

**CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP**  
**Chehalis Tribe “Lucky Eagle” Casino**  
**Rochester, Washington**  
**December 17, 2010**  
**9:30 a.m.**  
**Meeting Summary**

**MEMBERS, ALTERNATES & GUESTS PRESENT**

Bonnie Canaday, Chair, City of Centralia  
Mark White, Vice Chair, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation  
Glen Connelly, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation  
Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County  
Miranda Plumb, US Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS)  
Julie Balmelli-Powe, Lewis County Farm Bureau  
Janel Spaulding, Chehalis Basin Partnership  
Chanele Holbrook-Shaw, Citizen, Thurston County  
Bob Burkle, Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW)  
J. Roach, Citizen, Thurston County  
Lyle Hojem, Citizen, Lewis County  
Loren Hiner, City of Montesano  
Mark Swartout, Thurston County

Terry Harris, City of Chehalis  
Christine Hempleman, Department of Ecology (DOE)  
Bill Schulte, Lewis County  
Patrick Wiltzius, City of Chehalis  
Chuck Caldwell, Port of Grays Harbor  
Gary Waltenburg, Citizen, Grays Harbor County  
Bruce Treichler, Northwest Steelhead & Salmon Conservation Society  
Chris Stearns, Thurston Public Utilities District  
LaJane Schopfer, Mason County  
Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County  
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services  
Janet Strong, Chehalis River Basin Land Trust  
Paul McMillan, City of Hoquiam  
Paula Ehlers, DOE

**SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS:**

**Approval of Meeting Summaries**

Approved October 22 and November 19, 2010 meeting summaries.

**Non-Profit/Organizational Structure**

Mr. Schulte offered to review the authorization and retainer agreement with Dorsey & Whitney LLP with Lewis County legal counsel and notify Ms. Canaday so she can sign the agreement.

**Draft Letter to CBP Partnership on Member Participation**

After approving several revisions to the draft letter, Ms. Spaulding was asked to update the draft for review by members at the January meeting.

**Watershed Facilitator Position**

By consensus, the Partnership approved reclassification of the Watershed Facilitator position to Watershed Coordinator at a salary of \$51,698.

**Legislative Update**

- **CBP Letter to Governor’s Office**
- **Legislative Outreach and Brochure**

Members agreed to obtain the letter from the Flood Authority and directed Ms. Spaulding to draft a letter from the CBP and present the draft letter as well as the original Flood Authority letter to the Partnership at its January meeting for discussion and action.

Members agreed with Ms. Spaulding’s recommendation to have the STC review and edit the brochure for presentation to the Partnership in January.

**2011 CBP Meeting Schedule/Presentations from other Chehalis Basin Organizations**

Members agreed to schedule the January meeting on January 21 and delay a decision on rescheduling the April meeting until later in the year.

Members agreed with the recommendation with the caveat that there is flexibility in scheduling time on the meeting agenda.

**2011 Officer Elections**

Bonnie Canaday and Mark White were elected as Chair and Vice Chair, respectively for 2011

**Future Meeting Topics**

Ms. Canaday asked that all information be provided in advance of the meeting to afford an opportunity for members to review the material.

Members agreed to a request from Mr. Swartout to schedule a presentation by Dr. Alan Hamlet at a future meeting.

**GENERAL PARTNERSHIP BUSINESS**

**Welcome, Introductions, and Roundtable Comments**

Bonnie Canaday called the December 17, 2010 meeting of the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) to order at 9:35 a.m. Everyone present provided self-introductions.

**Discuss October 22, 2010/November 19, 2010 Meeting Summaries**

The minutes of October 22, 2010 and November 19, 2010 were approved as presented.

**SPECIAL PROJECTS AND PRESENTATIONS**

**Non-Profit/Organizational Structure Update**

Janel Spaulding reported that funding for the Partnership will likely end June 30, 2011. The Partnership has been working on an organizational structure for sustaining the Partnership for some time now and was finally contacted by a member attorney from Washington Attorneys Assisting Community Organizations (WAACO) for providing pro bono service to the partnership to help establish a new structure. At the last meeting, information was provided to members on watershed management partnerships that can be formed under RCW 39.34.20. Jon Leptich, an attorney with Dorsey & Whitney LLP, Seattle contacted her about providing legal counsel assistance to the Partnership. The firm specializes in land property law. She provided him with information about the Partnership. Ms. Spaulding distributed a copy of the authorization and retainer agreement.

Terry Harris asked about timing involved in the process. Ms. Spaulding said she's unsure of the length of time to complete the process. It appears the Partnership can reform under an interlocal agreement of two or more agencies to form a watershed management partnership for the purpose of implementing a watershed management plan. Mark Swartout noted that if a new interlocal agreement is necessary it will take some time for each agency to approve the agreement.

Ms. Spaulding noted that the provision within the pro bono agreement of the client providing either a \$400 or \$850 exemption application fee is language that must remain in the agreement. There is no obligation to pay the fee unless there is agreement to move forward in establishing a 501(C) 3 organization.

Terry Willis referred to other expenses, such as out-of-pocket expenses and asked whether the Partnership has some discretionary funds to cover those types of expenses. Ms. Spaulding said there might be some funds available in the Phase 4 Planning Grant to cover those types of expenses. She asked members for feedback on moving forward to have the Chair sign the agreement. Several members recommended moving forward as the agreement appears to be straightforward.

*Bill Schulte arrived at the meeting.*

Bill Schulte reviewed the agreement and asked if any members believe the agreement should be reviewed by their respective legal counsel. Mr. Harris said the only provision of any potential consequence is provision "C" pertaining to expenses. Mr. Swartout said he believes the Partnership has no legal standing and by signing the agreement, it shouldn't obligate the Partnership on any legal issues. Mr. Schulte suggested having Lewis County Attorney Glenn Carter review the agreement. He offered to review the agreement with Mr. Carter and notify Ms. Canaday so she can sign the agreement after appropriate review.

Mr. Swartout shared that he and Ms. Spaulding are meeting with other watershed planners in the state to discuss the next legislative session. The package of legislative issues DOE is moving forward includes four years of additional watershed funding beyond Phase 4. Chris Hempleman confirmed that the funding request is included in DOE's package of issues.

#### **Review Draft Letter to CBP Membership about Increasing Member Participation**

Ms. Spaulding distributed a draft letter authored by Kahle Jennings inviting members to become involved in the Partnership. The Steering Technical Committee (STC) reviewed the letter at its last meeting. She asked for feedback on the draft letter. The letter will be sent to participating and non-participating members.

Members offered several revisions to the letter:

- Revise the first sentence in the second paragraph to read, "The Chehalis Basin Partnership values the power of education and the value of local citizens' participation."
- Paragraph 2 appears to emphasize flooding rather than fish/wildlife habitat and water resources. Several members suggested deleting the reference to flooding in the third sentence within the second paragraph.
- Members suggested revisions to the third paragraph of the second paragraph to state, "While the CBP started as a forum to talk about water resources, as the group began organizing more formally, specific elements including water supply, fish/wildlife habitat, recreation and public education were added."
- Members agreed to revise the second sentence in the second paragraph to state, "We continue to bring in knowledgeable speakers on a wide variety of basin issues."

Ms. Spaulding indicated she would present the updated draft at the January meeting for further review and comment.

#### **Report Regarding Watershed Facilitator Position Description and Salary**

Ms. Spaulding reported that at the last meeting, the Partnership directed her to work with the STC to update the job description to reflect current job responsibilities since Ms. Napier assumed a new role within Grays Harbor County. The STC reviewed and updated the job description.

Additionally, the college previously conveyed that no pay increases would be provided to college employees next year. However, since then, the college executive team agreed that if the Partnership wants to move

forward, the college is agreeable to initiate a job reclassification and a raise. However, that decision is a Partnership decision.

Ms. Spaulding provided members with a current copy of the old and the new job descriptions. She outlined the changes and shared salary information provided by the college for facilitator and coordinator positions. Ms. Spaulding asked members to provide feedback on the job description, job title reclassification, and pay raise.

Mr. Schulte recommended changing the title to Watershed Coordinator and approving the salary increase.

***By consensus, the Partnership approved reclassification of the Watershed Facilitator position to Watershed Coordinator at a salary of \$51,698.***

### **Legislative Update**

#### ***Flood Authority Meeting – December 16, 2010 – Terry Willis***

Ms. Willis reported on the action taken at the Flood Authority meeting involving the General Investigation (GI) Study. Grays Harbor County is the fiscal agent for the CBP. The GI Study has been underway for several years involving restoration projects. Discussions over the last year centered on whether to include water retention as part of that study. Conversations occurred at the CBP as well as the Flood Authority on that issue.

Keith Phillips with the Governor's Office, approached the Flood Authority and offered to have the state assume sponsorship of that GI Study. At the December 16 Flood Authority meeting, members approved sending a letter to the Governor's Office asking them to assume sponsorship of the GI Study. Ms. Willis said she pointed out that the CBP is another partner. Mr. Phillips requires some clarifications on several items before the Governor's Office can move forward involving whether the \$1 million match accrued by the Partnership over the last several years could be used for any of the projects that might move forward if the GI Study included both components of restoration and flood risk reduction. He needs that clarification from the Corps of Engineers. The Corps has essentially approved the use of the accrued match for either of the processes, which was also reaffirmed at the recent Flood Authority meeting. Another issue of clarification is whether the Partnership supports all the steps of using the match for either purpose. The Governor's Office will not move forward on the sponsorship until the CBP sends a letter requesting such action. It's appropriate for both the CBP and the Flood Authority to send a letter.

Mr. Schulte suggested the action is premature because there still is no approved Project Management Plan (PMP). Secondly, in the PMP, the CBP has never approved changing the focus of the GI Study to include water retention (flood risk reduction). A year ago, the CBP discussed and voted not to change it but the vote occurred when a meeting quorum was not attained. That issue has never been addressed and there is still no approved PMP. He expressed concerns with the request by Ms. Willis, as there is no approved PMP.

Ms. Willis acknowledged that it's a viable concern, as Mr. Schulte knows that at one time, Mr. Phillips indicated that the PMP needed to be signed before the Governor's Office could move forward. However, he's removed that issue from the conversation at this point. She said she's unclear whether the Governor's Office still needs an approved PMP. It appears to be a prudent step. Additionally, Grays Harbor County cannot sign the PMP because it lacks the resources to fill the position. If Grays Harbor County signs the PMP as the sponsoring county, the county is obligated at that point, to provide the management for the plan. Lee Napier has moved on to other responsibilities and the county has no funding and no personnel. She said she advised

Mr. Phillips that Grays Harbor County cannot approve the PMP as funding and staff resources are not available, which might be why Mr. Phillips is stepping back from that requirement.

Mr. Swartout said although the PMP hasn't been signed, the major elements of ecosystem restoration and flood risk management as well as the two without project conditions reports are issues that the Governor's Office wants to know that the Flood Authority and CBP both support.

Mr. Schulte pointed out that the Partnership has never agreed to the changes to the original Ecosystem Restoration GI Study.

Mr. Swartout said the decision before the Partnership is whether the study will be a dual purpose study, whether it includes two without project conditions reports, and the match issue. If the state assumes sponsorship, the state will have to assume the burden of pursuing an approved PMP.

Mr. Swartout asked whether two letters will be sent from each entity, and if so, the CBP's letter could mention that the CBP has not agreed on any of the three issues.

Ms. Hempleman said she recalled Mr. Phillips indicating that one of the conditions of the state assuming the sponsorship was that the local jurisdictions must act together. Different messages from the Flood Authority and the Partnership is confusing. Ms. Willis said she recalled the discussion and isn't sure that it wasn't pointed more to the Flood Authority membership rather than both memberships. It's important for the CBP to state its position within the letter rather than letting the state direct the process.

Mr. Schulte agreed to forward a letter indicating that as the state works through the issue, the CBP is agreeable for the Governor's Office to use the time and funds the CBP has already accrued as a match. However, he's unsure if there is any other agreement. Mr. Swartout said utilization of the match couldn't occur until the PMP is signed, which much address the dual purposes and the two without conditions reports.

Glen Connelly questioned why the Partnership couldn't make a decision because it's possible to have the discussion now. Chris Stearns urged members to take some action so the Governor's Office can act now rather than deferring the matter to the next administration and Legislature.

Bob Burkle suggested members should agree that it's important for the state to assume sponsorship of the project as Grays Harbor County can't financially afford the responsibility. Mr. Schulte suggested it wouldn't be possible until the CBP has some assurance from the state on which direction it will pursue. Mr. Harris said it's obvious the Governor's Office wants agreement by both the Flood Authority and the CBP prior to moving forward. Mr. Swartout said the tone from Mr. Phillips is the desire for both entities to work together and collaborate from the same platform. The state doesn't want to assume that responsibility. If there can't be agreement, the state doesn't want to become involved in the middle. The CBP should have a facilitated discussion.

Mr. Harris asked about the Flood Authority's position on the three issues. Ms. Willis said the Flood Authority agreed that the study should be a dual purpose, that with and without project conditions reports should be included, that the Governor should assume sponsorship, and that the match should be used when appropriate for the two elements. Mr. Harris said it appears that if the CBP is not agreement, then it's likely the Governor will not be willing to assume sponsorship.

Mr. Schulte said the last discussion was that the dual purpose was problematic as long as it entailed \$24 million in 12 years or \$12 million in 24 years and, until the cost was provided by the Corps, there was going to

be no decision. That was the last issue of concern. The PMP couldn't address that issue because the Corps couldn't answer whether it would reduce the time and money the project would take.

Mr. Swartout said that within the PMP the dual focus and the two conditions reports increased the cost because it created two separate tracks. The Corps needs to provide a timeline and costs as if the two separate tracks continued. However, at some point in time, there will be a critical decision regarding the Twin Cities project. Based on that, it will entail only one without project condition, which will then change the total cost and timeline. At this point, that timeline and cost is unknown. That cost is what it will cost over the 24 year period. There is already congressional authorization for some funds to be spent. With the match, the Corps can now move forward and begin completing the work. Currently, that money is on hold. Much like the state, if the money is sitting and not being spent, it may disappear.

Ms. Willis added that the money is there at the discretion of Washington State congressional representatives. She noted that within the GI, flood risk reduction is being included and Senator Murray's office has made it clear that there will be no third GI study for water retention only. The fear is that if the group doesn't help the Governor's Office move forward, there won't be another GI available for flood risk reduction.

Mr. Schulte said he objects to the wording and the timeframe. Twenty-four years is unacceptable. Mr. Burkle pointed out that it may be longer if the project is not initiated at some point. He would like to know from the Corps how much the timeline can be reduced. Mr. Connelly asked if there are a specific number of years that would be acceptable. Mr. Schulte said it should be less than 24 years.

Mr. Swartout pointed out that the issue is the letter to the Governor's Office to assume the sponsorship. The Governor Office is requesting the CBP and the Flood Authority address the three issues in a letter, as well as the match issue, which will trigger the state to make a decision on sponsorship.

Ms. Willis suggested the letter could include an objection about the timeframe and that it is of concern. Mr. Swartout noted the letter is not indicative to the Governor that both entities are in agreement with the PMP.

Ms. Canaday asked about the steps that the Partnership should pursue to assist Grays Harbor County in its removal as the non-federal sponsor.

Mr. Swartout said the CBP could agree to send a letter to the Governor requesting the state to become the non-federal sponsor for the dual purpose, two without projects conditions GI Study with match applied to either project as well as including additional information that the CBP still wants a process for approval of the PMP. Lyle Hojem asked whether the Flood Authority would need to send a similar letter. Mr. Swartout said the Flood Authority might have a slightly different version. Ms. Willis said there doesn't appear to be any disagreement between the Flood Authority and the CBP regarding the three issues.

Mr. Schulte disagreed, as the CBP has never agreed to any of the issues. Ms. Willis clarified that the Flood Authority has agreed with the three basic issues and that the state should assume the role of non-federal sponsor. Mr. Hojem asked whether the CBP could fulfill those same obligations. Ms. Willis affirmed the CBP could make the same request. Mr. Hojem pointed out that the CBP is not ready to take that step.

Julie Balmelli-Powe recalled that the CBP discussed the two without project conditions and decided to wait until the Corps could provide the timeline and cost in January. Mr. Swartout suggested it's a moot point because if the CBP sent a letter supporting two without project conditions and in January one is eliminated, at least the letter has been sent requesting the state to be the non-federal sponsor.

Ms. Willis said the Flood Authority approved its letter and authorization has been provided to staff to develop the letter for Ms. Willis to sign. Ms. Canady suggested providing a copy of the letter to assist the CBP in creating its letter.

Mr. Swartout said the issue before the Partnership is attaining consensus on the dual purpose.

It was suggested the Partnership should send a letter outlining the CBP's wants and needs to enable the transfer of sponsorship from Grays Harbor County to the state. Mr. Schulte said Grays Harbor County could send any kind of letter. The issue is the type of letter the CBP will send. Ms. Willis said Mr. Phillips conveyed that the state hasn't moved forward in assuming responsibility because he was waiting for a letter from the Flood Authority conveying that request, which prompted the Flood Authority to authorize the letter.

Mr. Balmelli-Powe asked whether Mr. Phillips came back after the November Flood Authority meeting and confirmed that the state will assume sponsorship. Ms. Willis said she's unsure whether Mr. Phillips has responded in writing or spoken with Bruce Mackie who represents the Flood Authority regarding the issue.

Chanele Holbrook-Shaw said she understands the issues before the CBP but is unsure as to why the CBP doesn't support a dual study as most members agree that flood management is a huge issue and if funding can be obtained, it will be important as long as the CBP is involved in the process.

Mr. Schulte said he disagrees with the wording and with what the Corps has conveyed at this point. Until the Corps can address the questions, such as whether the match can be used for both purposes, whether the Corps is going outside its cost benefit analysis, and whether there are two purposes. The Corps said the information would be provided in January. At the last meeting, the CBP agreed to wait until January when those answers are available.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw suggested the issues involving the Corps shouldn't impact the CBP from moving forward. Mr. Schulte said he's not supportive of the timeline or the cost, as it's too much and too long. Ms. Holbrook-Shaw suggested those issues reside within the PMP and that the CBP doesn't need to reach consensus on those issues now. The issue is whether the study should be a dual purpose study regardless of the cost or the timeline. Mr. Schulte replied that he's not in agreement with a dual purpose until the information from the Corps is available in January.

Mr. Stearns said his concern involves having the Governor's Office deal directly with the Corps instead of the Partnership because it will be a stronger position coming from the Governor's Office. Mr. Schulte said the CBP agreed to wait for the information from the Corps.

Members were asked what obligation the Governor has as the non-federal sponsor to obtain any input from the CBP or the Flood Authority or whether the state can simply signing off on its own PMP. Mr. Swartout said the Corps is required to have an agreement by the local jurisdictions to move the project forward. In the House of Representatives, there is a provision in the authorization requiring local agreement to move forward with the project. Ms. Willis said it's similar to the Twin Cities project in that local jurisdictions have the authority to either support or not support the project. If local jurisdictions pulled support away from the Twin Cities project, everything she has learned up to this point indicates the project would go away. Mr. Schulte pointed out that it should be true, but it's not because the three jurisdictions pulled support from the Twin Cities project and the Corps ignored and hid the letters in a file until after the 2007 flood. The Corps did not act on the cities of Centralia and Chehalis and Lewis County's request to withdraw from the project.

Mark White said that although true, there are more than the three jurisdictions involved. He has been involved in the process for 10 years as a representative of the Tribe.

Mr. Swartout said his understanding of the process is that when the project moves from design to construction, local government responsibilities are initiated through funds for acquisition of properties and for operation and maintenance of the project. Without that local agreement, the project stops.

Mr. Burkle commented that obtaining any kind of certainty from the Corps is difficult and is not reality. He's worked with the Corps during his entire career. He asked how long the Ecosystem Restoration GI Study has been underway. Ms. Napier responded that it was initiated in 2001 with one project initially developed. The Partnership provided its match but the Corps didn't have the funds to follow-up causing the CBP to lose the funds to the state and elimination of the project. Mr. Burkle commented that is a real world example of the Corps. If some world event should occur and they need to divert funds, those funds will be diverted. In today's political climate, the Partnership is not going to receive a promise from the Corps.

Ms. Willis said it could be linked to the reference that by January the Corps indicated they would have the figures and timeline available. It's not possible to pin the Corps down to a particular date. Mr. Connelly questioned whether the Partnership should wait until January and then have the same conversation again. Ms. Canaday affirmed that would be advisable.

Ms. Canaday referred to the flood of 1933 and the conversations in 1934, which are similar to the conversations held today. There has been no progress. Unfortunately, she is afraid that in 2034, the same conversations will be occurring, which is frustrating.

Ms. Willis referred to the current climate of acceptance and moving forward and how quickly that climate can change. There will be numerous roadblocks in all the projects as new information comes forward. It would be a shame if the Partnership created the first roadblock. At some point, the CBP will need to take a leap of faith.

Mr. Stearns commented on the lack of DOE resources as well as focus on the issues of water in both Grays Harbor County and Lewis County and his unwillingness to lobby for more support unless the CBP is willing to work with the Governor's Office on transfer of the non-federal sponsor issue.

Mr. Harris acknowledged Mr. Burkle's comment that another disaster is all it takes to divert the funds appropriated for the project. If a flood were to occur now, it's likely action would move forward as there is momentum already in place. Unfortunately, stances people and agencies take tend to soften when disasters occur. If there is an opportunity, it's important to move forward now. As time travels further from the disaster, the less important it becomes. He expressed dismay with no action.

Ms. Canaday said last week is a prime example of a pending disaster. There are several more months for the potential of bad weather leading to floods. The process should continue moving forward.

Loren Hiner added that as a newer member, the Flood Authority and the CBP are essentially represented by the same people who are wrestling with the same issues and it's becoming a dance that is going on forever and nothing is getting done. He questioned why there are two organizations rather than one. Mr. White said there were efforts to have only one organization, but individuals lobbied Olympia and the Flood Authority was created. Mr. Hiner asked whether both organizations are ending as they currently exist. Mr. Harris said the focus of the two groups is supposed to be different. The CBP considered becoming the Flood Authority but relinquished it because members wanted to focus on its goals. Both groups have a separate focus. However,

because of the lack of funds, everyone is fighting for the same pot of money. Mr. Hiner suggested the CBP should move back to its single focus.

Ms. Willis said the conversation is difficult and that the issues have morphed over time. The GI Study initially focused on eco-restoration and over time and because of the joint membership of the two groups, flood risk reduction was considered. The choice of the CBP is possibly dooming the possibility of building dam structures. The Flood Authority doesn't have the capability to consider flood risk reduction as Congress will not authorize a third GI Study.

Mr. Schulte added that the CBP agreed by consensus in 2008 that it would not become involved in flood mitigation. However, events have forced the CBP into that position. The CBP has never agreed to become involved in flood mitigation and is basically arguing about whether to become involved or not.

Discussion followed on next steps and pending information anticipated from the Corps. Ms. Willis said the Flood Authority has approved sending the letter. A copy will be provided to the CBP.

Mr. White asked whether any other member is not supportive of sending the letter other than Mr. Schulte. Mr. Harris said he has a concern because if control is released to the Governor's Office it may mean the CBP is also relinquishing its control. Mr. Swartout commented that at some point a decision should be made based on a leap of faith. Mr. Connelly commented that it likely means that the CBP loses control or has control over nothing. Ms. Balmelli-Powe suggested the only loss to the CBP could involve loss of control of the original GI Study.

Discussion followed on ensuring the letter includes the Partnership's concerns. Ms. Holbrook-Shaw suggested members should commit to making a decision regardless of whether the Corps provides information in January. Mr. Schulte said he couldn't agree. Ms. Holbrook-Shaw questioned how long Mr. Schulte is willing to wait. Mr. Schulte said he is not rushing into any decision without data.

It was reiterated by several members that the issue has been ongoing since 1931. Mr. Hojem commented that the basin is at the bottom of the Corps' priority list if another disaster occurs elsewhere. Mr. Stearns urged members to move forward to take advantage of existing leadership.

Mr. White suggested Ms. Spaulding should draft a letter for consideration by the Partnership in January. Mr. Schulte recommended obtaining the letter from the Flood Authority and modify if needed.

***Members agreed to obtain the letter from the Flood Authority and directed Ms. Spaulding to draft a letter from the CBP and present the draft letter as well as the original Flood Authority letter to the Partnership at its January meeting for discussion and action.***

#### ***Water Smart Washington Proposed Bill – Janel Spaulding***

Ms. Spaulding reported DOE is proposing a new bill on Water Smart Washington that includes the extension of watershed planning for watersheds that have adopted management plans. The proposal is to extend planning for four more years.

Ms. Hempleman said other components of the bill include some changes as to how water is managed in the state. A summary of those changes will be posted on the department's website in a week, which will be forwarded to Ms. Spaulding. DOE representatives are willing to attend a meeting, review the proposed changes, and address questions.

***Legislative Outreach and Brochure – Janel Spaulding***

Ms. Spaulding asked members to consider meeting with legislators if the bill does not pass for continued funding. A brochure developed in 2009 can be updated. Members could request bridge funding to assist the CBP in transitioning to another organizational structure or seek support of DOE's Water Smart Washington bill. She suggested having the STC review and update the brochure for review by the Partnership in January.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw questioned the timing for contacting legislators. Several members suggested contacting legislators early.

Discussion followed on the message to convey and identification of members to meet with legislators. Members said the message is fully funding the Partnership or providing bridge funds to enable the Partnership to transition.

***Members agreed with Ms. Spaulding's recommendation to have the STC review and edit the brochure for presentation to the Partnership in January.***

**2011 CBP Meeting Schedule and Calendar**

Ms. Spaulding reported state agencies scheduled a furlough day on January 28, 2011, the next scheduled meeting of the Partnership. State agency representatives are unable to attend unless the meeting date is rescheduled. Another furlough day is scheduled on April 22, 2011.

Members agreed to schedule the January meeting on January 21.

Several members indicated they have other meeting conflicts on Fridays. Members agreed to delay rescheduling the April meeting at this time.

**2011 Future Meeting Ideas**

Ms. Spaulding reported Ms. Holbrook-Shaw recommended scheduling presentations from various other Chehalis basin organizations at each meeting, dependent upon time availability.

Members agreed with the recommendation with the caveat that there is flexibility in scheduling time on the meeting agenda.

Ms. Hempleman suggested inviting Bob Amrine with Lewis Conservation District to share information on voluntary landowner funding programs that help protect water quality. Members agreed to include it under the special presentation option.

Janet Strong asked how organizations would be contacted for providing a presentation. Ms. Spaulding indicated that she will contact organizations and extend an invitation.

**Nominations for Office Elections**

Ms. Spaulding reported that Mark White and Bonnie Canaday have agreed to continue serving as Vice Chair and Chair, respectively.

***Mr. Hojem and Mr. Harris moved and seconded to nominate and elect Bonnie Canaday as Chair and Mark White as Vice Chair. Motion carried.***

**Agenda Items for January 21, 2011 Meeting and Future Meetings**

- Letter to Governor's Office regarding GI Study
- Legislature Brochure review

Ms. Canaday asked that all information be provided in advance of the meeting to afford an opportunity for members to review the material.

Members agreed to a request from Mr. Swartout to schedule a future presentation by Dr. Alan Hamlet, Research Scientist, University of Washington Climate Impacts Group (CIG). The CIG has modeled the frequency of 100-year floods based on climate change models. He spoke at the South Sound Science Exposition and focused on the Nisqually. He also has information for the Chehalis basin.

**Special Presentation**

Ms. Canaday acknowledged Ms. Napier and thanked her for her service to the Partnership.

Paula Ehlers, Shorelines Programs Section Manager, Southwest Regional Office, DOE, presented Ecology's highest award for environmental excellence to Ms. Napier. The department issues the award to individuals, organizations, businesses that have shown leadership, innovation, or extraordinary service in protecting, improving, or cleaning up the environment. For over 10 years, Ms. Napier has coordinated the Chehalis Basin Partnership and lead entity work. She has been the Grays Harbor County staff representative to the Chehalis Basin Flood Authority. She was instrumental in launching the Marine Resources Committee and the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership. Ms. Napier provides quiet, thoughtful leadership and sees issues from a high level so that individual projects contribute to the long-term, overarching goals of the watershed. She works well with all different points of view, and has a firm grasp of the technical issues, and she has outstanding administrative skills that have been a major factor in applying millions of dollars of grant funding to the basin. Ms. Napier is a model for collaborative problem-solving that supports communities while protecting and restoring the environment. She leaves a legacy of accomplishment and a number of colleagues who hold her in the highest regard. She is also a pleasure to work with, always calm, even, and professional. Ms. Napier has moved on as the Interim Planning Director at Grays Harbor County.

Ms. Ehlers congratulated Ms. Napier and presented her with the award plaque.

Ms. Napier expressed appreciation to members and staff for the support over the years.

Members adjourned to a reception to honor Ms. Napier.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With there being no further business, Chair Canaday adjourned the meeting at 11:42 p.m.