships/Outreach	Max. Pts.
Project includes education component related to watershed health and salmon recovery.	0 – 3
Project incorporates volunteer labor.	0 – 3
Project involves partnership between public/private entities and/or multiple jurisdictions or agencies.	0 – 3
Does project support significant economic, social, or cultural values in area?	0 – 3
Does the project have greater than minimum match?	0 - 3

Mr. Crumley offered a suggestion of adding criteria to provide points for the field review. For instance, during the review team's site review of two projects that are both well written and appear to score similarly, one project could rise to the top because it's obvious that it's a better project. Ms. Napier questioned the timing of including the criteria based on the grant timeline. Mr. Amrine said the field review usually generates questions for the applicant, which would then be based on how the applicant addresses those questions. Mr. Crumley said it could also be a process that could be used for a tiebreaker, such as whether the applicant answered the questions sufficiently.

Mr. Swartout suggested keeping the scores as wide apart as possible, because of the goal to have a spread of projects. The process becomes extremely difficult when projects rank within one or two points of each other.

Ms. DeMond reported Ms. Spaulding also questioned whether the amount of the minimum match should be included on the scoring sheet. She also suggested refining the point spread. Mr. Amrine suggested including the minimum match. It was noted the minimum match is 15% except for design projects, which do not require a match. Members agreed to retain the existing language as the project application includes minimum match amount. Mr. Swartout noted an applicant with a minimum match would receive zero, but would receive a higher point if the minimum match was greater.

Members approved the project scoring sheet and ranking criteria based on the agreed changes.

Review Projects Proposed for the Next Grant Cycle

Instream Passage – Frank Staller

Frank Staller, Wild Fish Conservancy, distributed a copy of the agency's Letter of Intent for the Camp Delezene Fish Passage Project, letter of support from WDFW, and photos of the project site.

Mr. Staller said the proposal is a fish passage barrier project located on Delezene Creek, an old reservoir used in a logging camp. When Boy Scouts of America acquired the property, the dam began leaking resulting in the abandonment of the dam. Currently, it is approximately at 70% barrier and only during high flows is the creek passable for fish. During low flows, water travels under the dam because of the crack, which creates a total fish barrier. Another element includes the road, which is part of the dam structure. A 300-foot channel was abandoned, which bypassed the dam. Opening the road with the cooperation of Weyerhaeuser could potentially open the channel effectively bypassing the barrier. A culvert is located on the lower end of the channel because of the small tributary and wetland. Fish travel into the channel and become trapped. If Weyerhaeuser does not agree to redo the historic creek channel, the agency would like to repair the culvert for fish passage. Another component of the project is revegetating the old dam site, which is approximately 10 acres. The Boy Scouts of America only own three to four acres of the old reservoir site. Currently, the site is covered with grass. The Conservancy will work with the Boy Scouts in planting as well as establishing monitoring stations to monitor the success of the plantings.

Below the dam is a small fishway, with a bedrock intrusion with an eight-foot drop. To achieve fish passage, jackhammers were used to install three steps. The fishway has outfalls and during low flows becomes a barrier. If Weyerhaeuser doesn't want to reopen the old channel, the Conservancy wants to address the issues to improve fish passage.

Ms. Napier asked how the project site was discovered. Mr. Staller said his grandson is a Boy Scout and he also visited the site, as well as hunts in the area. Recently, a logging operation was completed on the site. Wayne Watne, WDFW, was working on the site during the logging operation. Mr. Watne added some large woody debris in the creek downstream of the fishway. During a mutual discussion the idea for the project was suggested, which Mr. Watne supports.

Mr. Staller addressed questions about the ownership of the property. The property was initially donated by Weyerhaeuser with a lease agreement. However, Boy Scouts of America now own the 80 acres and is not planning to sell the land. There was some controversy regarding the logging operation because it was located too close to the riparian corridor and trees labeled as danger trees were removed within the 150-foot buffer.

Mr. Staller said the Boy Scouts have approached Weyerhaeuser as Weyerhaeuser has worked on an area upstream, decommissioned a section of the road, and bypassed it. The intent is to convince Weyerhaeuser to pursue a project.

Mr. Staller addressed questions from members and discussed the potential role and assistance from Weyerhaeuser. Ms. Napier asked about the source of the match. Mr. Staller said he spoke with the Boy Scouts who indicated they can contribute the 15% match, if not more. They will engage in in-kind work through plantings and other work as well as providing equipment and labor. Through the logging operations, the organization has some funds set aside for the match as well.

Ms. Napier asked whether Weyerhaeuser donates trees. Mr. Crumley said it's possible to obtain some trees from DNR when available, especially if the Boy Scouts are involved because of the educational aspect. Mr. Staller said the planting estimate is high based on previous experience with other similar sites because larger plants will likely be required to establish the area. Mr. Crumley offered that it may be possible to include fencing if the area doesn't flood or overflows. Planting willows initially will help establish the area followed by spruce, which is a good restoration tree. Janet Strong said she was experienced success in planting red alder and black cottonwood along the Discovery Trail where reed canary grass is rampant and hard to control.

Birdie Davenport said it appears there are culverts under the road based on the photos. If the goal is restoring the channel, it appears both the upper and lower culverts would need to be addressed. Mr. Staller said that's the element of the project where Weyerhaeuser was reluctant to discuss because it will require either two bridges or two culverts, which is quite expensive. Weyerhaeuser will likely not agree and prefers to fix only the dam and the fishway. Ms. Davenport suggested the project description should clearly state how the SRFB funds will be used. Mr. Staller said it would basically entail a feasibility study for the culverts, which would be a component of the project. The agency's engineer will visit the site, meet with Weyerhaeuser, and discuss possible partnering prospects. The project consists of planting the lake area, addressing fish passage, and undertaking a feasibility study to restore the old channel. Mr. Staller said the dam includes a footbridge. The dam structure is used as a foundation for the footbridge, which will limit removal of the entire bridge structure. It will entail cutting notches to lower the outfall to avoid water undermining the structure. The goal is to increase fish passage. The feasibility study will help determine the best way to address it.

Members discussed other funding options. Mr. Carlson commented that the National Fish Passage Program application process is closed for this year for next year's funding. He suggesting quantifying high quality habitat upstream. Mr. Amrine said a PI is scheduled within the next several weeks. Mr. Carlson said it appears it's a good system but that needs to be spelled out in the application to improve the application. The application should include information on conditions upstream as well as downstream, such as existing fish stock. Mr. Staller said the SASSI report indicates that in that reach of the Chehalis, there is a significant Coho run. Mr. Stearns recommended that any future work to correct the channel should include information on how adding gravel in scoured areas below will benefit spawning Chinook. It's important to document what species will be impacted. Mr. Staller said it's possible Chinook may travel in the area, but the primary species of presence is Coho and steelhead. There may be Chinook present in the lower area.

Ms. Davenport asked whether Weyerhaeuser would be supportive of the work under the road if it's funded. Mr. Stellar said that's the goal and would likely be the first point in discussions with Weyerhaeuser.

Miranda Plumb commented that if there is consideration to apply for the National Fish Passage Project, the program strives for a 50% match, which includes in-kind. Including Weyerhaeuser could include the use of equipment and donation of labor for operation of the equipment.

Discussion followed on the viability of the project in terms of SRFB funds. Jason Lundgren indicated that based on the letter of intent and the committee's review, it appears there isn't an issue with the project's eligibility.

Mr. Amrine commented on the possibility of matching SRFB funds with funds from the Chehalis Fisheries Restoration Program through US Fish and Wildlife Service. There are many options available and it appears the project is good project, which will likely receive funding through some program.

Ms. Napier distributed copies of the floodplain project submitted by Andy Olson with the Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation. She asked members to provide feedback directly to Mr. Olson.

Other Funding Programs and Potential Stimulus Projects

Rich Carlson introduced Miranda Plumb. Ms. Plumb replaces Brian Peck for the Chehalis Fisheries Restoration Program (CFRP).

Mr. Carlson reported the top five projects submitted under the CFRP were reviewed and ranked:

- Satsop River Knotweed Control – Phase 2 - \$25,026
- Chehalis Basin Education Consortium Project - \$45,584
- Inlet Creek Fish Passage - \$6,525
- Preacher's Slough Fish Passage - \$115,000
- Drops of Water Newsletter - \$22,050

Historically, the program receives funding of \$200,000. Because of the economic uncertainty, half of the program funds will be withheld. Mr. Carlson requested the committee's review and suggestions. The project sponsor for Preacher's Slough Fish Passage is requesting \$115,000. Ms. Davenport said she submitted the project because she assumed it would be forwarded for the National Fish Passage Program. Mr. Carlson said the project was submitted, but it's unlikely the project will be funded with either stimulus or fish passage funding.

Mr. Carlson reviewed the project costs of the remaining projects. The projects were presented to the CBP under the assumption the program would receive \$200,000. Feedback included whether to pursue Preacher's Slough, a desire to publish some issues of *Drops of Water* newsletter, and potential impact to the Chehalis Basin Education Consortium Project if it doesn't receive full funding. A question to consider includes whether some projects can be delayed until next year.

Ms. Napier said she has discussed with the newsletter's editor, Margaret Rader, options for publishing the newsletter. Ms. Napier said she offered to fund the April and June edition. Technically, funds wouldn't be required until January 2010. The issue is what projects need funding now and what projects can be delayed. Mr. Carlson said the department is waiting for more information on economic stimulus package funds and state funding, which might be reduced based on the state budget deficit.

Ms. Napier asked Mr. Delvin about impacts to his project if funding is delayed. Mr. Delvin indicated he is concerned about delays to the project, which is also funded with Ag money that doesn't require a match.

Ms. Napier referred to stimulus funding for the Preacher's Slough project. Ms. Davenport reported the project needs \$300,000. The request for stimulus funds is \$300,000. Currently, only \$68,000 has been

secured for the project. Partial funding from the CFRP would not be enough to complete the project. Too many sources of partial funding will inhibit completion of the program because of contracting requirements.

Ms. Napier reported she is scheduled to participate in a conference call later in the day for submitting a regional package to National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

Mr. Delvin questioned the vehicle used for requesting stimulus funds. Ms. Napier commented that there are many programs offering sources of funds. The Recreation & Conservation Office (RCO) is working on a stimulus funding package through NOAA. The only program with limited information is RCO, which is working with NOAA to solicit projects for stimulus funding. RCO is sponsoring the NOAA program and is seeking projects of a certain funding level, which is why the region is packaging its projects. The issue is whether to take it to the next level and look at the region for barrier projects. The Quinault Indian Nation has indicated it's not interested in being part of the regional package because they have their own larger package. NOAA applications are due on April 4, 2009. Ms. Napier said the Regional Director (Nancy Allison) is taking responsibility for developing the package. Mr. Delvin said he viewed the application and that the NOAA grants are complicated.

Mr. Lundgren said RCO is attempting to take the lead along with other state agencies. The intent is working with project sponsors to submit projects through the regions, similar to the SRFB funding process. NOAA is seeking big multi-million dollar restoration projects. It doesn't appear NOAA wants a list of small projects totaling millions, but rather wants large multi-million dollar projects that are construction ready. RCO policy personnel are speaking with NOAA officials to obtain guidance on the strategic plan. He suggested working through Nancy Allison.

Mr. Carlson said the application form can be obtained through www.grants.gov.

Mr. Lundgren commented on the difficulty of writing one application consisting of multiple projects. He offered to send an e-mail to Ms. Napier with more information to provide clarity on the funding situation. Mr. Carlson added that NOAA may accept projects from half a million to \$20 million but are focusing on projects from \$2 million to \$10 million. The intent is funding projects that will create jobs involving restoration and construction.

Ms. Napier commented on the lack of success to secure stimulus funding at this point and asked members for feedback on project submissions. Ms. Strong suggested considering an invasive plant project. Ms. Davenport recommended sending an email to the Chehalis River Invasive Weed Management Group because a memorandum of understanding between DNR and that group enabling the department to pursue funding through the group. It's considered a coordinated weed management area. The group could likely apply to NOAA directly. April Boe said she understands that NOAA doesn't allow the use of herbicide. Ms. Napier said the current projects she has include the Satsop River Knotweed Control Project and Ms. Boe's Knotweed Control Efficiency and Upper Riparian Restoration Project. Ms. Davenport offered to work with Ms. Napier and Mr. Delvin to develop a project placeholder.

Mr. Carlson asked whether DNR has a list of small forest landowner culverts that have been ranked and prioritized and are pending based on funding availability. Mr. Lundgren said he doesn't believe the program is receiving any stimulus funds. Mr. Carlson suggested having someone apply. Ms. DeMond noted that many of the lower ranking projects are not shovel ready. Ms. Davenport said a DNR engineer was completing and is submitting a NOAA application for 10 large culvert projects within the Pacific Cascade region on DNR land.

Members discussed possible projects to submit beginning at the \$500,000 level. It was noted the higher dollar projects are preferable. Mr. Carlson said funding competition will be projects from the Great Lakes, New Orleans, Everglades, San Francisco Bay, and Puget Sound areas.

Ms. Napier asked members for feedback for submitting a regional approach for invasive weed removal. Mr. Delvin suggested working on the project concept and how it could be administered in more detail before moving forward with a project submittal.

Mr. Carlson said a federal website will be established with real time updates. The address is www.recovery.gov. Each project will receive a tracking number.

Members discussed the deadline. Ms. Napier said she needs a dollar figure by later in the afternoon in time for the conference call. Mr. Delvin referred to a project on the Satsop. Ms. Napier said the project is also included on her list as well. There are several people interested in partnering on the Satsop Floodplain Restoration Project, which is a former SRFB project. The project is included on the list at \$1.5 million or \$2 million if no match is available. The project is not shovel ready, however. The project needs design and permitting. Ms. Napier said she is suggesting the project should be submitted to the Chehalis Basin Flood Authority as a project.

Members discussed the federal stipulation that all projects funded with stimulus funding must be construction ready and what that actually entails.

Discussion refocused on the recommendation for funding the CFRP projects. Mr. Carlson suggested for the Satsop River Knotweed Control project to scale back the project and focus on maintenance on treated areas.

Members discussed the Chehalis Basin Education Consortium Project. Ms. Strong said she works closely with Ms. Jacobson. The project is important because children are the future's investment. Decreased funding will mean less time for children to participate in projects. The funds are used for bus transportation and a substitute teacher that are not supplied by the school district. Land trusts assists with the projects and many adult volunteers assist with the project.

Ms. Napier pointed out that the Preacher's Slough Fish Passage could be put to the top of the list if members believe it's a priority SRFB project. Mr. Swartout suggested it's important to be fair to a process. Mr. Amrine and Ms. Davenport said that if it was re-ranked it likely would be the top project because more engineering has been completed. Members commented that the project appears to be appropriate for stimulus funding. Ms. Davenport said another funding option is DNR's Aquatics Program.

Ms. Plumb asked whether it's possible to increase the project cost of Preacher's Slough Fish Passage by adding riparian restoration through additional plantings. Ms. Davenport affirmed the project cost could be increased through additional restoration. If money was no object, the project could include a 30-foot bridge, full blown slough restoration, and replanting of the riverbank. Members suggested submitting the project for NOAA funding. Ms. Davenport reviewed the various project components and indicated the total project cost could be \$500,000.

Members recommended for the CFRP, to fund the following projects:

- Satsop River Knotweed Control – Phase 2
- Chehalis Basin Education Consortium Project
- Inlet Creek Fish Passage

- Drops of Water Newsletter (2010)

Mr. Carlson said the justification for funding projects includes seeking funding from another source for the Preacher's Slough project. Funding for *Drops of Water* is secured through December 2009, but not in 2010. Members agreed to fund the newsletter in 2010 if additional funds are released through the CFRP program.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for April 10, 2009. The next meeting will focus on the remaining letters of intent.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Chair Amrine adjourned the meeting at 12:05 a.m.

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