

CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP
Chehalis Tribe Community Center
“Gathering Room”
461 Secena Road
Rochester, Washington
January 21, 2011
9:30 a.m.
Meeting Summary

MEMBERS, ALTERNATES & GUESTS PRESENT

Bonnie Canaday, Chair, City of Centralia
Glen Connelly, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis
Reservation
Kahle Jennings, City of Centralia
Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County
Miranda Plumb, US Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS)
Julie Balmelli-Powe, Lewis County Farm Bureau
Janel Spaulding, Chehalis Basin Partnership
Bob Burkle, Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife
(WDFW)
Lyle Hojem, Citizen, Lewis County
Mark Swartout, Thurston County
Dave Vasilauskas, City of Chehalis
Chuck Turley, Department of Natural Resources
Shannon Clay, The Evergreen State College
Jerry Ingle, Mason County

Terry Harris, City of Chehalis
Christine Hempleman, Department of Ecology (DOE)
Bill Schulte, Lewis County
Patrick Wiltzius, City of Chehalis
Bruce Treichler, Northwest Steelhead & Salmon
Conservation Society
Chris Stearns, Thurston Public Utilities District
LaJane Schopper, Mason County
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Janet Strong, Chehalis River Basin Land Trust
Paul McMillan, City of Hoquiam
Karen Valenzuela, Thurston County
Jim Hill, Citizen, Lewis County
Don Loft, Grays Harbor College
Nelson Magana, The Evergreen State College
Kim Ashmore, City of Centralia

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS:

Approval of Meeting Summaries

Approved December 17, 2010 meeting summary.

Non-Profit/Organizational Structure Update

The Partnership approved the retainer and directed Chair Canady to sign the retainer agreement to enable the Partnership to receive pro bono legal services from Dorsey and Whitney LLP.

Review Draft Letter to CBP Membership about Increasing Member Participation

The Partnership approved the letter as revised and directed Chair Canady to sign the letter for sending to the membership.

Review Legislative Brochure

Members approved the Legislative Brochure as revised.

Discussion Regarding the Flood Authority and the Basin-Wide General Investigation Study – Review Letter to Governor’s Office

Members agreed to send the letter as revised.

GENERAL PARTNERSHIP BUSINESS

Welcome, Introductions, and Roundtable Comments

Bonnie Canaday called the January 21, 2011 meeting of the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) to order at 9:35 a.m. Everyone present provided self-introductions.

Discuss December 17, 2010 Meeting Summary

The minutes of December 17, 2010, were approved as presented.

Announcements

Glen Connelly commented on the long term involvement and commitment of the Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation to the Chehalis Basin Partnership and its desire for continuing its long-term relationship and support of the Partnership's work. As a commitment to that value, Mr. Connelly presented a \$15,000 check from the Tribe to continue the Partnership's transition as a state-funded entity to a stand-alone organization. The funds are designated for the Coordinator's salary. Mr. Connelly reported that David Burnett, Chair of the Tribal Council, has expressed the Tribe's commitment to the CBP and the value of the Partnership and that the Tribe hopes to set an example for other basin stakeholders that the transition may be the future direction and may entail some contributions by all members.

Chair Canaday thanked Mr. Connelly and expressed appreciation to the Tribe.

Karen Valenzuela recommended sending a letter of gratitude and appreciation to the Chair of the Tribal Council.

Mr. Connelly added that as the Partnership transitions to a non-profit status, it will be easier for the Tribe to contribute funding.

SPECIAL PROJECTS AND PRESENTATIONS

Update and Presentation about FIN

Kim Ashmore provided an update on the funding and construction of "FIN," a fiberglass fish, for the partnership's use at schools, the Watershed Festival, parades, and other events. On the funding side, Mr. Ashmore said he explored options for funding the construction and recently attended a stormwater monitoring meeting in Vancouver where he proposed to participants the idea of constructing FIN for southwest Washington jurisdictions of Aberdeen, Longview, Kelso, Washougal, Clark County, Vancouver, Camas, Battleground, and Cowlitz County as well as Thurston County, Olympia, Lacey, and Tumwater. FIN could be shared between the jurisdictions with each jurisdiction contributing \$1,500 towards the cost of constructing FIN. To date, Mr. Ashmore said he's received support from six of the communities as well as other groups, such as Miranda Plumb who represents U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and could assist in submitting for grant funding opportunities, the tribes, and the Nisqually River Council. The list is growing and the funding allocation for each community could decrease. The goal is using FIN at southwest Washington events. Lyle Hojem has donated a trailer.

Mr. Ashmore described FIN for the benefits of some members. FIN is a 25-foot fiberglass salmon. Kahle Jennings said it was originally built by the North Olympic Salmon Coalition and was designed by an artist from Port Townsend. It was built in that area and is stored in Chimacum. FIN is available for a fee to groups at approximately \$300 a day.

Mr. Ashmore advised that the Partnership received permission to replicate FIN. He spoke with a local fiberglass company and it's possible to construct the fish at approximately \$21,000. Several communities are scheduled to follow up regarding participation. At this point, cities and counties have been contacted, as each jurisdiction's stormwater permit requires education and outreach. Each jurisdiction received funds from Department of Ecology for stormwater educational outreach.

Discussion followed on perhaps contacting local school districts to request funding support. Mr. Ashmore said the amount each jurisdiction is small in comparison to the amount of funding each jurisdiction received for its capacity grants. It's a small fee for each jurisdiction for use at local festivals and events. The school districts are facing many too budget issues to request funding assistance.

Non-Profit/Organizational Structure Update

Ms. Spaulding referred to the retainer agreement for pro bono services previously provided to members. At the last meeting members agreed to review the agreement with their respective legal counsel.

Bill Schulte said he had some concerns and reviewed the agreement with Lewis County Deputy Prosecutor Glenn Carter, who reviewed it and had no concerns. Mr. Schulte said he still has some reservations with a small group controlling the funding for the Partnership but acknowledged that those issues might be resolved through the work with the pro bono attorney.

The Partnership approved the retainer and directed Chair Canady to sign the retainer agreement to enable the Partnership to receive pro bono legal services from Dorsey and Whitney LLP.

Review Draft Letter to CBP Membership about Increasing Member Participation

Ms. Spaulding asked members for input on the draft letter to members encouraging participation. There have been numerous revisions to the draft as well as condensing the letter to one page. She asked for input on the draft.

Terry Harris suggested the purpose of the letter should be stated clearly at the beginning of the letter rather than in the last sentence of the letter. The letter provides good information on the Partnership and its work. It's important to clearly articulate the purpose of the request at the beginning of the letter. He suggested including an opening statement similar to, "Please send a representative from your organization on a regular basis." Additionally, the last sentence should be revised to state, "Again, please join us in our struggle to gain knowledge and reach agreement on wise decisions."

The Partnership approved the letter as revised and directed Chair Canady to sign the letter for sending to the membership.

Review Legislative Brochure

Ms. Spaulding reported funding for watershed planning ends June 30, 2011. The legislative brochure was created in 2009 and updated based on suggestions from the Steering Technical Committee (STC). She asked members to review the section on "Progress in Jeopardy." That section is the specific message the STC would like conveyed to legislators. The intent is providing the brochures during member visits to the Legislature.

Discussion ensued on the current environment at the Legislature with many groups seeking funding or seeking to retain existing funding levels. Groups requesting funding are not receiving positive feedback from legislators because of the state's budget crisis.

Mark Swartout noted that the Partnership is supportive of the Department of Ecology's Water Smart Washington bill, as it extends Phase 4 watershed planning. The program is included in the Governor's budget.

Lee Napier suggested the strategy should be the Partnership testifying before the Legislature during hearings on the bill. In the past, the strategy has been to seek legislative opportunities when they arose through individual visits to legislators by members. She said she's been asked to testify on watershed planning, which

was one method of outreach as well as the many natural resource committee members that are outreached on a one-on-one basis.

Mr. Swartout suggested tracking the bill for committee hearings. Ms. Spaulding offered to track the information and notify members. Ms. Napier suggested having Ms. Spaulding's name added to the hearing distribution list.

Mr. Hojem asked about the status of the existing budget. Ms. Spaulding explained that funding is available through June 30, 2011 with funding from other grants sufficient to fund her position through September 30. However, funding for meeting minutes and meeting space will expire at the end of June. A budget update can be provided at the next meeting.

Janet Strong referred to the Environmental Lobby Day, which is on February 15. Of their four priorities, one is to maintain environmental funding as currently provided, which aligns with the Partnership's goal.

Mr. Jennings offered that it's important to continually reach out to the legislators, as it may be easy for them to overlook watershed funding needs. Mr. Harris suggested each legislator should receive a letter reminding them that the Legislature established watershed planning bodies and encourage them to continue funding to operate until the Partnership can secure its own funding source. Chair Canaday suggested sending information electronically to all legislators.

Chris Stearns cautioned that there is some controversy in some legislative districts from citizens regarding water resources. Legislators in those areas may be more skeptical.

Mr. Harris offered to distribute the brochures during the upcoming Lewis County Economic Development Council annual meeting. He suggested using those similar venues to distribute the brochure.

Julie Balmelli-Powe objected to one of the bulleted items under *Progress in Jeopardy* as it conveys a negative connotation to the agriculture community. She suggested revising the third bullet to reflect, "Completion of a basin-wide groundwater model which would better assess management of water in the future." The same suggestion could replace similar text included under *Our Accomplishments* under *Water Quality*.

Chris Hempleman pointed out that "water budget" is a technical term used by DOE that is indicative of how much water is available and how much is possible for use. She also acknowledged the sensitivity of the term.

Mr. Stearns commented that DOE did not change its fees in the recent legislation that was submitted. Ms. Hempleman questioned the relationship of the comment to the water budget. Mr. Stearns replied that the programs for DOE are under more scrutiny than the Department of Health's Drinking Water Program. There is much attention on DOE regarding its programs. It may have missed out on cuts in the last biennium. Mr. Harris said this discussion is not speaking to money. Ms. Hempleman added that the department is encouraging planning units to focus on water management. There is uncertainty in the amount of water in watersheds to be managed, which is why there is watershed planning.

Mr. Swartout suggested revising the bullet to reflect, "Completion of a basin-wide groundwater model that will lead to the development of basin-wide water management."

Mr. Jennings asked whether the Water Smart Washington bill includes funding for watershed funding. Ms. Spaulding said the bill includes extending Phase 4 funding for another four years for planning units.

Discussion followed on the bill in its entirety and some controversial aspects of some provisions. Ms. Hempleman offered that the current bill is posted on the agency's website. Mr. Schulte said he reviewed an early draft and after the public comment period ended, the draft changed significantly. There were some provisions of concern to Lewis County. The department and Lewis County are working on some of the language. Mr. Swartout noted the brochure qualifies the Partnership's support of the bill to reflect the provision that extends watershed planning and implementation funds for another four years. Mr. Schulte said he will follow up to determine if the county's issues were addressed. Ms. Hempleman offered to follow up and forward information to Ms. Spaulding.

Members approved the Legislative Brochure as revised.

Discussion Regarding the Flood Authority and the Basin-Wide General Investigation Study – Review Letter to Governor's Office

Ms. Napier updated members on the history of the issue. The General Investigation (GI) Study was initiated with Grays Harbor assigned as the local non-federal sponsor working with the U.S. Army of Engineers. The project is basin-wide and will examine ecosystem restoration. The effort includes working with the Partnership to advance the project. Recent activity includes adding a second purpose, which is still under discussion. However, there is currently no local project manager as she was recently assigned to a new position at the county. The county is unable to assume the role as the non-federal sponsor/project manager. The Flood Authority has been working on the issue as it is interested in adding a second purpose to the project. At the last meeting, members discussed three issues and that the intent was to review the Flood Authority letter and modify the Partnership's letter if necessary. Grays Harbor County is not interested or able to be the project sponsor. The state has expressed willingness to assume that role, which is the purpose of the letter.

Ms. Balmelli-Powe asked whether the state has offered to fund the project manager. Ms. Napier said that it has been conveyed that the reason Grays Harbor County can no longer assume the project sponsor role is because of the lack of funds. The state has been advised it would be necessary to fund that effort. She shared some of the time commitments involved with the project management aspect of the project.

Chair Canaday added that the Flood Authority is scheduled to end by June 30, which is one of the reasons the groups are pursuing the state to assume project sponsorship.

Discussion followed on the state's budget shortfall, the Governor's budget, and the improbability of the state contributing additional funds. Mr. Schulte noted that additional funds will not be requested, as there is \$500,000 already included in the federal budget for the work entailed in the first part of the study. Until the state becomes the local sponsor, the state cannot access those funds.

Mr. Swartout shared that at yesterday's Flood Authority meeting, Terry Willis mentioned that the letter was sent from the Flood Authority. Ms. Balmelli-Powe said it was also mentioned that information is still pending from the Corps of Engineers on the costs to add the second study. Mr. Schulte said there were two issues pending for the Partnership to release the letter. It involved the Corps' cost benefits analysis and that there is no Project Management Plan (PMP). The Corps committed to having the information by the end of the month, but in reality, it may not be for another six weeks.

Mr. Schulte suggested sending a condensed letter to the state asking the state to assume the non-federal sponsor role and eliminating the remaining information in the letter.

Ms. Balmelli-Powe suggested including information that should the state ever elect not to assume the non-federal sponsor role, the groups' will be contacted to afford reconsideration of assuming that role to ensure the project remains viable.

Discussion followed on the suggestion. Mr. Swartout said if the state is unable to assume the role, the state will contact the groups. Mr. Jennings added that by forcing the state to assume this role, it also includes giving the state most of the control over the project. Mr. Swartout said it's a matter of trusting a process that will be open, transparent, and collaborative. Mr. Schulte said he understands the concern, but the counties can't afford to assume the role. Mr. Harris said he's concerned about the direction of both groups after the role is assumed by the state. However, there isn't much choice at this point.

Mr. Swartout said the PMP begins the process of adding structural and non-structural projects within the GI Study. Nothing can occur with the Corps or federal dollar assistance unless it's included in the GI Study. There are no purse strings going to the state, it basically is the state in charge of a process that is very important for everyone in the Chehalis basin. Once that occurs, the Corps is responsible for evaluating those projects and pursuing them to a certain level to determine whether some move forward. Over the long-term, a decision will be made in the next three to four years on the Twin Cities project. Based on that decision, one of the two without project conditions will drop off, which will change the cost and the timeline. After the design phase and construction phase begins, there is the possibility of a new non-federal sponsor for that phase of the project. That decision will need to be made in the next three to four years.

Ms. Balmelli-Powe expressed concerns that after three or four years, the Ecosystem Restoration project will be eliminated.

Ms. Napier explained that the process involves a feasibility process where there is a point at three years where the two conditions are evaluated. Ms. Balmelli-Powe commented that it could entail the state not having any use for the GI Study after the decision for the Twin Cities project is rendered.

Mr. Swartout suggested there is also the factor of political pressure to keep that from not occurring. Mr. Schulte said there isn't much support for the Corps' levee program in Lewis County.

Chair Canaday suggested the issues are of future concern and shouldn't be addressed in the letter at this point.

Discussion ensued on issues surrounding the Twin Cities project, decisions surrounding the establishment of a Flood Control District, and role of the non-federal sponsor. Mr. Swartout pointed out that the intent at this time is to assign a non-federal sponsor and resolve issues to obtain a signed PMP that will start the process where the federal government can begin accessing federal dollars appropriated for the project. There are plenty of problems associated with the process, but there are opportunities during the planning process to make changes. Ms. Balmelli-Powe reiterated that once the state assumes the role of non-federal sponsor, the basin will lose control. Mr. Swartout replied that it's important to have some faith that there will be an open and transparent process. Mr. Swartout and Ms. Balmelli-Powe disagreed on that point.

Ms. Hempleman said the issue is difficult for everyone to process. If the issue is to have a project manager to oversee the process, she questioned whether it would be possible to ask the state for the funding as a possible scenario. Ms. Napier said she believes Ms. Willis reviewed that option with Keith Phillips from the Governor's Office. However, at this point, no decision has been made. Mr. Schulte added that it would meet one objective, but there is a lack of trust between different parties. This is an attempt to have an outside source coordinate all competing and conflicting interests. It is generally agreed that if Keith Phillips agrees to assume that role, there is agreement to move forward. If the Governor's Office agrees to assume the role, the basin

has access to an outside third party facilitator as well as an opportunity to move forward. Ms. Napier said her comment pertained to the state hiring an outside facilitator rather than the basin hiring a facilitator.

Mr. Harris suggested that first and foremost it's important to move forward and if the Partnership doesn't take the next step, basin-wide efforts will stall.

Mr. Stearns supported moving forward as it builds consensus at the federal level.

Mr. Hojem supported sending the letter.

Mr. Jennings suggested the following revisions to the letter of striking the first sentence and include the remainder of the first paragraph. In the second paragraph, strike "Subsequently" and restate the paragraph to state, "the Flood Authority discussed your offer in a letter dated November 28, 2010, requesting the state to become non-federal sponsor of the GI, and the Chehalis Basin Partnership discussed your offer and concurs with the Flood Control Authority's request. Sincerely, Bonnie Canaday, Chair, Chehalis Basin Partnership."

Mr. Connelly recommended adding information addressing the ecosystem restoration match as well as adding a sentence about concerns that the Partnership has about having input on the PMP and the future of the project as it moves forward. Mr. Harris said the letter should indicate that the Partnership agrees with the points addressed by the Flood Authority and that it also wants to be included in the PMP in an open and inclusive process.

Mr. Schulte suggested that more revisions will delay approval of the letter. He suggested moving forward with the suggestions recommended by Mr. Jennings. Ms. Balmelli-Powe said she wouldn't support sending the letter unless the recommendation similar to Mr. Connelly's suggestion is included.

An extensive discussion followed with a majority of the members agreeing on the intent of the letter. Ms. Balmelli-Powe continued to advocate for more specificity to protect the basin and the Partnership's interests. Jerry Lingle commented that from a third-party perspective not involved in the issue up to this point, the letter as revised conveys a position of taking that first good faith step. It conveys that the Partnership wants to be involved in the future while keeping the letter as short and as simple as possible, which will likely accomplish more with the state rather than trying to force something on the state. The simplicity of the message is important.

Ms. Napier added that it's important for the Partnership to commit to the long-term efforts. She asked Ms. Balmelli-Powe to have faith that the Partnership is committed.

Miranda Plumb said the letter as currently revised is from the Partnership and it implies the Partnership's interest in an open and inclusive process.

Chair Canaday cautioned members that unless a consensus is attained on the letter, the state will not move forward in assuming the non-federal sponsor role.

Ms. Hempleman offered that the concern may be addressed in the PMP. Ms. Napier said the PMP calls out the parties involved at different levels. It also describes the Flood Authority and the Partnership. However, the PMP as currently drafted does not address decision-making by the two entities. In moving forward with finalization of the PMP, it might be a topic of discussion for consideration.

Mr. Stearns suggested that if there is an objection to the language, Ms. Balmelli-Powe should propose alternative language so that the Partnership can move forward in approving the letter.

Ms. Spaulding reviewed the previous suggested revision by Ms. Balmelli-Powe:

“In making this request to the state to be the non-federal sponsor, the Chehalis Basin Partnership expects to be included in open, transparent, and inclusive processes as it pertains to the position of the Partnership.”

Mr. Harris suggested the sentence already conveys that intent. The addition appears to be redundant.

Ms. Balmelli-Powe said she doesn't want to delay sending the letter but doesn't understand why the additional language is not acceptable.

Members agreed to send the letter as revised.

Grays Harbor Lead Entity Update

Ms. Napier distributed several informational materials. The Grays Harbor Lead Entity program is a process for salmon recovery and involves an annual grant cycle to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) for submission of projects for competing for grant funds. The SRFB awarded grant funding for the 2010 grant cycle in December 2010. The deadlines are similar each year. The process can be complex and involves organization, assistance to project sponsors to help develop strong applications, establishing a review committee, reviewing and ranking the projects, assisting project sponsors enter the applications into PRISM, meeting with the SRFB review panel, working with the region, and submitting the final application to PRISM to meet the deadline.

Ms. Napier reviewed the materials. The first is a memo to potential project applicants for the kick-off of the 2011 SRFB grant cycle. The program requires submission of an early project application into PRISM to include the project name, project type, and sponsor. The deadline for early submission is April 1, 2011. Project applicants should not delay entering the application into PRISM until March 31 because of the potential of encountering delays and problems.

After the early application is submitted, project sponsors have the opportunity to receive feedback on the project that can assist in strengthening the application. The Habitat Work Group (HWG) meets monthly and reviews projects submitted by sponsors. Members provide feedback. The HWG is scheduling time on April 8 and June 10 to review applications. Site visits to each of the projects are also scheduled to assist project sponsors. Those site visits are scheduled on May 12-13. Ms. Napier invited members to participate as project reviewers.

Final applications are due in PRISM on or before June 24. Project sponsors are also required to submit copies of their complete proposal to Ms. Napier by noon on June 24. The local review team ranks projects on July 8. The local review team recommendation will be considered by the Grays Harbor County Commissioners in their capacity as the Lead Entity on July 18. An optional early submittal date to the SRFB is August 12. The final deadline is August 30. However, the goal is for submission of all project applications by August 12 for the Lead Entity.

Don Loft shared that several students at the Evergreen State College is forming a non-profit habitat restoration group. He asked about eligibility for submission of a project. Ms. Napier said eligible applicants must be a 501(c) 3 or an entity. It is also for the group to partner with another entity.

Ms. Valenzuela asked for more information on who qualifies as an eligible applicant. Ms. Napier reviewed examples of previous applicants that included Chehalis Basin Land Trust, Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force, counties, conservation districts, land trusts, cities, and Tribes.

The HWG meets the second Friday of each month from 9:30 a.m. to noon at the Lewis Conservation District office in Chehalis.

Ms. Napier described future work of the HWG on the Habitat Work Schedule, which provides a data management tool for individuals to review projects of interest as well as providing ideas for possible projects. She likely will take data from the top 100 projects and populate the Habitat Work Schedule so visitors to the Grays Harbor Lead Entity section can view types of projects that have been completed. There are 26 Lead Entities state-wide and all were handling the process differently, making it difficult to track each lead entity.

Mr. Burkle offered a suggestion of having college students assist in entering data in the Habitat Work Schedule who may be interested in learning about the process.

Mr. Swartout added that private property owners can also submit project through local conservation districts.

Mr. Loft shared information on his previous work on databases for water quality and for culvert assessments and suggested there may be possibilities of combining much of the existing information. Ms. Napier said she will follow up on involving Mr. Loft and other students.

Ms. Strong said the agency's first project was a riparian restoration process along the Chehalis River located on City of Centralia land. It involved an educational effort involving plantings with students and teachers.

Ms. Napier said the Lead Entity website is available for additional information. She offered to email the link to members. The Habitat Work Schedule is not entirely populated at this point.

Mr. Loft added that the process provides a real opportunity for those sponsors who have projects to tap into students for assistance as there are many students seeking internships.

Ms. Napier reported on the need to establish a review team and the objective to involve more members from the Partnership to become members of the review team whether from a technical or a citizen perspective. Many people often refrain from becoming involved because they perceive technical skills as the overriding qualification when in fact at the end of the site visits, many people learn much and can contribute to the process. She invited members to consider volunteering for the local review team. Last year's team included Mark Swartout, Bruce Treichler, Glen Connelly, Bob Burkle, Chris Conklin, Miranda Plumb, and Mike Kuttel. Members receive copies of the application by June 27 and have until July 8 to review the applications. She described some of the details of the review process. Ms. Napier said she would like interested members to contact her about participating by February 4. Mr. Stearns volunteered to participate. Chair Canaday volunteered as an alternate.

Ms. Strong commented on the positive support she received when the review team visited her project site.

Other Business

Mr. Burkle commented on the changed parking situation for the monthly meeting of the STC. Mr. Swartout noted parking is also available at the Farmer's Market on an interim basis.

Chair Canaday thanked the Tribe for the use of the facility.

Agenda Items for February 25, 2011 Meeting

- Presentation from Alan Hamlet on Climate Change and Flood Frequency in the Chehalis Basin
- Budget Update
- Meeting Location of STC Meetings

ADJOURNMENT

With there being no further business, Chair Canaday adjourned the meeting at 11:53 a.m.

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