

Chad Stussy, Jim Hill, Kahle Jennings, Kernen Lien, Mark Swartout, Bruce Jones, Steve Craig, Glen Connelly, Lee Napier, and John Kliem were present.

Phase IV-DIP

John Kliem reviewed the agenda for his portion of the meeting. Last month, the group skipped a few boxes for the objectives in the workbooks.

Mark explained objective 7. The Chehalis Instream Resource Protection Program (IRPP) states that exempt wells are superior to other rights. The Attorney General's opinion stated that wells were restricted to 6 residential connections per well per project. To implement this objective, we need to first understand and clarify the law.

The group also left Objective 3, task 16 was blank. The group discussed this task. This task could make the watershed planning process crumble. If the state wants to regulate exempt wells, as a means to manage water resources, then the state needs to help local governments financially to take on a greater role.

The group began organizing three of the workshops. Mark suggested contacting the oversight committee list first to determine if the objective is already implemented. If it is, then organize a workshop with the participant list to determine tasks to improve the existing program/objective. John agreed that he intended to do some personal recruitment with the list of oversight committee. The standing committee members would also attend their respective workshops.

The group would like to schedule the entire workshop series. Most people already have the first Thursday and fourth Friday dedicated to CBP work. It seemed logical to use on one those days for a workshop.

Objective 1-Mark believes this is one of the objectives that is already being met. He thinks that most members of the oversight committee would state this work is already occurring. The next question would be is it occurring in a manner that works for the Chehalis Basin. Kahle thinks the STC should review the issue paper (Hydraulic Continuity) related to this objective. Steve commented that Ecology's answer to this objective would be on a case-by-case basis. They do not have a one-size fits all

answer. Kahle added that the group would like clarification to what degree is there flexibility. Steve is concerned that there is an expectation that a clear solution will result through this effort.

Bruce suggested a one-page introduction to the process and the issue paper(s) for each objective. *Note: the issues papers are difficult to summarize without losing the background that may help to frame the objective for the participants.*

The group assigned names to the list of representatives.

The group began working on the schedule for the workshops. The STC meetings for April, May and June would be designated for workshops on the objectives 1, 3, and 11.

- For Objective 1, the oversight committee will try to meet in April and the STC will host a workshop in June. Mark Swartout will be the team lead. For the April meeting Steve will check for Tom's availability, then circulate the dates for others to commit to. Steve will try to book a room at Ecology for this meeting.
- Objective 3 will be scheduled for the April meeting. Steve Craig will be the team lead. This group will meet at the County's Forestry Building.
- Objective 11 will be schedule for the May meeting. Glen Connelly will be the team lead. The Forestry Building might work for this meeting.

Lee will send out invites to reserve the date for the workshop with meeting materials to follow.

Statewide Workshop

The group discussed points for Lee to share during the panel discussion.

- Plan 2 Fund-Used this tool, forced us to convert actions into objectives and task, suggest using this tool during the development of the plan.
- Mention some of our successes-Watershed Action Council Grant, GIS Watershed Planning money.
- Share experiences that we learned from due to interaction.
- We established a significant level of trust and tremendous talent in the group.
- We put aside our differences and recognize commonalities.
- First started meeting in 1997.
- Certain individuals have stepped up to take the lead at key points in time.

- Invited our legislators to meet and they the majority showed up. We plan to continue to meet.
- Our decision making process is consensus.
- Were we able to carrying the momentum?
- We have experience some changes and we struggle with how to keep citizens engaged. Sometimes there is not a lot of opportunity for interaction.
- Many things happening at once-WQ, STC, CBP, and HWG gets to be a little overwhelming.
- The CBP was around before 2514. Because of the funding and the deadline, the focus of the CBP has shifted to watershed planning as a major emphasis.
- Lessons learned-trust takes time, size does matter one size funding scenario does not fit everyone.
- Diverse interest groups spread across a large land mass.
- It always takes longer than the original time estimate.
- Watershed planning is so demanding and it tends to overshadow other council issues.
- Budgets- entities are willing to donate time, but we cannot depend upon local dollars.
- Create a program (centennial) for watershed to compete for money to implement their plans.
- Phase 4 mechanism is inadequate. It only provides enough for basic administrative support.
- What would be the estimated cost to complete one of our objectives verses the money available from Phase 4. One entity is not going to fund regional issues beyond their jurisdiction.

The next meeting of the STC will be April 6th in Montesano at the County's Forestry Building.