

**Chehalis Basin Partnership
Steering Technical Committee/Water Quality Committee Joint Meeting
Montesano City Hall
112 North Main Street
Montesano, Washington
July 9, 2009
9:30 a.m.**

Meeting Summary

PRESENT

Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County	Joel Green, Grays Harbor College
Patrick Wiltzius, City of Chehalis	Bob Amrine, Lewis County Conservation District
Narendran Kodandapani, Grays Harbor College	Karl Braden, Quinault Indian Nation (QIN)
Janel Spaulding, Grays Harbor College	Jim Hill, Citizen, Lewis County
Christine Hempleman, Department of Ecology (DOE)	Don Loft, Grays Harbor College
Lyle Hojem, Citizen, Lewis County	Cheri Lindgren, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Kahle Jennings, City of Centralia	Julie Balmelli-Powe, Lewis County Farm Bureau
Mark Swartout, Thurston County	Glen Connelly, Confederated Tribes of the
Cindy Burton, USDA Natural Resources Conservation Svc.	Chehalis Reservation
Harry Pickernell, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation	Ginny Prest, WA State Department of Agriculture (USDA)

Welcome and Introductions

Mark Swartout called the July 9, 2009 joint meeting of the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) Steering Technical Committee (STC) and Water Quality Committee (WQC) to order at 9:35 a.m. He reviewed the meeting agenda. Discussions on clarifying the consensus decision-making process and future funding were added. Everyone present provided self-introductions.

Coordinated Water Quality Monitoring Program

Joel Green provided an update on the coordinated Water Quality Monitoring Program. A final report on the last two fiscal years is under development. The Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation is submitting recent data within the next several days.

Harry Pickernell advised that the Tribe will continue funding the program through December 2009.

Don Loft noted data tables are current through March 2009. Five separate maps, one for each testing parameter, will be updated accordingly. An objective is providing the maps on the internet and within the GIS Clearinghouse. Most of the data have also been submitted to the Department of Ecology (DOE) for inclusion in the Environmental Information Management (EIM) system.

Patrick Wiltzius arrived.

Update to the Detailed Implementation Plan

Janel Spaulding reported that Creative Community Solutions (CCS) incorporated outcomes from the Education and Outreach (E&O) workshops into Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP) Strategy 2.2. Subtasks for each working group are outlined in the DIP. CCS will present the final draft to the Partnership at its July meeting.

Christine Hempleman referred to task 2.2(2) and whether FIN will be the mascot. Ms. Spaulding said a slogan and mascot have not been created. She acknowledged Ms. Hempleman's suggestion.

Ms. Spaulding reviewed Interim Milestone (IM) 2.2 to develop an education and outreach work plan for the Detailed Implementation Plan, project participants, and tasks identified for each of the strategies/working groups:

- 2.2(1) Public Relations and Outreach Activities via Networking Events
- 2.2(2) Changing Attitudes and Perceptions Using Basin-wide Slogan & Mascot
- 2.2(3) Better Communications with the Public and Agencies: Tourist Guide
- 2.2(4) Distribution of Information through Community Newspaper
- 2.2(5) Public Workshops & Student Camps
- 2.2(6) Organizing Volunteers via Centralized Database
- 2.2(7) Workshop Events Promoting Education and Outreach – Landowner Workshop

Ms. Spaulding described the benefits of establishing a web-shared calendar using Google to connect activities. Ms. Napier asked about linking the Google calendar with an Outlook calendar. Ms. Spaulding indicated she'll follow up to ascertain whether it can be linked. The Google calendar will be embedded on the Partnership's website. Any changes made to the Google calendar will automatically update all calendars. Another goal is creating a CBP blog.

Discussion followed on how public agencies restrict access to some websites, which could prevent members from providing input on a blog website.

Ginny Prest arrived.

Mr. Wiltzius commented that not all citizens have access to a computer. Ms. Spaulding advised that there are other tasks for utilizing non-technological approaches.

Members discussed uploading and providing technical documents, such as nature conservancy studies. Ms. Spaulding said one option is providing documents through the blog.

Mr. Wiltzius suggested providing all technical reports on the Partnership's website. Ms. Spaulding referred to creating a link on the blog to the CBP's website, which contains a resource/library section. Project participant Breanna Trygg, WA Department of Fish & Wildlife Service, should be replaced with Miranda Plumb, US Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS).

Related to strategy/working group 2.2(2), Ms. Spaulding said an objective is creating a brand for the entire Chehalis basin. One option is working with Grays Harbor Vision 2020 for creating a basin-wide slogan.

Ms. Spaulding provided additional information on strategy 2.2(3) and developing a tourist guide with a calendar of events, map, watershed facts, and interactive community tips and photographs. Ms. Napier suggested members should forward examples of other maps to Ms. Spaulding, such as the map published annually in *The Chronicle* highlighting tourist activities in Lewis County.

Ms. Spaulding commented that project participant Dana Dietz is with the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (WCSSP).

Specific to strategy/working group 2.2(4), one target is creating a workshop where participants can learn more about writing articles and creating posters and brochures. The first workshop is tentatively scheduled for April 2010.

Ms. Napier suggested having the working group initiate a letter campaign to legislators in December.

Ms. Spaulding advised that with each edition of *Drops of Water*, a special section will be featured focused on Partnership work and activities. The August edition focuses on accomplishments over the last two years.

Members and guests offered feedback on accomplishments to include:

- Habitat projects funded through the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) and USFWS
- Highlight water quality work elements such as sampling
- Advancing the groundwater study and partnering with the Flood Authority
- Stream Team clean up activities
- Water rights
- Losing and gaining reaches flow analysis
- Developed the Watershed Plan, DIP, and implementation activities
- Current E&O activities
- Highlight the Watershed Festival
- Explain the difference between the CBP and the Flood Authority

Ms. Napier asked for members to receive information on submittal deadlines and topics for future *Drops of Water* editions.

Discussion followed on the possibility of the Flood Authority using the *Drops of Water* newsletter as an outreach tool.

- Distributed watershed maps to the local schools
- A link to the water quality monitoring map
- Watershed pledge and book

Discussion ensued on the status of a survey sent to all Centralia residents on the Stream Team. Ms. Spaulding said some residents believe clean up efforts will help prevent flooding. Approximately half of the survey respondents believe the Chehalis River should be dredged. Many people are frustrated and confused about the roles of different organizations in the Chehalis Basin, for example the difference between Stream Team and the Flood Authority.

Members reviewed strategy 2.2(5). Middle school teachers will be invited to an August 2009 workshop focused on watershed education. Grays Harbor College is conducting a summer watershed leadership program for high school students, as well as a two week day camps for elementary students. The work is funded through a grant from the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

Specific to strategy 2.2(6), Ms. Spaulding said item b involving a contact point for basin-wide speakers and activities bureau should be moved to strategy 2.2(3).

Ms. Napier asked what type of work volunteers are seeking. Ms. Spaulding said they are seeking physical work, such as planting trees and cleaning up trails.

Mr. Hill suggested including The Nature Conservancy on the project participants list.

Ms. Napier said another connection is the Marine Resource Committee (MRC) that will rely more on volunteer opportunities, such as water quality monitoring, training, and fish surveys because of funding constraints.

Mr. Swartout suggested contacting Thurston County about Stream Team volunteer activities. The county recently expanded its stormwater utility, which is now countywide.

Ms. Spaulding reported the working group is meeting next week to scope strategy 2.2(7) and the landowner workshop.

Cindy Burton said the initial intent is initiating workshops in Grays Harbor County and building on them so that they are relevant to other counties in the Chehalis basin. The target is engaging with and educating new landowners. Ms. Spaulding said other ideas include an annual recognition/awards dinner and an annual symposium. Ms. Napier suggested integrating the dinner and/or symposium with the Watershed Festival and/or Harvest Celebration.

Ms. Spaulding reviewed end results:

- Chehalis basin watershed professionals and citizens will be able to access coordinated and comprehensive web-based resources.
- Citizens will recognize that they are Chehalis basin residents.
- Tourist guide to the Chehalis basin watershed available both online and in hard copy.
- Chehalis basin will co-sponsor a grant to support “bureau specific” activities including materials and transportation.
- Well-trained teachers and mentors assisting students in the Chehalis basin watershed.
- An annual Chehalis basin watershed “volunteer event.”

Ms. Spaulding reported Debbie Holden, CCS, is presenting an E&O DIP amendment to the Partnership at its July meeting.

Ms. Napier reported that the Partnership will be asked to take action regarding IM 2.2 at the August meeting.

Clarification of Roles Between the CBP and Flood Authority

Ms. Napier distributed an updated version of a matrix developed to clarify the roles of the Flood Authority and the CBP.

Mr. Swartout provided an overview of the process to date for creating a tool for clarifying the roles of the two agencies. Ms. Napier commented that both organizations like the idea of clarifying roles. The matrix could be used for public outreach for the Twin Cities project, creating posters for the Watershed Festival and workshops that could be included in the *Drops of Water* publication, in local newspapers, and on the Partnership’s website. The Board Advisory Committee (BAC) created a first draft, which the Partnership reviewed last month. The roles and missions were extracted from the Flood Authority’s interlocal

agreement (ILA) and the Chehalis Basin Watershed Management Plan (WMP). She reviewed “shared responsibilities” as contained in the initial draft. Feedback from the CBP is indicative of one group dealing with flood risk management while the other group is dealing with year-round water supply. One group is contending with high water flows while the other is dealing with low water flows. Another suggestion is listing representatives from each organization. A common issue is that both organizations are working on the General Investigation (GI) Study. Feedback was presented to the BAC resulting in the matrix. She reviewed the revised document intended to send a clear and condensed message concerning the two roles and areas of cooperation.

Comments from members and guests included:

- Move enabling legislation paragraphs above the names of the organizations (preference) or as the first paragraph under the organization titles.
- An objective of the BAC is avoiding a bureaucratic message and creating a document in easy-to-read language for citizens to understand.
- The current version of the matrix is much more improved than the one presented to the Partnership. A suggestion included separating the title of the matrix (The Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority on one line and the Chehalis Basin Partnership on the second line) followed by subheadings on each organization, roles, and cooperation between the organizations.
- There was general agreement to strike “including flooding” within the second paragraph under the CBP section.
- Revise the second paragraph within the CBP column to read something similar to, “Created by House Bill 2514, watershed planning (RCW 90.82), and House Bill 2496 (RCW ‘x’) to address water and fish issues in the Chehalis basin.”
- Staggering the titles within the graphic might be more beneficial to the reader.
- There is room for one more statement on each side.
- What’s important is the role of each organization, such as one organization is geared as a citizen’s group while the other is a governmental organization of 11 jurisdictions. The information could be incorporated under the governing legislation paragraph and before the mission.
- Include meeting dates of both organizations.
- It appears the Flood Authority’s mission is protecting natural resources, commercial industry, and private property while the CBP’s mission is protecting habitat conditions for native fish and healthy communities. Flooding is an issue for the Partnership because floods damage habitat. The issue is whether there are alternatives to offset dams, levees, and dikes, such as buffering storm surge and installing roof/rain gardens to sequester stormwater during heavy rain events. The second bullet under *Areas of Cooperation*, “Develop environmentally sensitive solutions to manage water,” could address the issue. The comprehensive flood plan will help to identify recommendations/actions.
- Include source information for both organizations.
- Add the website addresses under the source line for both agencies.

Glen Connelly reported he is a member of the Twin Cities Project Communication Team. The team is discussing strategies to communicate information to the public. One idea is hosting three open houses in September, one in each county, showcasing the Twin Cities Project, providing status reports, explaining the process, and identifying public comment opportunities. The team suggested developing an outreach tool of frequently asked questions (FAQs) to answer questions. A FAQ list could be created for the CBP. Mr. Connelly provided additional information on the format of the workshops.

Ms. Spaulding indicated she’ll forward a copy of the Partnership’s logo to Mr. Connelly.

Members agreed with creating a FAQs list for the CBP. Mr. Connelly volunteered to collect questions as well as answers from members electronically. He indicated he'll share questions and answers with the committees at a future date.

Questions suggested by the members to date include:

- Ask and answer questions concerning the US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) levee project and the Ecosystem Restoration Project. (*What is the Twin Cities project? What does it include? What is the Ecosystem Restoration Study? What about the new GI Study recently authorized by Congress? What does that include?*)
- What is the CBP?
- What is the DIP?
- What's the difference between the Partnership, the Flood Authority, and One Voice?
- Who makes decisions for the Partnership?

Mr. Wiltzius suggested developing a draft list of questions and answers for discussion purposes for the CBP.

Ms. Balmelli-Powe said it's important for answers to be simple and concise. She asked whether there is a master list of CBP and subcommittee members with contact numbers and/or email addresses. Ms. Napier said she'll follow up with information.

General Investigation Update

Ms. Napier provided an update on the GI Study. The Flood Authority requested adding flood damage reduction, which the Partnership approved, leading to a multi-purpose study. Grays Harbor County is the project sponsor. There is interest in updating the project management plan. One of the first components is working with the US Geological Survey (USGS) on the groundwater characterization or decision support tool (DST). Work is underway to organize a meeting to discuss the project in detail.

Discussion ensued on GI Study components and how elements can be added to the project scope. Ms. Napier explained that input from the CBP, its subcommittees, and the Flood Authority can be incorporated into the project management plan. One option is distributing a draft project management plan for review. Another is exploring basin-wide floodplain restoration and levee projects rather than listing specific projects or activities.

Ms. Hempleman commented that it's not possible to secure federal funding unless projects are identified in the project management plan. Ms. Napier affirmed the statement. She described the process to update the GI Study and project management plan.

Clarification of Consensus Decision Making Process

Mr. Hill requested a discussion on a consistent approach to document or note actions or consensus decisions by the CBP in meeting minutes.

Mr. Swartout reported the Partnership's meeting agenda includes a section on actions to be taken. One idea is to have separate paragraphs in the minutes beginning with "Decision" with a description of the action taken by the CBP. The typeface could be bolded.

Other options include noting that there were objections or asking whether anyone objects with the information in bold typeface.

Ms. Napier and Mr. Jennings said the Chair could specify the action and ask if everyone is in agreement, or whether anyone objects.

Mr. Swartout offered another option of creating a record of decisions. He suggested developing protocol for the CBP Chair, such as, “the action is ‘x’, do I hear any objections.”

Future Funding

Members were provided with copies of a work plan for fiscal year 2010-2011 and a white paper authored by Mr. Swartout on “Sustainable Funding for Nisqually Watershed Planning.”

Ms. Napier reviewed the tasks, budgets, start and finish dates, deliverables, and timelines for the following grants:

- WRIA Phase 4, Year 4
- Watershed Council Year 1 (Legislative appropriation 1)
- Watershed Council Year 2 (Legislative appropriation 2)
- Planning Unit Support
- Lead Entity Operation

The Phase 4 Year 4 grant has been reduced from approximately \$125,000 to \$62,500 for years 4 and 5. At this time, it appears there is no watershed planning funds available after June 30, 2011, unless current legislation is changed. The Nisqually Watershed Planning Unit is facing the same situation. Mr. Swartout developed a sustainable funding report discussing alternatives to continue supporting watershed planning units. Legislation to extend watershed planning for years 6-9 did not pass.

Ms. Hempleman and Mr. Kodandapani left the meeting.

Planning unit support ends June 30, 2010. Ms. Spaulding is researching a \$30,000 funding source, which requires a match. The CBP should discuss future funding opportunities.

Mr. Swartout reported the Legislature provided grant funding through DOE to pay for four phases of planning and implementation. He’s under contract with the Nisqually Tribe to write the paper. He referred to page 6 and a discussion on implementation and funding options including special purpose districts and potential special purpose districts for watershed planning (flood control and drainage districts, shellfish protection districts, aquifer protection districts). Table 1 on page 9 outlines the processes to create special purpose districts.

Existing special purpose districts involving watershed planning include stormwater utilities and public utility districts.

Interlocal agreements are discussed beginning on page 11. For an interlocal cooperation agreement to take effect, governing bodies of participating agencies must authorize the agreement by ordinance or resolution. The agreement must be filed with the County Auditor prior to taking effect.

Mr. Swartout reviewed sources of funding and planning organizations in the Nisqually watershed.

Organizational charts were presented. The same model could be used for the CBP. Nonprofits have access to grant funding that is not available to governmental entities.

CBP Agenda for July

- Continue to refine the graphic clarifying the roles between the CBP and Flood Authority
- E&O update to the DIP
- Demonstration of the Partnership's website
- Discuss a consistent approach to document or note actions or consensus decisions of the CBP in the meeting minutes
- Present and discuss a draft FAQs list
- Introduce the sustainable funding issue
- Distribution list for the outreach letter

Agendas for the STC and WQC for August

- WQC
 - Continue discussions on the Water Quality Monitoring Program and funding
 - Water quality monitoring map
 - Discuss a draft FAQs list
- STC
 - Discuss a draft FAQs list

Ms. Spaulding said she understands the outreach letter wasn't mailed to county commissioners; however, it was not documented. Mr. Swartout said letters concerning development permits are typically sent to planning departments.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Mr. Swartout adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.