CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP
Chehalis Tribe "Lucky Eagle" Casino
Rochester, Washington
February 26, 2010

Meeting Summary

MEMBERS, ALTERNATES & GUESTS PRESENT

Bonnie Canaday, Chair, Mayor Pro Tem, City of Centralia
Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County (Alternate)
Kahle Jennings, City of Centralia (Alternate)
Julie Balmelli-Powe, Lewis County Farm Bureau
Janel Spaulding, Grays Harbor College
Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County
Terry Harris, City of Chehalis
Spencer Eaton, ESA Adolfson
John Penberth, Citizen, Pe Ell
Karen Valenzuela, Thurston County
Chris Hempleman, Department of Ecology (DOE)
Peter Holm , Chehalis River Council
Tom Bougher, Veterans Conservation Corps
Susan Grigsby, DOE
Stephen Stanley, DOE
Lyle Hojem, Citizen, Lewis County
Patrick Wiltzius, City of Chehalis (Alternate)
Bill Schulte, Lewis County
Mark White, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Jim Hill, Citizen, Lewis County
Dave Vasilauskas, City of Centralia
Chanele Holbrook-Shaw, Citizen, Thurston County
Art Lehman, Port of Centralia
Mark Swartout, Thurston County
Miranda Plumb, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Services
Bruce Treichler, Trout Unlimited
Mark Cline, DOE
Ron Averill, Lewis County

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS:

Approval of Meeting Summary	Approved January 22, 2010 meeting summary as amended.
Chehalis Basin-wide Watershed Characterization Project	Ms. Napier to work with Mr. Stanley to disseminate the characterization report to members. Members agreed with the recommendation for Ms. Napier to contact the Corps of Engineers on the basin-wide study and request funding for expanding the study to the entire basin.
Organizational Restructuring	Members approved a series of changes to the articles of incorporation. Ms. Spaulding was asked to obtain more information on creating a foundation. Ms. Spaulding will follow up with a non-profit agency in Tacoma for documentation assistance. The CBP established a subcommittee of Kahle Jennings, Bill Schulte, Mark White, John Penberth, and Tom Bougher with Janel Spaulding as lead to work on the articles of incorporation and bylaws. The subcommittee's work will be presented at the March CBP meeting.
Chehalis Basin Ecosystem and Restoration Project	Ms. Napier to follow up on definition of "residual flooding risk." Members offered several revisions and inclusions to the PMP presentation materials.
Cascade Land Conservancy	Members approved a request from the Cascade Land Conservancy to forward a request to the Grays Harbor County Lead Entity to recommend approval of additional funding from the SRFB for the Hoquiam River Surge Plain project for acquisition of property.

GENERAL PARTNERSHIP BUSINESS

Welcome, Introductions, and Roundtable Comments

Chair Bonnie Canaday called the February 26, 2010, meeting of the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) to order at 9:33 a.m. Everyone present provided self-introductions.

Discuss and Adopt January 22, 2010 Meeting Summary

The January 22, 2010, meeting summary was accepted by members with one correction changing "ITS" within the first paragraph on page six to "IRS."

SPECIAL PROJECTS AND PRESENTATIONS

Presentation on Chehalis Basin-wide Watershed Characterization Project –*Stephen Stanley*

Ms. Napier introduced Stephen Stanley, Department of Ecology. Ms. Napier said she viewed the presentation when she attended a Twin Cities Interagency Committee meeting. At that meeting, members reviewed mitigation alternatives for the Twin Cities project. The project focuses on an area and could be of interest to the Partnership in terms of what could be pursued on a pilot level or smaller scale project.

Mr. Stanley introduced team member Susan Grigsby.

Mr. Stanley said the presentation focuses on a tool for locating potential mitigation for different kinds of projects. The project was funded by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers approximately eight months ago to begin assessing water flow processes. It provides a broader coarse-scale understanding of where mitigation could be located.

Processes refer to the movement of surface and subsurface water, sediment, wood, pathogens, and nutrients. All of the processes act at a broader scale to affect the structure, such as how a stream is formed. Reducing the physical complexity of streams can lead to fewer areas downstream functioning as food chains for the environment. When the base of the food chain changes, the upper portion of the food chain is no longer supported as well. This project is viewed from a comprehensive and broad ecosystem scale. Understanding the relationship between products, structure, and function, helps to indentify how impacts on the landscape become threats and stressors. That entails changing behaviors and activities to reduce those threats and stressors to the environment. Science demonstrates that if the process is followed there is more success in mitigation projects by identifying landscapes that have better success.

The modeling process examines three primary components:

- Delivery
- Surface Storage
- Groundwater

The project involves two qualitative models. The models are not based on measurements, such as rates of flow, but are based on areas of the landscape that control the delivery, surface storage, and groundwater. Elements controlling delivery of water include forested areas and areas of rain and snow. Impairing those areas such as the removal of forests, results in higher peaks of water. Those areas on the landscape are examined to determine an area base score. The same methodology applies to surface water and storage. The analysis looks at a relative comparison of those areas within a watershed. The watershed can be divided into smaller components allowing for comparison of individual hydrologic units to provide a comparison of important areas and impaired areas. The first model determines important areas on the landscape controlling the movement of water.

The second model involves areas of landscape changed, impaired, or impacted by roads, forest clearing, and filling and ditching of wetlands. Those areas can modeled using satellite data at a coarse-scale, but accurate to the degree of providing information on which subbasins are more changed than others.

Landscape groups were created to run the models consisting of the following groups:

- Mountainous areas generally higher than 500 feet in elevation. Comprised of bedrock areas, rain-on-snow dominated areas, high precipitation areas, and high relief topography. The analysis size average is 8 to 10 square miles.
- Lowland areas generally less than 500 feet in elevation consisting of low gradient terrace landform, glacial drift, with lower precipitation. The analysis size average is 3 to 5 miles square miles.
- Coastal areas were included because the model is also used for a Puget Sound area project.

Mark Swartout questioned the difference in size between the landscape groups. Mr. Stanley said the primary reason is because mountainous land areas do not have the land use density and an eight to ten square mile group allows for a better understanding of the conditions without examining a smaller sub-base, which would require more computing power and time. That's the primary reason for selecting the

8-10 square mile landscape group. The lowland group of 2-5 square mile was selected because that is generally where city and county activities are located and it supports the work of jurisdictions in completing shoreline plans for critical areas updates. Another reason for not reducing the size to less than one square mile is because of the datasets used by the Natural Resources Conservation Service are mapped at a scale of 1:24,000, which still has some errors in the soil types.

Mr. Stanley reviewed the landscape groups examined for the upper Chehalis involving portions of WRIAs 22 & 23. Three mountainous groups were identified to include Satsop, Pe Ell/Black Hills, and an area above Newaukum/Skookumchuck.

Mr. Stanley addressed questions about the range between low and high annual rainfall, and peak rainfall. Mr. Stanley said each area was examined for an annual rainfall average. In some areas, the average rainfall was upwards of 70 to 100 inches. In another area the average was well over 70 inches. For the lowland areas, an average between 35 and 45 inches was factored. Bill Schulte noted that the Pe Ell area has been averaging 48 inches of rainfall. Mr. Stanley acknowledged that 48 inches would be indicative of a mountainous area. The intent was using rainfall as a specific criterion. However, it wasn't as effective as envisioned. The team agreed to use topography, landform, and the type of geology. The secondary criterion is rainfall. If there are variations in rainfall amounts between the mountain groups those groups will be split. Mr. Stanley added that the team is using the average rainfall within the basin but there is research on run-off events involving rain and snow.

Mr. Stanley displayed a graphic for assessing water processes in the first model. The model consists of (1) delivery or precipitation types, and (2) surface storage on the landscape, recharge (used USGS recharge model), subsurface flow and discharge. Loss through forested areas or through evapotranspiration was analyzed through assumptions based on the impairment model.

Mr. Stanley described how the data was analyzed and the results for predicting where mitigation could be located. The Pe Ell area has a relatively large area that's important for the delivery of water relative to the eastern area above the Newaukum. Satsop also has a relatively large area of importance. The lowland area near the Black Hills is also an important area from Tumwater to Oakville and then to Elma, which should be considered in terms of how it's relative to Centralia and Chehalis, which has a moderate importance in terms of delivery.

A different pattern for storage was determined. Storage is where water on the surface may be retained. In the Satsop area there is a large area in the upper terrace important for retaining surface waters. Boistfort Valley has storage areas as well as the Newaukum and the Skookumchuck near Bucoda. Areas of analysis include the number of historic wetlands and broad floodplains. Model 1 assumes no change, impairment, or impact of wetlands or floodplains in order to determine the amount of change in Model 2, which examines impairment.

Mr. Stanley displayed a map on the results of recharge. Because recharge is a function of precipitation there are important areas of recharge. Regional recharge occurs into the bedrock, which takes a relatively long time before discharging to lowland areas. He responded to questions on the timing of discharge from mountainous areas and described the complexity and differences associated with each watershed. The model is not measuring recharge.

Mr. Stanley displayed a map on the results of discharge. The model provides some idea on the location of recharge areas in the mountainous areas. However within the Newaukum area there appears to be considerable discharge occurring in the upper and mid-Newaukum River. There is also considerable discharge in the upper terrace of the headwaters of the Satsop. There are considerable wetland deposits in

that area to support the amount of discharge occurring in the Satsop area. Discharge is essentially the movement of subsurface water to the surface usually at the break of slopes. Another type of discharge is water discharging from a floodplain to a stream. It is essentially the conversion of groundwater to surface water.

A pie chart on the results of importance of recharge and discharge was displayed, which represents the total score. The analysis reveals a total score of recharge and discharge by areas. The Newaukum area score is higher for recharge than in the lowland area, which is lower. It's a helpful way of confirming what's occurring in the landscape and which areas might be important for discharge. Many areas within the Newaukum are consistently higher in score than in other areas for recharge. Results in the Boistfort Valley also reveal an area of importance for discharge.

Mr. Stanley referred to the 1962 Water Supply Bulletin published by J.W. Weigle, which involved the same area of investigation known as an artisan aquifer area, which corresponds very closely with the model as an important discharge area of artisan wells and springs. The area is located in the area of the upper Newaukum and the Deschutes.

Model 2 is essentially the same model with different variables using the same groups for impairments to the water process for delivery, surface storage, subsurface movement, and evapotranspiration, which can be modeled, based on change that occurs by the amount of forested or vegetation removed. Simple indicators are used because in areas of impervious cover, evapotranspiration is not occurring. For delivery, the indicator is the amount of forest loss. Delivery entails timing as well. With loss of forest cover, movement of water is synchronized quickly to the lowland areas. Loss of forest has been demonstrated to be a significant factor in the delivery and timing of water. For overland flow and surface storage, data was included on impervious cover, depressed wetland loss (urban and rural), and loss of floodplain (unconfined and moderately confined).

Terry Willis asked for the definition of a depressional wetland. Mr. Stanley advised that a depressional wetland is defined as an area that is generally less than 2% grade comprised of hydric soil. There are digital elevation models that provide the location of the 2% grade. Hydric soils only form when saturation occurs over a very long period. Those soils are mapped and by intersecting the two, it's possible to identify which wetlands are more likely depressional. Because they collect and hold water, depressional wetlands have a big influence on moderating downstream flooding.

For loss of recharge, the impact is based on high, moderate, and low density development. Lateral flows in the mountainous areas can be affected by roads by diverting water away from a hillside into a different watershed or a stream area. Discharge included some indicators that are surrogates, such as well density to provide an idea on the number of wells within different subbasins. Discharge also considered high permeable floodplains in urban and rural areas and slope wetlands in rural and urban areas.

The model works on a scoring basis of 0 to 1 for impairment. A higher score reflects a higher degree of importance.

Mr. Stanley reviewed the results of impairment for delivery, storage, and groundwater. For delivery, the model looks at where rainfall occurs and how its movement down slope is impacted. In the Pe Ell area, less change has occurred relative to the eastern mountainous group of the Newaukum, which reflects more impairment. That generally is indicative of forest cover loss by forest practices. Within the Satsop, higher areas are less affected than the southern areas, but generally the area has a wide degree of impairment throughout that particular mountainous group. The highest degrees of impairment are located

within the urbanized areas. The area around Pe Ell has the least amount of impairment of the three groups for delivery.

Surface storage is more of an issue within the lowland areas with a higher degree of impairment in urbanized areas. Most of the impairment is within the Boistfort Valley because even with rural activities, such as agriculture, storage areas are changed. The terraced areas of the Satsop reflect much impairment primarily because of agriculture activities. Because the Pe Ell and the Newaukum areas feed into the basin, they are two important delivery areas that are delivering to a storage area that has been significantly impaired.

Recharge is impairment to where water enters the landscape from the surface and movement to the aquifers. Generally, the overall basin is not in bad shape, which might be a surprise. However, the data reveals that recharge hasn't changed significantly regardless of the land use except where impervious surface and buildings have been added.

Terry Harris asked about comparing the storage map to elevation changes because within the areas of Tenino, Bucoda, Centralia, and Chehalis they are basically a large flat plain. He asked if that is occurring within the Elma area as well. Mr. Stanley said the location of storage areas is very critical. Both provide storage with Elma having a higher elevation. However, the Elma area has more of an effect on flood timing and erosion of flows than the lowland area, which will be described later.

Within the Newaukum area there is a high impairment of discharge. Discharge areas consist of sloped wetlands and valleys. Many of the mid-lowland areas have relatively high impairment of discharge because of the amount of rural and urban development. The Satsop mountainous area also has extensive discharge impairment. However, when comparing discharge versus storage, the impairment of discharge is more significant across the entire watershed.

Mr. Stanley displayed a color-coded synthesis map showing the relationship of impairment to importance. The greener color areas are areas to protect. They are areas of high importance for Model 1 and have a low degree of impairment. Those areas are functioning well and it's important to have policies to guide development that is consistent with maintaining the processes. Yellow coded areas are reflective of important areas that have changed significantly and where restoration measures should be considered. Gray areas are less important but have been highly changed and areas where more development could be located because of less impact to processes. Lighter greens are less important and are unimpaired or changed very little, but worth considering for conserving.

For delivery impairment, the mountainous area of the Satsop should be considered for restoration measures because the area will affect the timing and delivery of rainfall within the system.

Mr. Stanley responded to questions and indicated the main message is that delivery areas appear to be more impaired in specific areas of the upper watershed. If impairment occurs in the delivery areas, it will be important to consider storage areas downstream. If both are highly impaired, it becomes a predictor that more flooding will occur. Each of the maps must be considered individually to ascertain what problems exist in each of the land groups. One type of land use may impact delivery but have less impact on storage.

Mr. Stanley displayed a map for storage impairment and described the areas of impairment. The Boistfort Valley and the Newaukum are both important areas for storage restoration. For recharge, the watershed doesn't have significant issues. Generally, lowland areas are the most affected areas that should be of focus.

The discharge map is similar to the storage map with similar areas of discharge impairments. The more extensive area of impairment is within the Napavine area and the area of the Newaukum.

Mr. Stanley displayed the current FEMA floodplain map overlaid with overall scores for delivery and storage. A delivery map revealed areas most important for delivery in the watershed. In some areas, rain and snow play a big role in flooding. There are similarities between Pe Ell and the eastern mountainous area of the Newaukum and Skookumchuck with the likelihood of more precipitation flooding in the Pe Ell area than in the eastern mountainous area. Mr. Stanley displayed a map of important storage areas. Higher elevations of storage in the watershed moderate impacts of flooding downstream. Consequently, higher priorities should be considered for storage areas located in the higher elevations to provide more value for reducing flooding. Maps of impairment for both delivery and storage revealed that delivery is broadly impaired in the Satsop and the eastern area and storage is impaired in lowland areas.

Management recommendations include restoring storage areas in the terraced areas of the Satsop and the Skookumchuck and Newaukum areas. The study doesn't consider future projections for dams or stormwater facilities. The intent is a broad-scale tool for locating new mitigation and development activities.

The final report will be released next week with a draft available for comments over the next 30 days. The report will be available to use as a tool to help answer questions, particularly for critical areas ordinances and shoreline plans.

Mr. Swartout asked about the possibility of sharing the data with jurisdictions. Susan Grigsby advised that she's received data requests from some jurisdictions and that the information is shared.

Ms. Willis asked about the process for distributing the draft for comments. Ms. Napier offered to work with Ms. Stanley to disseminate the information to members who can provide the information to their respective jurisdictions.

Mark Cline reported that the study could include a Part B component if the Partnership finds the information to be a useful tool to include the remaining basin. Ms. Willis agreed it would be helpful to have the entire watershed system studied. Flooding is a big picture event including all wetlands and all projects. The study might lead to better conclusions of other measures to undertake to alleviate flooding. Mr. Cline noted that funding for the project was originally from the Corps of Engineers based on the levee proposal. There has always been recognition that the remaining system should be included as well. He said he considers the study as the framework as there are many more options. Local jurisdictions can use the information to help update critical areas ordinances. The study has proved to be a useful tool and continued funding will increase its usefulness.

Ms. Napier said one option is contacting the Corps of the Engineers on the basin-wide study to see if there is a possibility of funding to expand the study. Members agreed with the recommendation.

Ron Averill arrived at the meeting.

Status Report and Discussion Regarding Organizational Restructuring – *Janel Spaulding*

Janel Spaulding distributed drafts of bylaws and articles of incorporation for discussion purposes. At the December meeting, members directed staff to move forward and research the option of forming a non-profit. At the January meeting, a quorum of members was not present, which prevented some progress.

At the January meeting, members received copies of the bylaws and articles of incorporation. An electronic copy was also mailed to all members last week.

Ms. Spaulding referred to the January minutes and several pending questions addressed by members. One request included development of a proposed budget for expenditures for a new organization before pursuing any more efforts. Ms. Spaulding said a diagram has been created addressing that issue that will be reviewed after the articles of incorporation and the bylaws are completed.

Ms. Spaulding reviewed the suggestion to revise Article 4. Members agreed with the suggestion to revise Article 4, to state, "The activities of the corporation shall be supportive of the requirements of the Chehalis Basin Watershed Management Plan and Detailed Implementation Plan as approved by the Chehalis Basin Partnership as the plan may be amended."

Mr. Swartout pointed out that the provision may limit the organization to the two existing plans. At some point, the organization may need to create another plan. He suggested revising Article 4 to state, "…Chehalis Basin Partnership as the plans may be amended or for any additional plans that may be developed." Members agreed with the proposed change.

Mr. Schulte reported Glenn Carter, Lewis County Attorney, also provided some recommendations. He warned about problems with a public organization creating a private organization because after completion, the new non-profit can rewrite the bylaws and proceed in an entirely different direction. Mr. Carter recommended forming a foundation and having the documents reviewed by an attorney. Ron Averill added that he and Mr. Swartout are members of the Nisqually River Foundation, which could provide a good example of how a foundation is formed. Mr. Swartout noted that forming a foundation may impose some restrictions. Mr. Schulte agreed and indicated that after the Partnership creates a separate and independent legal entity, the Partnership would not have any control. Mr. Carter strongly recommended forming a foundation rather than a non-profit for that reason.

Mr. Penberth pointed out that the Partnership was created through a review by all attorneys of all member jurisdictions. He suggested the same process should be followed to avoid any future legal problems. Ms. Spaulding advised that all members will have the opportunity to review the documents with their respective legal counsel. Mr. Penberth suggested a legal review by each attorney before proceeding. Several members advised that prior to a legal review, the document should be finalized to the extent possible.

Members agreed with the suggestion to revise Article 4, Section 3 to state, "Accordingly, the ***(name of organization)*** will generate resources and funding to assist in the implementation of the Chehalis Basin Watershed Management Plan and Detailed Implementation Plan and to fund and/or assist in the operations of the Chehalis Basin Partnership."

At the January meeting, Ann Wick suggested that Article 5 should include information about the return of funds to the grantee if terms of the grant are not achieved. Members agreed that the requirement of returning funds is already covered as a stipulation of grant contracts.

Members discussed the option of forming a foundation rather than a non-profit. Mr. Swartout said a foundation is a subset of a non-profit organization. It's possible to have both organizations. One example is the Nisqually River Foundation. However a foundation is not a 501(c) 3 under the IRS.

Members discussed the differences and pros and cons between a foundation and a non-profit. Ms. Willis commented that Mr. Penberth's concern is that after forming a non-profit, members of the non-profit

could create their own rules and regulations that could be separate and distinct from the goals of the CBP. Mr. Swartout said it's important to remember that the CBP is the organization formed by the interlocal agreement with a non-profit as a separate organization foundation that provides the administrative and financial support to the Partnership. The CBP will not become the board of directors of the foundation. That is a separate entity with separate members.

Discussion ensued on options associated with forming a foundation. A foundation is a type of non-profit organization.

Mr. Penberth reiterated his assertion that the documents should be reviewed by all municipalities because the Partnership is changing the original agreement.

Ms. Spaulding advised that she will obtain more information on creating a foundation to present to members. She said she has a copy of the Nisqually River Foundation articles of incorporation that can be used as the basis of developing the Partnership's foundation. She also obtained an application from Washington Attorneys Assisting Community Organizations (WAACO) for assistance. However, it can take several months before the organization can review the documents. Additionally, another non-profit agency is available in Tacoma that could provide assistance. However, the CBP may be located outside of its service area. She said she'll contact the agency.

Ms. Willis questioned whether the fiscal agent responsibility transfers. Ms. Napier said that issue hasn't been discussed at this point. Ms. Willis said that currently, Grays Harbor County is the fiscal agency for the CBP. Mr. Averill commented that the Nisqually Tribe is the fiscal agent for the Nisqually River Basin.

Jim Hill questioned the appropriateness of incorporating before establishing the bylaws. Typically, an organization is formed first prior to submitting the articles of incorporation. It appears the process is backwards. It would be foolish to consider governance before establishing the organization. After the formation of the organization, that's the proper time to incorporate. Ms. Spaulding advised that draft bylaws have been developed. Filing of the articles of incorporation with the state doesn't require a set of bylaws.

Members discussed how to proceed with the next steps. Mr. Schulte suggested forming a subcommittee to complete the articles of incorporation and begin a draft of the bylaws. Kahle Jennings, Bill Schulte, Mark White, John Penberth, Tom Bougher volunteered to serve as members with Ms. Spaulding as the lead.

Members discussed the approval process and agreed the subcommittee will present materials at the next meeting.

Karen Valenzuela and Mark Swartout left the meeting.

Chehalis Basin Ecosystem and Restoration and Flood Risk Management Project Update (Basin-wide GI) – *Lee Napier*

Ms. Napier reported she provided the same presentation to the Flood Authority and is seeking feedback from members. The working group has been meeting for several months to update the Project Management Plan (PMP).

The PMP is a document describing the work to occur during the feasibility phase of a Chehalis Basin project for Ecosystem Restoration and Flood Risk Management in the Chehalis Basin. Grays Harbor

County is the local sponsor working with the support of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and other stakeholders to accomplish the PMP, feasibility study, and future engineering and design. The project is basin-wide. The Twin Cities project is a more specific project location.

The presentation was changed to reflect some of the input from the Flood Authority.

Project objectives include:

- Identify ecosystem restoration measures that would most economically provide long-term ecosystem restoration to the Chehalis River Basin.
- To define roles and responsibilities in the execution of this plan.
- To define a process to fund and implement creation of a flood risk management in ecosystem restoration solutions in the Chehalis River Basin.
- Reduce flood hazards and flood damage costs in the project area (basin-wide).
- Identify residual flooding risks, educate citizens, and develop emergency land use plans to reduce potential catastrophic damages from risen residual flooding risk.
- Reduce the adverse effects of flooding in the towns and cities of the Chehalis River floodplain.
- Reduce the adverse effects of flooding on transportation delays to critical transportation corridors.
- Provide a systems-wide approach to reducing flood damages in populated areas of the basin.
- Protect existing public utility infrastructure from flood hazards.
- Reduce the threat of catastrophic levee failure and reduce flood damages to the agricultural community and rural residents.
- Avoid adverse impacts to the socio-economic and cultural aspects of the basin.
- Maintain Corps's Tribal Trust Responsibilities under Treaties, Laws, and Executive Orders.
- Develop sustainable projects with the intent of minimizing operation and maintenance requirements, minimizing risk for catastrophic failure, and in conformance with Corps Environmental Operating Principles.
- Restore existing degraded riverine habitats for salmonid and improve Chehalis River ecosystem functions and processes.
- Ensure active public input in the planning process.

Kahle Jennings asked for the description of "residual flooding risk." Ms. Napier said she will follow up.

Mr. Averill said flooding concerns not only pertain to towns and cities, but to unincorporated areas as well. Mr. Harris noted that a subsequent objective addresses all areas, but that there should be consistency in all the objectives. It appears that one objective excludes unincorporated areas while another objective excludes areas that are not populated. Mr. Jennings suggested revising bullet 6 to state, "Reduce the adverse effects of flooding in the Chehalis River floodplain." Bullet 8 could be restated to, "Provide a systems wide approach to reducing flood damages in the basin."

The project teams, stakeholders and representatives include:

- Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority is represented by Lewis County as Lead Fiscal Agent
- Chehalis Basin Partnership is represented by Grays Harbor County as Lead Fiscal Agent
- Local Partners
- Responsibilities

- Local
- Federal

Ms. Napier reported the CBP will receive an interlocal agreement to outline how the Flood Authority and the CBP will work together. An agreement is important because the projects require a local and federal match. The local match must come from local, state funds, or in-kind services. Grays Harbor County is serving in the capacity of a coordinator or clearinghouse to initiate project discussions.

Non-Corps work accomplished and current efforts by the Chehalis Basin Partnership include:

- The *Chehalis Basin Level 1 Assessment,* published in December 2000
- The *Chehalis Basin Detailed Summary of Level 1 Assessment* reorganizes the Level 1 information by study area, as well as to summarize the data for easier use in the planning process.
- *Chehalis Basin Water Quantity Evaluation,* published in October 2003
- The *2002 Chehalis Basin Instream Flow Study*
- The *Multi-Purpose Water Storage Assessment*
- The *Municipal Water System Inchoate Water Rights Analysis* project in September 2006.
- In 2008, in partnership with the City of Centralia and the CBP, produced a water rights mapping project in the Skookumchuck Basin.
- Fecal Coliform Monitoring in Grays Harbor County in conjunction with the Conservation District to analyze specific subbasins.
- Developed *Chehalis Watershed Monitoring Plan and Quality Assurance Project Plan Framework.*
- The State of the River Reports (2006-2009) summarizing the basin-wide coordinated water quality monitoring program.
- The *Chehalis Basin Salmon Habitat Restoration and Preservation Work Plan* is the Lead Entity strategy for providing guidance to project planners and funding agencies in developing, evaluating, and implementing salmon habitat restoration and protection actions within WRIAs 22 and 23.
- Working basin-wide, the Conservation Districts of Lewis and Mason counties jointly inventoried barrier data into a single dataset resulting in the identification of 2,662 fish passage barriers within the Chehalis Basin.
- The *Lower Chehalis Riparian Assessment,* December 2003, examined the riparian condition of the lower Chehalis Basin Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 22 streams in the lower Humptulips, lower Wishkah, Wynoochee, Middle Fork Satsop, and East Fork Satsop Rivers where no watershed analysis had been conducted.

Ms. Napier said another section speaks to the work of the USGS on groundwater characterization. She added that based on the Partnership's earlier comments to expand the watershed characterization, she will include that project.

Mr. Averill suggested revising the characteristic of the basin-wide assessment to accurately reflect the work completed by the two conservation districts.

Mr. Jennings suggested including the municipal water system work as well. He noted that he and a representative from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) conducted flow monitoring at several different sites in the basin. Ms. Napier said she will update the information as part of the 2002 instream flow study to reflect the work.

Mr. Averill said there was work completed on a TMDL that affected junior water rights that impacted Lewis County in 2008. Junior water rights were stopped during a period in summer. That was under the interruptible water rights regulations. It was noted that DOE has the authority to invoke the action. Mr. Jennings said it may have been related to the temperature TMDL. Mr. Averill said DOE indicated that the TMDL is what triggered the action.

Ms. Hempleman expressed caution on how the work of the Partnership is captured as DOE conducted the TMDL. Ms. Napier reported that all the bullets pertaining to that work were removed. A bullet that was struck from the original PMP could be included stating, "The Chehalis/Grays Harbor Watershed Dissolved Oxygen, Temperature, and Fecal Coliform Bacteria TMDL Detailed Implementation Plan."

Chanele Holbrook-Shaw suggested including the completion of the CBP Watershed Management Plan

Ms. Napier reported the PMP is scheduled to be completed by May 14. Mr. Schulte asked about the process for the Partnership to approve the PMP. Ms. Napier said the briefing is the Partnership's opportunity to provide feedback and extend approval for Grays Harbor to execute the agreement. A current draft of the PMP has been released. The next version is scheduled to be released on March 4. Some appendices will be released on March 11. Another work group meeting will be scheduled to provide another opportunity for review. The goal is to authorize Grays Harbor to move forward on executing an interlocal agreement. The Flood Authority will review the final PMP first because it meets prior to the CBP's March meeting. The goal is for the CBP to authorize Grays Harbor to execute the agreement in April. The CBP will receive the final PMP as well as the interlocal agreement for its review and approval at the March meeting. Members will receive electronic links to the document prior to the March meeting.

Ms. Napier reviewed the communications strategy for the PMP involving a public involvement plan with key messages.

Mr. Penberth commented on the potential conflict of wetland restoration and creation of dikes. Ms. Napier advised that she doesn't believe there is a conflict. Ms. Jennings recalled from previous discussions involving the issue that there will be some impacts to wetlands by the levees. However, there were many wetlands that were drained and by restoring those wetlands and removing the drainage, those wetlands will provide storage capacity in the upper basin to reduce flooding impacts.

Mr. Schulte said the Corps Colonel and the project manager indicated the PMP will consider water retention. However, there is no reference included at this point. Mr. Averill replied that it will be included in the document. The issue was addressed. There will a list of projects to include water retention. Ms. Napier said it will be included under the Flood Authority's work.

Julie Balmelli-Powe expressed some concerns moving forward on levees only to determine after the studies are completed that large-scale water retention is a better possibility. Ms. Napier described the requirements of a feasibility study. The Corps has indicated that whatever has been authorized must be described. The Corps cannot explore "what if" situations and must only consider what exists. The best solution is to keep having the conversations and asking the questions. Ms. Balmelli-Powe said the Corps indicated that if in the future it's decided that levees are not the solution, any work up that point will not be considered as part of the match. Ms. Napier responded that as previously conveyed by the Corps, in order to be considered a match the Corps must review the scope and indicate whether it's included. Those are the constraints of working with the Corps.

Ms. Willis suggested that it will be important to list as many projects as possible by both the Flood Authority and the CBP.

Other Business
Ms. Napier reported a request was received from the Cascade Land Conservancy regarding its project that was submitted for Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) consideration on the Hoquiam River Surge Plain. The project was the third project submitted for funding. The project did not receive full funding because the Lead Entity did not receive as much funding as anticipated. Cascade Land Conservancy has been working with local land trusts to acquire two properties on the surge plain. The CBP has been requested to submit a letter of support to the Lead Entity requesting their support and submission of a letter to the Resource Conservation Office for a funding increase to obtain the full amount of funding necessary to acquire the property. The Partnership approved the request.

Mr. Jennings reported on a workshop on May 21 for private water rights transfer.

Agenda Items for March 26, 2010 Meeting
- Continuation of non-profit organization discussion
- PMP/Interlocal Agreement
- Report on the Geology/Hydrology assessment of the Doty/Dryad area

ADJOURNMENT
With there being no further business, Chair Canaday adjourned the meeting at 12:04 p.m.

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