

**CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP  
STEERING TECHNICAL COMMITTEE  
Thurston Conservation District  
2918 Ferguson Street SW, Bldg 1, Suite A  
Tumwater, WA  
June 2, 2011  
9:30 AM**

**Meeting Summary**

---

**MEMBERS, ALTERNATES, AND GUESTS PRESENT**

Glenn Connelly, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis  
Reservation  
Janel Spaulding, Grays Harbor College  
Mark Swartout, Thurston County  
Chris Hempleman, Department of Ecology (DOE)  
J Roach, Citizen, Thurston County

Bob Burkle, Washington Department of Fish and  
Wildlife (WDFW)  
Julie Balmelli-Powe, Lewis County Farm Bureau  
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services  
Jim Hill, Citizen, Lewis County

**Welcome & Introductions**

Mark Swartout called the meeting to order at 9:43 a.m.

Mr. Swartout reviewed the agenda.

**CBP Organizational Discussion**

***Discuss Internal Fundraising Ideas***

Janel Spaulding referred to a draft of a potential private foundation donor list. At the May Partnership meeting, members agreed not to pursue a separate fundraising arm at this time. Instead, members agreed to focus on internal and external fundraising efforts. Ms. Spaulding created a chart of the Partnership's basic operations that includes current funding sources.

Mr. Swartout asked whether the legislative appropriations are for specific projects and not for administrative support. Ms. Spaulding said there are three tasks - administrative support, education and outreach, and project implementation. Her position is funded from that appropriation. The appropriation was awarded in 2008 and an amendment was completed last year to combine the two legislative appropriations. There is approximately \$125,000 remaining.

Ms. Hempleman advised that she will confirm the legislative appropriation is still available as well as the storage grant.

Ms. Spaulding said Mark White indicated he would check to determine if the Casino can provide complimentary meeting space.

Members agreed to present the chart to the Partnership. Bob Burkle suggested including more details on the legislative appropriations as well as the tasks allowed under each of the grants.

*Jim Hill arrived at the meeting.*

Ms. Spaulding reported that support by Ms. Napier will be eliminated and no funding is available for Puget Sound Meeting Services to prepare minutes. The meetings will continue to be electronically recorded, however. Mr. Swartout suggested condensing the minutes to action items along with bulleted key points. He

suggested exploring the option of placing a recording of meetings on the website for public access. Additionally, the meeting notes should notate the availability of a recording of the meeting.

Ms. Hempleman advised that the department is communicating that funding will be limited over the next four years. Mr. Swartout advocated for DOE to include funds to extend watershed planning. Ms. Hempleman said the impetus will come from the Partnership encouraging the department to include planning funds.

Mr. Swartout suggested adding two headings to the chart denoting “Now” and “Future” to reflect current conditions and future conditions.

Ms. Spaulding reported the Partnership essentially has two ways to raise funds by member contributions or grants from private foundations. She referred to the list of private foundations. Most foundations require a letter of inquiry. The organization then receives an invitation to submit a proposal. Members reviewed the list of donors, proposal type, funding range, proposal deadline, and projects funded.

Ms. Spaulding said she is considering submission of an application for the watershed festival to the Washington Foundation for the Environment because the foundation funds projects that focus on community stewardship and awareness.

Mr. Swartout suggested presenting the information to the Partnership. He questioned the process for applying if the Partnership directs submittal of grant applications. Ms. Spaulding described how she coordinates grant submittals with Grays Harbor County. Ms. Hempleman asked if she has factored the time necessary for preparation of grant applications. Ms. Spaulding advised that she’s factored some time. Ms. Spaulding suggested the committees should become more involved in fundraising efforts by focusing on the committee’s interests. Mr. Swartout said that direction should come from the Partnership to the chairs of each committee. Ms. Hempleman said committee members must also be willing to assume some of the work in drafting grant applications. It will require members to volunteer. Ms. Spaulding commented that it’s likely members would be more willing to assist if specific projects are identified. Mr. Hill added that the chairs will have increased responsibilities to ensure the work is delegated and completed.

Members discussed options to include drafting applications during committee meetings or Ms. Spaulding providing a working draft.

Ms. Spaulding referred to an updated list of CBP members. There are 22 to 26 potential donors. Some organizations have no representative assigned. Ann Wick recently retired from the Department of Agriculture. Ms. Hempleman offered to follow up with the department for a replacement for Ms. Wick.

Julie Balmelli-Powe suggested adding John Lucas as the alternate for Lewis County Farm Bureau.

Mr. Swartout reminded members that jurisdictions with a stormwater utility are authorized to use some revenue for watershed planning. Ms. Spaulding reported she spoke with the stormwater contact at the City of Aberdeen who’s interested in working with the Grays Harbor Stream Team as part of the City’s education and outreach for its stormwater permit.

Ms. Spaulding asked for direction on how to pursue donation requests to members. Mr. Swartout said contributions likely would come from members who regularly attend meetings.

It was noted that Glenn Carter is the Lewis County alternate.

Members discussed ways to include the funding request on the agenda and agreed it would be an element of the budget review and identification of potential donors.

Mr. Swartout shared that he visited the Boise State University's Environmental Finance Center website. He suggested contacting Bill Jarocki, who worked closely with the Partnership. Mr. Jarocki might be able to provide some guidance and insight with respect to seeking grants from foundations and other organizations. Mr. Connelly said he believes Mr. Jarocki is no longer with the university.

Members shared ideas of possible sources of funding and potential donors to contact. It was acknowledged that many foundations do not fund government entities. Mr. Burkle recommended preparing an introductory letter explaining the purpose of the Partnership, which is basically a community-based organization of state agencies, cities, counties, tribes, and citizens who come together on specific issues. Including the Partnership's brochure could also be helpful in providing additional information about the Partnership. Other contacts offered included Steven Morrison at Thurston Regional Planning Council and Fish America's website. Ms. Spaulding noted that many organizations only fund projects within a specific geographic area, which typically is close to the foundation.

Ms. Spaulding reported that after the last Partnership meeting, several people approached her with concerns about what occurred at the beginning of the meeting. Those concerns may impact future attendance by citizens and members if they feel threatened. She questioned whether there are possible steps she can take prior to the beginning of meetings to prevent those situations from occurring. Mr. Burkle said that one method of addressing the issue could have been by him offering a motion supporting Mr. Schulte's assertion that Thurston County, Grays Harbor County, and the Chehalis Tribe should be expelled as a member of the Partnership because of their action to form the cooperative. He would have voted against the motion as well as many other members and the issue would have essentially been moot at that point.

Mr. Swartout commented that often the only way of influencing an elected official is by their constituents speaking up and disagreeing. Mr. Hill acknowledged that he needs to address his concerns with Mr. Schulte but feels threatened with his demeanor and his vindictiveness. His main purpose for attending meetings is to protect the river. Mr. Swartout agreed that the issue is the drama that occurred and members not willing to attend meetings when such actions occur. Ms. Spaulding expressed concerns that it could impact attendance as many citizens are attending and investing their personal time. Ms. Hempleman said the incident created a very unpleasant atmosphere. The question is not about a person or his or her point of view, but rather it's about a procedural question when the group can be completely held up by one person's point of view. She suggested there should be some clarification on the process. Mr. Hill added that the group is based on consensus action and everyone tries to respect everyone's point of view. If a point of view is presented without an obstructionist stance that's acceptable, but when one person controls the meeting, that's unacceptable.

Ms. Balmelli-Powe said she was also disappointed about the incident. Members at the last STC meeting had discussed the hope that the members of the cooperative would offer an explanation about their intent of the agreement. It would have been nice to have had a constructive conversation around that intent to resolve some of the questions. She said she didn't realize the cooperative agreement included a provision that the cooperative would assume control of the basin-wide General Investigation. That provision in the agreement requires an explanation. If that had occurred perhaps a lot of the hostility would have been eliminated. Mr. Swartout said the problem is having a constructive conversation without an argument occurring. During that discussion, someone pointed out the cooperative is a flood issue and that the Partnership has determined that flooding is not part of the CBP.

As staff support in the development of the cooperative agreement, Mr. Swartout said there never was any intent to create any conflict with the Partnership. The problem was the Prosecutor of Lewis County issuing an opinion. He shared the information with Thurston County's attorney who indicated it was not a legal opinion but an administrative opinion. Grays Harbor County also contends the review was not a legal review but an administrative recommendation. At this point, the only way to resolve it is in a court of law and not during a Partnership meeting.

Discussion followed on the fact that the Partnership took action to transfer the responsibility of the General Investigation (GI) study to the state. Ms. Hempleman said the GI Study wasn't the issue. Members shared opinions about the incident and how it could have been handled differently.

Mr. Hill reiterated that he was intimidated by Mr. Schulte's behavior and viewed it as extremely aggressive.

Mr. Connelly said from the tribe's standpoint and as a member of the cooperative, there is no intent to "take over." Ecosystem restoration and the basin-wide GI were mentioned because they are connected to larger projects and are related to flood control. There is a potential connection rather than taking over. The tribe has donated funds to the Partnership and the tribe has membership in all committee of the Partnership as well as providing the meeting place. The tribe is not withdrawing and never intended to withdraw. It clearly was a political action and no amount of arguing would have changed the outcome.

Ms. Hempleman offered a suggestion of conferring with Bonnie Canady about the possibility of her as chair speaking to the general nature of the Partnership and acknowledging the diversity of opinions that may exist but that those opinions should be aired in a cohesive and non-threatening environment.

J Roach asked about the incident. Mr. Connelly described the incident that occurred at the beginning of the meeting of Mr. Schulte objecting to Mark White chairing the meeting because the tribe is a member of the cooperative and his opinion that as such, the tribe by joining the cooperative automatically withdrew its membership from the CBP.

Members commented on the lack of trust by some, especially when a group operates on a consensus basis.

Mr. Swartout recommended having the chair contact the three members of the cooperative and receive confirmation that there was no intent to take over the Partnership and convey that message to Mr. Schulte.

#### **Discuss/Review List of Organizations for Monthly CBP Presentations**

Ms. Spaulding reviewed a list of possible organizations and contact names to provide monthly updates on the organization's activities during a Partnership meeting. The list was developed by the Water Quality Committee and is also used as a reference to solicit articles in the *Drops of Water* publication.

Mr. Hill suggested including the Nature Conservancy because of its work in the basin.

Ms. Spaulding said the updates provide a way for organizations to share information on projects completed or underway in the basin.

Mr. Swartout suggested adding the Chehalis River Council.

Mr. Connelly asked about the inclusion of some organizations, such as farms and oyster companies. Ms. Spaulding said many of the farms work with Kathy Jacobson on various plantings. Additionally, the shellfish industry is impacted by water quality. Brady Engvall attended previous WQC meetings and is

involved with groups in Grays Harbor focusing on restoration and conservation. Ms. Hempleman said the private groups connect more to the tie between the economy and the environment. Agriculture is a major element in the watershed plan and farm practices impact water quality. Mr. Swartout said he would like to learn about the number of days Brady's Oysters is shut down from harvesting during the year. Mr. Roach said it typically amounts to several weeks a year.

Mr. Hill commented on the informative presentation on the Skokomish River and silt impacting gravel bars along the river.

Mr. Swartout suggested a presentation on McDonald Creek by a student named Jared, who is known for his inspirational presentations.

Mr. Swartout suggested inviting Janet Strong and Margaret Rader to provide a joint presentation on the Land Trust and the River Council.

Mr. Swartout suggested including an educational topic on each month's agenda.

#### **CBP June Agenda, STC July Agenda**

Ms. Spaulding reviewed the June CBP agenda:

- Lara Fowler, Water Rights 101
- Alan Hamlet, University of Washington, Climate Impacts Group
- Monthly organizational presentation – Jim Tyner, Onalaska High School
- Update on the status of the GI Study and Budget
- Continue CBP organizational discussion

STC July 7 meeting agenda includes:

- Discuss direction from CBP on drafting a letter for donation requests
- Discuss options for soliciting donations from cities/counties. Ms. Spaulding noted it's also important to acknowledge that some cities are contributing to the watershed festival.

CBP July meeting agenda includes:

- Andy Gendaszek, USGS presentation
- Nadine Romero, Scatter Creek Hydrology Model
- Receive direction from Partnership on grant applications/letter of intent

Ms. Hempleman suggested including a discussion on potential projects to respond to funding opportunities. Ms. Spaulding suggested the committees should begin fundraising efforts by reviewing the Detailed Implementation Plan and identifying specific projects.

Mr. Swartout questioned the process of learning about foundations and ways to approach different organizations. He suggested a discussion to receive tips on ways to connect with foundations when seeking funding opportunities.

Ms. Hempleman provided a brief update on recent activity at DOE. The Washington Water Smart program is not moving forward. DOE is under pressure to process water rights. The Legislature funded the Water Resources Program with a stipulation of processing 500 water rights, which is substantial. Many will not be approved. If the 500 applications are not completed within the first year, funding for the second year will be withdrawn. There are discussions throughout the agency on how to secure the funds for that program as well as staff resources. That focus will impact all programs in the agency. She continues to advocate for watershed planning.

Discussion ensued on the timing associated with the legislation.

Mr. Burkle reported WDFW did not receive funding for hydraulic project approvals, with more cuts to the program occurring. There will also be less technical assistance from the department and on-the-ground field work. The department still maintains the responsibilities but no funding support. It is likely the watershed stewardship program will continue for this region as well as the Shoreline Master Program update staff support.

**Adjournment**

With there being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:18 a.m.

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