

Phase IV-Draft Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP)

John Kliem reviewed the agenda for the group.

The agenda included:

1. Finding similarities/relationships between Interim Milestones
2. Brainstorming/evaluating options
3. Other DIP review/comments/ideas
4. Determining What's Next

John posted the five DIPs and their respective Interim Milestones (IM) on the wall for the group to review. Comments from the group included:

- Why isn't DIP 1 under DIP 3? DIP 1 highlights Ecology's processing of water rights and applicability to the Chehalis communities.
- Link the following IMs. 4.2 with 1.1, 1.2 with DIP 3, 3.4 with 1.2, 3.1 with 1.2 & 3.4, 5.2a with 2.2, 4.2a with 2.2.
- The group discussed adaptive management concepts a component of the DIP(s).
- Part of the adaptive management would include an annual work plan to insure that the document is dynamic. This includes modifying the current annual plan of work.
- The current implementation plan should span 2007-2008 work period.
- Begin a bi-annual review of the implementation plan fall of 2008.
- Discuss remaining 13 strategies in the introduction.
- Plan additional workshops to refine work plans. This would apply to the current five and the additional thirteen.
- Produce an annual report for the CBP to highlight accomplishments. Include a section for each committee.
- When does the CBP expect to initiate implementation?
- When do people need to acknowledge their commitment(s)?
- The group felt the flow of this document was better than versions created before John was hired.
- The group would like to see a flowchart/picture to summarize the DIP. The visual would summarize how the DIP works. The visual should show the flow between the DIP and the WMP.
- The group suggested looking at the obligation table from the Nisqually DIP.
- Emphasize that all strategies are dependent upon available funding. Include that language in the introduction and the obligation table.
- Describe Plan2Fund and Watershed Directory Resource.
- CBP should initiate discussions with federal agencies. This might lead to additional dollars. Mention the federal agency(s) in IM 2.3.

Next steps for the DIP

- STC will get one more edit. The revisions from today will be sent to Lee who will send them out to the STC. The members should e-mail comments to Lee. The group will discuss the document during the August 3rd meeting.
- Along with the next draft, Lee will circulate a letter to workshop participants. The STC should also send comments to Lee regarding the letter's content.

Evaluation of the Municipal Water Rights/Inchoate Rts

Lee Daneker briefed the group regarding the status of his work. He was hired to review and summarize the WRATS database information on rights held by Group A Water Purveyors. This would also include a review of select water system plans to help compile data related to quantity of the water rights and the use (inchoate portion). His findings and the group feedback are summarized below:

- Many of the systems that seemed worth exploring are not required to submit full water system plan due to the size of the system (less than 1,000 connections).
- A suggestion was made to still identify those systems for future consideration. He will include that as part of his deliverable to produce a table.
- Regarding the table deliverable. He is finding it challenging to produce a concise 8 ½ x 11 table. There is considerable amounts of information that lead to an cumbersome table.
- He distributed data sheets produced after his review of individual water system plans.
- A suggestion was made to explain supplemental rights in the final report.
- Some felt it was important to identify which streams were of concerns based on the location of the water right. Others agreed, but felt it was beyond the scope of work for this limited contract.
- The group agreed Phase 3 for this project should be the development of a list of priority streams. This work would include locating the diversion for the right and locating the nearest instream flow point.
- For the next STC meeting, Lee Napier will try to develop a general map that locates the water systems, streams, and roads for the 20 plus plans.

The group discuss sending a letter to the water systems included in Lee's summary of the water system plans. The group thought it would be appropriate to ask the providers/managers to review the data sheet for consistency. Someone would contact the systems with a large surplus. Napier will contact systems located in Grays Harbor County. Swartout will contact systems located in Thurston County. Jennings will contact the Lewis County systems. The group asked Jennings to also run the letter by Patrick for his feedback.. The letter will not go out until after the August STC meeting.

STC agenda for August 6th meeting will include: further discussion related to the inchoate water rights by Lee Daneker, GIS presentation by Lee Daneker, and SOW for the legislative appropriation.