



CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP

**Chehalis Tribe Lucky Eagle Casino, Buffet Overflow Room
Rochester, Washington**

**March 22, 2019
9:30 am – 12:00**

Meeting Summary

MEMBERS* and ALTERNATES' PRESENT

Alissa Shay', *Port of Grays Harbor*
Amy Spoon*, *WDFW*
Brian Thompson*, *Lewis Co. Farm Bureau*
Bobby Jackson*, *Lewis County BOCC*
Chris Stearns*, *Thurston PUD*
Colleen Suter', *Chehalis Tribe*
Ed Mock, *City of Aberdeen'*
Jim Hill*, *Citizen*
John Bryson, *Quinault Indian Nation*

Kaitlynn Nelson', *Thurston County*
Kim Ashmore*, *City of Centralia*
Lee Napier', *Lewis County*
Mike Noone*, *Ecology Water Resources*
Patrick Wiltzius', *City of Chehalis*
Phil Papac*, *Port of Grays Harbor*
Terry Harris*, *City of Chehalis*
Tye Menser*, *Thurston County*

GUESTS

Caprice Fasano, *Quinault Indian Nation*; Lauren MacFarland, *Quinault Indian Nation*; Dave Vasilauskas, *City of Chehalis*; Paula Holyroyde, *League of Women Voters Thurston County*; Shannon Shula, *Thurston County*; Mark Mobbs, *Quinault Indian Nation*.

STAFF

Kirsten Harma, *Watershed Coordinator*
Cynthia Carlstad, *Facilitator, NHC*

FOR MORE INFORMATION

- Meeting summaries are available on the Chehalis Basin Partnership website: www.chehalisbasinpartnership.org
- PowerPoint presentations from this meeting are available on the Chehalis Basin Partnership website: www.chehalisbasinpartnership.org/presentations

MEETING

1. Welcome, Introductions

The Chair convened a welcome and participants introduced themselves.

2. Approval of February Meeting Notes

All in favor.

3. Partner Updates

- Ms. Fasano announced that she and Ms. MacFarland have been working on rule updates for Forest Practices Type F streams. Ms. Napier suggested that a broader update to planning directors and planning groups would be helpful for the implementers to better understand the rationale and science behind the rule revisions. Mr. Mobbs noted that

because it is a formal DNR rule-making, there will also be a public hearing in Olympia at some point.

- Ms. Suter reported that the Chehalis Tribe's big riparian planting project is getting underway.
- Mr. Noone announced that Ecology will be making \$250,000 available for technical support on the Watershed Plan Update. The Planning Unit needs to request this funding from Ecology by June 30, 2019.
- Mr. Bryson announced that Quinault Indian Nation has been working with BHP on its proposed potash terminal at Port of Grays Harbor. He also noted that Quinault has elections this coming weekend for three positions. Lastly, he announced that the Tribe has just declared a disaster on the fishery for sockeye, closing the season down before it started this year.
- Ms. Shay reported that the Port had a ribbon cutting at Friends Landing for a new accessible playground. It was a great project with many donors.
- Ms. Harma reported that March 22 is World Water Day and read a brief purpose and theme statement for the day.
- Ms. Harma made a call for volunteers to participate in the SRFB field review process on May 14 and 15. She will follow up via email.
- Ms. Harma announced that she will be attending student congress for the Chehalis Education Consortium today – 4th and 8th grade students learning and participating in environmental education activities.

4. Watershed Plan Update Work Plan.

Ms. Carlstad opened the topic by introducing herself and a little bit about her background. She is a licensed hydrogeologist, and brings that technical background to her role as a facilitator. Her roots are in Washington State and she brings a deep commitment to local groups formulating their own pathway. This emphasizes clear expectations, open communications, and empowerment to the planning group to create the Plan Update that reflects their values for the watershed.

Charter Addendum to 2004 Operating Procedures

The group discussed Planning Unit membership and decision making. The 2004 Operating Procedures Manual is the governing document over the Partnership. It is somewhat out of date and does not address the RCW 90.94 Watershed Plan Update, but otherwise it is still a sound governance basis. Ms. Carlstad suggested that the group consider an abbreviated project charter as an addendum to the Operating Procedures Manual to describe how the Partnership will create its Watershed Plan Update:

Ms. Carlstad walked through a straw dog charter and participants discussed some of the elements:

- Participant thresholds for Partnership members – Ms. Harma described the outreach that she has done so far – sent a letter last August to those who have not been participating. Individual members followed up with outreach to those that did not respond. Regarding citizen members, so far only Lewis County has designated a citizen member. Other counties need to decide and act if they plan to invite a citizen to join.

The straw dog charter states that additional outreach to listed members who have not responded regarding intent to participate in the Plan Update would occur during April, and May 31 would be the deadline for members to commit and begin participating in the Watershed Plan Update to establish voting eligibility.

- Participant role for Quinault Indian Nation (QIN) – QIN was not signatory to the original Initiating Governments Agreement. RCW 90.94 requires that all tribes in the planning

area be invited to participate. QIN has indicated they will participate, and this has been welcomed by Chair Harris in a letter from the Partnership. Mr. Stearns noted that there is a difference between the two participating tribes – Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis has its reservation within the basin, while the Quinault Indian Nation has usual and accustomed fishing rights to the Chehalis Basin. Ms. Napier suggested that there is better participation language in the original Operating Procedures or ILA.

- Outreach and support for Partnership members to maintain participation – Original Operating Procedures lay out a process that is too lengthy to identify when someone may be at risk of losing membership for this project. The straw dog charter compresses this schedule. Interest in an incentive-based approach was expressed. Mr. Noone chimed in that projects in approved plans are eligible for funding, which is an incentive. Mr. Harris noted that all members report to someone within their organization’s hierarchy and suggested that everyone have a backup contact identified should it be necessary for the Partnership to inquire into their absences. This suggestion was reinforced by other participants. Mr. Harris requested that all members bring contact info for their up-chain contact to the next meeting. Mr. Mobbs suggested that rather than tying membership to meeting attendance, membership retention could be tied to decisions – if someone is able to keep abreast of topics and ready to participate in decisions, then that may be acceptable. Mr. Stearns cautioned that sometimes people come to this type of situation with a perspective that can be disruptive. This sentiment was reinforced by several members, particularly because of the short timeline to develop and approve the Plan Update. Mr. Menser clarified that participation by alternates will maintain membership for an organization. Ms. Napier shared that for smaller cities, like Pe Ell and Napavine in Lewis County, Lewis County will do their best to keep them briefed. Mr. Stearns observed that one of the consequences is that Ecology will go to rule making if the Planning Unit doesn’t succeed. Mr. Thompson would like to see more industry representatives – forestry, dairy, etc. Ms. Carlstad summed up this discussion that the intent is to help members track and participate, and they can all work to the goal.
- Planning team organization structure:
 - Planning Unit is formal decision-making body – methods, plan itself, etc.
 - Steering-Technical Committee – workhorse group guiding more day-to-day decisions. Will likely have at least one conference call or meeting monthly.
 - Technical Work Groups – will do bulk of technical work on developing plan content; pretty significant time commitment for these groups:
 - Population/permit exempt well estimates
 - Water use estimates
 - Sub-basin delineations
 - Offset projects
 - Facilitator / Coordinator – tracking and managing process overall, choreography
- Consensus decision-making – Operating Procedures spell out consensus model. A slight variation is to have members work off-line to develop potential solutions if disagreements cannot be resolved in the Planning Unit. Ms. Napier said that this seems in alignment with practices that the Partnership has used historically.

Next steps will be to make any edits members agree on for the charter, confirm membership and attach to charter, and get signatures. Ms. Fasano asked whether signatures would be policy

representative or technical representative, and Ms. Carlstad indicated this would be policy representative.

General Schedule and Work Plan:

The general schedule in the table below was discussed.

<p>MARCH-JULY 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish planning structure/membership and work groups • Mine original Watershed Plan for useful content – volunteers will review in April, looking for specific information that would be relevant to the Plan Update – this is an action item for members prior to the April meeting. Mr. Stearns reported that recent groundwater analysis has also been done for Thurston PUD that will be useful. Ms. Harma recommended that a similar review effort be done for the salmon plan. • Confirm target schedule milestones • Delineate sub-basins – most logical to do after water use estimates are done so appropriate sub-basin sizes can be determined. • Develop future growth projections and permit-exempt well estimates. Ms. Napier said that Nisqually had good success using TRPC model. Since Grays Harbor and Lewis Counties don't have a model, contracting with TRPC may be a good option. This task was reported to be time consuming by the Nisqually group, and left less time for developing projects than desirable. Mr. Stearns stated that growth in Thurston County has been faster in some areas of the county than others. • Identify/evaluate potential offset needs & projects • Coordinate with other efforts
<p>AUGUST- DECEMBER 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop projected permit-exempt well consumptive use estimates and potential impacts • Engage net ecological benefit determinations – will need ongoing guidance from Ecology. Mr. Noone shared that the technical review team at Ecology will be looking for more detail than was feasible to develop for Nisqually given the early deadline for that plan. • Begin plan update – vision is for concise addendum. Mr. Stearns commented that the geology of south Thurston County enables groundwater to move rapidly and varies seasonally – an important characteristic to understand and incorporate. • Plan for public outreach – nothing explicitly required except for SEPA and for rule-making. Planning Unit can decide to do more. Rural people are the populations most affected by this Plan Update. Ms. Napier brought up the public process needed to get County adoption. What information will commissioners want to feel comfortable approving a resolution? Ms. Harma expressed the need to have communication tools – e.g. a fact sheet to provide to members of the public. • Coordinate with other efforts

<p>JANUARY- AUGUST 2020</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decisions and integration of offset projects into draft plan • Draft net ecological benefit determinations for • Complete areas of additional analysis needed for plan • Complete draft plan update and begin internal review
<p>SEPTEMBER - NOVEMBER</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize plan and obtain approvals – need to accommodate internal organizational review. Potential joint county meeting to approve or at least preliminary approval. Mr. Menser shared that Thurston County Commissioners gave staff authority to take the plan update to Ecology to avoid the potentially problematic situation where Ecology adopts and Plan Update that the counties don't approve and adopt. This all needs to be done well in advance of the requirement to deliver to Ecology. • Ecology review and adoption. Required by February 1, 2021. Not stated when Planning Unit needs to deliver Plan Update to Ecology. Deadline is legislatively set, so Ecology can't revise, only the legislature can. Mr. Noone thinks that if Plan Update is delivered in November, Ecology will have adequate time to review. • County adoption

Organizational Structure

Participants discussed implementing the organizational structure described above.

- Steering Committee - Ms. Harma confirmed those who want to be on the committee and will schedule a re-occurring monthly call for Steering Committee.
- Technical work groups
 - Population / Water Demand Forecast
 - Habitat Work Group
 - Other Strategies - Mr. Stearns shared that in WRIA 1 they had some success with a water recycler from dairy farms; this could be an idea for Chehalis – recycling dairy waste.
 - For sub-basin delineation – wait until water demand forecast is developed as this will inform sub-basin delineation
 - Plan Development Work Group – will likely be added as the Plan Update begins to take shape.

Planning Unit Individual Input on Challenges and Needs to Improve the Plan Update Process.

Ms. Carlstad oriented the group to the exercise for this agenda item. Three flip chart sheets were posted around the room with the following topics:

- Permit-exempt well estimates and impacts
- Offset projects and net ecological benefit (NEB)
- Plan update process

Participants were asked to add their thoughts and ideas to these flip charts - topics they need more information about, areas they think will be challenging, ideas that will support topics, or whatever else they want to provide input on. The purpose of this is to identify areas that may need more attention, and help Ms. Carlstad and Ms. Harma develop a detailed work plan that addresses the needs of the Planning Unit.

Following the individual input time period, Ms. Carlstad reviewed the content on each flip chart with the group, and brief discussion occurred about some topics.

Plan Update Process:

- Do – be familiar with existing plan
- Where’s the lead agency? Ed and Phil plan to follow up with Grays Harbor County
- Where does Habitat Group fit into our process? Intent is to help identify offset projects.
- More info on time commitments needed
- I would like to better understand what the Planning Unit will be doing specifically versus the Technical Committee and Work Groups.

Permit-Exempt Well Estimates and Impacts

- Thurston P.U.D. has some well log data for Lewis County, Thurston County and only the McCleary area for Grays Harbor County.
- Concern: How to account for the larger developments/apartments on a single permit-exempt well.
- Concern/information – Rural or low income residents who are already experiencing problems with supply or quality in their exempt wells
- How specifically are we targeting the impacts?
- Impact evaluation needs to include seasonal impacts.
- Consumptive water methods and models – how many should we do? WRIA 11 did 3...

Offset Projects And Net Ecological Benefit (N.E.B.)

- Homework – start looking at all mitigation projects now. Details later.
- The need to think outside the box in terms of projects and offsets, that take into account the unique characteristics of the Chehalis Basin.
- Consider Plan for WRIA 11 had different criteria – Do not weigh too heavily as a guide. Ecology may be increasing standards for some project types. Tier status used may not be applicable for WRIA 22/23. Don’t recommend screening based on how WRIA 11 tiered projects.
- Look into Whatcom P.U.D. projects with the Dutch Co. Regenix for work with Dairy Industry (near Lynden, WA) using reverse-osmosis to create “new water” in sub-basins that are in need of water (over-allocated)
- Consider the sub-basins – net benefit may vary depending on location within the basin. Agree!
- How will conservation efforts affect “use it or lose it” for exempt wells? Or will it?
- How to quantify NEB for habitat projects? Will Ecology provide guidance on this?
- How valuable are residential conservation efforts and products to the NEB
- I know of a small water system with a .5 cfs or 27 ac-ft of water rights that could be converted to city water currently 100% consumptive.

5. Request for Signature on Letter of Understanding Regarding Collaboration on Regional Agriculture Development in the South Puget Sound / SW Washington Region

As a follow-up from the February meeting, Ms. Harma raised the request made by Mike Peroni for the Partnership to sign the above-titled letter. The letter does not obligate the Partnership to anything. Mr. Stearns and Mr. Thompson expressed support. Mr. Menser shared that Thurston County signed the letter. The Planning Unit agreed that Mr. Harris is authorized to sign on their behalf.

6. Action Items

The following were listed as next steps for the Watershed Plan Update:

- A. Ms. Harma will schedule standing monthly check-in for Steering/ Technical Committee
- B. Ms. Carlstad and Ms. Harma will convene Technical Committees
- C. Ms. Carlstad/Ms. Harma will develop detailed workplan with milestones
- D. All Partnership members should review the original Watershed Plan and report back in April on useful content.
- E. Planning Unit will review straw dog charter and send comments prior to April meeting.
- F. All members should provide a supervisory contact to Ms. Harma, in case she needs to inquire into an organization's continued interest in participating.

ADJOURNMENT

With there being no further business, Chair Terry Harris adjourned the meeting at 12:00.

NEXT MEETING: March 22, 2018