

**CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP  
STEERING TECHNICAL COMMITTEE  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife  
600 Capitol Way  
Olympia, WA  
June 4, 2009  
9:30 AM**

**Meeting Summary**

---

**PRESENT**

Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County  
Glen Connelly, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis  
Reservation  
Christine Hempleman, Department of Ecology (DOE)  
Bob Burkle, Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)  
Phil Rupp, Lewis County  
Janel Spaulding, Grays Harbor College  
Joel Green, Grays Harbor College

Jim Hill, Citizen, Lewis County  
Dave Rountry, DOE  
Bill Schulte, Lewis County  
Chanele Holbrook-Shaw, Citizen, Thurston County  
William Thomas Gow II, Puget Sound Meeting  
Services  
Julie Powell, Lewis County Farm Bureau

**Welcome & Introductions**

Glen Connelly called the meeting of the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) Steering Technical Committee (STC) to order at 9:38 a.m. He reviewed the meeting agenda.

**Report on the Workshops and DIP Update**

Ms. Spaulding reported on the May 13 and May 20 Education and Outreach Workshops. Each workshop included approximately 25 participants. During the second workshop, small working groups were formed focusing on specific tasks for education and outreach within the basin. Currently, the seven small working groups include:

- **Media & Marketing** – basin tourist guide, calendar, map, and a brochure of interesting facts on the basin
- **Publications/Training** – Margaret Rader will host a workshop on writing newsletter articles and skills based training on how to write publications, and letter writing campaign to legislators on funding needs for the watershed
- **Teacher Training** – Led by Eric Baker, Pacific Education Institute, who will lead a teachers institute comprised of middle school teachers from Grays Harbor and Pacific County school districts on field investigations and interaction with students. In July 2010, a second teachers' institute will be held followed by June 2011. A toolbox for teachers will be developed.
- **Volunteer Coordination** – Janel Spaulding, Dave Rountry, and Birdie Davenport are working together on creating a volunteer database for coordination of volunteer resources.
- **Public Workshops and Camps** – working group will focus on senior projects mentor training workshops
- **Events** – workgroup will inventory current special events occurring within the basin and create a brochure to publicize events. Conduct landowner and forest steward council/landowners workshops. Conduct recognition awards dinner to recognize volunteers, community members, educators, and project sponsors involved in salmon

recovery restoration projects. Conduct annual symposium for showcasing achievements and providing educational opportunities.

- **Webshare** – workgroup members Janel Spaulding, Candy Bowen, April Boe, and Miranda Plumb will meet to setup online calendars to share information on events utilizing Google calendar.

Ms. Spaulding advised that she will forward information on all the workgroups to members. She invited members to consider joining a workgroup. The groups will meet as needed with a possible annual meeting of the workgroups to track progress.

The information from the workshops will update Strategy #2 within CBP's Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP). John Kleim and Debbie Holden, Creative Community Solutions (CCS), are working to update the DIP, which will be forwarded to the membership.

Ms. Spaulding reported on the registration of the CBP for the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) *Adopt Your Watershed Program*. Citizens interested in learning about their watershed can visit EPA's website, which includes the Chehalis basin. EPA forwarded a certificate as well as some resource materials.

Ms. Spaulding reported she met with Jason Robertson and Ron Pinnick with *Grays Harbor 2020*, a community vision and action planning process for Grays Harbor County. Some of the plan's strategies closely align with some of the goals of the Partnership. One of the community's goals is calculating and promoting the economic value of natural services, such as flood and surge plain protection, which closely aligns with the Partnership's Earth Economic Study. *Grays Harbor 2020's* goal is working with other organizations and groups to achieve some of its strategies.

Another strategy is hosting annual celebrate natural festivals, which closely aligns to the annual Watershed Festival and the Shorebird Festival in Hoquiam.

Establishing an environmental education coordinator with countywide responsibility is another goal of *Grays Harbor 2020*. Ms. Spaulding said she was identified as a possible candidate for the role but cautioned the representatives that she couldn't assume more tasks other than providing reports to the organization on her activities. *The Friends of Grays Harbor* offered to assist in her reporting to *Grays Harbor 2020*, as well as posting information on the website.

Ms. Spaulding responded to questions from members. At this time, there is no funding associated with the environmental education coordinator position. No other tasks are contemplated other than reporting on her activities. She indicated she believes she has the time to devote to the process. Additionally, the Partnership will be recognized as a lead partner in *Grays Harbor 2020* achieving its strategies.

Members and participants discussed funding sources for *Grays Harbor 2020*. Members generally agreed with Ms. Spaulding participating at the level of providing periodic updates to the organization.

*Dave Rountry arrived at the meeting.*

#### **Chehalis Basin Partnership Meeting Debrief-Group**

Bill Schulte reported approximately one year ago, the Partnership met and discussed the extent the Partnership should become involved in flood mitigation. There was consensus by the Partnership that the organization was not interested in becoming involved in flood mitigation.

Ms. Napier said she didn't recall that conversation during the Partnership meeting. Mr. Schulte reiterated that the Partnership voted not to become involved. Since then, the Partnership is involved with Earth Economics in flood mitigation, the Flood Authority, and the General Investigation (GI) Study, which creates a problem. Before the committee wants to move forward with any of those projects, it will be necessary to brief the Partnership on the two studies and obtain a vote on the course of action the Partnership wants to pursue.

Ms. Napier said the Partnership has been involved with the GI Study, which is an ecosystem restoration study since 2000. Mr. Schulte countered that the moment the study involved the Flood Authority, the action went against the express vote of the entire Partnership. That's what occurred at the meeting after the 2007 flood, approximately four to five months after the flood. The Partnership took a vote and indicated members would not become involved with the Flood Authority, flood mitigation, or flood control. Ms. Napier said that direction was not her recollection during the meeting.

Jim Hill said the discussion was pre-Flood Authority formation. Mr. Schulte said they were getting ready to form the Flood Authority because as they were developing the authority, the Partnership was asked about its involvement. The Partnership voted no and indicated it did not want to get involved in the process, and now it appears the Partnership is involved. Mr. Hill clarified that the discussion at the time pertained to legislators approaching the Partnership about coordinating the Flood Authority. The Partnership indicated it would rather have the role of a resource entity. The Partnership did not want to assume the role of forming a Flood Authority. Ms. Napier agreed that was her understanding of the conversation.

Mr. Connolly asked Mr. Schulte if he researched the meeting minutes. Mr. Schulte said he was in attendance at the meeting. The Partnership indicated it did not want to get involved and wanted to stay focused on its core mission of water quality and salmon recovery. There was consensus. Everybody agreed not to become involved in the Flood Authority or flood mitigation and would remain focused on its core mission.

Mr. Hill disagreed and said he doesn't believe that was the fine line in terms of how it's being portrayed now. Mr. Schulte said it was a statement that he made and it's in the record. It was his understanding and there appears to be a disconnect. To fix the disconnect, he suggested going before the general membership and seeking authority to become involved and outlining the benefits for the Partnership and the Flood Authority. Lyle Hojem began the discussion during the last meeting about the Partnership having a clear understanding of who does what and where the line is drawn.

Mr. Hill verified that Mr. Hojem's comments were correct and that it will be necessary to reconsider and reevaluate where the Partnership stands as the Flood Authority is now formed and has established some clear goals. The Partnership's role really hasn't changed and it's a valid point to go back and revisit the issue during another discussion to ensure the fine line is clarified.

Ms. Napier referred to a February meeting where members questioned what role the Partnership would assume. Legislation occurred and the Flood Authority was formed in June. During that period of time during 2008, the Partnership questioned the role it should serve. Mr. Schulte said the question was never addressed to the general membership. Ms. Napier disagreed and indicated it was always with the general membership. Mr. Schulte said members voted not to get involved and never voted to become involved, or the extent or type of involvement. At the last Partnership meeting, Mr. Hojem asked for clarification on the Partnership's role and how it wants to be involved.

Ms. Napier said members discussed their role and recognized the Partnership will not be the authority for any flood control, but members also recognized that it could be resource in a forum. The Partnership continued to host educational meetings by inviting different presenters to share observations about the flood. She said she's puzzled with the comment that the Partnership suddenly decided it wasn't going to become involved. Meanwhile the Partnership continued to provide educational forums while the Flood Authority began to meet. Many people began wondering what happens at Flood Authority meetings, so the Partnership agenda included periodic reports on Flood Authority meetings to keep members informed. As the Flood Authority developed its ready project list, the Partnership was aware of several implementation projects that it could submit for consideration. Those projects were vetted before the Partnership involving the project with Earth Economics and the groundwater characterization project with the US Geological Survey (USGS), which has been renamed. Both projects were submitted to the Flood Authority for consideration. The Flood Authority is currently deciding on how to fund the projects. Ms. Napier said in her last report to the Partnership there was the understanding that the Flood Authority may be funding some projects that assist the Partnership in implementing its watershed plan and through the GI Study, the Partnership may be funding some projects that will help the Flood Authority recognizing that the Partnership deals with low flows and the Flood Authority deals with high flows with the assumption the connection will benefit both entities. In early 2009, the Chair of the Flood Authority, Commissioner Averill, attended a Partnership meeting where she specifically asked the Partnership what role they wanted to play. Members did not offer a response. Mr. Schulte said that action does not constitute a vote. Ms. Napier emphasized that all members were silent on the issue. When the STC develops recommendations for moving forward on different projects, the Partnership must say something if it's not the direction they want to proceed.

Mr. Schulte asserted that it is not clearly defined and that the STC's agenda is not approved because members are silent. There must be a clear delineation of what the Partnership's interests are. Ms. Napier said members indicated interest in pursuing the ecosystem project. However, there was no vote. Mr. Schulte said there was no consensus either, as there was no request to ask for consensus. Ms. Napier said the Chair operates the meeting based on the agenda specifying an action item.

Mr. Schulte said as things change over time, it appears the Partnership has hit one of those changes. He said he's uncomfortable and will cause problems until the Partnership clearly delineates the differences between the two groups and how they interact through a consensus vote.

Ms. Napier affirmed that it's been a question the STC has been asking because there has been no dialogue occurring at the Partnership. Mr. Schulte said his request is to have the discussion and achieve some understanding. He said he feels the STC has been operating without any consensus from the Partnership.

Mr. Hill disagreed with the assertion. Mr. Schulte said that it's his position. He said he didn't open the last discussion. It was Lyle Hojem who indicated that the Partnership must have an understanding of where everybody is on the issue and what the projects will be. At the last meeting where the Partnership achieved consensus, the consensus indicated that the Partnership wouldn't get involved in the Flood Authority or flood mitigation. Ms. Napier agreed, but indicated she doesn't believe the organization is going in another direction. The intent is to implement the Watershed Plan and finding mutual interests between the two organizations. Mr. Schulte agreed, but noted there needs to be some clarification.

Mr. Hill agreed that a member needs some clarification and that reclarification would be timely. It's timely to have the discussion.

Mr. Schulte said he wouldn't necessarily clarify himself as a new member because he's been a member of the Partnership for some time. The situation has changed, and it's important to clarify the roles of the groups and how they interact.

Mr. Schulte said he understands the study underway by Earth Economics, which will benefit the Partnership as well as the Flood Authority. It's a good project. However, he's unsure what the GI Study entails and how it fits. Before committing time, effort, funds, and interaction with the Flood Authority, Mr. Schulte said he'd like a briefing and some open discussion about the project.

Bob Burkle reported that he's involved in a groundwater investigation in Chambers-Clover watershed with USGS and is familiar with the study. The effort involves data research by reviewing well logs, strata, geology, and high and low watermarks. Data are used as tools for other work. Mr. Schulte asked how the project interfaces with the US Army Corps of Engineers study.

Ms. Napier advised that Grays Harbor is the project sponsor for the GI Study. Some activity occurring in the Twin Cities led to interest in a basin-wide effort. Grays Harbor stepped up and offered to work on the larger ecosystem restoration. The benefit of having the Partnership and Grays Harbor County involved is the 50/50 match with the Corps project. As watershed planning funds were used, a substantial match was accumulated that has not been fulfilled by the Corps of Engineers because of the work involved in developing the watershed plan. The Corps of the Engineers was involved during the development of the watershed plan and discussed ways for the two organizations to work together and in determining where gaps existed. That's why the three-way partnership between Grays Harbor County, the Partnership, and the Corps occurred.

After the departure of the Corps project manager, fewer funds were forthcoming. There also was a pause in the Twin Cities project. Today, there is interest once again to begin exploring ecosystem restoration. There may be habitat restoration from the ecosystem project, which will not mitigate what occurs with the Twin Cities project. The Twin Cities project is the levee system flood control project. A lull period transpired until the 2007 flood when momentum began to increase for the Twin Cities project. The Corps approached the county about initiating the ecosystem project, which resulted in negotiations between Grays Harbor County, the Partnership, and the Flood Authority for ripe and projects that are ready to move forward. A year ago, the Partnership submitted the project to DOE for funding. It's important to understand hydraulic continuity, which is the understanding of how groundwater and surface water interact. There was emphasis in obtaining funding to work with USGS to gather data and create a model to help understand the interaction throughout the basin while also recognizing it's also of value to the Flood Authority because if storage is contemplated, it's important to understand that interaction. The project was presented to the Flood Authority for possible funding. The Board Advisory Committee of the Flood Authority was assigned to look at ripe and ready projects for viability in terms of timing and budget. Budgets were examined to determine sources of funds to cover the projects, which may be part of the miscommunication and misunderstandings because the two entities are working together to obtain as many resources as possible with meetings and exchange of information occurring frequently. The Flood Authority and the Board Advisory Committee developed a list of projects. While the USGS project was not funded, the Flood Authority agreed to take ecosystem restoration funds and work with USGS and the Corps. The Corps contracts with USGS to complete the work on behalf of the Partnership. The Partnership is contributing \$90,000 in state funds, which is a match to \$90,000 in federal funds. That project appeared to be the best way to expend ecosystem funds because it consists of one large project.

Mr. Hill referred to the GI Study and the Corps involvement prior to the Katrina hurricane. After Katrina hit, all projects were delayed because funds were diverted to recovery. The groundwater interaction project began as a groundwater storage project, which morphed into groundwater interaction.

Ms. Napier apprised members of the status of the GI Study with concurrence and direction by the Flood Authority as well as the Partnership. The funds will be used to help implement the watershed plan. It's anticipated that data on both high flows and low flows will benefit both groups.

Chris Hempleman referred to statements concerning the Partnership's role in water quality and habitat. The original legislation for watershed planning focused on water availability for farms, fish, and for growth. That is the primary focus for watershed planning rather than water quality and habitat.

Mr. Schulte said the mission statement includes water quality and habitat. He shared his background and some of the reasons for his concerns. He is a member of the Chehalis River Council (CRC) and is the Vice President on the Board for the Chehalis River Basin Land Trust. He served in the Coast Guard with a large part of his service in marine environmental protection. He obtained a degree from The Evergreen State College in environmental management in 2005. During the 2007 storm, his newly built house was inundated with seven feet of water. His goal is to develop a solution or some way to mitigate flooding. At a recent Partnership meeting, the Mayor for the City of Montesano indicated people shouldn't be so stupid as to build near the river. Mr. Schulte advised that his home is 20 feet above and 500 feet from the 1996 high-water mark. Prior to purchasing the property, he researched the property to ensure it wasn't located within the floodplain. Most of the flooding occurred because of bridge construction and design. He said he fears that the two groups are developing different concepts on how to control mitigation and wants to ensure that the two groups interact, that there's a clear line of distinction, and that a solution is developed that provides flood mitigation for the entire basin. It will not be about only building dams or levees. After construction of dikes or levees, local governments cannot prevent people from filling behind dikes and levees. Other options could include improving existing dikes and levees, wetland restoration, water retention along the headwaters, or purchasing property in the floodway to remove homeowners from risk. There's not only one solution to the issue. The issue is to avoid two competing systems canceling one another. If one group begins to create problems, Mr. Schulte said he will "rock the boat." He indicated he is not anti-Partnership or anti-environment except for dams or levees and will vote against the Twin Cities Corps project. As long as the groups continue to proceed in different directions, no progress will occur.

Ms. Napier said the STC would like to work together with the Flood Authority. However, when the Partnership/STC presents a proposal to the Flood Authority, it appears to be received with some skepticism with respect to treating the Partnership/STC as if it's an environmental interest. While many of the topics are environmental in nature, many people who attend are concerned about regulating the environment. There are fewer environmentalists represented now.

Mr. Schulte noted the Flood Authority is comprised of 11 members with some representing the Partnership and some representing dam and levee interests. Individuals who believe dam and levees as the solution view the others as a threat. The Flood Authority is split in terms of the desired approach. The third group involved is the Corps, which he believes is operating independently. The Partnership is heading on one course while the Flood Authority is headed on another track. He said he's unsure of the Corps' track. He indicated he's against dikes and levees because there is no control in dictating to property owners what they can do with their property. The right course of action is a solution that requires multiple actions. As long as the watershed is divided into three different groups, actions will be cancelled by each entity. Each group should work with the Corps and have the Corps accept data from

other entities, such as Earth Economics. It's important to determine how to interact with the Flood Authority as well as considering how to approach the Corps so that data from the studies can be incorporated within the Corps planning process. Currently, the Corps is scheduling an open house in August for a presentation on the Corps' solution. The first thing is to develop a consensus between the two entities (Partnership and Flood Authority) on how to work together and determine final goals. Currently, the Flood Authority believes the Partnership/STC is anti-water retention. Mark White is not helping the situation by commenting on his intent to kill a dam project. That may be part of the solution. When there was interest in studying potential dam sites within the upper basin, Partnership representatives sitting on the Flood Authority only approved half of the project. There was no good political reason for the decision other than displaying political power and that the group had the ability to interfere with each organization.

Mr. Connolly disagreed.

Mr. Schulte said he believes that's the issue and it's creating a problem. The objective is coming together and agreeing that a solution may include particular steps. Once there is some understanding between the two entities, some trust can form, which must occur fairly quickly prior to the Corps achieving 100% design causing the loss of ability to influence that solution.

Ms. Napier said when there were discussions about the Lewis County Public Utilities District (PUD) project as a storage option, there appeared to be some opposition. She said she put forward an option of the Partnership assessing storage options and sites throughout the basin for low flows with the recognition that there would be benefits to high flows as well. The Partnership has funds for assessments, but it requires examining candidate sites throughout the basin.

Mr. Schulte asked why the funds couldn't be combined with PUD funds for the PUD study. Mr. Connolly said the PUD study involves only two specific sites. Mr. Schulte said the PUD has already examined multiple sites. The instant each entity believes they have the answer, the end result of canceling each other's efforts occurs.

Mr. Connolly said the PUD appears to be cancelling everyone's efforts as they determined two areas without further studies.

Mr. Hill said prior to the formation of the Partnership, there was a study of potential retention sites. Mr. Schulte said Lewis County spent \$12 million studying potential dam sites in Lewis County. Mr. Hill offered to provide a copy of the study. Ms. Napier added that it was not possible to secure information from the Corps' Twin Cities project to include in the initial study, which led to some frustrations. Mr. Schulte said the Corps will not release the information, which caused Lewis County to pay for the study again with Northwest Hydrology. The Partnership has access to that information.

Ms. Napier commented that the complication of working with the Flood Authority on other retention sites concerns the funds and the purpose of the funds for the Partnership to study low flows while the Flood Authority should focus on high flow sites. The Board Advisory Committee proposed a suite of solutions by having the Lewis County PUD project continue while the Flood Authority will continue to focus efforts on other candidate sites throughout the basin.

Mr. Schulte asked why only the first two steps were approved. Ms. Napier said based on her observation, it was because there was some issues associated with not understanding the project. Mr. Schulte said he has no information on the GI Study and will use that same position and vote against it. He acknowledged

that stance doesn't make sense. The study is for obtaining information. The goal is to determine whether the two sites are feasible. This is one reason for the distrust between the groups.

Mr. Hill said a representative from the Corps regularly attended Partnership/STC meetings, which stopped around the time Katrina hit. The Partnership is a forum bringing different groups together for discussions.

Chanele Holbrook-Shaw commented on frustrations associated with providing information to citizens as well as encouraging their participation. She expressed concerns with encouraging people to attend and participate at meetings when there appears to be constant hostility with some members voting against or deliberately attempting to stop or hamper a process instead of working together to bring about positive results that promotes positive and collaborative efforts throughout the basin.

Julie Powell agreed with both Ms. Holbrook-Shaw and Mr. Schulte. She said she's observed the Flood Authority meetings because flood mitigation is important to her as she suffered personally in the 2007 flood. She views the Partnership as environmentally minded with focus on water quality and repairing damage to the river. The Flood Authority's objective is saving people from the devastation of floods. There is no way the two groups will come together without both sides giving up something. The issues appeared to be discussed evenly until the issue of water retention was addressed. Water retention to any degree, whether off-site or through dams in the upper Chehalis, will have to play a part in solving flood mitigation. There will be some detriment to the environment in some respects. It's been over a century of disagreement in trying to solve the problems. However, because there are two different ideas, nothing is solved. Water retention must be part of the solution and the issue will have to be discussed and worked by all parties. The discord involved the type of water storage, which is why it should be studied. Ms. Powell commented on the possible benefits to the Chehalis River through upstream retention and how it became an issue when retention was addressed as one possible solution.

Ms. Napier noted that there were a number of factors which led to the concerns involving timing, type of water storage, the approach, and concerns that it might not be an effective solution.

Mr. Schulte commented on previous attempts to consider dams. The PUD is looking at locations that were not previously studied and do not impact landowners. The sites may not be the right locations, which will limit options, as there must be sufficient acre-feet to make a difference in the flood stage. The two sites were considered at the end of nearly 30 years of studying potential dam sites and solutions. It appeared there was consensus at the Flood Authority until dams were mentioned. There will be 23 tributaries affected by a dam with two only negatively impacted. That's the study that should be moving forward that the Flood Authority only partially funded. Mr. Connolly noted that there was some skepticism with the feasibility study and rather than expending thousands of dollars, some members requested information on potential fatal flaws and some science prior to proceeding with the study.

Mr. Schulte said he'll react similarly to the GI Study in terms of skepticism and fatal flaws. Ms. Napier noted that the GI Study will be phased. Mr. Schulte said he'll use the same skepticism to block the next step. The PUD Study also entailed data gathering and researching the possibilities. Some members of the Flood Authority created problems and only voted to approve one-half of the funding.

Discussion ensued on substantial overlap of members from the Partnership sitting on the Flood Authority. There needs to be some clarification in the interaction between the two groups and working toward a consensus to avoid cancelling each entity's actions. There must be trust, willingness to work together, and a desire to avoid blocking projects because of personal interests.

Bob Burkle referred to previous comments about the Chehalis River. There appears to be a perception held by many people that the Chehalis River is in trouble in terms of fish, a dead river in the summer, and how dams will improve the river. In reality, the upper Chehalis River system (main stem and upper south fork) are not only meeting escapement goals, they are exceeding escapement goals by a factor 2.7 to 1 for the south fork and 4.6 to 1 for the main stem. There are substantial numbers of fish produced in the Chehalis River. It's a major engine for fish productivity in the Chehalis system. Typically, footprints of dams are located on top of spawning grounds. Additionally, areas downstream lose several miles of spawning because gravel recruitment ceases and river processes simplify. It would very difficult, if not impossible, to replace spawning grounds, as well as improving runs in the Chehalis by adding flow. Additional flow was promised by the Corps of Engineers when it constructed the Wynochee Dam in the early 1970s. The Corps guaranteed 200 cubic feet per second of coldwater minimum flows throughout the year to enhance fish. However, in the last ten years of return data, the dam is under escapement goals by 33%. The Wynochee River stands out as the one river that is not meeting escapement goals. Fish runs are dying.

Mr. Schulte commented that most people who view the Chehalis River only view the seven-mile stretch between Chehalis and Centralia. That stretch of the river takes seven days for a unit of water to move through. There are other tributaries that would contribute to gravel replenishment below a dam site. Additionally, it's unfair to compare what the Corps and Tacoma Power and Light did as there have been lessons learned. The Flood District will control water flow as well as include fish ladders. There are a series of reasons for dams involving recreation, reservoirs, flood control, navigation, and irrigation. It's not possible for one dam to achieve all those elements. The dam will be a flood control dam. The Flood District will control the dam, not the Corps. An agreement can negotiated between the Flood District and the PUD to use the dam primarily as flood control.

Mr. Burkle said fish passage over dams and downstream of dams are problematic and ongoing issues have not been solved. There is no one solution that works. The Baker River is an example of a system that was built to achieve fish passage where \$30 million was expended on the spillway. However, the system doesn't work perfectly. Billions in dollars are being spent on testing spillways in the Columbia River. There has to be evidence that the systems work. That information will be part of the GI Study.

### **Earth Economics Proposal**

Ms. Napier said the Partnership proposed the GI Study to the Flood Authority. At the last meeting, the Flood Authority, the Partnership, and Lewis County agreed to develop an interlocal agreement where Grays Harbor will contract with Earth Economics to complete the work for the Partnership and the Flood Authority. Based on the outcome of that meeting, it appears Lewis County may contract with Earth Economics on behalf of all the groups to complete the work.

Mr. Hill asked whether the Partnership will have any input on the scope of work. Ms. Napier said the scope of work has not changed and is proceeding as previously discussed.

Mr. Schulte said representatives from Lewis County and the Flood Authority are eagerly anticipating data Earth Economics will provide because of the reputation of the company as well as acceptance of data by the Corps.

Ms. Napier reported the Flood Authority is contributing \$75,000 to the project with Earth Economics contributing \$900,000 from other sources.

Mr. Hill asked whether there will be access to the data or the model. Mr. Schulte advised that the model is a national science foundation model. The consultant from Earth Economics collects information and inputs data into the model producing a product. This particular consultant is known for developing solutions that work better and cost less, which is why the Corps approves this particular consultant's work.

Mr. Hill commented positively on the Flood Authority's intent to assign value to land use, which is productive for the Flood Authority when it considers projects. It will provide a land use picture of the basin in terms of land value.

### **General Investigation Study**

Ms. Napier reported on the need to update the project management plan. There has been a change in Corps' staff. Bill Goss is the new project manager for the Twin Cities project as well as the Ecosystem Project. Mr. Goss is arriving in June. There appears there will be more representation from the Corps, and because there is some geographical connection between the two projects, the same project manager will be assigned to both projects.

Members discussed the need for the Corps project manager to attend meetings.

Mr. Schulte advised that if the Corps doesn't coordinate with the groups, there are several Lewis County Commissioners who will vote against the Twin Cities project because it's not worth the amount of funds for a solution that will create problems downstream as well as upstream.

Ms. Napier said the GI Study is an ecosystem-wide project and is one component of the ecosystem project in that it will be the decision-support tool representing a groundwater/surface water interaction model from USGS.

Mr. Burkle commented on the Partnership's meeting and a request to develop a letter to clarify the roles of the Partnership and the Flood Authority. Ms. Napier said it's likely staff will review the request and present a proposal to both groups for review and approval.

Joel Green said he reported on the status of the Grays Harbor College Natural Resources Program, which is slated for suspension. Questions were raised about the status of the GIS Clearinghouse and staffing needs. Don Loft is willing to continue staffing the GIS Clearinghouse after the departure of Narendran Kodandapani at the college.

Mr. Hill questioned the location of the server and whether it will continue to reside at the college. Mr. Green said he's unsure of the funding for maintaining the server at the Satsop Development Park. Phil Rupp said he asked the county's GIS employee to contact Mr. Loft about possibly hosting the server. Mr. Green offered to follow up with Mr. Loft on possibly relocating the server to Lewis County.

Mr. Green clarified that the forestry program will remain intact through the college. However, the GIS instructional program, fisheries, aquaculture, and watershed assessment educational programs are being terminated. Mr. Hill commented on the need to track any unused funding from the programs. Mr. Green said he offered his services beyond June 30, 2009 to continue work on the State of the River Report. The college hasn't responded to his offer at this point. The college is however, committed to fulfilling the deliverable, but is assessing options at this point.

David Rountry commented on the collaboration between himself and Mr. Green on several DOE management contracts through the college. He asked whether the college intends to fulfill all contract elements. Mr. Green reported Mr. Loft's contract expires at the end of December. He said he's unsure of future action by the college beyond December. Mr. Loft is working on adding water quality monitoring data to the GIS Clearinghouse. It's likely another location will be determined for the server for accessibility. The issue is updating and maintaining data.

*Mr. Schulte and Ms. Powell left the meeting.*

Mr. Rountry said one supporting element of the GIS Clearinghouse project is the Water Quality Monitoring Program. It's an important and integrated element of the program. The issue is how to sustain the effort. He asked about adding a discussion on the topic to a future meeting agenda. The Water Quality Committee recognized during its last meeting, that the issue needs some attention. There was also a brief introduction of the issue during the last Partnership meeting.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw pointed out the possibility of Mr. Loft pursuing a grant application or future funding source as part of the master thesis work. Ms. Spaulding said the subcontract for water quality monitoring between the college and the Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation expires on June 30, 2009. The Tribe plans to continue water quality monitoring efforts. Mr. Connolly said there have been some internal discussions within the Tribe about moving funds to continue water quality testing.

Mr. Hill suggested adding the issue to the next agenda of the Water Quality Committee.

Members discussed future funding needs for the GIS Clearinghouse, Water Quality Monitoring Program, and other program needs.

#### **Phase 4 Workplan**

Ms. Napier distributed a copy of the general operating budget. Last year's scope of work was updated somewhat. There are seven tasks. Task 1 includes general administration involving time spent on administering the contract, billings, and preparing quarterly reports. Task 2 and Task 3 are items completed under a prior contract with no action required. The contract has been reduced from \$125,000 to \$62,500 requiring some cuts in projects.

Task 4 includes project coordination involving support to the subcommittees, minutes, and staff support for meetings.

Task 5 implements the DIP. This year a variation occurred with the focus on outreach and education instead of focusing on forestry and Ag. There will be some updating of the DIP dependent upon the outcome in May. The issue is how much time to devote to updating the DIP. The contract is from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010.

Task 6 includes outreach and education through Ms. Spaulding's work, article in the *Drops of Water*, and sponsoring editions of the *Drops of Water* newspaper. Sponsoring an edition costs approximately \$6,000. Outreach strategies include the work by Ms. Spaulding on the survey developed by Randy Lehr. A revised version was used on stream teams. Work scheduled with the Citizen Advisory Committee actually entailed only general outreach. That task could be removed with focus mostly on stream team volunteer activities. Some of the deliverables of the task included the survey and summarization of the results, outreach plan, and a report on the outcome of stream team efforts.

The second half of Task 6 includes developing outreach materials and newsletters. Ms. Spaulding has developed flyers for events and there have been discussions about developing a newsletter. During that discussion, there were conversations about the struggle of funding the *Drops of Water* newsletter. It was agreed to support the newsletter because of its name recognition and many people beyond the Partnership rely on the publication for outreach. Ms. Spaulding continues to work with Margaret Rader on the newsletter.

Mr. Rountry referred to US Fish and Wildlife Service's list of projects and the Partnership's level of support on some of the projects. Ms. Napier said the projects were funded but the contracting period allowed for more additions allowing for a longer service period. For example, the department funded editions of the *Drops of Water*. The Partnership sponsored the April edition, extending the department's contract for funding one extra edition. Additionally, there were some funds from the Marine Resource Committee to fund the June edition providing for funding two additional editions by the department.

Discussion followed on future funding concerns for the newsletter.

Ms. Napier reported other public outreach efforts included public service announcements and other ways for public involvement. Ms. Spaulding has been able to organize programs for different volunteer activities. Ms. Spaulding also publicizes meeting notices in newspapers and on the website.

Task 7 involved an activity involving the City of Centralia.

Ms. Napier said the review is a quick overview of the tasks. Funds have not been assigned to the tasks. The budget elements include salary and benefits covering Ms. Napier's time, contracted services, such as Puget Sound Meeting Services, travel, and meeting room rental and refreshments. There might be the possibility of the Lucky Eagle Casino waiving rental fees. However, no refreshments would be included. There are also locations that may be needed, such as for long workshops and for paying for refreshments. The remaining funds are approximately \$6,000 for the *Drops of Water* and other facilitator services. Volunteer hours account for the required 10% match totaling a value of \$6,200 in volunteer hours. Members attending meetings are factored at \$15 an hour with the exception of state employees, whose time does not count.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw offered a suggestion of reducing the costs associated with producing minutes by having Puget Sound Meeting Service attend and transcribe several meetings a month instead of all meetings of the Partnership. Members discussed the option and agreed on the importance of having meeting minutes for all Partnership meetings.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw suggested seeking sponsorships for refreshments at the monthly Partnership meeting.

*Ms. Holbrook-Shaw left the meeting.*

Ms. Napier referred to Task 5 and asked for feedback on implementing and refining the work plan. She asked members for consideration as to whether to update the workplan or continue with ongoing outreach efforts. Mr. Connolly said he reviewed the DIP and it appears work is occurring on many of the tasks although some may not be as descriptive or refined as desired. Ms. Napier said USGS is included within the DIP. Considering the work items that must be undertaken, the issue is whether the DIP can be refined at this point. Earth Economics is also included in future work. Although not directly related to the DIP, much of the work is a contributing factor in completing some of the work in the DIP. She suggested developing language indicating the STC will consider ways to update the DIP next year.

Mr. Rountry asked whether there is a summary on the status of tasks associated with the DIP. Ms. Napier said Ms. Spaulding is tracking contracted work, which is not necessarily related directly with the DIP.

Mr. Hill referred to a spreadsheet and timeline Ms. Napier previously presented at meetings. Ms. Napier suggested reviewing the information at the July meeting.

Ms. Napier referred to Task 6. There is agreement to continue contributing articles in the *Drops of Water* newsletter. She asked members whether there's interest in pursuing another survey. With the reduction in funds, there are limited resources for funding outreach activities.

Ms. Hempleman asked about the source of funds for Ms. Spaulding's coordination efforts. Ms. Spaulding said the funds are from her salary and benefits from planning unit support that will eventually shift to the grant contract with DOE.

Ms. Hempleman advised against pursuing another survey because of the lack of expertise. Surveys require specific skills in terms of design, distribution, and evaluation of data. Members generally agreed to eliminate another survey.

Ms. Napier referred to task 6b regarding outreach materials. Many of the activities can be accomplished under Ms. Spaulding's ongoing activities, but it wouldn't be billed against the grant. She suggested moving the activities to the project coordination task under Task 4.

Discussion followed on Google calendar coordination. Ms. Spaulding described how to coordinate the different calendars with Google calendar. The Partnership's website includes a calendar.

#### **Next STC Meeting**

Members discussed the upcoming July 4<sup>th</sup> holiday and potential conflicts with scheduling a regular meeting on July 2, 2009. After reviewing calendars and possible topics, members agreed to schedule a joint meeting with the Water Quality Committee on July 9, 2009 in Montesano. Agenda topics could include roles and interaction of CBP and the Flood Authority.

*Mr. Burkle left the meeting.*

Mr. Hill reported Mr. Schulte also asked for a separate outreach letter to be mailed in addition to the letter that was revised by the CBP at its last meeting. Ms. Napier said the issue could be addressed by the Partnership.

#### **CBP Agenda for June 26 Meeting**

Ms. Napier and members reviewed possible topics for the June 26 CBP meeting:

- Request by Mr. Schulte for separate outreach letter
- Clarification of the Earth Economics Study and the GI Study and how it supports the Partnership's work.
- Invite representative from the US Army Corps of Engineers
- Update from Earth Economics (Ms. Napier said she'll contact Mr. Schulte to determine if an update is still requested.)
- Update on the Winter Creek projects by Don Loft (placeholder if time permits)

**Thoughts and Suggestions to Eric Schwartz Regarding Kayak Trip on the Chehalis River**

Ms. Napier asked members to provide recommendations based on a request by Eric Schwartz, a local reporter from *The Chronicle* newspaper, who is kayaking the length of the Chehalis River from Rainbow Falls in Lewis County to Grays Harbor beginning on June 5. Mr. Schwartz is seeking contacts with individuals interested in conservation, environmental concerns, water rights, and wildlife as he makes his way down the river with a photographer. Members offered the suggestions for potential contacts:

- Various community members and organizations who are involved in riparian restoration work, such as landowners and local land trusts. Eric Erler and Eric Delvin, and Terry Willis were mentioned as potential contacts.
- Ron Schillinger, City of Montesano
- Chehalis River Basin Land Trust, Janet Strong
- Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Audubon Society
- Friends of Grays Harbor
- Janel Spaulding volunteered

**Adjournment**

With there being no further business, Mr. Connolly adjourned the meeting at 12: 14 p.m.

Prepared by Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary/President  
Puget Sound Meeting Services