

Mark Swartout, Steve Craig, Jim Hill, Chad Stussy, Chanele Holbrook Shaw, Lonnie Crumley, Glenn Connelly, Terry Willis, Terra Hegy, Bruce Jones, Molly Gibbs, and Lee Napier were present.

Report out on the Legislative Briefing with the House members

Mark, Lee, Terry, and Chanele attended the meeting with the Chehalis Basin House of Representative members earlier that morning. The meeting was well attended. Representatives Blake, Takko, Kessler, DeBolt, and Alexander attended. The group had prepared a presentation, but soon found that the Representatives had their own issues to discuss with the group. Those who attended shared with the group that this worked very well. The issues raised by the Representatives were very similar to the issues the CBP discussed at the December meeting.

Some of the comments/questions from the Representatives included:

- The planning process in WRIA 17 really exploded when they tried to adopt the plan. How did you get public/stakeholder input into your process? Our process was explained and acknowledged by Representative Kessler as a good approach.
- Transferring water rights may be a legislative issue for 2006. Representative DeBolt explained a situation where Centralia and Morton were unable to receive a water rights transfer. We shared that Napavine also experienced that same problem.
- The group was encouraged to stay involved with TPAC and to use this type of process to develop mitigation banking to implement watershed plan recommendations.
- What is the tribal participation? It was explained that the Chehalis Tribe had signed the intergovernmental agreement. The Quinalts were described as participants in meetings, but not a voting member of the group. It was also explained that the Quinalts perceived the plan as lacking "teeth" and that they wanted to see more concrete solutions as this point before adopting a plan.
- Why are you here today? Members of the group stated several times that they hoped to put a face to the CBP for the legislators. They hoped that when watershed issues were considered by the legislators that they would use CBP members as a resource. We also asked for a line item in Ecology's budget to cover the administration of the CBP.

After hearing the information, the STC thought we should try to meet annually in this type of forum with members of the Senate and House.

Annual Plan of Work (APOW)

Members of the group asked about the schedule to complete Phase IV work. They would like to see the details related to completion of this work described in the APOW.

Swartout suggested that we consider hiring a facilitator to help Napier with the work load. They would like to work with John Kliem who previously helped with facilitation of workshops to develop several work plans.

Nomination of Officers

Jim Hill and Lee Napier reported that they had asked several elected officials to consider serving as the vice chair for the group. Everyone asked declined because of prior commitments. Commissioner Beerbower was recommended by several elected official. They felt that Grays Harbor County already had a vested interest and he should serve as the vice chair. Commissioner Beerbower reluctantly accepted. He is concerned about the appearance that Grays Harbor County plays too many major roles in the watershed. While he is happy to serve, he does not want the appearance of a Grays Harbor County dominated group. Grays Harbor County representatives currently serve as project manager and a committee chair.

At the CBP meeting, Commissioner Beerbower will be named as a nomination for the vice chair position.

Draft Work Plans for Instream Flows

Terra Hegy and Bruce Jones were asked to help with the discussions of the instream flow work plans. Jones commented that he would like to see the format change for the work plans. He would like a visual to help track the schedule and accomplishments. He also mentioned that the WMP Supplement supported tribal water rights. The WMP does not appear to make the same statement. He hopes the CBP/Basin stakeholders will agree to voluntarily protect instream flows.

Terra Hegy shared a paper she put together related to her idea for an instream flow discussion (copy attached). The group asked her to relate her points to the current list of tasks. She did and also volunteered to work with a WDFW Hydrogeologist to refine the tasks.

Lonnie Crumley mentioned a 40 lot subdivision in the Cedarville area of Grays Harbor County. He questioned the impact to the aquifer if this development occurs. Jones mentioned concerns about the Humptulips River flows still being low and the relationship to the Hogan's Corner wellhead development. *Note-Napier and Jones talked about the Humptulips situation and realized that the water source for the Hogan's Corner development was not connected.* During this discussion, the group again realized they would need to consider rules to prioritize subbasins for instream flow/quantity projects.

Hegy asked if the group had considered a hydrologic study to determine how growth pressure will impact the aquifer(s). She shared several studies with the group. One related to water temperature that was conducted through airborne thermal remote sensing. The Walla Walla watershed sponsored this study. Connelly added that the Chehalis Tribe intends to fly the mainstem to gather airborne data.

Based on the discussions, Jones and Hegy will revise the draft work plans and send the documents to Napier for distribution.

Swartout asked if the tribes would consider partial adjudication. Since this does not technically exist he means quantify water rights, excluding tribal. Jones and Connelly will ask this question.

Due to a change in weather, the group adjourned earlier than expected. They assigned Napier the task of completing the APOW. She will present this to the CBP in December.

The next meeting will be January 5, 2006 at the WDFW office on Capitol Way. The group is meeting in Olympia to accommodate those members who need to attend the SRFB meeting also in Olympia that day.

Instream flow discussions for the Chehalis River Basin (WRIA 22-23)

How discussions could proceed (proposed by Terra Hegy, Wa. Fish and Wildlife)

1. Address the easiest (i.e. data complete) first: discuss the 4 streams for which there is currently adequate habitat and flow data:

- a. Satsop at RM 5
- b. Skookumchuck at RM 1
- c. Chehalis above Pe El, RM 110.9
- d. Humptulips at RM 23.8

*Implements 5
Task 2 as
subtasks*

The Planning Unit saw these recommendations in Fall 2003. Ecology and WDFW met with the Quinault tribe at their request to discuss these flow recommendations April 11, 2005.

There is hydrology on 4 streams which will enable flows to be set modified by hydrology. There are 2 streams that there is inadequate hydrology on (Black River and the west Fork Hoquiam). Ecology has placed gauges on these but so far there is only 1-2 years of data. In order to make the best instream flow recommendation possible, since we have less than 10 years of data (rule of thumb), exceedance curve hydrographs would have to be synthesized.

2. Next, address the 6 streams for which Jean Caldwell originally gathered data for in 1985. In fall of 2004, Ecology hired Ms. Caldwell to update the original study using the most current preference curves (these indicate actual observations on where each species of fish occur in terms of depth, velocity, and substrate). This involved re-entering the data and re-running the PHABSIM model. She came up with new Weighted Usable Area curves (the habitat part of the equation) and gave us a report. The streams on which she re-ran the model are:

Chehalis nr. Ceres
Main stem Newaukum
SF Newaukum
NF Newaukum
Cloquallam
Wishkah

In order to complete instream flow recommendations, adequate hydrology would be advisable. This we have on the Chehalis, mainstem and South Fork Newaukum, and possibly Cloquallam (although the data is old).

3. The planning unit could look at all the stream management points (31) and determine which need to have instream flows modified from the 1976 rule, based on new data and hydrology. I would recommend that emphasis should be on those areas that are already or will be experiencing growth.

4. There has been discussion on determining which flows are "achievable." First, we would need to define better what this means. Does this mean, during the low flow period? Does it mean Mean Annual Flow? Is it for enhancement purposes?