

CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP
Chehalis Tribe “Lucky Eagle” Casino
Rochester, Washington
July 24, 2009
9:30 a.m.

Meeting Summary

MEMBERS, ALTERNATES & GUESTS PRESENT

Bonnie Canaday, Chair, Mayor Pro Tem, City of Centralia
Mark White, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis
Reservation
Glen Connolly, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis
Reservation
Art Lehman, Port of Centralia
Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County (Alternate)
Kahle Jennings, City of Centralia (Alternate)
Amy Iverson, Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife
Don Loft, Grays Harbor College
Phil Rupp, Lewis County
Miranda Plumb, US Fish and Wildlife Service
Chanele Holbrook-Shaw, Citizen, Thurston County
John Kleim, Creative Community Solutions
Bill Barmettler, Citizen of Lewis County
Cindy Burton, US Department of Agriculture
Chris Hempleman, Department of Ecology (DOE)

Bill Schulte, Lewis County
Lyle Hojem, Citizen, Lewis County
Terry Harris, City of Chehalis
Chuck Caldwell, Port of Grays Harbor
Joel Green, Grays Harbor College
Chris Stearns, Thurston County PUD
William Gow II, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Debbie Holden, Creative Community Solutions
Karen Valenzuela, Thurston County
April Boe, The Nature Conservancy
Mark Swartout, Thurston County (Alternate)
Bill Goss, US Army Corps of Engineers
Charlotte Danforth, City of Centralia
Susan Troyanek, City of Centralia
John Donahue, Washington State Department of
Transportation

GENERAL PARTNERSHIP BUSINESS

Welcome, Introductions and Roundtable Comments

Chair Bonnie Canaday called the July 24, 2009 meeting of the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) to order at 9:35 a.m. Everyone present provided self-introductions.

Discuss and Adopt Draft Meeting Summary for June 26, 2009

The minutes of the June 26, 2009 were approved by consensus.

SPECIAL PROJECTS AND PRESENTATIONS

Follow up to Consensus/Operating Procedures Discussion

Lee Napier referred to Jim Hill’s request to follow up on the previous discussion pertaining to the committee’s operating procedures and consensus actions. The request is to consider a change in the operating procedures to clarify actions and how the consensus of the committee is achieved. Additionally, each meeting summary could include a summary of actions considered and acted on by the committee for easier tracking of actions by the Partnership.

Chair Canaday said summarizing the outcome of actions would be helpful to members. Ms. Napier advised that the minutes from this point forward will include a summary list of actions taken during the meeting.

Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP) Update

Report on the Draft DIP Amendment

Ms. Napier referred to last month's overview of the workshops in May to update the Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP). When the DIP was developed, the initial intent was updating the plan every two years. Within the DIP, there are five DIP strategies. DIP #2 on recommending adequate funding level for water resource management was the focus of this year's update. Essentially, the strategy was designed as Watershed Facilitator's work plan for 2009/2010. The work plan involves the interim milestone focusing on developing an education and outreach work plan for soliciting funding. That milestone served as the foundation for the job description of the Watershed Facilitator.

Ms. Napier introduced John Kleim, Creative Community Solutions, who provided a presentation on the products from the workshops held in May. The education and outreach stakeholders were invited to attend the workshops to build cooperative relationships among education and outreach community members as well as creating a two-year action plan for all education and outreach organizations working in the Chehalis Basin. The workgroups identified seven tasks to enhance DIP 2.2, Implement an Education and Outreach Plan for the Chehalis Basin:

- Milestone 2.2 (1) – Public Relations and Outreach Activities via Networking Events:
 - Web-share through established internet services
 - Appoint staff or volunteer as dedicated web coordinator
 - Web-share through established internet services

- Milestone 2.2 (2) – Changing Attitudes & Perceptions using Basin-wide Slogan & Mascot:
 - Design Chehalis Basin slogan, pick mascot
 - Develop an ad campaign
 - Develop in-house strategy/plan for message delivery

- Milestone 2.2 (3) – Better Communications with Public and Agencies: Tourist Guide:
 - CBP Calendar of events, map, watershed facts, interactive community tips & photos
 - Make available on-line

- Milestone 2.2 (4) – Distribution of Information through Community Newspapers & Other Publications:
 - Writer and designer training
 - Workshop to identify leaders and resources
 - Letter campaign to legislators

- Milestone 2.2 (5) – Public Workshops & Student Camps:
 - High school senior & school project mentor training workshop
 - Watershed Steward Certification training
 - School volunteer and community member watershed education workshop
 - Day camps at Alder Creek, Cispus & County Extension
 - High school job training at summer Watershed Leadership Program Camp

- Milestone 2.2 (6) – Organizing Volunteers via Centralized Database:
 - Organize volunteer database
 - Hire coordinator for basin-wide education & outreach

- ID volunteer roles, tasks, job descriptions
- Recruit volunteers
- Milestone 2.2 (7) – Workshops Promoting Education & Outreach with Landowners:
 - Promote current events
 - Annual recognition awards
 - Annual symposiums showcasing achievements
 - Landowner workshops featuring natural resources focus (farm, ag, backyard stewards)

Ms. Spaulding will work on the work plan focusing on the seven tasks.

Lyle Hojem asked about the identity of the evaluator of the program, how the funds will be expended, and tracking and recording the work. The issue is whether the Partnership is expending its funds effectively to ensure the Partnership is receiving value.

Kahle Jennings acknowledged the importance of the questions. One example is the initiation of a Centralia Stream Team through the City's stormwater program. Students from the Aberdeen area involved in a senior project volunteered to clean up China Creek as well as post signs on dumping. They worked on the project for several days to fulfill senior project requirements. One of the students expressed interest in forming a stream team in Aberdeen to work on local issues in that area. The City was also contacted by some Longview volunteers who expressed interest in working on a project because of Centralia's efforts. They've requested assistance in organizing as a group. There are projects underway because of expenditure of funds. Those projects need to be documented to ensure the dollars expended reflect that there has been value and favorable impacts.

Ms. Napier added that the stream team began voluntarily. The team applied for a grant from DOE. The grant included a contract containing performance measures. There are several ways to evaluate stream team efforts through volunteer hours and contribution of materials as well as measurements through the grant contract.

Bill Schulte asked about the budget for the tasks. Mr. Kleim said the groups are beginning planning efforts on each of the action items.

Mr. Hojem said his concern pertains to how grants are expended and how value is determined in the expenditure of those funds. Ms. Napier said each proposal involves a scope of work. The partnership provides input on the proposals. If successful, a contract is negotiated, which includes measures for deliverables and outcomes. The Partnership has the opportunity to review the work product and provide feedback.

Chris Hempleman said many of the grants are through DOE, which are reviewed and evaluated. In terms of education and outreach, it's rarely evaluated effectively. Previous research often reveals that those efforts, although they appear to be effective, are really not accomplishing behavior changes. She suggested the groups need to meet on an annual or semi-annual basis and discuss how to evaluate the effectiveness of their efforts. One example is determining whether landowners are really incorporating best management practices that are making a difference.

Mr. Jennings commented on the concept of a “report card” or an annual report of accomplishments, and suggested the Partnership might consider an annual report card on annual accomplishments. Mr. Hojem agreed an annual report card would be helpful.

Mark Swartout pointed out that the Partnership does not frequently receive information on the Partnership’s budget, source of revenue, work items, and the timeline. There are multiple revenue sources, which can be confusing. Ms. Napier said a work plan was developed for each task along with the assigned grant. The information includes the grant name, tasks, budget, and the timeline, which was presented to the Steering Technical Committee (STC). The information can also be distributed to the Partnership. Mr. Swartout suggested developing an annual report from the work plans for presentation to the Partnership annually.

Terry Harris suggested that the Partnership needs a budget reflecting revenue source and amount and expenditures. Ms. Napier offered to provide an easier to read budget document.

Mr. Harris questioned how the information on different tasks will be disseminated to the public and how the public is aware the information is available. Mr. Kleim said another element of the work involves establishing a website. All the tasks are slated to occur but will involve planning efforts. As the projects/programs develop, measures can be included to gauge the effectiveness of each program’s outcomes.

Members offered comments. It was noted volunteers contribute to projects in terms of cleanup and improving the quality of creeks and streams within the basin, which defines the value of those projects. Volunteer hours are tracked and those hours can be used as a match to grants.

Ms. Napier asked members to provide feedback and determine whether to add the tasks to the DIP to serve as the 2009 update. Mr. Schulte asked about the budget for the program. Ms. Napier said that typically, a budget is not included in the DIP.

Mr. Harris questioned the intent and outcome of Watershed Steward Certification training. Ms. Napier replied that the training is an element of the study camps through the Pacific Education Institute. During the camp there is completion of a project involving an established curriculum for achieving certification as a watershed steward.

Mr. Schulte questioned why the DIP doesn’t include a budget. Ms. Napier explained that the DIP is a work plan intended to generate discussion, planning, and finally implementation actions. Certain tasks are called out in the DIP. Initially, when the DIP was developed, there was tremendous involvement and input. However, when leadership was needed on the different actions, there were problems with people committing to pursuing the actions, developing a timeline, and establishing a budget. However, by defining actions, publishing the actions, and pursuing networking efforts, it was soon discovered that there are people who are willing to take the lead in implementing some of the actions. It’s important to articulate what the groups need in order to make advances.

Mr. Harris described how the DIP is basically a wish list/living document with ongoing additions and subtractions. Many of the reasons for eliminating some actions are financing or it’s too costly for the outcome. It’s difficult to attach a budget when the Partnership doesn’t have any idea from year to year what funds will become available.

Mr. Schulte said he’s confused as the plan is referred to as a Detailed Implementation Plan. Ms. Napier said the document title is prescribed in legislation. Mr. Kleim suggested considering the document as a

placeholder where many people have many ideas. The document should be viewed as a conversation piece for initiating community conversations on different projects. Inclusion of the tasks will assist the Partnership in initiating outreach and education efforts. The seven milestones have been generally described as well as what the desired outcome will be. The groups' next steps will involve determining specifics on moving forward and designing the project.

April Boe said documenting the tasks assists individuals and agencies in obtaining grants. Having a plan makes it easier to obtain grants. Ms. Napier and Mr. Jennings commented on the importance of having the plans documented especially when contacting legislators to seek funding support. The Partnership has been successful in obtaining funds from the Legislature. It's up to each member to look within their respective agency/organization to consider what can be contributed in accomplishing some of the goals. Mr. Harris agreed with the importance of each organization considering how it can contribute financially to the basin.

Ms. Boe shared that having the plan enabled her organization to secure \$300,000 in grants for on-the-ground projects from state and federal sources. Plans enable agencies to move forward in seeking funding from various sources.

Miranda Plumb agreed it's important because the grant documents specifically request information on plans. Additionally, a lot of time is funded by other agencies through the work of its employees on different projects.

Mr. Hojem said his reason for addressing the issue was not to establish a budget for the public but for the Partnership to receive a report so that members know what the funds are buying and how the funds are expended. It's important for members to know how the funds are expended and whether it's occurring correctly and benefitting the basin.

Mr. Swartout provided some historical perspective on the Partnership's work over the last nine years. The CBP spend four to five years developing the Watershed Plan, which included upwards of 50 actions to help manage water resources within the Chehalis Basin. By statute, the CBP was required to prepare a DIP. The DIP is basically a skeleton where details/tasks are added, changed, or removed. An entire meeting was spent discussing the difficulty of groups progressing from planning to implementation. The difficulty in going from a planning model to a business model is in obtaining revenues to implement the DIP. The CBP is currently fluctuating between the two. The CBP took an action item on the education and outreach element and in May agreed to expend resources on detailing the tasks for implementing the tasks. However, the CBP did not approve moving forward on the tasks, which will involve applying for grants and determining the amount of funding needed to complete those tasks.

Ms. Napier referred to current DIP Interim Milestone 2.2, Develop an Education and Outreach Work Plan for Soliciting Funding. Four tasks are associated with the milestone. The proposal before the group today would replace the four current milestones with the seven tasks. Mr. Kleim added that during the workshops, he asked participants to identify the next steps for moving forward to aid in the preliminary discussions on each of the tasks. Ms. Napier said the cost of the tasks are minimal in comparison to the other milestones because of the opportunity to leverage resources, which is one of the reasons why so many people were interested in pursuing education and outreach as part of the DIP to ensure implementation activities continue.

By consensus, the CBP approved the amendment to the DIP to add seven tasks to Interim Milestone 2.2.

Mr. Harris proposed involving all schools in the basin within the student camp program.

Present and Discuss CBP Website

Debbie Holden, Creative Community Solutions, presented the CBP website. She reviewed information contained on the website:

- Home Page
- Membership
- About the Chehalis Basin
- Education and Outreach and Getting Involved (under development)
- *Drops of Water* publication (under development)
- Technical Assessments & Reports
- Salmon Recovery (will be changed to: Grays Harbor County Lead Entity)
- Watershed Plan
- Information Links
- Calendar of Events
- CBP Organization

General topic information included on the website includes salmon, water quality, river flow, watershed, and flooding. Each user's internet browser determines how the user returns to the site when accessing links. If visitors continue to encounter problems, the issue will be revisited to improve how users return to the site when using a link. All domain names were purchased including Chehalisbasinpartnership.org, net, and com. The website is hosted through Grays Harbor County. Most of the documents are in PDF format. Any document not in PDF format will link to another website. User-friendly terminology is included as well as simplifying the website for ease of use. The website models existing websites including Marine Resources Committee and the Lead Entity website. Janel Spaulding is responsible for updating the website.

Ms. Holden provided a live demonstration of the website.

Chair Canady questioned the reason for changing *Salmon Recovery* to *Grays Harbor County Lead Entity*. Ms. Napier said the program is titled Grays Harbor County Lead Entity.

Chair Canady offered a suggestion of expanding the width of the website to reduce the amount of necessary scrolling by the user.

Karen Valenzuela referred to the change in the title and indicated *Lead Entity* is a fairly bureaucratic term that might be confusing to citizens. Ms. Napier said the focus is on the Chehalis Basin and salmon habitat restoration. Mr. Jennings suggested substituting *Salmon Habitat Restoration* and including a subheading of *Grays Harbor County Lead Entity*.

Mr. Jennings suggested including "Report Card" or "Success Stories" as a sidebar documenting the Partnership's successes. Ms. Holden advised that Ms. Spaulding is currently working on the *Education and Outreach* page, which could include successes. Ms. Napier invited members to provide feedback when the page is released. Ms. Holden advised members of a quick trick to expand the size of the webpage by pushing the "control" key on the computer keyboard as the user rolls the mouse wheel. That option enables users to zoom in and out.

Ms. Plumb referred to the Chehalis Fisheries Restoration Program, which began in 1993. She said she is currently evaluating and documenting the success of the program over the last 20 years. She offered to provide a presentation at the end of year on what's been accomplished in the program in terms of funding and salmon recovery.

Chair Canaday suggested including a distribution email list of potential volunteers.

It was noted that Ms. Spaulding is working on a Google calendar listing events and activities of organizations working within the basin.

Ms. Napier updated members on the USGS project, which is moving forward in the next step of data collection. She provided a copy of a press release from USGS informing citizens of its work within the basin collecting information as well as a summary of the scope of work. The project relates to actions in the Watershed Management Plan in terms of understanding hydraulic continuity as well as in the DIP.

Follow up Discussion regarding Clarifying Roles and Responsibilities of the Chehalis Basin Partnership and the Flood Authority

Ms. Napier distributed several versions of charts depicting the respective roles and shared responsibilities between the CBP and the Flood Authority. Members of both organizations have expressed interest in clarifying the roles and responsibilities. The CBP was the first organization to review the schematic drawing, which was prepared by the Flood Authority's consultant; ESA Adolfson. The CBP reviewed the schematic at its last meeting. At that time, respective roles and share responsibilities would best be clarified by calling out tasks in the Watershed Plan or the Flood Authority's draft Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan. The CBP indicated there appears there is conflicting information in the way the information was presented.

Additionally, the CBP received a diagram from Terry Willis. Ms. Willis was asked to present to the Grays Harbor Farm Bureau about the roles and responsibilities of the two groups. In addition to feedback from the Partnership in June, the membership stressed the importance of keeping the diagram simple. The third version was developed by the Flood Authority's Board Advisory Committee with a change reflecting "Areas of Cooperation" between the two organizations and a listing of each organization's mission, enabling legislation, and an accomplishment. The third version was presented to the STC and the Water Quality Committee at its June joint meeting, which revised the chart to include information on, "Who are they", "What Do They Do?", and "How Do They Cooperate?" with enabling legislation, membership, mission, accomplishment, meeting information, website address, and areas of cooperation centered in the middle of the chart.

The Flood Authority reviewed the last version and agreed it's a useful tool to help clarify roles and responsibilities. Additionally, the Partnership has been asked to attend the public outreach meetings for the Twin Cities project to discuss activities occurring within the Chehalis Basin.

Mr. Hojem said Ms. Willis conveyed the importance of including information on the citizen group, *One Voice*.

Ms. Valenzuela reported she was invited to speak to the Thurston County Farm Bureau about flooding in south Thurston County and what the county plans to do to address flooding. She indicated the information will be helpful to her during that meeting.

Feedback included:

- Eliminate “including flooding” under enabling legislation for the CBP.
- “Areas of Cooperation” should include a fourth item pertaining to “Address flooding issues.” One member suggested the addition of the fourth item is not necessary as “manage water” item 2 under “Areas of Cooperation” covers that element.
- CBP should look at alternatives to control stormwater runoff by creating buffers, utilizing bioswales, and rain gardens. Controlling flooding within the basin is an area of concern of both organizations.
- Members shared varying opinions about the CBP’s role in flooding. Many members acknowledged that the CBP serves as a forum to address issues of flooding while not directly involved in any flooding projects. Members discussed the importance of including clarifying language with the goal of not confusing the public in terms of both organizations’ role in dealing with flooding. “Managing water” should be clarified to reflect what type of water. Flooding needs to be addressed to reflect that both organizations are working in cooperation on the flooding issue.
- Some members suggested that the inclusion of *One Voice* in the diagram is not necessary. Members discussed the inclusion and agreed the purpose of the diagram is defining the responsibilities and areas of overlaps between the two organizations. Members agreed not to include *One Voice* as the goal of the document is clarifying the differences between the two entities.

Members discussed whether to include flood issues and how it should be included. Mr. Hojem said the Flood Authority’s responsibility is flooding, which is why it shouldn’t be included within the “Areas of Cooperation.” He suggested including it within the section pertaining to the Chehalis Basin Partnership reflecting cooperation with the Flood Authority in its flood authority. Mr. Schulte acknowledged the comment and suggested it would be better addressed within the “Areas of Cooperation” as the CBP is not looking at flood mitigation but at flood related issues, such as water quality, how it effects different tributaries, etc., so that the CBP can provide information. They are issues that will be considered when flood mitigation is addressed. The CBP is already providing information to the Flood Authority on flooding issues. Retaining it with the “Areas of Cooperation” captures where both entities are working together. Mr. Green agreed it should be included in “Areas of Cooperation.” He cited the preservation of the Hoquiam River surge plain as an example of protecting habitat and as a way to reduce the effects of flooding.

After further discussion and exchange of opinions, members agreed by consensus to eliminate, “including flooding” within the first paragraph under the Chehalis Basin Partnership and adding item #4 under “Areas of Cooperation” stating, “4. Addressing flood related issues.”

Present Concept of Developing a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) Document

Ms. Napier referred to the development of the frequently asked questions and introduced Glen Connolly, who led the discussion. Mr. Connolly reported that as part of his role on the Board Advisory Committee, he volunteered to attend the state team working on the Twin Cities project, which includes a communications team that is part of the public outreach component. In preparation of the open houses, a list of frequently asked questions (FAQs) was suggested for citizens. He suggested it might be beneficial to include a list of questions about the CBP as part of the outreach tool.

Ms. Valenzuela expressed support for developing a FAQ to distribute during the meetings.

Mr. Connolly asked members to provide feedback to him electronically on possible questions to include. The FAQ can be included on the CBP's August agenda for review. Ms. Napier advised that she'll send out the list of questions that have been compiled to date.

Introduce White Paper "Sustainability Funding".

Mr. Swartout referred to a white paper on "Sustainable Funding for the Nisqually Watershed Planning." The Nisqually Indian Tribe is the lead agency for watershed planning within the Nisqually watershed. The tribe contracted with Thurston County to develop the white paper. Both the CBP and the Nisqually Planning Units are entering the fourth year of the Phase 4 grant funding with only one year of funding remaining. Funding for the fourth year is half of what it was the first three years. Following the fifth year at the reduced rate, no other funding is anticipated under the Phase 4 Grant Program.

The CBP has discussed the issue over the last several years on the next steps for financing the implementation of the Watershed Plan as well as the management structure of the organization. What's not included in the paper is more information about nonprofits and its role in providing administrative support and funding. The CBP previously discussed creating a nonprofit organization for securing grants for implementation of the Watershed Plan and for providing administrative support to the Partnership. He asked members to consider directing the STC to frame the questions for the next and future meetings on ways to approach the issue.

Mr. Harris suggested the CBP should revisit the issue of forming a nonprofit as a way of securing funding.

Mr. Swartout framed the issue as to whether the CBP wants to continue as an organization after July 1, 2011, and if so, how should it be funded. With no objection from membership, Mr. Swartout confirmed the STC will develop a framework for future discussion by the CBP on ways to address the organization's future.

Agenda Items for August 28, 2009 Meeting

- Review and approve the 2009 Salmon Recovery Funding Board List of Projects due September 1, 2009. The review team is evaluating the project list on August 14, 2009
- Review of some project accomplishments both proposed and completed by Miranda Plumb
- Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document review.
- Report from STC on Sustainability Funding

OTHER BUSINESS

Chanele Holbrook-Shaw reported on the first fundraiser for the Heernett Foundation scheduled on August 8, 2009, at the Hub City Club in Centralia, which will include music and a live auction from 7:00 p.m. to midnight.

ADJOURNMENT

With there being no further business, Chair Canady adjourned the meeting at 11:56 a.m.

Action Items:

Approval of Meeting Summary:

Approved June 26, 2009 Meeting Summary

Inclusion a Summary of Actions in Meeting Summaries:

Members agreed with suggestion to include a summary of actions in each set of meeting summaries of the CBP.

DIP Amendment:

The CBP by consensus, approved the DIP amendment as presented for Interim Milestone 2.2.

CBP Website:

CBP approved moving forward with the suggested format of the website and offered some minor suggestions on titles and formatting changes.

Clarifying Roles & Responsibilities of the CBP & Flood Authority

CBP approved by consensus the diagram developed by the STC with agreement to eliminate, "including flooding" within the first paragraph under the CBP and adding item #4 under "Area of Cooperation" stating, "#4. Addressing Flood related issues."

FAQ:

Members agreed with suggestion to develop FAQ to distribute at Twin Cities project public meetings. Members to provide feedback electronically to Glen Connolly. Ms. Napier to electronically send questions drafted to date to all members. Members scheduled to approve FAQ at its August meeting.

Sustainability Funding:

The CBP directed STC to develop a framework for future discussion on how to move forward as an organization after July 1, 2011.