

**CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP  
STEERING TECHNICAL COMMITTEE  
Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife  
600 Capitol Way  
Olympia, WA  
August 5, 2010  
9:30 AM**

**Meeting Summary**

---

**MEMBERS, ALTERNATES, AND GUESTS PRESENT**

Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County  
Julie Balmelli-Powe, Lewis County Farm Bureau  
Janel Spaulding, Chehalis Basin Partnership  
Glen Connelly, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis  
Reservation

Bob Burkle, Washington Department of Fish and  
Wildlife (WDFW)  
Chris Hempleman, Department of Ecology (DOE)  
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services  
Miranda Plumb, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

**Welcome & Introductions**

Glen Connelly called the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m.

Members reviewed the meeting agenda.

**CPB FY 2010 Contracted Work Plan**

Lee Napier reported the majority of the discussion will focus on the work plan from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011, with some discussion on work items beyond that timeline. She distributed copies of two work plans.

*Miranda Plumb arrived at the meeting.*

Ms. Napier referred to work items under contract. Ms. Spaulding is dedicated full-time while her time is approximately one-half FTE.

Ms. Napier reviewed her work plan:

- **Task 1 Administration** – Quarterly progress reports to the Department of Ecology (DOE), Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP), and its standing committees.
- **Task 2 Project Coordination** - Provide overall project coordination and general staff support to the CBP and its standing committees.
- **Task 3 Implement and refine the Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP)/annual work plan**
- **Task 4 Outreach to the community** – regarding progress on implementation of the Watershed Plan and DIP, and sponsoring one edition of the *Drops of Water* publication.
- **Task 5 Working through a committee** – continue to implement the tasks associated with DIP Interim Milestone 1.2: Measuring to Manage Water Quantity. This work includes continuing to work with US Geological Survey (USGS) to further the scope of work associated with the Watershed Characterization and Water Resource Management Tool.

- **Task 6 Working through a committee** – continue to implement the tasks associated with DIP Interim Milestone 2.1: Develop a Finance Strategy Work Plan. This task focuses on developing a clear plan for obtaining resources through capacity building and partnerships. As the DOE grant ends on June 30, 2011, the CBP needs to operate under the assumption that no more grants will be forthcoming.

Ms. Napier reviewed Ms. Spaulding's work plan:

- **Task 1 Administrative Support** – Quarterly progress reports to the DOE, CBP, and its standing committees.
- **Task 2 Outreach** - provide overall project coordination and general staff support to CBP and its standing committees.
- **Task 3 Project Implementation and refine the Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP)/annual work plan**

Ms. Hempleman asked whether the tasks correspond to the grant contract. Ms. Napier said both position tasks are tied to the grant contracts. Her tasks are primarily related to Phase 4 while Ms. Spaulding's tasks are primarily related to Planning Unit Support and the Watershed Council contract.

Ms. Hempleman asked whether the USGS contract covers any of Ms. Napier's time. Ms. Napier indicated there is no administrative oversight included in the contract.

Mr. Connelly reported that he met with USGS representatives who plan to collect temperature data over the next several weeks. USGS is deploying a fiber optic cable that transmits laser pulses down a cable and back providing temperature data of over a kilometer.

Ms. Napier said any of the work that she may complete under the USGS project could be charged against Task 2 or Task 5. Future contracts with USGS should include administration.

Ms. Napier referred members to her work plan. It's important to ensure that everyone understands the direction associated with the tasks to provide input on future direction as well as to help frame the discussion for the CBP as the process moves forward. Under Task 3, outreach to potential and committed implementation partners is important because it recognizes implementation partners as well as other individuals who should be involved. Matching funds are needed for the planning unit grant, as the grant requires a 50% match. Additionally, it's important to consider the composition of the CBP as it currently exists. The CBP expressed interest in forming a non-profit with a fundraising function while recognizing the CBP will continue to exist. She suggested reviewing current participation by CBP members at meetings and in the implementation of the plan as well as habitat projects.

Ms. Napier distributed a copy of the current membership of the CBP and suggested discussing whether it's appropriate to address vacancies and/or contacting members who haven't been participating. Ms. Spaulding drafted a letter earlier in spring concerning membership, which hasn't been mailed.

Bob Burkle questioned membership by federal entities. Ms. Napier advised that membership is comprised of those members who signed the intergovernmental agreement or as identified in the operating procedures. The four state agencies represent one vote. Miranda Plumb commented that she also believed the US Army

Corps of Engineers was a member of the CBP. Ms. Napier said the Corps was very active in early 2000/2001 during the first Basin-wide General Investigation. The Corps is not a member of the CBP.

Ms. Napier asked for feedback on current members that have not been involved, ways to promote active participation, and whether some interests may be missing that could be filled by citizen representatives. Members discussed the following categories of membership and potential ways of encouraging members to re-engage:

- Mason County - suggestion included sending a letter addressing the county's non-participation.
- Cities – Aberdeen was previously involved. Hoquiam has never participated. McCleary is not involved and Montesano was involved when the Mayor was the forester. A councilmember from Napavine was previously involved but is no longer on the council. Participation by Ocean Shores was sporadic. Pe Ell was involved when John Penberth was the Mayor. Members provided feedback and acknowledged the importance of having an organization working together on watershed management, especially in a watershed as large as the Chehalis. Ms. Hempleman offered that it might be that many of the agencies do not realize or understand how much a planning group, such as the CBP, means to water management in the basin. It may be possible to contact those entities and solicit input and ideas of mutual interest. Many of the cities are contending with water rights and water issues. Mr. Burkle noted that most of Mason County drains to the Puget Sound basin. Mr. Connelly mentioned Kahle Jennings as a possible resource for contacting cities as he understands the connection between watersheds and development. He suggested having Mr. Jennings draft a letter to the cities outlining the reasons why the City of Centralia is involved and highlighting the importance of being involved in the CBP. Ms. Napier suggested contacting Mayor Schillinger and asking whether the City's current forester could represent Montesano as forestry representation is missing. She offered to contact the Mayor. Ms. Spaulding shared that she's contacted some of the cities and the response has been since the CBP is doing a good job, they don't need to attend. Ms. Napier suggested inviting Hoquiam to provide a presentation on some of their funded habitat restoration projects as a way to entice interest in ongoing participation.

Julie Balmelli-Powe commented on the group, One Voice, which is interested in providing a presentation to the CBP in September as there appears to be some misconceptions on the group's goals and intent. Ms. Napier advised that she'll check with the CBP because of the Partnership's desire not to become involved in flooding topics. Ms. Hempleman suggested inviting another group as well such as Trout Unlimited or Northwest Steelhead Conservancy to provide a different viewpoint. Ms. Balmelli-Powe said other than One Voice supporting water retention there are few differences between each group's agenda. One Voice prefers dams rather than levees. At this point, only two solutions have been proposed. The presentation may only emphasize the dam viewpoint with other messages somewhat lost during the presentation.

Ms. Napier asked for confirmation from members to outreach cities, check with Mr. Jennings on drafting a letter to cities, and obtaining information from the CBP on how to address the response from many cities that since the CBP is doing a good job, they do not need to be involved. She'll contact Mr. Jennings and Patrick Wiltzius prior to the next CBP meeting regarding the letter. Members agreed with the direction.

Members discussed some of the misconceptions regarding the Lead Entity Program, the role of the Habitat Work Group (HWG), and the CBP's role as a citizen review group for habitat restoration projects that are submitted to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board for funding. Ms. Napier explained how the technical review of habitat restoration projects is conducted. It might be useful to review with the CBP its role in the lead entity process as well as the role of the HWG and the technical review teams within the HWG.

Several members offered suggestions on the project review process involving the HWG, technical review, and clarification of the CBP's role. A flow chart might be helpful to highlight the processes and interrelationship between the groups and the programs.

Members continued the review of membership categories:

- Water Districts – the most participation by a water district was by Grays Harbor Water District #2 when a commissioner attended. A similar approach of sending a letter to the boards might suffice to invite participation.
- Citizen Representatives include a citizen from each of the four counties. Each Citizen Representative has a vote. Currently, the position representing Grays Harbor County is vacant. Initially, Citizen Representatives met as a committee early in the process. The committee hosted informational meetings during the development of the Watershed Plan. The committee assisted early on with public outreach. Currently, the chair is Chanele Holbrook-Shaw. The committee decided to meet only as needed. Ms. Napier suggested seeking appointments for Grays Harbor County and Mason County. Citizen Representatives are appointed by each county's Board of Commissioners. Members discussed possible next steps for filling the vacancies.

Ms. Balmelli-Powe suggested sending public announcements of upcoming meetings to local newspapers as a way to attract attendance.

- **State Agencies** – Currently, the representative for WA Department of Natural Resources (DNR) is not active. Ms. Hempleman said she spoke with a coworker who is a liaison with DNR about representation. She offered to follow up with the employee. Mr. Burkle offered Birdie Davenport's name as a possible candidate because she is active on the Marine Resources Committee and the HWG. Ms. Napier suggested having Ms. Davenport appointed as the alternate.
- **Stakeholder Group Representatives:**
  - **Business Representative** – the position has never been filled. Possible action could include a discussion with the CBP regarding interest in appointing a representative. One potential candidate is David Jarzynka with Briggs Nursery located in Grays Harbor County.
  - **Fishery Interests** – currently represented by Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force, which is a regional fisheries enhancement group. The task force receives funding from WDFW and the US Fish and Wildlife Service. The task force consists of volunteers and is involved in nutrient enhancement, Satsop hatchery, and is a project sponsor in the Lead Entity Program. Each group is different with the composition of the group driving the efforts of each group. The task force is a basin-wide group.
  - **Forestry Interests** – currently assigned is Weyerhaeuser represented by Annette Grainger, who hasn't been actively involved. Other suggested members included Cascade Land Conservancy or land trusts. Ms. Napier offered that those groups could be represented through the Citizen Representative category. Mr. Burkle commented that environmental groups are not a representative group. Ms. Napier replied that there were no environmental groups represented when the CBP was formed. There were some discussions early on about creating the category but Margaret Rader, at that time, was involved as a Citizen Representative. She suggested a member of an environmental group could serve as a Citizen Representative, which is a way of adding representation without having to change the composition of the CBP. There were several

environmental members when the citizen committee was active. That might be the reason why there was no environmental interest added to the membership. Ms. Spaulding offered a suggestion of considering recreational groups. Mr. Connelly suggested shellfish groups. Mr. Burkle commented that the shellfish groups are represented on the Marine Resources Committee.

Ms. Napier referred to Task 3 of her work plan of identifying and securing project resources and partnerships to implement the DIP. She distributed several documents pertaining to DOE stream gages and a grant previously awarded requiring development of a scope of work.

Discussion focused on the stream gages. Ms. Napier referred to stream gages located within DOE's Southwest Region, which encompasses the Chehalis River basin. Mr. Hempleman explained that there are three different gages consisting of manual gages, which are read monthly for water depth, telemetry gages, and stand-alone gages. DOE lost a substantial amount of funding for monitoring. Additionally, the distribution of gages is inequitable across the watersheds. The department examined the program and subsequently eliminated 13 gages within the Chehalis basin. Several more are proposed for removal leaving only the Black River and Wishkah gages.

Ms. Hempleman reported that the program was applying similar criteria driving many other programs, such as retaining gages in areas where there are listed ESA species, growth pressures, pending instream rules where stream flow data are critical, and other critical factors.

Ms. Napier advised that the department had discussed removal of the gages and there were implications that the proposal would be reviewed with the CBP prior to any action occurring. She asked for guidance for including the issue on the CBP's agenda.

Ms. Plumb suggested the material, when presented to the CBP, should highlight those areas within the Chehalis basin.

Ms. Hempleman said there are ways to retain the gages proposed for removal by either providing technical support meeting specific requirements or funding of approximately \$12,000 to \$14,000 per fiscal year with a two-year commitment.

Discussion followed on the information to present to the CBP. Ms. Plumb suggested clarifying that the gages slated for removal are low flow and not the early warning gages. Members discussed USGS gages that are also in the basin.

Members agreed to include the gages on the CBP's August agenda.

Ms. Napier referred to background information on a Watershed Storage Feasibility Study Grant for the Chehalis Basin Multi-Purpose Storage Assessment Project grant awarded to the CBP in December 2007. DOE called for projects in 2007 and the CBP submitted its proposal in June 2007. DOE responded to the submission and indicated the department wasn't interested in funding a project for developing a list of projects that should be accomplished as part of the DIP. Recognizing that it would not be an eligible activity under the proposal and prior to the execution of the grant contract, the CBP sponsored a workshop facilitated by John Kleim. The intent was to take what's known in the Multi-Purpose Study and develop three projects to consider for further feasibility analysis. At that time, the CBP didn't want involvement in the Skookumchuck Dam because it was too controversial. After reviewing the executive summary of the storage report and recommended projects and brainstorming prioritization criteria, the workshop group identified two

projects involving Aquifer Storage and Recovery and Wetland Restoration. At that point, Ms. Napier said she was ready to move forward with a contract with DOE when the December 2007 flooding event occurred. That contract was delayed and now is a good time to consider moving forward to develop a scope of work.

Ms. Hempleman asked whether aquifer storage and recovery pertains to injecting or passive recharge. Ms. Napier said both options were mentioned in the Multi-Purpose Study. However, many people didn't know enough about injection and there was some discussion on habitat restoration as a way to provide storage. There were some similar projects underway and it was an opportunity to leverage existing resources.

Ms. Hempleman asked about drain tiles in the Chehalis basin. Ms. Balmelli-Powe said it was her impression that there are many, with most installed in the 1950s and 1960s.

Ms. Napier asked for feedback on assisting in the development of a scope of work. The award is based on the project application for either aquifer storage and recovery or wetland restoration. The contract needs to be executed or the CBP could lose the funds.

Mr. Burkle asked whether the project could be informed by the USGS study. Ms. Napier responded that information could be part of the scoping to determine how the USGS work can help provide information for the project. The grant is for approximately \$210,000.

Mr. Connelly, Ms. Hempleman, Ms. Spaulding, and Ms. Plumb volunteered to work with Ms. Napier to fine-tune the proposal prior to presentation to the CBP. Ms. Hempleman offered to contact Dave Burdick, Contracts and Grants Coordinator, and provide an update on progress on the grant as well as obtaining information on the grant deadline.

Ms. Napier provided members with a copy of a project proposal for the Decision Support Tool for Watershed Planning in the Chehalis River Basin in response to the call for preliminary project proposals from DOE.

Ms. Napier introduced Task 6, a new task to the contract of working through committees to continue to implement the tasks associated with the DIP and develop a finance strategy plan. The task focuses on developing a clear plan for obtaining resources through capacity building and partnerships by July 1, 2011. Additionally, she and Mark Swartout have been working with a statewide group and DOE to define the need for watershed planning and ways to seek legislation to fund planning efforts.

Ms. Napier reviewed Ms. Spaulding's work plan that includes support to Ms. Napier for project coordination and support to the CBP. By July 1, 2011, Ms. Napier said she likely will be fully transitioned back to her county position with Ms. Spaulding assuming many of her current responsibilities. Task 3 pertaining to project implementation is under the Planning Unit Contract of \$30,000, which requires a \$30,000 match. Ms. Napier shared a copy of the match amounts achieved to date totaling \$6,945 of the \$30,000 match required by June 30, 2011.

Ms. Spaulding reviewed the categories of the match primarily consisting of committee meetings and stream team activities. The match consists primarily of volunteer hours. Sign in sheets is the tool used to document volunteer hours. Volunteer hours can only be from private or local sources and do not include state employees. Members discussed other potential match sources, such as funds provided from the US Fish and Wildlife Service for the *Drops of Water* publication. Ms. Hempleman advised that she will follow up with the department to determine if funds for the *Drops of Water* publication and the Chehalis Basin Education Consortium are eligible as matching funds.

Ms. Napier asked members to consider other volunteer efforts in support of implementing goals of the Watershed Plan that could be counted toward the match.

Mr. Burkle suggested considering volunteer hours from the Marine Resources Committee as a possible match.

### **Other Business**

Ms. Hempleman reported Charles Pitts at DOE is working on statewide groundwater monitoring and is seeking assistance in identifying projects planning units have completed utilizing DOE planning unit funds involving groundwater assessments. She asked for verification of the two projects she believes the Partnership has completed related to quantity. Those projects include the 2003 Water Quantity Evaluation and the Multi-Purpose Storage Assessment. Members offered suggestions of other possible projects, such as the GIS Clearinghouse and the Water Quality Monitoring. Ms. Hempleman said the projects pertain to groundwater only and not surface water.

Ms. Hempleman commented that if funding does end in 2011, the planning unit is still eligible to apply for special projects funding through DOE.

*Miranda Plumb left the meeting.*

### **CBP August 27, 2010 Agenda**

Ms. Napier reviewed proposed agenda topics:

- DNR Presentation on Mass Wasting Pilot Project
- Update on Watershed Festival
- Possible update on GI Study (Project Manager Bill Goss is on an overseas assignment. A meeting is scheduled on August 9 to discuss the issues surrounding the two GI Studies and whether flood risk reduction can be removed from the GI Study and included as an alternative in the Twin Cities study)
- WACCO Update
- Membership Discussion
- DOE Gages

### **CBP September Agenda**

Ms. Napier reviewed potential agenda items for the September meeting:

- DOE Exempt Wells – Don Davidson
- Discuss One Voice request for a future presentation

### **CBP October Agenda**

- City of Hoquiam Project Presentation

### **CBP November Agenda**

- One Voice Presentation
- USGS Water Quantity Presentation

### **STC September 2, 2010 Meeting**

- Continue Discussion on Long-Term Sustainability

- Storage Scope of Work Update
- Potential assignment from CBP on Membership
- Planning Unit Match Follow-up

**Adjournment**

With there being no further business, Mr. Connelly adjourned the meeting at 11:58 a.m.

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