

Lee Napier, Charles Pitz, John Mudge, Kernen Lien, Mark White, Chad Stussy, Steve Craig, Kahle Jennings, Terry Willis, Chanele Holbrook Shaw, Glen Connelly, Jim Hill, and Mark Swartout were present.

Groundwater Assessment-WMP Action 2

Mark Swartout asked the group to consider forming a work group to continue this project as a subcommittee. During our workshops, a suggestion was made to form a water quantity committee. Kahle had volunteered to chair that group. He is still interested in chairing the group, if there is a need and a commitment to participate. The group will work with Charles today and then determine how to proceed based on the discussions. Charles added that there is a need for non-technical discussions to help formulate the questions that need to be answered.

Swartout suggested that for today the group could start formulating questions. Charles would like a better understanding of what the group would like to get from him. This will help him to understand the level of commitment expected from the group.

Expectations and/or questions from the group;

- We understand there is a large degree of continuity in the basin. If we are going to manage water we need to really understand the interaction, both at a watershed and basin scale. Through our work with Charles we could refine a project.
- What kind of tools do we need to manage water and understand interaction to make management decisions? Chapter 5 of the homework assignment describes this question.
- The Dungeness/Quilcene watershed is a good example to further investigate.
- Use GIS to determine where the population density impacts water supply.
- About 15% of the watershed can be considered characterized through assessments.
- How do we model the watershed to understand and guide water supply in the future?
- Can we achieve a basin wide understanding of the interaction between groundwater and surface water aquifers?
- Basin wide approach encourages everyone to use the same tool.
- Will this process, initiation of a study, halt all development?

Questions formulated by the group and noted by Swartout on the whiteboard.

We want help from Charles answering:

- What is our geographic area and scale we want to model?
- What level of accuracy do you want the tools to provide?
- How will the tool be used? And by whom?
- Should the tools be predictive?
- What do we want to predict?

- What constraints are there based on budget?
- What is the long term commitment of the Partnership to achieve the goal?
- Are we committed to collaborating in developing and using one model?
- Will the Partnership want to use the model to predict the capacity (water supply) of the watershed?
- What are the impediments in collecting the data needed for the model?
- Will there be areas that will require a higher degree of accuracy and how will they be determined?
- What data do you already have?
- Do we want spatial (location of impact), temporal, or both?

Swartout asked if Charles could continue to meet with the group until the end of the year?

DIP

The group discussed the Partnership's decision to postpone approving the DIP during their September 23rd meeting.

Mark White expressed disappointment that the CBP did not approve the DIP. Steve Craig explained that the state felt it was necessary to delay action until the issues brought out through the QIN letter could be addressed or at least further examined. Mark responded that his business committee would like to see the DIP adopted to allow the Partnership's momentum to continue.

The issue regarding action by the Partnership to support comments by a nonmember was discussed.

- Can anyone delay action by the Partnership?
- The action by the Partnership was an effort to be courteous to the QIN because of the level of support they provide by sending staff to attend meetings.
- To what degree can a nonmember influence our process?
- Is it fair for someone to come in at the 24th hour and state the group's work did not meet their expectations?
- The group would like to keep the Partnership whole. How do we manage the conflicts?
- The group viewed the delay as an opportunity to consider tribal concerns.
- Is the Partnership engaging in issues that are outside of their purview? The group was split regarding this question because not everyone understood the issues.

What is there to work through in the QIN letter?

- A meeting between the two tribes;
- A meeting between the two tribes and Ecology to develop a common understanding regarding how to work together;
- A Partnership meeting hosted by QIN.

A question was asked why the meeting location was changed. Lee responded that she made the suggestion because she did not know if it was acceptable to invite another tribe to a meeting at the casino. Mark White clarified to Lee that the Partnership could invite QIN policy members to attend Partnership meetings. Correcting Lee's misunderstanding, the group decided that the meeting could remain at the Lucky Eagle.

The group reviewed a draft letter inviting QIN to the next Partnership meeting. Steve will make the changes and send a copy to Lee who will circulate the revised draft to the STC. The group set a deadline to mail the letter of October 11th.

Water Rights and Water Quality teleconference.

Lewis County offered to sponsor a site. The group wanted to participate as part of the December 7th STC meeting. The conference begins at 10am.

CBP agenda

The group discussed the agenda and suggested the following items.

- Curt Holt-fish management
- Festival update
- DIP discussion

STC agenda for November 2nd meeting

The next meeting will be at Department of Ecology. The proposed time will 9:30-3:00.

The agenda will include:

- Continue discussions with Charles-Circulate questions to the group and ask for input. 9:30-noon.
- Discuss if we should continue to further development of the remaining 13 objectives.
- Legislative briefing-Lee will try to schedule the date before the next meeting.