

CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP
Chehalis Tribe “Lucky Eagle” Casino
Rochester, Washington
January 22, 2010
9:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

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
Ron Maul, Lewis County Farm Bureau
Bruce Mackey, ESA Adolfson
Spencer Eaton, ESA Adolfson
Matt Ely, USGS
Andy Gendaszek, USGS
John Penberth, Citizen, Pe Ell
Lisl Fasser, USGS

Amy Iverson, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)
Teri Liomin, Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force
Lyle Hojem, Citizen, Lewis County
Patrick Wiltzius, City of Chehalis (Alternate)
Ann Wick, Department of Agriculture
Bill Schulte, Lewis County
Mark White, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Theresa Julius, Grays Harbor Council of Governments
Jim Hill, Citizen, Lewis County
Dave Vasilauskas, City of Centralia

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS:

Approval of Meeting Summary

Accepted December 18, 2009 meeting summary by members present.

Organizational Restructuring

Members reviewed articles of incorporation and bylaws and provided feedback with direction to staff to continue the review at the February meeting. There were several offers for local jurisdictional counsel to review the documents.

Chehalis Basin Partnership Brochure

Members reviewed the brochure and offered recommendations on improving the document. Staff was asked to provide the document as a Word document with members revising and personalizing the document for their use when visiting legislators. Members did not endorse the brochure as a document representing the CBP at this time, but rather an information piece to assist local jurisdictions when visiting legislators.

GENERAL PARTNERSHIP BUSINESS

Welcome, Introductions, and Roundtable Comments

Chair Bonnie Canaday called the January 22, 2010, meeting of the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) to order at 9:34 a.m. Everyone present provided self-introductions.

Lee Napier reviewed the bylaws to determine a quorum for the meeting. A minimum of 10 members is required for any action by consensus.

Discuss and Adopt December 18, 2009 Meeting Summary

The December 18, 2009 meeting summary was accepted by members present.

SPECIAL PROJECTS AND PRESENTATIONS

Chehalis Basin-wide General Investigation Project Update

Ms. Napier reported on the status of the General Investigation Study. Efforts are ongoing on the development of a Project Management Plan (PMP). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will have a final draft of the PMP sent electronically by January 28, 2010. The final draft has been reviewed and approved by the Corps. The schedule will be aggressive. The Board Advisory Committee and the Steering Technical Committee are scheduled to meet on February 4 to discuss the PMP. Participants will review the PMP and document comments, which will be provided the Corps the following week. The comments will be focused to help the Corps understand the view of the committees and help them prepare for a joint meeting with the Corps on February 25, 2010. The Corps will develop the agenda based on the committees' concerns discussed at the February 4 meeting. The Corps will attend with adequate resources to address comments.

John Penberth suggested calling a special meeting of the Partnership. He questioned the STC making decisions without input from the CBP. Ms. Napier reported the assignment was delegated to the STC from the Partnership and the Flood Authority to the Board Advisory Committee. Previous updates provided to the Partnership have resulted in members directing the STC to continue moving forward on the work. All members are invited to attend the meetings. The meeting on February 4 is open to everyone. Mr. Penberth recommended calling a special meeting on February 4 and distributing an agenda. Ms. Napier invited everyone to attend and provide input at the February 4 joint meeting.

Presentation and Status Report of the Chehalis Basin Watershed Characterization and Decision Support Tool

Ms. Napier introduced the presentation, which was initiated during the development of the Chehalis Basin Watershed Management Plan. Under Action 2, the plan stipulates developing a groundwater study to address the hydraulic continuity issue. The study would provide specific information about the character of groundwater throughout the basin to enable decision-makers to better answer questions. Interim Milestone 1.2 within the Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP) stipulates measuring and managing water quantity by completing a groundwater study. The scope included questions to answer to include assistance with cost analysis as well as identification of potential funding sources.

Bill Schulte arrived at the meeting.

The Department of Ecology (DOE) offered the assistance of Charles Pitz. In 2007, Mr. Pitz met with CBP representatives and assisted in articulating a scope of work and some background info. At that time, Steve Craig was the watershed lead and he initiated contact with the US Geological Survey (USGS). Working with USGS provided an opportunity to receive some federal funding if a non-federal match could be secured. CBP worked initially with Matt Ely, USGS, on what support USGS could provide as well as different scopes of work, some of which have been funded. Another connection with the project that ties with implementing the watershed plan as well as with working with the Corps of Engineers is building further on surface-water characterization. During the recent work with the Flood Authority over

the last year, it became apparent that some of the Partnership's low flow projects had a connection in the interaction of the two issues.

Matt Ely reported that at the onset of the process, different drafts of USGS proposals were provided with funding amounts constantly changing. The goal was to build a decision-support system, essentially, a huge toolbox of tools. Funds became limited, so the goal was to build a decision-support tool as part of the toolbox. The Corps took over some of the work that was proposed. The original scope of work was reduced. Currently, the effort includes data collection with a reduced interpretative groundwater study than what was previously envisioned. The original decisions-support system to look at and characterize the groundwater surface-water system of the entire basin has been reduced at this time.

Ms. Napier responded to questions about the funding source for the work. The funding is from the outcome of the legislative appropriation. The funds were held by DOE. DOE contracted directly with USGS to manage the funds for the CBP. Mr. Ely said the current work is funded through DOE with matching funds provided by USGS and the Corps of Engineers.

Andy Gendaszek, Hydrologist, USGS, presented groundwater and surface water data collected to characterize the hydrogeologic setting of the Chehalis River Basin and the interaction of groundwater and surface-water features in selected representative areas. The program is a basin-wide program involving a large geographic area and an intensive field effort. The work began in August 2009 to focus on groundwater surface-water interactions. He acknowledged the assistance of Lisl Fasser, USGS.

During six weeks in August and September, the team collected data of well levels and groundwater measurements. Data was obtained from well level measurements from private landowners, local, state and tribal agency wells. It provided an overall snapshot of water resources in the aquifers within the Chehalis River Basin.

The second element of the work involved characterizing groundwater surface-water interactions. In September 2007, Mr. Ely led a seepage run, consisting of a series of streamflow measurements in different areas of the Chehalis and its tributaries. A monthly monitoring network was established to determine gain or loss of streamflow throughout the river over a course of a year.

The seepage measurement will be repeated in August 2010 as well as employing some new techniques to determine where exchange is occurring. That information will be published in a USGS scientific investigation report in June 2011. New surface water gages that were installed in coordination with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will more effectively model the watersheds of the Chehalis River Basin. The two gages are located at Salzer Creek near Chehalis and Elk Creek near Doty.

The two studies involve mass water level measurement and groundwater surface-water interaction studies. Both of the studies were developed in coordination with the CBP. The first study was split between USGS and DOE and the second study is by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

A massive field effort was undertaken during the summer with a goal of obtaining water level measurements from 250 wells throughout the basin in Lewis, Thurston, and Grays Harbor Counties. The team ended up with over 300 wells. An electric tape was used to measure water levels. It entailed a six-week effort. Cooperation was obtained from private citizens as well as from local, state, and tribal agencies utilizing monitoring networks. It was important to obtain data across the basin to ensure a geographic coverage as well as vertical coverage because of the difference in aquifers across the basin.

Mr. Gendaszek displayed a color-coded map of the wells with different colors assigned based on depth of the water. The information can be downloaded from the USGS website. Well depths varied depending on the aquifer. To interpret data, wells were identified within the shallow and deep aquifers.

Terry Willis asked whether the data accounted for wells that may have water from a shallow aquifer but were drilled deeper to obtain better quality of water from a deeper aquifer. Mr. Gendaszek affirmed that the data accounts for those instances where a well may be producing water from several aquifers. However it's important to tie the well to a particular aquifer, otherwise the information won't be as valuable.

Mr. Gendaszek said Google maps were used as the base. Each well was assigned a number based on the township range section of the Public Lands Survey System, elevation of the well at land surface, well depth, date of well measurement, and the depth of water below land surface. The information connects to the official National Water Information System (NWIS) database where groundwater levels as well as streamflows are standardized so that the information is on record and archived along with data from the other 49 states.

The analysis was used to develop cross sections in key locations as well as developing general flow paths of groundwater through the Chehalis River Basin.

A seepage run is basically a series of streamflow measurements that are taken in close increments of time. In September 2007, streamflow was recorded in multiple locations along the river and major tributaries to ascertain gains and loss of streamflow. Based on the seepage investigation, the largest area of gains will be focused on for groundwater and surface-water interactions. Groundwater is a potential contributor. The measurements account for influx from other water systems. USGS was able to secure funding to instrument seven wells continuously every hour with an additional seven wells measured each month from October to September to ascertain how stream flows vary throughout the year and how water level varies within the wells. The goal is to focus on seasonal changes and how a fine-scale change in streamflow affects groundwater and vice versa.

Mr. Gendaszek reviewed results of some of the data. Data analyzed to date reveals there is strong connection between streamflow and what's occurring in wells. The information from the 2007 seepage investigation will be refined. Similar techniques will be used to measure inflows and outflows of groundwater into and out of the stream. A new technique will be employed using temperature as a tracer of groundwater, as groundwater is often a different temperature, which can help to identify groundwater flows within a smaller reach of the river. The thermo profiling technique, fiber optic Distributed Temperature Sensing (DTS), involves a coil of fiber optic placed along the reach of a river with temperature measured at different points along the river.

Mr. Gendaszek referred to the existing gage network and the two new gages added to the basin. The Elk Creek gage was requested by the Corps because they were not effectively modeling the watershed and the Corps wanted to have a relatively undisturbed small basin. USGS installed the gage in November 2009. Currently, it is recording water level. Over time as USGS takes streamflow measurements to measure the amount of water moving through, USGS will develop the relationship between stage and discharge and document real time flow. That information is available on the USGS website. The gage at Salzer Creek will be installed next week. The gage will measure a smaller basin where the Corps can more accurately assess the watershed in that area. The area is also more developed.

The products scheduled for delivery include information on the USGS website on the well inventory. A USGS data series will be published in September 2010 on the water levels. Tying the two studies will be a scientific investigation report characterizing at the course scale the hydrogeology and the seepage measurements. That report will be published in June 2011.

Mr. Gendaszek acknowledged and thanked private, state, local, and tribal well owners for their cooperation and participation. Members interested in learning more can visit the USGS website.

Lyle Hojem commented on the changes in landcover over the years and how that will affect testing levels. Mr. Gendaszek said one of the reasons for adding a gage at Salzer Creek is to help the Corps model that that type of landcover. The precipitation in that area will be different in terms of how much it impacts the basin than in an area of old growth forest.

Ms. Willis commented favorably on the project and asked for a copy of the presentation. She asked if USGS also received permission from the well owners to publish the information. Mr. Gendaszek said USGS does not publish identifiable information. Landowners were provided with a copy of the agency's policies. Ms. Willis noted that many of the well sites were more frequent in the upper part of the basin and fewer towards the mouth of the basin. Mr. Gendaszek said the main reason for the difference in distribution was because of the availability of wells in the upper basin versus in the lower area of the basin. The test wells were proportionate to total well density.

Jim Hill asked about the likelihood of having data available to document storage potential of groundwater. Mr. Gendaszek said a groundwater model would need to be developed to document how water flows through the entire basin. The data provided generalized flow direction. Mr. Ely said the goal is to eventually work towards that goal. The effort will entail incremental steps. The intent is to understand in general terms, the flow system and the nexus between surface-water and groundwater. Some of the next steps involve mapping aquifers to provide information on possible areas of storage. Much more work needs to be done. The result of this work will not define storage or recovery at this point.

Status Report and Discussion Regarding Organizational Restructuring

Ms. Spaulding reported at the last meeting, members requested research in developing a non-profit organization. She distributed several handouts including steps necessary to form a non-profit, sample bylaws, and sample articles of incorporation for a non-profit.

First steps for establishing a non-profit includes filing articles of incorporation with the Washington State Secretary of State's Office. The filing fee is \$30. The articles require a name of the organization, and at least three founding directors. After the paperwork is completed and filed, the organization will receive its UBI number from the state.

Filing of IRS Form 1023 and Form 8718 is required to obtain 501(c)(3) status. The filing fee with the IRS depends on the organization's gross receipts, but it could be as high as \$800.

Kahle Jennings commented that it appears the filing fee would be difficult to determine as no history of gross receipts has been established. Ms. Spaulding advised that she met with a representative from the Nisqually River Foundation for guidance in determining what's required to establish a non-profit organization. The IRS fee is something members will need to discuss. She referred to the draft bylaws

and the requirement to apply for a federal Employer Identification Number (EIN). It takes approximately five to six months before the ITS issues a determination on the 501(c)(3) application. The state also requires charitable solicitation registration at a cost of \$30 for the filing fee and \$10 annually thereafter.

Ms. Spaulding said the Partnership will need to consider establishing a bank account and potential categories for board members could include representatives with fundraising/financing experience, public administration, scientific background, or citizen-local knowledge.

Mr. Penberth asked about the intent of forming an organization if the state is not willing to fund the effort. He questioned the goal of continuing the organization without the support of the state financially. Mark White described the difficulty associated with receiving or soliciting funds from different funding sources if the organization is not established as a non-profit. The Tribe would like to funnel some funds to the Partnership and it's been difficult. It would be easier to funnel the funds if the organization was a non-profit organization. Mr. Penberth said his perspective over the last 12 years is that the Partnership has wasted much money and doesn't have much to show for it. Mr. White commented that he and Mr. Penberth's perspectives are entirely different and that continuing the organization is important.

Mr. Jennings commented on the initiating legislation that stipulated that local parties had an interest in the management of water where they live and work. Just because the state has fallen on tough economic times doesn't mean local jurisdictions are no longer interested in the management of water. Local jurisdictions need to continue the organization as the CBP is beginning see some results of the funds spent over the years in terms of products.

Several members shared their perspective for supporting the establishment of a non-profit organization to continue the work and to receive funding.

Mr. Penberth suggested it would be important to develop a proposed budget for expenditures for a new organization before pursuing any more efforts. Ms. Napier advised that at last month's meeting, she presented budget information on the impact to the Partnership of not receiving any state funding after June 2010. The Partnership was aware of the funding issue and began looking at options for restructuring a year earlier than anticipated. In anticipation of that discussion, she presented the Partnership with budget information on the different categories in terms of what could be retained and what wouldn't because of the lack of a funding source. A starting figure of \$130,000 for basic operations to include staffing support for the Partnership and subcommittees, meeting minute support, and resources for outreach and development of projects to leverage other funding was mentioned during the December discussion. Mr. Penberth cautioned that it will require full-time efforts to seek ongoing funding support for the organization. It's likely funding will no longer be available and the organization would not have any authority to implement any projects.

Terry Harris suggested developing a budget for the basic operation. The organization should develop a wish list of projects so that when potential contributors are identified, the organization will be ready to pursue funding opportunities. Potential funding sources will contribute when those opportunities are identified. That's the process for enticing funding support. It will be difficult at the onset to identify an operating budget until the organization understands personnel and other expense needs.

Ms. Napier referred to the legislative brochure that highlights work in process that will be jeopardized because of the lack of ongoing state funding. She cited the work of local stream teams and projects occurring throughout the basin. Because the basin has identified projects, many project sponsors have

received funding because of the list. The benefit of the organization is having a coordinating body that can leverage other funding resources.

There was general support expressed by members to continue moving forward in the development of a non-profit organization. Mr. Jennings asked about the method for payment of the required fees and whether any of the fees could be funded through existing funding sources. Mr. White commented on the possibility of the Tribe offering some funding support.

Ms. Spaulding referred members to the draft of the articles of incorporation.

Mr. Hojem asked for an explanation of the process to help him in describing the effort to local citizens. Mr. Jennings replied that the Partnership is moving forward to establish a non-profit organization so that the organization can access sources of funding currently not available to the Partnership, which was formed by an interlocal agreement. Mr. Hojem questioned the budget proposal of \$130,000. Mr. Jennings reported the \$130,000 base budget is the amount necessary to maintain organizational functions. Additional funds will need to be secured to pay for projects included within the DIP. Depending on the intent of the work the Partnership wants to continue, it will be necessary to secure funding.

Ms. Willis asked whether forming the non-profit organization will entail the continued operation of the Partnership to take advantage of funding opportunities that the non-profit is not eligible to receive. Ms. Spaulding advised that the intent is to form a separate entity and that the Partnership would remain intact. Ms. Napier said the Partnership's bylaws stipulate a process that must be followed if the organization were to disband. The Partnership would remain in operation with the establishment of a separate non-profit organization.

Mr. Harris commented on the requirement of the organization to undergo an annual state audit and the importance of having a treasurer or accountant on staff.

Mr. Jennings pointed out that there is no sunset provision in the statute for watershed planning units even if the state no longer funds the work. Planning units have the option of disbanding, but there is no statutory provision for disbanding the group if state funding is no longer available.

Ms. Spaulding reviewed the draft articles of incorporation. Requirements for moving forward include:

- Establishing a name of the organization
- Effective date of the organization
- Purpose of the organization
- Dissolving the organization
- Board of Directors
- Registered Agent
- Signatures of founding directors - incorporators

Members discussed the lack of quorum for consensus action and how to move forward.

Suggestions by members regarding the name of the organization included keeping the organization name simple to avoid confusion with other organizations with similar names. Consider including "river" within the name as "basin" can be difficult for many people to comprehend. A suggestion was offered to discuss

naming options with other local organizations with similar names to receive feedback. Ms. Spaulding said she will present some name suggestions.

Mr. Hojem suggested revising the first sentence in the second paragraph of Article 4 to read, "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, or as the Plans may be amended."

Patrick Wiltzius suggested revising 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."

Mr. Penberth questioned the Partnership's process as a quorum is unavailable to move the issue forward. Mr. Jennings advised that the suggestions by members will move forward to the next meeting when a quorum is present for the Partnership's discussion and action. Mr. Penberth advocated for the Partnership to discontinue the discussion. Chair Canaday and Mr. Harris advised Mr. Penberth of the Partnership's intent to provide feedback on the draft documents and that there is no intent for any decisions to occur at this point in the process.

Ms. Spaulding said the organization needs between three to five directors. Ms. Napier suggested the Partnership's discussion will likely determine the representation desired on the board.

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.

Ms. Willis asked whether any RCWs need to be cited within the articles of incorporation. Ms. Napier recommended that if any RCWs are included, they likely would be included within the bylaws.

Discussion followed on the individuals as incorporators rather than representatives of local governments. Mr. Penberth suggested it will be important to discuss the responsibility of the incorporator. Ms. Napier suggested that the discussion is crossing between the incorporators and the board of directors, which could represent two different groups of individuals. Mr. Jennings questioned whether the incorporators must be three individuals and not individuals who are representing government. Ms. Napier said it's possible for a government to form a non-profit. However, it's also possible for a member to receive direction from their respective entity to sign the articles of incorporation. Mr. Harris said he is unable to make a decision for his agency as a lone Councilmember. It's likely that members of the Partnership are already protected because none of the members can legally obligate their respective organizations through representation on the Partnership as a single member of their respective entity.

Mr. Hill suggested the discussion pertains more to governance and bylaws than articles of incorporation.

Mr. Penberth suggested it would be important for members representing counties or cities to consult legal counsel on their respective role.

Members reviewed the draft bylaws. Ms. Spaulding said the bylaws are modeled from the Nisqually River Foundation bylaws. More modifications will likely be required specifically for the group. Bill Schulte suggested a review by the full membership is necessary. He recommended having members

review the draft to prepare for a discussion at the February meeting. Mr. Harris recommended having the information sent prior to the meetings, to afford an opportunity for members to review the material and formulate any questions prior to the meeting.

Terry Liomin recommended having legal counsel review the draft bylaws. Mr. Harris said he'll speak to his City Manager about the possibility of the City Attorney reviewing the draft bylaws. Ms. Liomin noted that a non-profit legal organization is available in Tacoma with attorneys on staff to review bylaws and articles of incorporation. She offered to provide contact information to Ms. Spaulding. Ms. Spaulding said she will need to review whether the Partnership is located outside the service boundary of the Tacoma organization. Another organization, Washington Attorneys Assisting Community Organizations (WAACO), can also assist in preparing documents. Ms. Willis pointed out the importance of an impartial review. Ms. Napier said she'll also have the county attorney review the document as well as the perspective the role the county can play and whether the county can participate in the non-profit organization.

Other review resources include the Washington State Association of Counties (WSAC) and the Association of Washington Counties (AWC).

Sustainability Strategy Update and Discussion

Ms. Napier reported on her participation in statewide discussions about the sustainability of watershed planning. She was invited to different forums as the Partnership's fiscal agent and as lead agency staff to discuss the Governor's budget and its impact to watershed planning. Neil Aaland with WSAC is connected to the eastern Washington planning group. Mr. Aaland has asked planning units to provide a list of projects that will be impacted by the Governor's budget. There have also been efforts to speak to the Ways and Means Committee and legislators about the funding situation. There are many environmental community groups that are concerned about the state's budget and what impacts it will have on watershed planning across the state. Those groups are taking a leading role to ensure something occurs for funding. Ms. Napier said she will continue to participate in those conversations.

The CBP is also developing a message through a draft brochure, which includes background information about the Partnership and information on the current funding situation. Ms. Napier distributed the draft brochure for review. Ms. Napier reviewed elements of the brochure and asked for feedback:

- Description of the Organization
- Accomplishments
- Description of the Chehalis Basin
- Progress in Jeopardy
- Contact Information

Last month, members expressed a desire to begin transitioning to a new organization. Across the state, stakeholders are calling for a need to re-describe the program as the programs are moving to the implementation stage, which may necessitate a new definition of the planning units. In this case, the brochure includes priority work in jeopardy based on feedback from the Partnership:

- Forming a non-profit organization to replace the current organizational structure.
- Working with local, state and federal partners to complete the watershed decision support tool.
- Continuing the Chehalis Basin Ecosystem and Flood Risk Reduction Project.
- Working with agriculture and forestry stakeholders to develop local water banks.

- Continuing integration of watershed planning and salmon recovery.
- Local outreach to support citizen based stream teams.
- Continue water quality monitoring throughout the watershed.

Mr. Schulte referred to the membership of the Partnership and questioned the identity of the two water purveyors. Ms. Napier said the statute defines water purveyors. For the Partnership, the two largest water purveyors are the Boistfort Water District in the upper Chehalis and the Grays Harbor Water District in the lower Chehalis.

Mr. Schulte offered some suggestions for revising the last paragraph under “Progress in Jeopardy.” He questioned the statement pertaining to funding jeopardy of the Chehalis Basin Ecosystem and Flood Risk Reduction Project as it’s funded through the Corps as a pass through to Grays Harbor. Ms. Napier said a match is required for the project, which has been provided. Mr. Schulte suggested removing the project from the list as it weakens the message since the project is funded.

Mr. Harris questioned the jeopardy associated with forming a non-profit. He suggested the jeopardy is the current organizational structure because of the funding situation. He suggested revising the statement to state something similar to, “loss of organization because of the lack of funding.” He suggested simplifying the statements.

A suggestion was offered to prioritize the accomplishments.

Mr. Jennings suggested the second bullet under “Progress in Jeopardy” should be revised because it would be difficult for the average citizen to understand a “watershed decision support tool.” Ms. Wick suggested including an opening statement on the funding problem and the need to form an organization. Mr. Jennings suggested the statement could state something similar to, “Local governments, organizational representatives, and citizen volunteers have invested 10 years in crafting a watershed plan and developing priorities. The organization is working on implementation and a period of time is required to transition a different funding source since the state is withdrawing its support.”

Members acknowledged that finalization of the brochure can’t occur because of the lack of a quorum for consensus. Members suggested having the brochure sent out electronically so that members can use the information to share with their respective legislators with the understanding that the brochure is not representative of the CBP.

Mr. Penberth commented that the Partnership was formed to provide a framework for local citizens. He recommended including the amount expended to date to show the impact to citizens on how much has been spent over the last 12 years while providing a stepping stone to the next meeting on what will be required to continue the organization.

Julie Balmelli-Powe commented that the Chehalis River basin is not in jeopardy, but that language should refer to the fact that the organization is working to maintain and restore the basin to a higher quality.

Mr. Jennings responded that as the Public Works Director for the City of Centralia, attending Partnership meetings has provided benefits for him personally in his role. One of those responsibilities involves looking at the City’s 50-year water supply. The work of the Partnership benefits the City and residents of Centralia.

Ms. Spaulding advised that she'll convert the document to a Word document so that members can access and modify the document for their respective purposes.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Spaulding distributed information on the 9th Annual Chehalis Basin Student Congress sponsored by the Chehalis Basin Education Consortium (CBEC) on Friday, March 19, 2010 at Grays Harbor College. Kathy Jacobson, CBEC Coordinator, is seeking volunteers to assist in a facilitated discussion as well as workshop presenters.

Mr. Jennings referred to the four successful watershed festivals held in Centralia and more recently in Aberdeen. Some members have expressed an interest in sponsoring an activity in the upper basin. As the City of Centralia has a well established event on July 4 involving the Summerfest at Fort Borst Park and a parade, he's reserved "Fin" the 40-foot salmon for July 4. He invited members to participate in the event. Members attending between 7:00 a.m. and 11:00 a.m. will receive breakfast served by the City Council of Centralia.

Agenda Items for February 27, 2010 and Future Meetings

- Presentation on the Watershed Characterization focusing on the Twin Cities Project
- Basin-wide General Investigation Report
- Continuation of non-profit organization discussion

ADJOURNMENT

With there being no further business, Chair Canaday adjourned the meeting at 11:51a.m.

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