



CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP

Fairfield Marriott Inn, Rochester, Washington

February 28, 2020

9:30am - 12:00pm

Meeting Summary

MEMBERS* and ALTERNATES' PRESENT

Wes Cormier*, *Grays Harbor County*
Jane Hewitt', *Grays Harbor County*
Lee Napier', *Lewis County (phone)*
Tye Menser*, *Thurston County*
Dave Windom*, *Mason County*
Alissa Shay', *Port of Grays Harbor*
Phil Papac*, *Port of Grays Harbor*
Kim Ashmore*, *City of Centralia*
Terry Harris*, *City of Chehalis*
Brian Shay*, *City of Hoquiam (phone)*
Jim Hill*, *Lewis County Citizen*
Lauren McFarland', *Quinault Indian Nation*
Kris Koski*, *City of Aberdeen (phone)*
Brad Murphy', *Thurston County*

Dusty Guenther*, *Boistfort Valley Water*
Terry Willis*, *Grays Harbor Citizen*
Mike Noone*, *Ecology Water Resources*
Paula Holroyde*, *Citizen, League of Women Voters Thurston County*
Megan Tuttle*, *WDFW*
Bob Johnson*, *WDNR*
Chris Lunde*, *Port Blakely*
Brian Thompson*, *Lewis County Farm Bureau*
Nick Bird*, *City of Ocean Shores*
Jaron Heller*, *City of McCleary*
Jan Robinson*, *Chehalis River Basin Land Trust*

GUESTS

Joel Massman, *Keta Waters/Quinault Indian Nation contractor*; Bob Amrine, *Lewis Conservation District*; Jill Van Hulle, *Aspect Consulting*; Tom Culhane, *Ecology*, Matt Rakow, *Ecology*;

STAFF

Kirsten Harma, *Partnership 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 the meeting and participants introduced themselves.

Ms. Harma passed around an attendance sheet to everyone.

Ms. Carlstad announced that Lewis County will no longer mail hard copy agendas in advance of CBP meetings. Materials will be distributed through email only and hard copies provided at the meetings.

Ms. Carlstad announced the results of the meeting location survey were split on people's preferences, so for the remainder of the planning work, meetings will rotate between the Fairfield Marriott Grand Mound and the Satsop Business Park.

Approval of January Meeting Summary

All were in favor of the meeting summary with no changes needed.

Watershed Plan Addendum Approval Process

Ms. Carlstad introduced Watershed Plan addendum approval process topic. Members were provided with a form last month to vet within their individual organizations to clarify internal review and approval processes. The schedule for having a complete draft Watershed Plan Addendum for review is August 2020. The approved Addendum needs to go to Ecology for review and adoption by November 2020. These points were made during the discussion:

1. Required plan elements are the following:
 - 20-year consumptive domestic water use estimate from new permit-exempt well connections
 - Impact assessment for streamflow
 - Project and actions to offset estimated consumptive use and meet Net Ecological Benefit
 - Net Ecological Benefit
2. Lewis County – Ms. Napier, planning staff and possibly environmental staff will review the draft Addendum; She plans to come to CBP approval meeting with approved resolution for Lewis County to approve the plan (approved at September Lewis County Commissioner meeting). She keeps commissioners briefed.
3. Grays Harbor County – Similar to Lewis County.
4. Thurston County – They haven't discussed the need for a resolution. Talked with administrative staff, and their process will be to give a couple briefings and get thumbs up from Board. May not need formal resolution.
5. Mason County – Will be looking for consistency with WRIA 13 and 14 plans that Mason County is also part of. Population projections, consumptive use estimates are the biggest items for them. Ms. Carlstad noted there are some differences between the Ecology-led watersheds (like WRIs 13 and 14), and the locally led watersheds like the Chehalis. We have less time to develop our plan addendum.
6. Ecology (Mr. Noone) – It is a tight timeline for review. Ecology wants to front-end as much work as possible. There won't be time for changes after it goes to Ecology. Ecology will either adopt or not. Once it's adopted, it can't be changed.
7. Mr. Thompson – Lewis County Farm Bureau meets once a month, and this has to go to their Board. He also tries to pass things through Thurston and Grays Harbor – Pacific Farm Bureau chapters, and Dairy Federation. It's a tight schedule. They will mostly focus on whether there could be negative impacts to members. Many different interests are represented within the Farm Bureau, so this is not predictable.
8. Ms. Willis – She is Grays Harbor-Pacific Farm Bureau chair and will coordinate with Mr. Thompson. Ms. Willis also asked about the Addendum itself - will we see portions of Addendum before August? And how big will the document be? Ms. Carlstad: About 100 pages with more detail in attachments on methods. The Addendum won't contain much watershed characterization, which is already in the Watershed Plan. Ms. Carlstad said a working draft Addendum is in progress and she would like members who are interested to review and give input along the way. She can also distribute an annotated outline if people are interested. Ms. Willis is less interested in an outline than content.
9. Mr. Bird – It will take a while to work through their council. He would like a canned briefing presentation soon to get them up to speed. Several other members requested canned presentation this too.
10. Mr. Hill asked if there is anything at legislature that may change deadlines – Mr. Noone said no.
11. Ms. Harma stated that in order to have a viable plan, we need members to contribute projects.
12. Quinault Indian Nation – Ms. McFarland stated that they are trying to keep council updated but will also need to schedule larger meeting with the council. The timing seems

ok. She is glad to hear that supporting methods, and technical basis will be included in appendices as that is important to them.

13. Mr. Culhane commented that having Ecology involved along the way should help streamline Ecology's review. Mr. Noone cautioned that Ecology's involvement does not mean they are evaluating it; at this stage Ecology is just providing helpful input and feedback that should help the CBP hit the mark if we follow their advice for Addendum content and methods.
14. City of Chehalis – Chair Harris is keeping the City staff and elected officials updated. The engineering and planning staff will need to review the Addendum.

Ms. Carlstad asked who has a general interest in being part of a working group developing the Watershed Plan Addendum, and several people raised their hand. She will send out an email to develop a team. Ms. Napier recommended that each county be provided content that pertains to them in advance of full plan Addendum.

Public Engagement

Ms. Carlstad described that the public engagement requirements are minimal for the Addendum – a SEPA checklist must be done when the Addendum is complete. SEPA requires public notice, typically 14 days for something like this. Individual projects may require additional SEPA environmental review when implemented. Grays Harbor County will be the SEPA lead entity and will need to make decisions about how broadly they distribute public notice.

The CBP is fortunate to have three active citizen members, but they do not necessarily represent all of the public. Ms. Carlstad asked for thoughts from the group, and the following discussion points were made:

- Mr. Hill suggested doing a PSA through a newspaper, like the Centralia Chronicle. Information should include how the policy was established that requires this Addendum, what the Addendum will do, its timeline, and how the public can be involved.
- Chair Harris recommended that realtors are an important audience since they are working directly with property transactions. Ms. Napier volunteered to give presentation to Lewis County Realtors and Master Builders. Ms. Hewitt suggested a similar for those organizations in Grays Harbor County. Mr. Menser has regular check-ins with Master Builders and meets with realtor organizations.
- Ms. Willis advocated that that we do as much as possible. She will also use the canned presentation for the Farm Bureau, both at local and state level. State Farm Bureau is involved in “Hirst Fix” statewide, so it is important they know what is happening at local level. Mr. Noone acknowledged Ms. Harris’ point and encouraged the group to provide clear information to statewide organizations to head off misunderstandings.
- Mr. Hill suggested that a person should be designated who can go to various meetings, like chamber of commerce.
- Ms. Harma raised the topic about public involvement in plan implementation. The original Watershed Plan called for public involvement in implementation.
- Mr. Bird said that in his jurisdiction public involvement extends the timeline for getting approvals; we need to factor that in.
- Chair Harris suggested combined meetings for some interest groups could be effective.
- Ms. Shay sought clarification about the purpose of the public engagement – are we looking for input to refine/change the Addendum or just provide information/education? Mr. Noone said more the latter, and Ms. Shay emphasized we need to make that clear. Ms. Carlstad said that if the Addendum were to contain policy recommendations or things that could be regulatory that would be a reason to seek public input on Addendum content. She also commented that she has some concerns that people in the Chehalis may hear

concerning things from other watersheds that do not apply to the Chehalis. We want to head off misunderstandings to the extent we can.

- Mr. Thompson asked who people should contact if they have projects, and Ms. Harma responded to contact her.

Ms. Carlstad closed the agenda item saying that NHC will take lead on developing a canned presentation, and potentially a poster and flyers that could be distributed at events like the watershed festival.

Offset Projects

Thurston County

Mr. Murphy presented examples of offset projects that are expansions of mitigation sites for stormwater runoff. The Albany Road stormwater facility in Rochester is one example – this project was funded through the first round of the Streamflow Restoration Grant program.

He showed an example of a site west of I-5 just south of the Great Wolf Lodge where WSDOT needed mitigation for a highway project. They mitigated the highway runoff by restoring a historical wetland. To restore the historical wetland, the project broke field drain tiles and restored a wetland that exists today. The concept for Streamflow Restoration offset projects is to expand these types of projects, and the extra water storage and environmental benefits could be counted toward the offset requirements.

Mr. Murphy showed another example of a completed project just south of 216th Ave SW and I-5 crossing. There was an existing wetland that was expanded beyond what was required for highway mitigation. A third example was a little further south on I-5 – “the foot” wetland; this one also enhanced an existing wetland.

Thurston County is coordinating with their public works department to identify new sites where this expansion concept could be applied. Mr. Hill asked how land access was obtained and Mr. Murphy said he believed WSDOT acquired easements. Mr. Massman asked how Ecology viewed these projects that add storage volume to stormwater requirements, and how you would quantify that water offset benefit. Mr. Noone said that quantification is the responsibility of the Plan Addendum developers to demonstrate to Ecology. Mr. Culhane said it was typically based on numerical model estimates.

Mr. Murphy showed additional examples from Clark County where wetland features were created along a connected corridor. These examples were from a developing suburban area with substantial housing subdivisions and commercial areas. In all these cases, the extra water would otherwise run off quickly to a surface water body so conveying it to the wetland re-times its contribution to streamflow. Ms. Holroyde asked if this concept could be applied along I-5 in the Centralia-Chehalis section, and Mr. Murphy answered possibly. Mr. Noone asked about maintenance requirements, and Mr. Thompson expressed concern about these types of sites becoming invasive weed nurseries if maintenance is neglected. Ms. Carlstad noted that these types of projects may be best suited for developing areas where stormwater ponds are being built. Mr. Murphy noted that there are also opportunities in rural areas where there are wetlands that were historically drained.

Ms. Carlstad asked if field drain tiles are common in the Chehalis. Mr. Thompson said that the Soil Conservation Service (former Natural Resources Conservation Service) used to pay farmers to install drain tiles. Quite a bit of it was clay tile and has largely broken down. This practice was not done as much in Grays Harbor County. Mr. Amrine said it was most common in Lewis County where there are poorly drained soils. Ms. Carlstad suggested that upgrades to these drainage systems may be of interest to farmers in exchange for restored wetlands on part of their land.

Mr. Massman asked about plan approval requirements and needing actual quantified water, particularly with projects like these being discussed. Mr. Culhane and Mr. Noone clarified that there can be a water benefit, albeit small. There may be also a Net Ecological Benefit.

Mr. Thompson asked about the gravel pits along I-5 and whether these could be used for storing water to recharge the aquifer. Mr. Noone responded that he is not familiar with these specific gravel pits, but most must have a reclamation plan.

Ms. Harma asked Mr. Murphy about graphics to explain the types of projects he presented, and Mr. Murphy said he will check with others at Thurston County. The Albany Street Stormwater facility had a water offset quantified for the Streamflow Restoration grant application.

Port Blakely

Mr. Lunde sent a memo to Ms. Harma and Ms. Carlstad describing a possible offset project concept from Port Blakely. Port Blakely is working on several conservation projects currently and doesn't have capacity to take on another one. But they identified two land parcels that could have value for conservation/water storage purposes that they could be willing to sell to a conservation landowner.

The first site is a 35-acre parcel along South Hanaford Creek adjacent to farmland and forest land. The second site is along the Hoquiam River. It is 35 acres and has a salmon-bearing stream passing through. It is bordered by Chehalis Basin River Land Trust land. Ms. Hewitt asked and confirmed her understanding about adjacent land ownership. Port Blakely intends to sell this land but is willing to enter into an MOA to sell the land to a conservation buyer over a 2-3 year timeframe for the benefit of the Watershed Plan Addendum. Ms. McFarland asked if they had other land holdings, they would be willing to sell, and Mr. Lunde responded it was possible they did. Mr. Bryson asked if the Quinault Indian Nation had ever approached Port Blakely about purchase, and Mr. Lunde was not sure.

Ms. Carlstad reviewed the ways parcels like these could help satisfy Addendum requirements – water storage from mature forest, and various aquatic habitat and water quality net ecological benefit. She also commented that we do not currently have any projects in the Hoquiam.

Mr. Lunde closed by letting the group know that the Port Blakely decision process for selling these parcels would be local so the bureaucracy would be minimal.

Plan Element Updates

Ms. Carlstad gave an update on permit-exempt well projections and consumptive use estimates. After getting guidance from the Demand Forecast Workgroup and finishing follow-up work, the new estimates are as follows:

- Permit-Exempt well projections – updated projection is 4,400 new connections by 2040.
- Average irrigated yard size – 0.08 acres per home (includes many without any yard irrigation)
- Total consumptive use estimate is approximately 1-2 cubic feet per second (cfs) or 525-1000 acre-feet per year.

There was some discussion about applying a safety factor to the permit-exempt well projections and consumptive use estimate. This could be done by applying a simple multiplier (like 1.5) to consumptive use estimate, by requiring projects to be distributed throughout the basin where aquatic species needs are greatest (these are not Ecology requirements). Ecology will require the CBP to have projects that exceed the consumptive use estimate to provide reasonable assurance that enough projects will get implemented to fully address the estimated use. Mr. Amrine asked for more clarification around subbasin-specific estimates and projects. Chair Harris advocated for continuing the CBP's work through implementation for the Addendum offset projects.

Ms. Carlstad gave a quick overview of the updated Workplan Overview handout:

- Meeting dates and locations are listed
- No other changes on dates for work and approvals
- Mr. Noone revisited the approval / adoption process. Ecology does not want to have a delay in County approval until after Ecology adoptions. This occurred in the Nisqually because of the extremely short timeline for that plan, but the process was not optimal. The conclusion of this discussion was that each County should have an approved resolution that they vote to approve plan with no further modifications from Ecology. Ms. Napier will share the resolution they used for the Nisqually so other counties can consider that as a template or starting place.

For the Good of the Order / Public Comment

Chair Harris thanked Ms. Shay and the Port of Grays Harbor for offering use of their facility at the Satsop Business Park. It was a great venue, and he appreciates them and the lower Basin community pushing the CBP to use it.

He opened the floor for public comment and partner updates.

- Ms. Holroyde – In conjunction with the League of Women Voters Thurston County Water Study, they are holding two “where’s the Water” forums – the first is March 5 with the following topics/ speakers:
 - What are the Impacts of Sea Level Rising in Thurston County? / Candice Penn, Climate Specialist, Squaxin island Tribe, Brian McTeague, GIS MNGER, Squaxin island Tribe PLUS
 - Lee First, Twin Harbors Riverkeeper – Sharing her float trip down the Chehalis to give others the perspective from the river
 - Developing Information about Flood Control on the Chehalis River / Andrea McNamara Doyle, Ecology Office of Columbia River Director.
- Mr. Hill announced that today is the last day for people to submit projects to the Lewis County Hearing Examiner for the Voluntary Stewardship Program.
- Mr. Lunde announced that Port Blakely was proud to sign a stewardship agreement with Oregon Department of Forestry last week. This is the first step and major milestone in formalizing approval for their Habitat Conservation Plan.

ADJOURNMENT

With there being no further business, Chair Terry Harris adjourned the meeting at noon.

RECORD OF DECISIONS:

1. June 28, 2019 – Members voted by full consensus to review the Charter Addendum as edited at this meeting within their organizations and be prepared for a second reading and approval at the July 26, 2019 meeting.
2. July 26, 2019 – Members voted by full consensus to approve the Charter Addendum to the 2004 Operating Procedures. The Quinault Indian Nation voted “Formal Disagreement, but Willing to Go with Majority” and will provide a written statement to include with the final charter.

NEXT MEETING: March 27, 2020