

CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP
Chehalis Tribe “Lucky Eagle” Casino
Rochester, Washington
June 26, 2009
9:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

Meeting Summary

MEMBERS, ALTERNATES, & GUESTS PRESENT

Mark White, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation

Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County

Kahle Jennings, City of Centralia (Alternate)

Bob Burkle, Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW)

Don Loft, Grays Harbor College

Phil Rupp, Lewis County

Miranda Plumb, US Fish and Wildlife Service

Julie Balmelli-Powe, Lewis County Farm Bureau

Janel Spaulding, Grays Harbor College

Mark Swartout, Thurston County

Karen Valenzuela, Thurston County

Ann Wick, US Department of Agriculture

Bill Goss, US Army Corps of Engineers

Nancy Chin, US Army Corps of Engineers

Bruce Mackey, ESA Adolfson

Bill Schulte, Lewis County

Jim Hill, Citizen, Lewis County

Lyle Hojem, Citizen, Lewis County

Terry Harris, City of Chehalis

Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County

Patrick Wiltzius, City of Chehalis (Alternate)

John Penberth, Citizen, Pe Ell

Joel Green, Grays Harbor College

Chris Stearns, Thurston County PUD

Christine Hempleman, Department of Ecology (DOE)

Glen Connelly, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation

Jerry Louthain, HDR

Melinda Posner, MPC Consulting

Dan Pearson, Dan’s Dahlias

Karen Klocke, Department of Health (DOH)

Cheri Lindgren, Puget Sound Meeting Services

GENERAL PARTNERSHIP BUSINESS

Welcome, Introductions and Roundtable Comments

Mark White called the June 26, 2009 meeting of the Chehalis Basin Partnership (CBP) to order at 9:34 a.m. Everyone present provided self-introductions. A revised meeting notice and agenda was distributed.

Discuss and Adopt Draft Meeting Summaries for April 24, 2009 and May 29, 2009

Members approved the minutes of April 24, 2009 and May 29, 2009 as presented by consensus.

SPECIAL PROJECTS AND PRESENTATIONS

Detailed Implementation Plan Update - Report on the May Workshops

Janel Spaulding briefed members on the May 13 and May 20, 2009 education and outreach (E&O) workshops held in Montesano.

The goals of the workshops included:

- Develop a two-year E&O plan with strategies all organizations in the Chehalis basin can utilize.
- Foster relationships between the different organizations to meet goals and continue projects during the current economic times of reduced funding and resources.
- Encourage more coordination of all activities within the Chehalis basin.

A slide highlighting workshop participants was presented.

At the May 13, 2009 workshop, attendees completed an inventory of E&O within the basin and discussed some existing gaps. One outcome was matching needs with skills and resources of the different agencies.

Ms. Balmelli-Powe arrived at the meeting.

Ms. Spaulding reviewed other workshop activities including a TV news spot.

The May 20, 2009 workshop built on needs identified and inventory work to create vision for success and develop a two-year action plan with specific tasks to complete by 2011. Seven small working groups were established to complete the tasks within the two-year action plan. The working groups will begin meeting in July 2009. Workshop participants also brainstormed a "wish list" for E&O if resources were unlimited. Ms. Spaulding reviewed tasks, coordinators, and participants for the working groups who will help implement action plan strategies/tasks:

- **Media and Marketing.** Tasks includes improving the ability for citizens to identify their residency within the Chehalis basin, developing a basin tourist guide and map, publishing products online by April 2010, articulating messages and identifying the best media for distribution, leveraging business and corporate assistance, targeting messages to local communities, and focusing media on stewardship opportunities.
- **Publication Training.** Strategies consist of hosting a workshop in April 2010 to educate people on writing publications, identifying roles and begin planning the workshop in July 2009, conducting a letter writing campaign to legislators to raise awareness and outline funding needs in the Chehalis basin in October 2010, and co-sponsoring a grant to support bureau-specific activities including materials and transportation.
- **Teacher Training.** Grays Harbor College (GHC) and Pacific Education Institute (PEI) are collaborating and conducting a middle school teacher institute in August 2009 at GHC. The meeting will provide watershed training to Grays Harbor and Pacific County teachers. Field investigation training is scheduled for the winter 2010. A second teacher's institute is envisioned for summer 2010 followed by a second field investigation training exercise in spring 2011. The working group's vision is creating an online digital toolbox with vocational resources and local contacts.
- **Volunteer.** Tasks include meeting in July 2009 to identify a common clearinghouse to store volunteer opportunities by summer 2010 and develop an online calendar, creating a basin-wide speakers and activities bureau, and assembling a group similar to the "Friends of the Chehalis Basin" organization. The working group's overarching goal is conducting a basin-wide volunteer event to bring everyone together and highlight successes.

Mr. Rupp arrived at the meeting.

- **Public Workshops and Camps.** PEI and WDFW representatives are hosting a high school senior and school project mentor training workshop at GHC. Ms. Spaulding encouraged CBP members interested in mentoring high school students to attend. PEI is funding the program with a grant from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) focused on environmentally related projects. GHC and AmeriCorps are hosting an Alder Creek day camp at GHC in July 2009 and 2010. High school students have an opportunity to receive job training this summer as part of GHC's summer watershed leadership program.
- **Events.** The initial focus for this working group is promoting current events. An evening awards dinner is proposed in 2010 to highlight those working in the basin. Another event includes hosting

annual symposiums in April 2010 and 2011 showcasing achievements and providing education opportunities. Landowner workshops are planned for July 2010.

Ms. Plumb arrived at the meeting.

- **Web Share.** Workshop participants agreed Google calendar provides an effective way to share information. A master calendar is under development to reflect all events and/or activities within the Chehalis basin. The CBP's new website, www.chehalisbasinpartnership.org, is up and running. The working group's goal is developing a coordinated comprehensive web-based resource for professionals and citizens in the Chehalis basin.

Ms. Spaulding outlined next steps:

- Update Strategy 2 in the Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP) with information from the workshops.
- Creative Community Solutions (CCS) will attend the CBP's July meeting and discuss the DIP update.
- Working group goals will be compiled into a two-year E&O plan.
- Participants discussed scheduling an annual joint meeting with the CBP to report on activities.
- Participants discussed forming an E&O subcommittee of the CBP. The citizen advisory committee currently is not active.

Ms. Napier referred to ongoing challenges related to E&O. Education and outreach was a focus when creating Ms. Spaulding's position. The Partnership needs to update the DIP. One element includes marketing. A topic for the July CPB meeting includes discussing outcomes from the workshops and how they translate into an update to the DIP.

John Penberth asked how the activity helps in pursuing CBP goals on water quality, water quantity, fish habitat, and instream flows. He referred to the letter from the Quinault Indian Nation (QIN) concerning withdrawals from the Chehalis River. It's more important to address the issue of keeping water in the river rather than feel good activities. The Partnership should spend time and resources addressing key elements outlined in the interim bylaws.

Ms. Napier said that workshop participants represent water quality, water quantity, habitat, and other programs. The workshops provided a mechanism for people to jointly meet who have common interests and goals. The DIP includes big-ticket items. People, agencies, and organizations are currently doing work to implement the plan. It's important everyone understands that work and that gaps are identified that need to be filled. The DIP was updated to address concerns raised by the QIN.

Discussion ensued on agencies that have ceased withdrawing from the Chehalis River and gaining a better understanding of who is using the water and how to increase instream flows.

Mr. Penberth suggested that addressing instream flows is more important than E&O efforts. The Partnership should be discussing water quality, water quantity, and salmon habitat. He asked staff to provide budget information on a regular basis.

Chris Stearns expressed concerns about conserving water in the Chehalis basin and ensuring water quality remains good for his customers.

Chris Hempleman advised that instream flow levels are established. To the extent it can, DOE regulates how much water is in the river. She acknowledged that more can be done to retain water within the river system.

Glen Connelly commented that the only way to encourage members of the public to modify behaviors and actions is through E&O. E&O is an important component to facilitate changes in the basin.

Terry Harris supported the idea of volunteers and groups willing to pursue E&O. One question to consider is establishing a message(s) and how the working groups distribute message(s) and/or information is distributed to the public. The CBP should be kept informed of E&O at all levels.

Ms. Willis requested future meeting agendas highlight the relationship between action items and the DIP.

Ms. Napier said staff could provide a refresher briefing of the DIP in July.

Ms. Willis and Jim Hill thanked Ms. Spaulding for her efforts and accomplishments over the last year.

Kahle Jennings reported the Chehalis Stream Team is meeting on June 30, 2009 from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. to discuss future clean up activities.

Ms. Spaulding shared that a clean up along Scammon Creek is planned for July along with a stream walk of China Creek.

Ms. Napier described how water quantity is being addressed by storage projects. The CBP created a multi-purpose storage study, discussed storage options from a low flow perspective, and was awarded a grant to assess other storage options. The Partnership was poised to work on storage issues in 2008 when the 2007 flood occurred shifting the focus to high flow issues. The Flood Authority has resources available and is evaluating mechanisms to address high flows. High flow situations do have low flow benefits. She acknowledged that she can provide additional budget information if requested.

Review Operating Procedures

Ms. Napier reported that following the 1997 storm event, the Legislature passed the Watershed Management Act (WMA) in 1998 (Revised Code of Washington [RCW] Chapter 90.82). The legislation created watershed planning units throughout the state. Engrossed Substitute House Bill (ESHB) 2514 facilitated the formation of the CBP.

The purpose in the interlocal agreement (ILA) states, "This Agreement shall designate a planning unit and a lead agency for purposes of assessing and managing the water resources of the Chehalis River Basin and to pursue strategies within the Chehalis River Basin which include the key elements of flood reduction, fisheries, recreation, water quality and water quantity, and examine their relationship to economic health and sustainability."

The Chehalis River Basin Partnership shall coordinate efforts focusing on:

- Improvement of water quality
- Management of water resources to provide ample supplies for farms, fish, industry, and people (including restoration of healthy runs of salmon and steelhead)

- Reduction of the effects of flooding
- Increase recreational opportunities
- Increase watershed awareness through education

Ms. Napier reviewed the composition of the Partnership comprised of counties, cities, tribes, water supply utilities, port districts, state agencies, federal agencies, major interests (timber, agriculture, business, fisheries, recreational, environmental, and industrial water users), and private citizens. Grays Harbor County is designated as the lead agency and fiscal agent.

Mark Swartout reported that the QIN is listed under “Tribes” on page 3 of the ILA. However, the QIN never signed the ILA. The QIN is not a voting member, but attends meetings and provides comments. Ms. Napier added a QIN representative actively participates at Habitat Work Group (HWG) meetings.

Ms. Napier reviewed the purpose statement contained in the CBP interim bylaws. The WMA establishes a voluntary planning process to assess and manage water resources of the Chehalis River basin and to develop strategies within the basin addressing water quantity, water quality, fish habitat, and instream flows. She highlighted provisions for the composition, quorum requirements, and conduct and frequency of meetings. Decisions are based on a consensus process, which has served the Partnership well.

Discussion ensued on the consensus method for decision-making. Ms. Napier commented that the decision making structure enables non-voting members to speak on an issue, which could influence a voting member’s action.

Ms. Valenzuela commented that using the term “voting” is confusing when discussing the consensus method of decision making. Ms. Napier acknowledged the confusion. Voting refers to the CBP taking an action. When taking an action, members are asked whether there is concurrence.

Mr. Stearns questioned why larger landowners in the Chehalis basin, such as Weyerhaeuser, are not represented on the CBP. Ms. Napier indicated forestry is included within the category of major interests. Weyerhaeuser is a voting member.

Ms. Napier reviewed Appendix B, “Seeking Consensus,” and the top six types of agreement reflecting consensus:

1. Endorsement: “I like it.”
2. Endorsement with a minor point of clarification: “Basically I like it.”
3. Agreement with reservations: “I can live with it.”
4. Abstain: “I have no opinion that prevents this from going forward.”
5. Stand Aside: “I really don’t like this but don’t want to prevent the group from agreeing.”
6. Formal disagreement but willing to go with majority: “I want my disagreement noted in writing but I’ll support the decision.”

Two types of responses by one or more interest groups indicate a lack of consensus:

1. Formal disagreement with request to be absolved of responsibility for implementation: “I don’t want to stop anyone else but I don’t want to be involved in implementing it.”
2. Block: “I don’t support this proposal and will work to see that it won’t be implemented.”

Ms. Napier advised that it is incumbent for members to work towards a solution prior to blocking a proposal because “blocking” ends the discussion.

Mr. Penberth said that decision making by consensus provides members and the public with an opportunity to express views and influence actions.

Chehalis Ecosystem General Investigation Update - Project Overview and Request from Flood Authority

Ms. Napier provided a historical overview of the General Investigation (GI) Study through the US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) for ecosystem restoration. The project was initiated in 2000. However, there has been limited activity because of the lack of funding. The project is now active because of an appropriation of \$574,000 from Congress.

Ms. Napier reported there are two GI studies, one related to an area of specific flooding and another with a basin-wide ecosystem focus. Lewis County Commissioner Averill convened a meeting between all project sponsors interested in the GI Study on April 1, 2009. The Flood Authority was interested in a GI Study beyond the Twin Cities project, which addressed flood damage reduction. The Flood Authority asked to partner with the basin-wide study that is ecosystem focused. Commissioner Averill asked Grays Harbor County to consider adding flood damage reduction to the current GI Study resulting in a multi-purpose study. At the April meeting, the Partnership indicated it was interested in the possibility of the CBP and Flood Authority working together through an ILA between Lewis County and Grays Harbor County. She asked for direction on whether to add flood damage reduction to the Ecosystem GI Study.

Mr. Swartout pointed out that unless a project is involved in a GI Study, that project likely has no future to obtain federal funding or support.

Discussion ensued on a project management plan executed by Grays Harbor County on behalf of the Partnership in 2001 and how low river flows are factored in the project.

Mr. Penberth commented that the CBP and Flood Authority possess different views on outcomes. If the Flood Authority is successful with establishing a flood district, the CBP may be asked to sponsor activities it might not support. Ms. Napier replied that the GI Study will identify all potential projects for federal funding consideration. The Corps will have an interest in what it represents. If a flood district is approved, the Corps will have another set of projects it may represent.

Mr. Penberth suggested elected members of the CBP and not their respective representatives or staff should vote on whether to add flood damage reduction to the Ecosystem GI Study.

Discussion followed on what’s required for an implementing partner of the Flood Authority or the CBP to sponsor projects and whether the Partnership can withdraw from a project if members don’t agree with actions taken by the Flood Authority and/or a flood district. Ms. Napier advised that it depends on the project. The Partnership is an integral part of the GI Study. Grays Harbor County is the sponsoring agency. It’s envisioned for the Partnership to discuss how the project positively or negatively affects its work.

Mr. Hill said he understands an objective of the Flood Authority is to form a flood taxing district with the flood authority disbanding. It doesn’t appear problematic to work with the Flood Authority on an issue-by-issue basis.

Chehalis Basin Partnership

Meeting Summary

June 26, 2009 Page 7 of 7

Ms. Napier reported that the ILA between Lewis and Grays Harbor Counties could include concerns discussed by the membership.

Ms. Willis acknowledged the Flood Authority will be different from the flood district. The ILA is with the Partnership (Grays Harbor County) and the Flood Authority (Lewis County).

Nancy Chin added that the federal government is contracting with Grays Harbor County. The plan is to amend the federal cost share agreement to include the basin-wide multipurpose scope and update the Project Management Plan.

Mr. Swartout said making a decision to move forward on the GI Study doesn't mean members agree to implement all projects identified in the study. Those decisions will be made at a later date.

Ms. Valenzuela said adding flood reduction to the scope of the GI Study appears to be consistent with the mission of the CBP.

Ms. Chin provided a status report of the Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment (EDT) modeling. A goal was to add more data, train locals at GHC to manipulate the database, and transition the database from the hands of the contractor to the locals. A training session on how to use the database was conducted several months ago with the contractor. However, it doesn't appear a local person is available to participate in the training. The Corps ceased work with the contractor, is re-scoping the project, and will make a decision on whether to close the project out or hand it off to another person.

Ms. Napier said EDT could be a tool to evaluate habitat restoration projects within the basin. The model was funded and transferred without an assigned administrator. Funding is available for training. However, there are no funds to administer the model in the long term.

Members discussed status of data collected to this point.

Bob Burkle explained how WDFW uses EDT data. Maintaining and revising the database is a significant commitment that WDFW is unable to make at this time because of limited resources and the agency meeting its statutory requirements. Data developed are not lost.

Mr. Jennings indicated he would like additional information on the cost to an agency for administering the EDT model to enable the Partnership to make an informed decision. There may be an opportunity to solicit a volunteer agency. Ms. Napier said it will likely require a half-time position to maintain and administer the model.

Mr. Burkle added that WDFW estimates the cost to administer the model at \$80,000 annually.

Joel Green reported he attended the first training session and a substantial amount of work could be accomplished with a quarter-time position.

Mr. Hill agreed with the suggestion to obtain additional information on costs to administer and maintain the EDT model.

Ms. Napier noted the Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force, which played a key role in initiating the model recommends abandoning the project. Potential uses for the model include identifying projects for habitat restoration, evaluating habitat conditions, and ranking projects.

Chehalis Basin Partnership

Meeting Summary

June 26, 2009 Page 8 of 8

Mr. Swartout said it's difficult to determine a time commitment maintain and update the model based on the amount of data other agencies are collecting.

Mr. Burkle pointed out that the Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership (WCSSP) is developing a recovery/sustainability plan. He suggested pursuing a grant to fund the administration and maintenance of the EDT model on a region-wide basis.

Ms. Napier suggested another factor to consider is the time required to market the model to ensure its long-term success.

Mr. Swartout suggested putting the project on hold rather than abandoning the work. Ms. Napier said the Corps has contracted with ICF Jones and Stokes. Ms. Chin said the contract can be left open for a short window of time. If the contract is closed, the Corps could release funds to advance the Chehalis GI. The Corps could also open up a new contract at a later date.

Mr. Jennings expressed concerns with expending public funds on a privately-owned system. The Partnership will have to pay for using the system. Mr. Green said the server is housed and maintained at an IFC Jones and Stokes site free of charge. The contractor will be paid with grant funds to train an administrator and others who in turn will input data into the model.

USGS Decision Support Tool

Ms. Chin provided a status report on the US Geological Survey (USGS) Groundwater and Surface Water Characterization Project. The Corps assembled a technical team to review the proposal, schedule, and costs. The Corps expects to negotiate a SOW and award a contract later this year.

Project Management Plan Update

The Corps is updating the Project Management Plan (scope, schedule, and cost) for the GI Study to include a multipurpose study involving habitat ecosystem restoration and flood risk management. The current plan is focused on restoration with ancillary flood damage benefits. A team is working on the scope, which should be available within the next month. Ms. Chin reviewed a "Draft Chehalis River Basin Investigation Multi-Purpose Road Map" document outlining the processes for the environmental restoration and flood risk management studies.

Discussion ensued on what a 35% design represents. Ms. Chin said a 35% design provides enough detail to obtain cost information and a methodology to evaluate alternatives.

Bill Goss added that an objective is to solicit review and input from stakeholders at each stage of the project design beginning at 10% and ending at 100% complete design.

Mr. Harris asked how a preliminary design can be developed when all water contributors have not been identified on both sides of the levee. Mr. Goss advised that one goal is identifying all parties up front and involving them early in the process.

Mr. Burkle said a 35% design enables WDFW to assess impacts related to fish projects.

Ms. Napier asked for feedback on working with the Flood Authority to expand the GI Study to include flood damage reduction. There were no objections from members.

Mr. Schulte requested clarification on whether the Partnership is rendering a decision on becoming involved in flood mitigation, expanding the GI study, and cooperating with the Flood Authority. Ms. Napier advised that the request is to include flood damage reduction rather than "flood mitigation."

Mr. Penberth asked whether staff can make decisions for elected officials. Ms. Napier pointed out that the composition of the Partnership is decided by each jurisdiction in the appointment of a primary or alternate member. Mr. Penberth commented that several CBP members are also members of the Flood Authority.

Ms. Napier asked for concurrence on Grays Harbor County continuing to seek funding to implement actions in the DIP including the USGS decision support tool (groundwater/surface water characterization). There is an opportunity to fund the item through the GI Study. There were no objections from members.

Mr. Hojem agreed with the action as requested as long as the ILA spells out the difference between the two organizations for taxpayers.

Flood Authority Update - Status of Contract for Services with Earth Economics

Ms. Napier reported the Flood Authority was briefed on the contract for services with Earth Economics and other tools. She outlined how the effort benefits both the Partnership and the Flood Authority in implementing the Watershed Plan and evaluating benefits of a project. The Flood Authority authorized the project funds. The Flood Authority authorized Lewis County to enter into a contract with Earth Economics. The Partnership will also have access to ecosystem services tool. The Flood Authority is interested in an analysis and valuation of land in terms of flood reduction. Earth Economics will provide a report at a future Partnership and/or subcommittee meeting.

In response to a question from Mr. Schulte about the Corps accepting the data, Ms. Napier said the Corps has a method to evaluate economics. The methodology proposed by Earth Economics could provide another option.

Twin Cities Outreach Event

Ms. Napier reported on an outreach event for the Twin Cities project scheduled for September 23, in Montesano, September 30, in Centralia, and a third event in the Thurston County area. She asked whether the Partnership is interested in participating in the events, which provides an opportunity to educate citizens about the work of the CBP.

Members generally agreed the Partnership could take advantage of the prospect to clarify the roles between the CBP and Flood Authority.

Ms. Napier said she'll work with the Steering Technical Committee (STC) and report to the Partnership at a later date.

Clarifying Roles and Responsibilities of the Chehalis Basin Partnership and the Flood Authority

Ms. Napier introduced Bruce Mackey, Project Manager for the Flood Authority. Lead staff worked with the advisory committees (STC and Board Advisory Committee) to develop a graphic to clarify the different missions and role of the CBP and Flood Authority. The graphic will be presented to the Board Advisory Committee, STC, and the Flood Authority on July 7, July 9, and July 16, 2009, respectively for further discussion and editing. Ms. Napier reviewed the graphic of respective roles and shared responsibilities of the Flood Authority and the CBP based on the 2008 ILA and 2004 Chehalis Basin Watershed Management Plan. She responded to clarifying questions from members. Feedback from the Partnership and members of the public is summarized below:

Chehalis Basin Partnership

Meeting Summary

June 26, 2009 Page 10 of 10

- How does role 1 (blue) compare with role 5 (yellow) and whether the two roles could be a shared responsibility? It was noted that the two roles are distinct in that role 1 states in part, “Identify and implement...” and role 5 states in part, “Coordinate flood control activities...” Another member suggested further clarification because the two roles are not a shared responsibility”

Ms. Willis said the matrix was developed from house bills creating the Flood Authority and CBP as a guide. The enabling legislation also outlines requirements for each of the entities.

Mr. Harris stressed the importance of clearly distinguishing the two organizations.

- Including a reference to the house bills on the document automatically separates the two organizations.
- The CBP didn’t coordinate responses following the 2007 flood event.
- The Partnership’s idea of “coordinate responses” varies from the public’s perspective, which is to initiate clean up efforts.
- Replace “flood” with “high flow” in role 5 under the CBP.
- Dams and dikes are not the only mechanisms available to deal with flood control.
- Another idea is to include requirements outlined in the legislation establishing the organizations.
- Revise #3 under the CBP to read, “Protect water rights in the Basin.”
- The general public might not understand the difference between high and low flows as it relates to shared responsibility 4, “Manage water quantity.” Members typically understand “flood” and “low water.”

Mr. Connelly suggested preparing materials for the Twin Cities outreach event highlighting what each agency is doing and any overlaps.

- Strike shared responsibility 4 and list “managing flood waters” on the Flood Authority side and “managing year-round water quantity” on the CBP side.
- Citizens might inquire about combining the roles and the two agencies.
- Technically, neither agency has the authority to “manage” water quantity. The two organizations have an interest and can influence the process.
- Revise 6 under shared responsibilities to read, “Participate in the Corps of Engineers General Investigation to achieve their separate goals.”
- It is critical to separate the roles to help the public understand that the Legislature created two different agencies.

Ms. Willis suggested narrowing the focus of the graphic. She encouraged the CBP to retain shared responsibility 2, “Work toward basin-wide solutions.”

- It might be helpful to identify the jurisdictions represented within the two organizations and possibly the names of those making the decisions.
- Highlight how the two agencies “cooperate” rather than “overlap.”

Ms. Napier reported she’ll present the updated graphic as the July meeting.

Agenda Items for July 24, 2009 Meeting

- Discuss how outcomes from the workshops translate into an update to the DIP and present Draft DIP amendment
- A demonstration of the CBP’s website

Chehalis Basin Partnership

Meeting Summary

June 26, 2009 Page 11 of 11

- Continue conversation on clarifying roles and responsibilities of the CBP and the Flood Authority
- Resume the EDT model discussion

Mr. Jennings volunteered to research and identify a potential lead agency for administering the EDT model.

Ms. Spaulding distributed recyclable shopping bags with CBP's logo. The bags will be distributed during the Watershed Festival.

ADJOURNMENT

With there being no further business, Ms. Napier adjourned the meeting at 12:22 p.m.

Prepared by Cheri Lindgren, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services