

**CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP
STEERING TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Building
600 Capitol Way
Olympia, WA
June 5, 2008
1:30 PM**

Meeting Summary

PRESENT

Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County	Jerry Louthain, HDR
Mark Swartout, Thurston County	Randy Lehr, Grays Harbor Community College
Christine Hempleman, Department of Ecology	Samuel Iwenofu, QIN
Kahle Jennings, City of Centralia	Cheri Lindgren, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Chad Stussy, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)	Janel Spaulding, Watershed Facilitator
Glen Connelly, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation	

Welcome & Introductions

Chair Mark Swartout called the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) Steering Technical Committee (STC) meeting to order at 1:37 p.m.

Progress Report – Pilot Water Right Project

Jerry Louthain, HDR, reported a final map showing all recorded water rights and pending water rights applications within the Skookumchuck basin is nearly completed. The map reflects points of diversion for surface water, points of withdrawal for groundwater, and place of use (not shown on the map). Mr. Louthain presented a draft map. The majority of water rights can be found along the stream. He pointed out Prairie Creek, Hanford Creek, tributaries, and the Skookumchuck mouth at Centralia. A spreadsheet detailing the amount of water rights, water rights holder, file number, priority date (date the application was filed) is included with the map. There are only five pending applications in the entire basin.

In response to a question from Chair Swartout, Kahle Jennings said Centralia would like to consider trading surface water rights on the Newaukum River for rights on the Skookumchuck.

Mr. Louthain said the project should be completed by the end of June. HDR will present the map and supplemental data to the CBP at its June meeting. HDR is working on a Scope of Work (SOW) to assess water rights claims (8,500) for the entire Chehalis watershed. A similar project was undertaken for the Skagit basin.

Mr. Jennings reported an assessment of water rights claims in the Chehalis basin would serve as mini-adjudication and could assist with water management as well.

Mr. Louthain noted a use less than 5,000 gallons per day is exempt but could be considered legitimate claims.

Members discussed HDR's work in the Skagit for the Western Washington Agricultural Association.

Mr. Jennings emphasized that the pilot project work on the Skookumchuck is based on a paper survey.

Ms. Hempleman arrived.

Discussion ensued on current activity in the water rights market. Mr. Louthain reported a significant issue concerns the brewery water rights in Tumwater. The cities of Tumwater, Olympia, and Lacey have requested the Conservancy Board's review of the water rights for processing. Chair Swartout suggested discussing the issue at a future STC meeting.

Members commented on the transfer of agricultural water rights of the old Leprechaun Dairy to Grand Mound for municipal purposes, whether there is a provision addressing interbasin water rights transfers, and mitigating impacts.

Meet and Welcome New Watershed Facilitator

Chair Swartout welcomed Janel Spaulding, Watershed Facilitator. He described the committee's role to the CBP. He suggested developing a work program for Ms. Spaulding. Lee Napier said the STC could discuss a work program as part of the Phase 4 grant amendment.

Chair Swartout reported on Chad Stussy's upcoming departure from the WDFW.

Randy Lehr reported on his acceptance of the position of a Water Resource Manager in the Midwest. He is leaving Grays Harbor College the first week in July.

Mr. Iwenofu arrived.

Groundwater Characterization Model Discussion

Chair Swartout reported an HDR employee contacted him, Ms. Napier, Mr. Jennings, and Mr. Connelly several times over the last several months on whether HDR or the US Geological Survey (USGS) should complete the groundwater characterization model. Mr. Jennings provided background information on how HDR is involved in the task. HDR's position as a consultant means quicker completion of the work at less cost than USGS. HDR wants an opportunity to complete the work.

Chair Swartout said the STC evaluated pros and cons of having either USGS or a private firm completing the work. The subject was presented to the CBP and the CBP agreed with moving forward.

Mr. Swartout reported he raised the issue at the Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority (Authority) meeting earlier in the day. Keith Phillips from the Governor's Office indicated the US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) is interested in working with USGS. The issue is how far HDR is willing to pursue which agency should complete the work. The Partnership does not have funds to contract with a consultant.

Members discussed pros and cons of using USGS or a private firm previously discussed by the STC. Chair Swartout noted private industry consultants could complete future projects related to the model.

Mr. Lehr asked if the STC considered academic resources to complete the groundwater characterization model. Watershed hydrologists are available at the University of Washington (UW) who undertake the work as well as a consultant. Academia projects typically take longer (4-5 years), but the Partnership receives a higher quality deliverable costing much less. Chair Swartout suggested scheduling the subject for the STC's July meeting agenda.

Ms. Napier reviewed the response HDR sent to her on the USGS proposal:

- The USGS proposal needs a clear set of goals and objectives.
- USGS is proposing collection of the same information collected by Charles Pitz for DOE's pilot project.
- HDR would expand Mr. Pitz's project area approximately three miles downstream and four to five miles upstream into the Newaukum subbasin to collect more data.
- Referring specifically to task 2.5 in the USGS proposal, DOE generally requires a higher level of detail before accepting studies for setting instream flows.
- Building the model is the first step.
- The planning unit needs to decide how to run the scenarios to answer the goals.
- HDR doesn't understand why it's necessary to complete two separate reports for the hydrogeologic analysis and numerical modeling.
- The budget is four times what the Partnership should fund.
- A four-year project schedule seems long.

In response to the second bullet point, Mr. Jennings reminded members Mr. Pitz's work was a focused study. The intent was not to complete a groundwater model.

Ms. Hempleman suggested giving Matt Ely with USGS an opportunity to respond to HDR's comments.

Mr. Jennings disclosed that the City of Centralia has a contractual relationship with HDR. He said his comments are intended as informational. HDR's comment on the geographic focus is related to perceived benefits in alluvial deposits.

Specific to the last bullet, Ms. Napier explained that HDR believes the project will take four months for data collection, four to six months for modeling and calibration, and one to two months for report development.

Mr. Lehr said HDR's suggested a 12-month timeframe appears accelerated and doesn't provide for wet and dry season modeling comparisons.

Discussion ensued on asking Mr. Pitz and Nadine Romero with Thurston County to conduct an independent review of the USGS Scope of Work (SOW) and HDR's comments with a discussion scheduled for the STC's July meeting.

Mr. Connelly added that his discussions with the HDR representative indicated that the Partnership is not receiving good value for the amount USGS wants to do the work. He said USGS appears be very professional and is providing a match for the work.

Mr. Lehr suggested the STC could also solicit Grays Harbor College for input on the USGS SOW and HDR's comments.

Mr. Iwenofu said Quinault Indian Nation (QIN) could also be a resource for review of the proposals.

Chair Swartout emphasized that the discussion is not about HDR, but rather what agency will complete groundwater characterization work.

Mr. Jennings said if the decision is for a consultant, a Request for Proposal (RFP) process is required.

Discussion followed on other options including intergovernmental agreements, shopping the proposal through academia resources, and the thoroughness of academic peer review.

Chair Swartout proposed developing a white paper for the Partnership on what each entity can provide, the outcomes, and a recommendation. Mr. Stussy agreed. It's important to exhaust all options. He expressed interest in the academic strategy.

Chair Swartout asked Mr. Lehr to follow up with the University of Washington for a contact person the STC can work with.

Ms. Hempleman reported she'll follow up with Mr. Pitz on evaluating the USGS SOW, HDR's critique, and the option of considering academic resources.

Chair Swartout advised that he will follow up with Ms. Romero. He added he would like input from both Tribes on a white paper evaluating options to eventually forward to the Partnership.

Members discussed the date of the next meeting and agreed to reschedule the meeting to July 17, 2008 because of the holiday.

Members discussed whether the Corps will use USGS to complete a three dimensional model, which could influence the Partnership's decision on the entity to complete the groundwater characterization work, and the possibility of USGS, US Army Corps of Engineer, and academic resources embarking on a collaborated venture.

Discussion ensued on the facilitator position to support the Authority.

Mr. Stussy reported WDFW's meeting room is booked for July 17. Chair Swartout advised he will follow up on another meeting location.

Members discussed complications related to a Fred Meyer facility expansion in the floodplain near the Port of Chehalis and required mitigation for wetlands. Additionally, I-5 serves as the economic artery for the West Coast and provides economic benefit to local communities in Lewis County, which is one reason why developers want to locate businesses near the freeway.

Work Plan for 2008-2009 Grant Contract with Department of Ecology

Ms. Napier distributed a current SOW for Phase 4 Implementation - DOE grant - handout. The amendment awards remaining funds for Year 2 of the Phase 4 Implementation project. It's important to expend all funds. Members reviewed the tasks and considered new ones. She noted tasks 2 and 3 are completed. Task 5 was reduced and involves implementation and refining the Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP) and work program in the fall of 2008. The question is whether to update the DIP or identify next implementation steps and goals. Members generally agreed to continue to refine the DIP through annual work plans rather than overhauling the task. The annual work plan will be the deliverable. Chair Swartout reported the USGS SOW touches upon many of the goals and tasks contained in the DIP.

Members discussed developing a prioritized list of projects to position the CBP for emerging grant fund opportunities for advancing the DIP.

Ms. Napier reported Task 6 was significantly revised and focuses on outreach and reenergizing the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC). The primary outreach medium will be articles in the *Drops of Water* newspaper insert. Ms. Spaulding is interested in the outreach component and working on reorganizing the CAC. The original task, "Work with citizen volunteers, develop and implement an education and outreach work plan." was not fulfilled. Ms. Napier said she worked with Ms. Hempleman to revise the task. The deliverables for the task include preparing several articles for the *Drops of Water* insert and sponsoring one edition of the *Drops of Water* publication. The estimated cost to complete the task is \$8,438, of which \$5,000 should be reserved for one edition of the *Drops of Water* publication.

Discussion followed about the Authority meeting held earlier in the day. Chair Swartout reported Commissioner Macleod spoke about developing a work plan for the \$2.5 million from the state for a basin-wide study. Apparently, there are agencies spending funds and requesting reimbursement from the Authority. The Authority will work to develop a work plan once the facilitator is hired.

Ms. Spaulding suggested retaining some of the language removed in Task 6. She spoke about creating an individual website for the Partnership and developing a newsletter that could also be posted on the website. The associated costs would be minimal. She said she'd also like to develop an "adopt a stream" program.

Chair Swartout supported the idea of adopting a stream program, which would provide a nice shift for the CAC.

Mr. Jennings and Chair Swartout offered the idea of publishing news releases and taking advantage of local radio spots to call attention to and help in marketing the Partnership and its work.

Ms. Napier suggested Ms. Spaulding could research free advertising opportunities. Ms. Spaulding added that the minutes and meeting agendas could also be posted on a Partnership website. Mr. Lehr said Grays Harbor College Public Relations Office could provide some assistance.

Ms. Hempleman reported the grant amendment must be approved by the end of the biennium. She indicated she will be on vacation after June 17.

Ms. Napier suggested it might be helpful for Ms. Spaulding to familiarize herself with other planning units, such as the Nisqually River and Watershed Council meetings. Members discussed upcoming meetings and coordinated attendance and travel arrangements.

Ms. Spaulding was asked to work with Ms. Napier and Ms. Hempleman to refine Task 6.

Members discussed Task 7, which is completed. Ms. Napier said there is approximately \$30,000 remaining for allocation to another small task or redirected for outreach.

Mr. Stussy asked whether outreach includes the annual Watershed Festival. Ms. Napier said an option is allocating some of the Task 7 funds to the Watershed Festival.

Discussion ensued on whether there are plans to cut watershed planning unit funding (from \$125,000 to \$67,000) with the next state budget cycle and DOE lobbying the Legislature on behalf of the Partnership. Ms. Hempleman said one goal is to wean watershed planning units off dedicated funding. She said she understands there will be supplemental implementation funding. Ms. Napier emphasized that the Partnership needs \$125,000 for planning support. Ms. Hempleman conveyed DOE staff has been asked

to discourage planning units from approaching the Legislature separately for funding requests. DOE will assemble a legislative package based on demonstrated needs. Mr. Jennings suggested it's prudent to ensure CBP's interests are reflected in DOE's budget request.

Discussion followed on how DOE's budget request is presented to the Legislature and how DOE and Chehalis Basin programs were funded in the last budget cycle. Ms. Hempleman conveyed that she will follow up with DOE staff when she returns from vacation.

Chair Swartout noted the CBP is now competing with the Puget Sound Partnership for funding in the next legislative cycle.

Discussion followed on organizing and identifying funding streams to support a Grays Harbor County Marine Resources Committee (MRC), coordinating fresh and marine water activities, and continued funding for salmon recovery projects. Mr. Jennings suggested focusing resources to retain agriculture (AG) and forestry practices. Ms. Napier asked whether retaining those uses could be accomplished through outreach. A new task (Task 8) could discuss developing approaches to retain local AG and forestry practices. Mr. Jennings said a reference to the DIP could be included in the text. He suggested Ms. Napier could contact Terry Willis and the Lewis County Farm Bureau on providing further details related to the work. Task 8 could state, "Work with agricultural and forestry representatives to the CBP to implement DIP #4 to keep AG and forestry on the land."

Ms. Hempleman conveyed she will talk with DOE staff about whether Mr. Jennings' suggestion provides enough detail for the grant amendment application.

Conversation followed on Task 6 capturing whether the Partnership will develop and distribute a citizen survey on water resource and watershed management.

Watershed Facilitator Annual Work Plan Discussion

Mr. Swartout cautioned members on the amount of the workload directed to Ms. Spaulding. The preferred approach is developing an annual work plan.

Ms. Napier explained the current strategy is division of the work. She will continue to act as the lead for the CBP and Ms. Spaulding will lead the Water Quality Committee and citizens group.

Mr. Jennings said it's important to identify deliverable products demonstrating the Partnership's success at the end of 2008.

Chair Swartout recommended Ms. Spaulding's annual work plan should include the Water Quality Committee and STC components. A work plan could be submitted to the CBP for approval. He asked Ms. Napier, Mr. Lehr, and Ms. Spaulding to build a work plan framework. Mr. Lehr reported the college is working on developing a job description for the Watershed Facilitator position, which will inform a work plan.

STC July 17, 2008 Meeting Agenda

(Location to be determined - 9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.)

- Groundwater characterization model discussion (Mr. Pitz and Ms. Romero)

CBP June 27, 2008 Meeting Agenda

- Progress report on the pilot water right project in the Skookumchuck basin (30-45 minutes)

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Chair Swartout adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

Prepared by Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services