

**CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP**  
**Chehalis Tribe “Lucky Eagle” Casino**  
**Rochester, Washington**  
**August 28, 2009**  
**9:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.**

**Meeting Summary**

**MEMBERS, ALTERNATES & GUESTS PRESENT**

Mark White, Vice Chair, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation  
Glen Connelly, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation  
Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County (Alternate)  
Kahle Jennings, City of Centralia (Alternate)  
Amy Iverson, Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW)  
Don Loft, Grays Harbor College  
Phil Rupp, Lewis County  
Miranda Plumb, US Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS)  
Julie Balmelli-Powe, Lewis County Farm Bureau  
Janel Spaulding, Grays Harbor College  
Chanele Holbrook-Shaw, Citizen, Thurston County  
Roberta Davenport, Department of Natural Resources (DNR)  
Bill Barmettler, Citizen, Lewis County  
Dave Vasilauskas, City of Chehalis  
Chris Hempleman, Department of Ecology (DOE)

Bill Schulte, Lewis County  
Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County  
Patrick Wiltzius, City of Chehalis (Alternate)  
John Penberth, Citizen, Pe Ell  
Joel Green, Grays Harbor College  
Karen Valenzuela, Thurston County  
Danielle Westbrook, Thurston County  
Bill Goss, US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps)  
Charlotte Danforth, Citizen, Centralia  
Susan Troyanek, Citizen, Centralia  
Ann Wick, Department of Agriculture  
Janet Strong, Chehalis River Land Trust  
Ron Schillinger, City of Montesano  
Dave Rountry, DOE  
John Donahue, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)  
Cindy Burton, USDA, Columbia Pacific RC&D  
Cheri Lindgren, Puget Sound Meeting Services

**GENERAL PARTNERSHIP BUSINESS**

**Welcome, Introductions, and Roundtable Comments**

Vice Chair Mark White called the August 28, 2009 meeting of the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) to order at 9:31 a.m. Everyone present provided self-introductions.

**Discuss and Adopt July 24, 2009 Meeting Summary**

Lee Napier offered the following corrections and/or clarifications to the July 24, 2009 meeting summary:

- Within the attendance section, Charlotte Danforth and Susan Troyanek are citizens of the City of Centralia.
- Related to the “Follow up to Consensus/Operating Procedures Discussion,” she clarified that the Chair was also asked to restate actions at the end of discussions to ensure everyone is aware that the Partnership took an action concerning a specific item.

*Karen Valenzuela arrived at the meeting.*

- Specific to paragraph 5 on page 5, it was not Mr. Hojem’s intent to exclude the public from seeing the budget but rather provide her with direction on who the audience would be when preparing the budget and report documents.

*The minutes of the July 24, 2009 meeting were approved by consensus with the corrections and clarifications recommended by Ms. Napier.*

## **SPECIAL PROJECTS AND PRESENTATIONS**

### **Follow Up Discussion and Input to the Frequently Asked Questions Paper**

Glen Connelly provided an overview on the development of a list of frequently asked questions (FAQ) including a list of questions about the CBP as part of a public outreach tool for the Twin Cities project. A draft list of FAQs was distributed. Public meetings for the Twin Cities project are scheduled on September 16, at Swede Hall in Rochester, September 23, at the City of Montesano, and on September 30, at Centralia Middle School.

*Julie Balmelli-Powe and Bill Schulte arrived at the meeting.*

In response to a question from Patrick Wiltzius, Mr. Connelly said one objective is creating a handout for citizens. FAQ could also be posted on the CBP's website.

Comments from the Partnership included:

- Specific to questions 1 and 6, include text indicating that the Partnership is a nonregulatory organization.

*Miranda Plumb arrived at the meeting.*

- Combine questions 1 and 3.
- Replace "Decions" with "Decisions" in the answer to question 4.

Ms. Napier advised that the Steering Technical Committee (STC) will refine the FAQ list at its September meeting.

- Describe the purpose of the Watershed Management Plan (WMP) and Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP) and the organizations that developed the plans.

Kahle Jennings and Ms. Napier invited members to forward additional comments to Mr. Connelly at [gconnelly@chehalisribe.org](mailto:gconnelly@chehalisribe.org) or their respective representatives on the STC by September 2, 2009.

### **Review and Accept 2009 Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) List of Projects**

Ms. Napier briefed members on the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) and funding process. The Technical Review Committee reviewed projects proposed for funding. She asked the CBP to authorize the Chair to sign Appendix F – Lead Entity List Memorandum – 2009. Grays Harbor County Commissioners will be asked to take the same action on August 31, 2009. The list will be submitted to the SRFB on September 1, 2009. Grants are awarded based on a public competitive process.

Ms. Napier provided additional information on lead entity responsibilities. Based on the Revised Code of Washington (RCW), counties, cities, and tribal governments are to jointly designate the area for which a habitat project list will be developed. That area in this case is the Chehalis watershed consisting of Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIA) 22 and 23. As the lead entity, Grays Harbor County is responsible for

submitting the salmon recovery project list. Technical reviews through the Habitat Work Group (HWG) and review by the citizens committee ensure the best projects are submitted each year:

- Both committees are knowledgeable about watersheds, habitat, and fish conditions.
- Members bring expertise to help ensure strategies and projects are based on science.
- Members provide input as to whether or not the projects and strategies will technically work.
- Citizens committees help to ensure strategies and projects have community support and provide feedback regarding community interests in salmon recovery.

Ms. Napier described Grays Harbor County's process and timeline involving early interaction with project sponsors. Project sponsors submit letters of intent. The review team comprised of Mark Swartout, April Boe, Bob Burkle, Miranda Plumb, Mike Kuttel, Amy Iverson, and Miles Batchelder met with each sponsor and reviewed and ranked projects. The CBP considers the technical recommendation. Grays Harbor County gives final concurrence prior to submitting the projects to the SRFB.

*Phil Rupp arrived at the meeting.*

Ms. Napier reported this year the Coast Region was allocated \$2 million. The lead entities collaborated to determine a funding amount for each of the four lead entities within the Coast Region. Grays Harbor County was awarded \$582,000.

Ms. Napier reviewed the top three salmon recovery projects:

1. **Preacher's Slough Fish Passage.** The project removes approximately 1,400 yards of fill and replaces the barrier with a 120-foot bridge on Preacher's Slough Road. Upon completion of construction activities, the channel will be fully passable to all fish. Hydraulic connection will be restored to seven miles of Preacher's Slough, side channels, and the main stem. In addition to impediments to fish passage and other hydraulic connectivity, Preacher's Slough Road degrades other high ranking habitat features identified in the local strategy, such as large woody debris (LWD) recruitment and water quality. Water sampling at the blockage site found lower water temperature, higher dissolved oxygen, and salinity lower on the side of the barrier open to the river. Removing the barrier will create significant improvement to water quality. The total cost of the project is \$300,000. DNR is requesting \$100,000 from the SRFB. The project sponsor match, along with a contribution from USFWS, totals \$200,000.
2. **Wicket Floodplain Connection/Barrier Removal.** Sponsored by the Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation, the project involves three land parcels owned by the tribe, WDFW, and a private landowner. The grant will restore 120 acres of flood storage in the Chehalis River, establish native riparian vegetation along 0.8 miles of the main stem, and open access to 14 miles of important spawning and riparian habitat along Davis Creek. Construction removes a 1.08-mile dike bordering the Chehalis River on 200 acres of agricultural land recently purchased by the tribe. The sponsor is requesting \$188,000 from the SRFB. The SRFB requires a 15% match, which is met with a \$33,000 contribution. However, the contractor will receive value from the dike material creating a higher local match.
3. **Hoquiam Surge Plain Acquisition – Phase 2.** The SRFB funded Phase 1 of the Hoquiam Surge Plain and acquisition of 714 acres last year. This phase involves the purchase of the remaining 644 acres that includes approximately 10 river miles of high quality surge plain and riparian habitats

within an area with depressed stocks of Hoquiam fall Chinook and Hoquiam winter steelhead. The Cascade Land Conservancy is requesting \$414,450 from the SRFB. The sponsor match is \$907,000.

The three projects total \$702,000. The intent is submitting the list as presented. In the event another lead entity does not expend its total appropriation, the lead entities will work to fill funding gaps. If additional funding becomes available, an alternate project for consideration includes:

4. **China Creek Restoration.** The project involves stream habitat restoration by widening the channel in specific locations and adding LWD, engineering rock bend for streambed gradient control, riparian plantings, and removal of blackberries and reed canary grass. A photo illustrating constraints and conditions of the channel was provided. The funding request is \$56,956. The sponsor match is currently estimated at \$10,300.

A map of the Chehalis Basin and its 11 sub-basins and main stem was presented. The locations of salmonid habitat restoration projects funded to date were highlighted together with projects proposed for the current funding cycle. Since 1999, 44 projects were funded by the SRFB. To date, the SRFB invested approximately \$7 million and project sponsors have contributed \$4 million in match funding.

In response to questions from Terry Willis on a breakdown of the 44 projects, Ms. Napier advised that six were land acquisitions and the remaining projects are barrier corrections, assessments, and riparian planting projects. The SRFB does not rank projects and has a history of honoring the rankings submitted by lead entity organizations. Habitat strategy calls out what actions are important on a sub-basin level. She provided additional information on the criteria favoring good projects and the process.

*Mr. Connelly left the meeting.*

Kahle Jennings asked how the SRFB measures success. Ms. Napier said the agency measures success based on feedback from the community. The SRFB also monitors performance.

Bill Schulte asked how many projects were submitted for the current funding cycle. Ms. Napier replied that 12 letters of intent were submitted, but only nine complete applications were submitted for consideration. Mr. Schulte suggested it would be helpful to receive a list of the nine projects and the criteria used to rank the projects in the future.

Members discussed whether salmon runs have increased based on implementation of projects to date.

Ms. Willis expressed interest in receiving a complete project list to gain a better understanding of phased projects beginning with land acquisition followed by improvements to achieve salmon recovery.

Mr. Schulte advised that restoration projects are planned for the Hoquiam Surge Plain acquisition.

Ms. Napier referred to the value of land acquisitions and factoring that into the cost/benefit analysis.

Mr. Jennings asked if determining whether salmon runs have increased is difficult because of impacts related to floods and oceanic conditions. Joel Green said that ideally, all projects should have a before and after monitoring component to determine the effect of the project on fish. However, monitoring is generally not a high priority. Increasing fish habitat will increase the abundance of fish. However, fish

abundance can be masked by larger scale factors such inter-annual variation based on oceanic conditions, fishing, and habitat.

Ms. Napier reviewed the requested action of authorizing the Chair to sign Appendix F – Lead Entity List Memorandum – 2009, which is due to the SRFB on September 1, 2009.

***The CBP expressed no objections to the Chair signing Appendix F.***

Discussion ensued on next steps and options if Grays Harbor County does not receive the total amount of \$702,450 to complete the three top projects.

### **Watershed Festival Update**

Janel Spaulding provided an update on the Chehalis Watershed Festival scheduled on September 19, 2009 at Morrison Riverfront Park & Rotary Log Pavilion in Aberdeen from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. She described scheduled activities including a basin-wide water taste test, musicians, performers, a salmon bake hosted by the Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation, free long boat sailings, alpacas, a fishing demonstration, and an appearance by the giant salmon, “Fin.” A table is reserved for the CBP. Volunteers are needed to staff the table, as well as assist with set up and take down. A sign-up sheet was distributed to members and guests. This year, a security guard was hired to monitor tents and tables. Proclamations will be issued by each member jurisdiction.

Roberta Davenport reported she is sponsoring a three-hour ecological tour of the surge plain on one of the tall ships on September 17. Seats are available for \$35. Additional information will be forwarded to Ms. Napier and Ms. Spaulding.

Ms. Spaulding provided additional information on the availability of posters advertising the festival and advertising and promotion strategies.

### **Coordinated Water Quality Monitoring Program Update**

Mr. Green reported the coordinated Water Quality Monitoring Program, funded by the DOE, was implemented in fall 2006. The Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation was subcontracted to collect and analyze water samples. Goals of the program include characterizing water quality throughout the Chehalis River basin, identifying transient water patterns in water quality over time and spatially, locations where water quality can be improved, and identifying potential restoration sites.

Data were ranked and graphed using Excel. Sites and land use were mapped using GIS. Result parameters were based on Washington State criteria outlined in the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 173.201A for pH, dissolved oxygen (DO), fecal coliform (FC), turbidity, and temperature.

Mr. Green reviewed rating criteria for each of the water quality parameters. The intent is gauging tendencies or trends in water quality without considering specific violations. The ranking system was established reflecting that if the water quality sample did not meet criteria the following percentage of time, samples were ranked under the following color scheme:

- " 0%-5% = purple
- " 5%-15%=blue
- " 15%-25%=green
- " 25%-35%=yellow
- " 35% plus= red

Salmonids within the Chehalis basin include Chinook and Coho Salmon, Chum, Pink, and Steelhead along with Cutthroat Trout and Char (Bull Trout and Dolly Varden).

The healthy range for pH for fish is 6.5-8.5. Bar charts highlighting pH at sites within WRIAs 22 and 23 were presented. The pH was consistently within the healthy range for fish for all sites. There were several outliers within WRIA 23 involving over 2,000 records. The pH conditions for fish are healthy within the Chehalis River basin.

Salmon and trout require a high level of DO than other fish species. State criterion for salmonid spawning, rearing, and migration is 8 milligrams per liter (mg/l) and 9.5 mg/l for Char spawning and rearing. A chart showing DO levels for all monitoring sites for years 2006-2009 was shared. DO tends to be higher during winter and lower in summer and is largely dependent on water temperature with colder water containing higher levels of DO. DO results for most of the sites in the lower Chehalis basin (WRIA 22) fell within an acceptable range. An exception was Winter Creek in Westport. Ranking based on a percentage of samples below 8 mg/l was presented. Approximately 65% of the samples were below 8 mg/l. A slide highlighting the top six sites with low DO most frequently was provided. Data and ranking for the upper Chehalis basin and the range of DO for those sites were reviewed. The sites that most frequently were less than 8 mg/l included the Black River, and Hanaford, Scatter, Lincoln, and Beaver Creeks. Maps of the sample sites, topography, and land use were provided.

Mr. Green reported fish are not as impacted by higher levels of FC as people are. The FC dataset for all sites for years 2006-2009 was presented, as well as separate datasets and rankings for lower and upper Chehalis basins. Winter Creek is at the top of the list and Ocean Shores Creek was not far behind. The five sites with the highest levels of FC in WRIA 22 include Winter and Ocean Shores Creeks and specific locations on the Hoquiam River, Colloquium Creek, and the Wishkah River. The five sites with the highest levels of FC within WRIA 23 include the Newaukum River, China, Gerard, Lincoln Creeks, and the Skookumchuck River at Tono Road. A map highlighting FC results throughout the Chehalis basin was presented.

Turbidity is a measure of the cloudiness of the water due to suspended solids. Examples of different levels of turbidity were provided. Turbidity clogs fish gills inhibiting respiration. Suspended sediments settle on the bottom of rivers and eventually wash downstream. One consequence is salmon eggs not receiving sufficient oxygen. State criteria regulate the amount of turbidity allowed for activities, which cannot exceed 5 nephelometric turbidity units (NTUs) above the background level before an activity occurred or upstream of an activity. For this study, 7 NTUs was established as the baseline. Higher turbidity levels were found in winter with lower levels in summer. Turbidity data for sample sites was presented. High levels of turbidity can result when the range of samples is less.

Ms. Willis asked whether the graph includes the number of samples taken at each site. Mr. Green advised that the report will include a table with the information.

Sites with the highest turbidity rankings in the upper basin (WRIA 23) included the Sterns, Salzer, and Eaton Creeks, and the Skookumchuck River. Sites with the highest turbidity levels in WRIA 22 include Winter Creek and the west fork of the Satsop River at Cougar Smith Road. A graph illustrating turbidity throughout the Chehalis River basin was provided. Problem areas include Winter and Ocean Shores Creeks, Johns and the Satsop Rivers, and several areas in the Centralia/Chehalis area.

Discussion ensued on the natural occurrence of higher turbidity frequencies in estuaries. It was noted Winter Creek traverses primarily through residential areas.

Mr. Green reviewed a topography map of the west fork of the Satsop River. Characteristics consist of steep slopes and steep sections of creek. A land use map was also provided.

Water temperature was analyzed by season for salmon, trout (Cutthroat, Rainbow, Steelhead), and Char (Bull Trout and Dolly Varden). A graph illustrating how temperature changed over time was presented. Temperatures are higher in summer and decrease in winter. It appears fish encounter more difficulty during summer months with more samples not meeting the criterion. During winter month most of the samples fell within the healthy range. The period for fall, winter, spring salmon, and trout spawning runs from September 16 to June 14. For the report, the timeframe was modified to September 1 to May 31. Samples were collected from the sites monthly. Chinook salmon begin spawning in July and most trout have completed spawning by the end of May. Pacific Salmon and Char spawn in the fall. Trout spawn in spring. The fall, winter, and spring seasons had a temperature criterion of 13 degrees. Most of the monitoring sites fell within the highest and second best quality ranges.

A ranking of the sites in both the lower and upper watersheds was provided, as well as an evaluation of the summer period between June 1 and August 31 to ensure valid comparisons of monitoring sites. A map of the sites indicates more sites are falling within the "red" zone. Mr. Green reviewed rankings for summer for both WRIAs 22 and 23.

Temperatures were evaluated for the Char, Bull Trout, and Dolly Varden. A graph revealed rearing temperatures for Char at 12 degrees and spawning in fall of 9-10 degrees. Data reveals difficulty for Char during summer months. Habitat within the Chehalis River basin is limiting. Many of the samples fell within the "red" zone. Data suggests water temperature is not sufficiently lower at the beginning of the spawning period in September and October. November is the best month for spawning. Sample sites didn't include smaller streams with colder temperatures. At least 15% of the samples did not meet temperature criteria for Bull Trout primarily because of the summer season. A ranking for WRIAs 22 and 23 was presented. A spawning map reveals most sites pose problems for spawning during September and October. Some sites are good in November. Good habitat for Char can be found in the Humptulips and Satsop Rivers, and Scatter Creek. It's important to protect habitat in the Chehalis River basin. Char prefer colder temperatures. Char are now extinct in northern California and are classified as threatened under the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. Loft advised that a map of the sites and the number of records for each site will be uploaded to the GIS Clearinghouse later in the day. More records are needed over the next several years to provide a clearer picture, particularly for temperature.

Ann Wick asked that the dataset for the Black River include a breakout of surrounding residential and agriculture land uses.

Mr. Green responded to questions on how to access the report. The report includes water quality monitoring data and will be available on CBP's website within the next several months. Members were asked to follow up with Ms. Napier for more information on accessing data. The map can be accessed through the GIS Clearinghouse at [www.graysharborcollege.edu](http://www.graysharborcollege.edu)

Ms. Spaulding clarified that the report will be posted on the Partnership's website. All water quality data will be available on the Grays Harbor College GIS Clearinghouse site and displayed in a map format.

Ms. Willis expressed concerns about having to visit two sites to obtain the information. Mr. Green acknowledged the concern and indicated a direct link from the CBP website to the GIS would be beneficial.

Karen Valenzuela suggested also including a link within the report as well.

Ron Schillinger referred to the significant progress achieved on the Coordinated Water Quality Monitoring project and meeting some of the goals within the Watershed Management Plan.

Ms. Napier advised that Grays Harbor College is scaling back its Natural Resource Program and will no longer coordinate the water quality component or GIS Clearinghouse.

Ms. Spaulding reported the Water Quality Committee (WQC) discussed possible ways to continue funding for the Water Quality Monitoring Program. The Watershed Council Year 2 grant expires on December 31, 2009. The Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation will continue collecting data from 95 monitoring sites for the next six months. The Partnership owns seven long-term monitoring probes, which the tribe will also maintain. The issue before the Partnership is whether it wants to continue the Water Quality Monitoring Program and, if so, how it's funded. WQC members discussed some funding options:

- Ask members about the potential for cities, counties, and state agencies to assist in funding for the program.
- Ask businesses and/or organizations to sponsor monitoring sites.
- Applications for a new grant cycle with the DOE for fiscal year 2011 opens September 1, 2009 and closes December 1, 2009.

Questions for the Partnership from the WQC include:

- Who will coordinate the effort and identify funding alternatives?
- What elements should be factored into the program?

In response to a comment from Mr. Schulte about considering the organization's budget and priorities before making a decision, Ms. Napier clarified that there is no budget available to continue this program beyond 2009.

Discussion ensued on forming a subcommittee to evaluate funding options. Ms. Willis commented that now is not a good time for cities, counties, and state agencies to help fund the program because of current budget constraints.

Mr. Wiltzius advised members that the CBP cannot afford to fund data analysis but should continue to collect data. WQC members wanted to bring the issue to the Partnership for consideration, as it's unlikely the committee can spearhead the effort on its own.

Chanele Holbrook-Shaw asked about the link between water quality monitoring data that could inform future U.S. Army Corps of Engineer projects. Ms. Napier referred to the work to develop a project management plan. The concept proposed by Ms. Holbrook-Shaw could be explored. However, it must fit within the confines of the Corps program.

John Penberth asked about what's required by regulatory agencies in terms of water quality monitoring. He suggested that if DOE is the regulatory agency, DOE should fund the program. The Partnership doesn't have the staff or time to research funding opportunities. Government agencies are experiencing budget shortfalls. He commented positively on the work completed to date.

Mr. Schillinger reported that Mr. Loft completed part of the work to satisfy his master thesis requirements.

In response to a question from Mr. Schillinger on funding, Mr. Loft said his position with Grays Harbor College is funded through December 2009. He described the next steps for the Water Quality Monitoring Program.

Mr. Green said his position is funded through September 15, 2009 to complete the report. Mr. Loft will be available until the end of the year for additional water quality analysis, GIS Clearinghouse, and mapping products. There is no funding allocated beyond December 31, 2009.

#### **Follow Up Report Card/Budget Reporting Request – Fiscal Report – Watershed Council Year 2 Grant**

Ms. Napier distributed a CBP work plan for state fiscal year July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011. The beginning budget column does not reflect current balances. The work plan is a tool to track the Partnership's work. She provided an overview of grants, associated tasks, and budgets:

- **WRIA Phase 4, Year 4 out of 5 from DOE.** The grant funds general operations of the Partnership. The amount of the grant is \$125,000 for years 1-3. The allocation was reduced to \$62,500. An important deliverable is funding another edition of *Drops of Water*.
- **Watershed Council Year 1 (Legislative Appropriation 1).** A \$75,000 line item was included in DOE's budget this year. The grant was initiated in 2006. Funds were used to develop outreach tools and hosting the Watershed Festival. Ms. Napier proposed using the balance of approximately \$36,000 for Ms. Spaulding's salary rather than to fund the Watershed Festival.
- **Watershed Council Year 2 (Legislative Appropriation 2).** Support staff was needed for watershed coordination. An appropriation of \$75,000 is reserved through the contract with Grays Harbor College to pay for Ms. Spaulding's time. Other tasks under the grant include the GIS Clearinghouse and assessing long-term water quality trends in the Chehalis Basin. Nothing has been billed against acquiring the data and administering the Ecosystem Diagnostics Treatment (EDT) model because there is no one to administer the model. DOE is contracting with USGS on the Partnership's behalf to analyze the connection between river flow and groundwater levels (\$130,000 of the \$560,000 legislative allocation). Data collection began in 2007 during the low flow period. USGS is collecting data. Data will be incorporated into the decision support tool (DST) negotiated through the General Investigation (GI) Study with the Corps.
- **Planning Unit Support from DOE.** The \$54,000 grant was used to pay for Ms. Spaulding's time. An opportunity for another \$30,000 is available once the grant is expended, which will require a 50% match.
- **Lead Entity Operation.** The \$55,000 grant includes a contract between Grays Harbor County and the Resource Conservation Office. The money covers the time it takes to develop the SRFB project list.

The end date for the Planning Unit Support grant should be June 30, 2010 rather than June 30, 2009. Ms. Napier reported the current balance is \$23,000. It's expected that the balance will be expended by the end of October. At that point, Grays Harbor County will shift up to the \$75,000 Watershed Council Year 2 legislative appropriation.

Ms. Valenzuela asked whether the entire \$560,000 legislative appropriation will be spent by the end of the year. Ms. Napier advised that Grays Harbor County will work with DOE to extend the contract date to June 30, 2010 for the remaining balance.

Mr. Jennings suggested noting remaining balances in "parentheses."

Ms. Napier distributed samples of a grant worksheet and Form B1. Grays Harbor County staff routinely uses the grant worksheet to track grant amounts/amendments, totals billed, and balances. Form B1, submitted quarterly, provides additional detail and is a running budget summary for projects with interlocal costs and/or other in-kind contributions. Project elements consist of salaries, benefits, contracts, travel, equipment, goods/services, other, and match. DOE requires a 10% match before Grays Harbor County is fully reimbursed for project components. The STC discussed a reporting format and developed the work plan document. The STC believe the Partnership would likely want copies of the grant worksheet summary on a quarterly basis.

Mr. Schulte asked whether the CBP and/or Grays Harbor County are audited. Ms. Napier replied that Grays Harbor County is audited annually and can include grants administered by the county on behalf of other entities.

Ms. Napier responded to questions related to budget and eligible cumulative element costs contained on Form B1.

Mr. Jennings expressed a preference for the grant worksheet format along with a column showing remaining balances rather than the detail contained in Form B1.

Mr. Schulte said he'd appreciate more detail to determine whether other funding streams could be reallocated to other programs. Mr. Jennings pointed out that each grant is separate and a reallocation requires renegotiating a contract. Ms. Napier reiterated that funding for the Water Quality Monitoring Program expires at the end of the year. There is no other resource at this time available to fund the work.

Discussion ensued on strategies used to secure funding from the Legislature for the last two years, sustainable funding, and how in-kind contributions are calculated and tracked. In response to the latter, Ms. Napier described how in-kind contributions are totaled quarterly, which are then included in the cumulative costs on Form B1.

Mr. Schulte asked whether the Partnership has a grant writer. Ms. Napier advised not at this time. Grant opportunities are reported to the CBP. If directed by the Partnership, staff completes and submits grant applications. Mr. Schulte commented that many grants require a local match.

Mr. Schillinger concurred with Mr. Penberth's previous statements.

Chris Hempleman commented that DOE's budget is also constrained. DOE does not require water quality monitoring unless it's associated with a permit or a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Study requirement. She encouraged members to research grant opportunities and compete for grants.

Dave Rountry advised that the best case the CBP could make for additional funding is documenting the products and outcomes for the work funded through grants.

Ms. Schillinger suggested informing legislators about the Partnership's work products and outcomes.

Ms. Hempleman referred to the concept of watershed planning units approaching the Legislature collectively.

Members discussed the initial legislative intent for watershed planning funding.

**Agenda Items for the September 25, 2009 Meeting**

- Report from the STC on sustainable funding

**ADJOURNMENT**

With there being no further business, Vice Chair White adjourned the meeting at 12:13 p.m.

**Summary of Actions Items:**

Approval of Meeting Summary

Approved the July 24, 2009 Meeting Summary as amended.

Review and Accept the 2009 SRFB Project List

The CBP expressed no objections to the Chair signing Appendix F – Lead Entity List Memorandum – 2009

Input and Direction Regarding the FAQ Document

Members were asked to forward additional comments to Mr. Connelly on the FAQ document at [gconnelly@chehalisribe.org](mailto:gconnelly@chehalisribe.org) or contact their respective representatives on the STC by September 2, 2009

Direction and Input Regarding the Water Quality Monitoring Program

Members discussed the Water Quality Monitoring Program and the need to identify another funding source to continue the program.

Input Regarding the Format to Report Fiscal Status

Members reviewed fiscal status reporting formats and provided input.