

CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP
Chehalis Tribe “Lucky Eagle” Casino
Rochester, Washington
September 25, 2009
9:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

Meeting Summary

MEMBERS, ALTERNATES & GUESTS PRESENT

Bonnie Canaday, Chair, Mayor Pro Tem, City of Centralia	Bob Burkle, Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW)
Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County (Alternate)	Teri Liomin, Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force
Kahle Jennings, City of Centralia (Alternate)	Lyle Hojem, Citizen, Lewis County
Julie Balmelli-Powe, Lewis County Farm Bureau	Patrick Wiltzius, City of Chehalis (Alternate)
Janel Spaulding, Grays Harbor College	John Penberth, Citizen, Pe Ell
Chanele Holbrook-Shaw, Citizen, Thurston County	Karen Valenzuela, Thurston County
Dave Vasilauskas, City of Chehalis	Mark Swartout, Thurston County (Alternate)
Chris Hempleman, Department of Ecology (DOE)	Pete Holm, Chehalis River Council and Chehalis River Basin Land Trust
Art Lehman, Port of Centralia	Cheri Lindgren, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Chuck Caldwell, Port of Grays Harbor	
Jim Hill, Citizen, Lewis County (Alternate)	
Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County	

GENERAL PARTNERSHIP BUSINESS

Welcome, Introductions, and Roundtable Comments

Chair Bonnie Canaday called the September 25, 2009, meeting of the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) to order at 9:30 a.m. Everyone present provided self-introductions.

Discuss and Adopt August 28, 2009 Meeting Summary

The minutes of the August 28, 2009 meeting were approved by consensus.

SPECIAL PROJECTS AND PRESENTATIONS

Watershed Festival Debrief

Janel Spaulding reviewed highlights of the Watershed Festival held on September 19:

- The City of McCleary won the second annual water taste test.
- The salmon bake was hosted by the Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation’s Canoe family.
- “Fin” the traveling salmon was featured at the festival.
- Free long boat sailings were provided.
- Music.
- Numerous hands-on activities available during the festival.

Ms. Spaulding shared several photographs taken at the festival. She thanked everyone who assisted with planning and staffing the event.

Chanele Holbrook-Shaw arrived at the meeting.

Twin Cities Outreach Meetings – Input to the Frequently Asked Questions Paper

Lee Napier reported on the third Twin Cities project outreach meeting scheduled for September 30 at the Centralia Middle School Gym from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. She reviewed project participants. The Partnership is staffing a table at the open house.

Ms. Napier reported input from the CBP and Steering Technical Committee (STC) was incorporated within the “Frequently Asked Questions Regarding the Chehalis Basin Partnership” document. She reviewed questions contained within the document, specifically the question pertaining to retention/dams.

Julie Balmelli-Powe arrived at the meeting.

Karen Valenzuela reported Thurston County’s open house in Rochester at Swede Hall was well attended. Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) staff did a good job advertising the open houses. The reverse side of the meeting flyer is printed in Spanish. Ms. Napier agreed WSDOT did an exceptional job organizing the meetings and reaching out to the public.

A discussion on an issue associated with monitoring on the Humptulips River was added to the agenda.

John Penberth said he attended the meeting in Rochester where the PUD supplied information on a dam option, which the PUD supports. The amount of water retained would total 260,000 acre-feet, which is twice the volume in Lake Mayfield. Mr. Penberth said he’s opposed to the dam. Water from the dam traveling down the Chehalis valley could destroy the town of Pe Ell. The dam on the Green River leaks. It’s estimated permitting, construction, and operation and maintenance (O&M) of the Twin Cities dam will cost approximately \$336 million. The dam is 220 feet tall. Property values will decrease in the town of Pe Ell because no one wants to live below a dam.

Update Regarding the Chehalis Basin-wide General Investigation Study

Ms. Napier reviewed a memorandum from Grays Harbor County to the CBP and the Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority (Authority) regarding the Chehalis Basin General Investigation (GI) Study. The Authority is interested in working with the Partnership on the GI Study to add flood damage reduction.

Grays Harbor County, representing the Partnership, is the local non-federal sponsor for the basin-wide Ecosystem Restoration Project. The local sponsor asked U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) to initiate the study in 1999 and signed a Feasibility Cost Share Agreement (FCSA) in 2001. There is federal interest in pursuing a feasibility phase study. The Project Management Plan (PMP) was scoped to identify solutions for ecosystem restoration and reducing flood damage by restoring natural functions within the Chehalis River basin.

Currently, two separate Corps projects/studies are underway in the basin:

- The Twin Cities project which is a site specific project authorized by congress. The local sponsor is Lewis County.
- A basin-wide General Investigation (GI) study with an emphasis on ecosystem restoration. The local sponsor is Grays Harbor County.

In April 2009, the Chair of the Authority asked the Partnership to add flood damage reduction to the basin-wide Ecosystem Restoration Project. The project’s focus changed from a single purpose (ecosystem restoration) to a multi-purpose study with the addition of flood damage reduction.

Terry Willis asked whether the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) study on water connectivity is compatible with the two studies. Ms. Napier replied the basin-wide Ecosystem Restoration Project is a component. A supplement outlining a new purpose with additional partnerships necessitates updating the PMP. That work is considered part of the feasibility study. The PMP is a critical component of the feasibility phase of planning. With clearly defined work tasks, the PMP provides a basis for cost and schedule control of the feasibility study as well as facilitates communications and reviews. The feasibility phase requires a 50/50 federal and non-federal match. For example, if the PUD brings something to the table, it's critical that it's described in the PMP, as well as establishing a relationship with the Partnership during the process.

Discussion ensued on match accrued on behalf of the CBP, such as collection of data by nonfederal funding sources. The Ecosystem Restoration Project is in the feasibility phase of data assessment. The Twin Cities project is approaching 35% design. Ms. Napier referred to the need to identify ecosystem restoration projects during the project management phase. Examples of projects are those contained in the Habitat Work Plan or the barrier assessments. The Authority is developing a draft Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan, which could include another list of projects moving through the feasibility stage to determine those of interest to the Corps for design.

In response to a question from Kahle Jennings, Ms. Napier confirmed that flood risk management also known as flood risk reduction is a new component of the Ecosystem Restoration Project. The Corps is referring to the basin-wide project as a multi-purpose study.

Chris Hempleman commented that it's likely many projects could address both goals.

Mr. Penberth asked about the amount of funding available for ecosystem restoration. Ms. Napier advised that the Corps is funded through congressional appropriations. Last spring, Congress appropriated \$574,000 for the ecosystem project. The funding level will not significantly increase until projects are identified and authorized by congress.

Bob Burkle noted that the Wickett and Preachers Slough projects approved by the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) include flood management elements.

Ms. Valenzuela asked whether the "Chehalis River Basin Feasibility Study," the "Chehalis River Basin Study," and the "Chehalis River Basin Project" is the same study. Ms. Napier clarified that the "Chehalis River Basin Project" is the basin-wide ecosystem restoration and flood risk management project, which is at the feasibility stage.

Ms. Valenzuela asked whether the GI feasibility study is basin-wide or focused on the lower basin in Grays Harbor. Ms. Napier said it's basin-wide and attempts to include the estuary. She acknowledged Ms. Valenzuela's comment.

Mr. Jennings said the Humptulips and Hoquiam Rivers flow directly into the harbor. Ms. Napier advised that the language in the memorandum was taken from the PMP and should be corrected.

Ms. Valenzuela said a fact shared at the Thurston County open house is that the dams are proposed at a location in the basin where only 6% of the water is located and a two-foot difference in flooding is expected.

Ms. Willis emphasized that a two-foot difference in flooding is critical and shouldn't be minimized.

Discussion ensued on whether natural storage components, groundwater storage, and wetland mitigation/enhancements to retain and filter water are under consideration as potential projects. Ms. Napier advised that the Partnership was interested in evaluating aquifer recharge; however, aquifer recharge has not been discussed since the 2007 flood event. USGS is signing an agreement with the Corps to develop a ground/surface water model. The model could assess groundwater storage and surface water interaction. The ecosystem project will also look at other storage options.

Mr. Swartout complimented Ms. Napier on her presentation. The GI issue is complicated. He stressed the importance of ensuring projects are identified in the PMP because projects are not federally funded unless they have completed a GI study.

Ms. Napier reported the PMP must address the following:

- Study tasks and deliverables.
- The estimated cost of individual study tasks and total study cost including the negotiated cost of work items to be accomplished by the local sponsor as in-kind services.
- The schedule of performance and milestones.
- The specific coordination mechanism (interlocal agreements [ILAs]) between parties.
- Procedures for reviewing and accepting the work of the parties to the agreement.

Next steps include completing the update to the PMP, developing and executing ILAs describing the local partnerships, and developing and executing the FCSA. The Authority previously directed the Board Advisory Committee (BAC) to provide input. The PUD and TransAlta will also contribute to the discussions.

Ms. Napier asked for input on whether the STC should work on the project.

Mr. Penberth suggested waiting until the joint agreement is developed and expectations from the parties are identified. Ms. Napier said that information is part of the agreement. Mr. Penberth said the Partnership is not represented on the Authority. Ms. Napier pointed out that CBP members have a seat at the table representing their respective jurisdictions. The Authority does not have a role in the GI study for the basin-wide project. Mr. Penberth said the CBP should have a seat on the Authority particularly if the Partnership is signatory to an agreement. CBP members should not jointly represent their jurisdictions and the Partnership at Authority meetings.

Ms. Willis acknowledged Mr. Penberth's comments. Members of the Authority represent their respective jurisdictions and not the CBP. She proposed having the CBP appoint Ms. Balmelli-Powe to represent the Partnership if the Authority agrees. The appointee would not be a voting member but would have a voice at the table. She indicated she doesn't see a conflict with CBP members also representing their jurisdictions on the Authority.

Mr. Swartout commented that the relationship between the Authority and Partnership is stronger now because of mutual benefits gained from the new GI Study.

Ms. Napier asked for input on whether the STC should to work with the BAC and the Corps to advance the PMP for the basin-wide GI Study. Mr. Swartout added that the STC will review the list of projects and work with member jurisdictions to ensure future projects are incorporated within the list.

Ms. Willis agreed that the STC and BAC should meet and discuss a strategy to update the PMP.

There was general consensus for the STC and the BAC to work together to update the PMP.

Ms. Napier reported she will provide updates on progress. The PMP will provide the basis for cost and schedule control of the feasibility study as well as facilitate communications and reviews. It's likely the first agreement the CBP will see is the one detailing how the Authority and Partnership will work together.

Ms. Napier provided an overview of the September 23 open house held at Montesano City Hall.

Sustainability for Watershed Planning White Paper

Mr. Swartout reported Thurston County works with the Nisqually Watershed Planning Unit. He was under contract to author the "Sustainable Funding for Nisqually Watershed Planning" report. He provided a historical overview of House Bill (HB) 2514 approved by the Legislature in 1998 creating the 1998 Watershed Planning Act (WPA) and the creation of CBP. The legislation establishes the framework to develop local solutions to watershed issues on a watershed basis. The Partnership elected to engage in all four elements of watershed planning involving water quantity for people and fish, water quality, habitat, and instream flows.

The Legislature provided grant funding through DOE to pay for four phases of planning and implementation. Phase IV provides base funding for five years to support watershed plan implementation efforts. At some point, the CBP will not have base funding support from DOE.

Mr. Swartout reviewed the purpose of the WPA, which includes providing local citizens with the maximum possible input in managing local water resources. The issue is how the Partnership moves forward when Phase IV funding expires on June 30, 2011.

Chris Hempleman shared that if the Legislature provides DOE with funding, DOE will competitively allocate implementation funds to viable watershed councils.

Mr. Swartout reviewed special purpose districts for watershed planning including Flood and Drainage Districts, Shellfish Protection Districts, and Aquifer Protection Districts.

A county legislative authority may create a Shellfish Protection District (SPD) with or without the approval of cities. No public vote is required. Because deliverables associated with watershed planning are not necessarily tangible, voters are not likely to vote in favor of a special purpose district. Counties are required to form SPDs when the Department of Health (DOH) closes or downgrades recreational or commercial shellfish growing areas. Thurston County created two SPDs identified as Henderson Inlet and the Nisqually Reach. The Board of County Commissioners (BoCC) approved establishing a fee to pay for a septic system operation and maintenance (O&M) program. Septic systems are split into high and low risk systems with annual assessments of \$96 and \$34, respectively. One initial goal for Henderson Inlet was maintaining status quo water quality conditions. Thurston County met with DOH

last week. DOH is removing all conditional shellfish harvesting areas in the Henderson Inlet watershed. There is no special benefit test in a SPD.

Members discussed shellfish harvesting restrictions in Grays Harbor County and Winter Creek. Mr. Swartout said establishing a SPD is pursued within the watershed experiencing the problem. Counties are not required to assess a fee when forming a SPD. Once a district is created, the legislative authority must develop a report including recommendations to improve water quality.

Discussion ensued on whether it's possible to combine flood and/or drainage districts and aquifer protection districts. Ms. Willis said one of the goals of the Authority is to form a flood district.

Patrick Wiltzius left the meeting.

Mr. Swartout said another option is whether a flood district could assume the work of the Partnership.

Jim Hill arrived at the meeting.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw asked whether a special purpose district could help fund the CBP. Mr. Swartout affirmed that it's possible.

Mr. Swartout said an example of an existing organization involved in watershed planning and formed under the Interlocal Cooperation Act (ICA) is the Hood Canal Coordinating Council (HCCC). The HCCC is a watershed-based council of governments formed in 1985. Early financing of the organization included financial contributions by each governmental member. Currently, the HCCC relies primarily on grants with little financial support from members. The ICA enables jurisdictions to spend up to 10% of water related revenues on watershed management activities through an ILA.

A staff member at Boise State University previously recommended the Partnership form a nonprofit corporation, which is another option. Staff would write and submit grant applications. The Office of State Procurement (General Administration) may enter into an agreement with a public benefit nonprofit corporation enabling nonprofits to purchase products from state contracts at a lower cost.

Mr. Swartout reviewed current and possible organization charts based on the Nisqually River Council (NRC) as a model. The Chehalis River Council (CRC) is a nonprofit organization. The Nisqually River Foundation (NRF) writes grants and provides administrative support to the NRC. One legal issue is whether a public benefit nonprofit corporation can apply for both government and private foundation grants. Typically, nonprofits can only apply for private foundation grants or must have a government sponsor apply for a government grant.

Some concepts include:

- The CBP could evolve into a nonprofit with members serving on the board.
- CBP governance would remain and a nonprofit created to provide administrative and grant writing support to the organization.

Mr. Swartout asked for guidance from the CBP on next steps.

Ms. Balmelli-Powe asked about the timing involved for establishing a nonprofit organization. Mr. Swartout suggested inviting Justin Hall with the NRF and a representative from the HCCC to attend the next Partnership meeting to discuss processes and lessons learned.

Ms. Valenzuela expressed support of Mr. Swartout's suggestion. There is momentum to form a flood district. Another consideration is avoiding duplication of efforts.

Pete Holm reported the CRC is a 501c3 nonprofit corporation. The CRC has acted as the fiscal agency for other entities. It's possible the CRC has a role in the process.

Ms. Willis advised members to exercise caution, carefully evaluate enabling legislation, and consider what could be lost if the CBP was combined with a flood district. Another concern is the perception within the community that the CBP is facing a financial problem and the Partnership will go after the Authority's funds. Members have tried to assure the Authority that is not the case. The Partnership is simply evaluating whether a flood district would benefit the CBP.

Ms. Balmelli-Powe said she would prefer securing government grants to restore the watershed rather than taxing property owners who have endured much during the last several floods.

Mr. Penberth commented that taxpayers create flood districts. Taxes cover maintenance of the infrastructure and not administrative costs. He said he's actively campaigning the Legislature to sunset the CBP because the organization has outlived its usefulness. He referred to a statement by Mr. Swartout whereas local citizens are to have the maximum possible input in managing local water resources and not function simply as a sounding board for the Partnership. The Authority will have difficulty selling flood district funding beyond maintenance of infrastructure. Mr. Swartout said he's not advocating for any one concept and is providing options for members to consider sustainable funding options.

Mr. Jennings said a portion of the payment from customers purchasing power from Bonneville Power helps fund salmon restoration. It's not incomprehensible to think that a flood district and funding could be used for other activities, such as mitigation. A link can be made between the work of the Authority and the CBP. The Legislature sent clear but contradictory messages when it passed the watershed planning act. The Legislature wanted local people to participate in managing water resources, which is a process without an end date. The Legislature funded watershed planning for a limited period of time. Watershed planning units need to identify how to sustain those efforts.

Ms. Valenzuela said good watershed planning includes flood mitigation. She referred to developing a comprehensive approach recognizing the intrinsic values of environmental and economical intact ecosystems that act as large water storage systems decreasing the need for engineered solutions.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw said it would be helpful to understand the pros, cons, and experiences from HCCC and NRF representatives and then work over the next several months on developing a strategy that supports CBP needs.

Ms. Balmelli-Powe commented that from a farmer's perspective, she supports the idea of the public having an opportunity to cooperate with the Partnership. Additionally, the CBP should remain a grassroots organization focused on serving the Chehalis basin.

Mr. Swartout advised that if the Partnership decides that its members would serve as the board of a nonprofit, the board has a direct say on the work performed by the nonprofit.

Members discussed the projected population growth rate within the Chehalis basin.

Mr. Penberth commented that the work of the CBP from its inception has been under the direction of DOE. A nonprofit would be required to comply with state law.

Chair Canaday pointed out that the CBP is not seeking a change in role but potential options for identifying potential funding strategies beyond June 2011.

Mr. Swartout summarized the direction of the Partnership as directing the STC to review the white paper, develop a different ILA enabling jurisdictions to contribute funding (HCCC or LOTT model), research and evaluate nonprofit options, and extending an invitation to HCCC and NRF representatives to share information about their respective organizations.

Chair Canaday asked for continuing updates from the STC.

Ms. Napier shared information on Mr. Swartout's presentation at a statewide watershed workshop on October 22, 2009.

Fiscal Report – Watershed Council Year 2 Grant

Ms. Napier provided an update (and spreadsheet) on the Watershed Council Year 2 Grant. In 2007, the Legislature appropriated a line item in DOE's budget for funding the CBP. Specific projects included planning unit support, the GIS Clearinghouse concept, water quality monitoring, Ecosystem Diagnostic Treatment (EDT) model, and ground-surface water interaction. The last component is not included on the spreadsheet because funding was coordinated directly between DOE and USGS. Based on the Partnership's direction, DOE is managing the ground-surface water interaction project with USGS. The other four components are managed by the Natural Resource Directors at Grays Harbor College.

Ms. Napier reported *Task 1 – Janel Spaulding/Watershed Coordination* currently includes a balance of \$75,000.

Task 2 – Narendran Kodandapani/GIS Clearinghouse includes a balance of \$10,067. Beginning balance was \$60,000. Grays Harbor College discontinued most of its Natural Resources Program and terminated its contract with Mr. Kodandapani at the end of August 2009. The college is unable to host the infrastructure required for the GIS Clearinghouse. It's currently housed at the Public Development Authority. Grays Harbor College is paying Public Development Authority \$300 a month to host the GIS Clearinghouse. At this point, the future of the program is unknown.

Ms. Napier provided information on visitors to the site from March through August 2009. At this point, updates to the program are not possible because of the lack of staff resources.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw expressed disappointment if the clearinghouse is terminated as it took many years of work to develop.

Bob Burkle left the meeting.

Chair Canaday commented that \$300 per month to host the GIS Clearinghouse appears to be excessive. She suggested researching options for other organizations to host the program at a reduced cost.

Discussion ensued on the requirements to host the GIS Clearinghouse. Ms. Napier said she's requested information on the requirements for hosting and maintaining the program, but has been unable to obtain the information from the college. Mr. Jennings suggested contacting the hosting company for more information.

Chair Canaday offered that the City of Centralia's technical staff could contact the host. The Partnership supported the suggestion. She agreed the CBP should retain and maintain the information.

Mr. Holm commented that 100 users is not necessarily a small number as users likely include the Nature Conservancy, Capital Land Trust, and other nonprofits that are developing a unified perspective on the status of the Chehalis basin, which is important.

Ms. Willis said the concern involves problems associated with obtaining hosting specifications from the college.

Task 3 – Don Loft, Joel Green, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation - Water Quality Monitoring is the largest expense. Beginning balance was \$245,000 with \$44,005 remaining. The college hired and assigned a staff person (Director of Natural Resource-first Randy Lehr then Joel Green) to act as the water quality monitoring coordinator. However, the college is not renewing the contract. The college paid for Mr. Green's time to produce the "State of the River Report." An outstanding invoice of \$75,000 is anticipated from the Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation for water quality monitoring activities during 2009. Mr. Loft is also under contract until the end of December 2009. Ms. Napier reported she met with college staff and advised them that there are insufficient funds to cover pending expenditures. Grays Harbor College is responsible for administering the contract on the Partnership's behalf with the tribe, which should be honored. She directed the college to cancel the contract with Mr. Loft because there is insufficient funding available to continue the contract. The original contract was for \$18,000. The intent is saving \$9,000 by canceling the contract during the last quarter of 2009.

Ms. Willis asked how the college exceeded the budget and who had oversight responsibility for ensuring funding was available to meet expenditures. Ms. Napier reported that many people were involved in the management of the grant; however the college staff did not clearly understand where funds were to be expended. Soon after Mr. Green accepted the position with the college, she met to explain the CBP and their expectations related to this appropriation.

Conversation followed on whether remaining funds could be allocated to other tasks.

Task 4 - EDT Model includes a balance of \$50,000. The proposal was acquiring the EDT model and funding a coordinator. Mr. Green did not bill any time against the grant. The CBP previously discussed the program. There is no long-term funding to support the project (annual subscription fees and model administrator). Ms. Napier proposed reallocating the funds to another task. There have been no volunteers to administer the model.

Ms. Holbrook-Shaw said she understands that Jones and Stokes owns the data and provides access to the Partnership. Ms. Napier advised the EDT model was developed by and resides with the contractor. No entity outside the contractor has administered the model.

Mr. Hill said the WDFW utilize the EDT model. Ms. Napier said WDFW expressed interest in administering the model for a fee. Related costs include training users and funding upgrades. Mr. Hill asked about the gain or loss if the CBP elects not to fund the project. Ms. Napier replied that the contract is between DOE and the college. DOE will require justification to reallocate funds necessitating a contract amendment.

Mr. Swartout said the issue before the Partnership is whether to pursue Task 4 or reallocate the funds to another task.

Mr. Jennings said DOE and Grays Harbor College are responsible for making the decision on reallocating funding. He recommended forwarding a message to DOE on the Partnership's concerns with Grays Harbor College administration of funds with a request to DOE to provide a status report to the Partnership.

Members discussed how cost overruns occurred for Task 3 and the roles of the CBP, DOE, and Grays Harbor College.

Ms. Napier said the intent of the briefing was to provide members with an update on the grant and outstanding issues. Mr. Jennings volunteered to assist Ms. Napier and the DOE with follow up tasks.

Possible Agenda Items for the October 23, 2009 Meeting

- Presentation by Earth Economics
- Follow up on the October 22, 2009 watershed lead workshop
- An update on the GI PMP
- Continued discussion on sustainable funding with representatives from the HCCC, NRF, and the CRC

ADJOURNMENT

With there being no further business, Chair Canaday adjourned the meeting at 12:24 p.m.

Summary of Action Items:

Approval of Meeting Summary

Approved the August 28, 2009 Meeting Summary as presented.

Update Regarding the Chehalis Basin-wide General Investigation Study

Directed the STC and the BAC to work together to update the PMP.

Sustainability for Watershed Planning White Paper

Directed the STC to review the white paper and sustainable funding options including developing a different ILA enabling jurisdictions to contribute funding (HCCC or LOTT model), research and evaluate the nonprofit options, and invite HCCC and NRF representatives to brief the Partnership on their respective organizations.

STC to provide updates to the Partnership on a continuing basis.

Fiscal Report – Watershed Council Year 2 Grant

Directed the City of Centralia's technical staff to contact the party hosting the GIS Clearinghouse for specifications.

Mr. Jennings volunteered to assist Ms. Napier and the DOE with follow up tasks.