

Mark Swartout, Lonnie Crumley, Kernen Lien, Steve Craig, Taylor Pittman, Steve Stinson, Kahle Jennings, Glenn Connelly, Jim Hill, Chad Stussy, Patrick Wiltzius, Chanele Holbrook Shaw, and Lee Napier were present.

***Family Forestry Foundation Informational Presentation***

Steve Stinson, Executive Director for the Family Forest Foundation, (FFF) was invited to present the Habitat Conservation Plan proposed for Lewis County. Before he began, the group asked him to describe the Farm Forestry Association (FFA) and the Family Forest Foundation. The FFA was established in 2000, as a funding source for the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). FFA and FFF work together. FFA is a membership organization and can lobby for resources. FFF is a project type organization and receives money. Another project is the development of a statewide data base that identifies the family forestry lands. Family forests are different from commercial foresters in the sense that they are not publicly traded.

The FFF started, in 1998 by local landowners to develop a Lewis County HCP. The objective was to keep family forest lands providing income and habitat. To date the FFF invested 8 years and over \$2 million (including \$750,000 of in-kind contributions).

He presented to the group an overview of the Lewis County HCP. One of the challenges facing FFF is conversion of land. The HCP can be viewed as an incentive to keep the land in forestry. He reviewed results of a Lewis County Forest Landowner survey. The survey asked questions about the age of the landowner and the reasons for owning forest land,

What is the Lewis County HCP?

- Provides regulation certainty through a 100-year plan.
- Substitutes some state forest practice rules.
- Describes site-specific conservation measures to protect, maintain and enhance habitat while perpetuating family forestry.
- The Services would issue an Incidental Take Permit to Lewis County
- Qualified landowners who want to implement the provisions of the FFHCP would receive Certificates of Inclusion from the County
- Describes Riparian Prescriptions specific to stream size, stream flow, initial vegetative condition, slope and gradient, includes a no-

- harvest inner zone, a partial-harvest outer zone, minimum 50-year rotation in uplands, and equipment Limitation Zones
- The Forest and Fish Rules have more zones with larger buffers.
  - Landowners from the Cowlitz and Chehalis Basin can participate in this program.

The group asked the following questions:

- How will you address roads? Under the current Forest and Fish regulations.
- How does a landowner participate? The landowner develops a plan for consideration by Lewis County. The county reviews it for compliance with the HCP. If accepted then the HCP is submitted to DNR with a forest practices application. The landowner does have an opt out period of 30-days once they receive acceptance notice for the county. The landowner submits activity reports to the county. Lewis County is responsible for review and approval and reporting of the HCP.
- Is this more lenient than Forest and Fish? No, it an equivalent planning process.
- Which species are addressed? It included 60 species comprised of the forest and fish species within the county and 17 upland species.
- All the science is Lewis County specific, so another county would need to develop their own HCP process.

Stinson concluded that the scoping is complete and the draft HCP should be available for review this spring. The group thought the CBP might be interested in hearing this presentation.

#### ***Phase IV-Letter to Group A Water Systems***

The group discussed the audience, which could include a small system operator, a contracted operator, or a local government.

Should we do the minimum required by the law and just contact the systems? The group wanted to encourage participation from water systems for two reasons. First the water system plans must now be consistent with watershed management plans. Secondly the group's work would benefit through identification of systems that have larger water rights and a small demand. This approach was used in another watershed to address the inchoate water rights as part of an implementation action. Can we tie in the water rights database with the group A water system database? The group agreed to start with the minimum requirement in the law.

Could we use the watershed council grant source to secure funding to help evaluate the database issue? The scope of work for this grant would encompass a review existing water rights for municipal water supply purposes (Group A systems of 15 or more connections), to identify those that may be inchoate, and to initiate a process to determine how these rights might be used to meet the projected future needs. This will include an analysis of the relationship between these rights and implementation of instream flow strategies. The funds requested in this application will be used for outreach to the universe of Group A systems, compilation of information regarding these systems relevant to this task, development of a decision framework which the Partnership will use to address this issue, and preparation for presentation(s) and discussion(s) of this work at meetings of the Partnership and at meetings of Partnership's Steering and Technical Committee (STC), and participation in STC and Partnership meetings on this issue. The group will take this idea to the CBP.

The suggested the following changes to the draft letter to the Group A systems:

- Add to the Q & A "As we develop and implement our plan, we will contact you if there is a link between your system and an obligation to implement."
- Address the letter to the authorized owner or management board. Contracted operators, please forward this letter to the authorized owner/board.
- Define Group A Water System in the introductory sentence. Begin the letter with "You have been identified as a group a system; therefore the Chehalis Basin Partnership..."
- What are the other definitions for Group A?
- Define inchoate water rights.
- Revised fourth bullet of the Q & A to read "How can participation benefit a Group A Water System?" They could learn more about watershed issues that affect the larger group of stakeholders in the Chehalis. When updating your water system plans, your knowledge will help you to provide consistency with the Chehalis Basin Plan. Better informed in the decision making process. The implementation work plan cannot obligate your system to anything if you are not a willing participant.

Napier will incorporate the changes and send the letter out with the October meeting mailing.

### ***CBP Agenda for October***

- Watershed Council Grant proposal which is due October 31.

- Legislative Briefing-update from Napier regarding meeting with Senator Swecker and proposed legislative briefing.
- Nisqually River Council Overview and show Brian Walsh's slide show.
- Letter to Group A Water Systems.
- Nomination for Chair and Vice Chair-organize a nominating committee. Nominations are brought back for the November meeting. Election would be in December. What about having the citizen members volunteer for the nomination committee.

#### ***Phase IV-Work Plan***

##### Work Plan #1-

No new tasks.

Swartout though the prioritization of the tasks for this work plan seemed obvious. The group ranked task 6 as the number one priority because without the study we won't know where to do the work. This would also need to include a new subtask to prioritize the subbasins to initiate the planning work because the basin is so large. This would become a subtask for Action 6. Shaw pointed out that some headwaters do have extensive research such as the Scatter Creek watershed. We might also be able to use the pilot groundwater study currently being developed by Ecology. Can we get help from Leslie Lingley to help us scope this action? Other subtasks for Action 6 include analysis of the cost to perform the study, and identify sources of funding.

##### Work Plan #3-

Add a task "Compare inchoate water rights with the future needs of each group a water system." Stick to the planning horizon already defined in the water system plan process i.e. if water systems plan for a 20 year horizon, then use that to define future needs.

As discussed by the group, the watershed council grant would help implementation of tasks 1, 2, and 3.

Why is Task 4 in this work plan if it's an instream flow action? It addresses quantity.

##### Work Plan #7-

The group did not add tasks.

Revised Task 9 by adding continue to make...

Swartout proposed a ranking for the tasks. He suggested 1, 12, a grouping of 13-15, and 2 as the first four priorities.

#### Work Plan #9-

Copy Task 4 to Work Plan 7. Revise the Task 4 of this work plan by adding for enforcement to the end.

Lump 2, 3, 7, 9 and 10 to identify the voluntary actions.

Lump 1 with 5 and 6, which would become subtasks.

#### Work Plan #10-

Research the Idaho One Plan method. The group did not understand this task. *For more information check out the*

*website <http://www.oneplan.org>*

Task 14 could focus on municipal, agriculture, or exempt well water efficiencies.

Many of the tasks (5, 7, 8, 12 and 13) are requirements for water system planning.

Tasks 6, 9, 10, and 11 are agricultural in nature and may be resolved by farm bureaus or conservation districts.

Should we combine work plans 10 and 23? Create titles for the work plan such as municipal, agriculture and exempt wells? Lee will create a new format for this work plan by breaking out for the three types of conservation.

#### Work Plan 21-

Add a new task "Determine future impacts based on zoning and growth potential."

Pair some tasks 2 & 7, 1 & 8, 3 with 10, & 11, and 4 with 5 and 6. Define progress.

#### Work Plan 25

Add to Task 1 at the end ... identify ways agriculture can support instream flows.

Ask the Water Quality Committee to review Work Plans 31, 36, 38, and 41.

The next meeting of the STC is November 3. The location will be announced at the CBP meeting.