



CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP

Conference call with screen share

August 28, 2020

9:30am – 11:45am

Meeting Summary

MEMBERS* and ALTERNATES' PRESENT

Lee Napier', *Lewis County*

Kaitlynn Nelson', *Thurston County*

Alissa Shay', *Port of Grays Harbor*

Kim Ashmore*, *City of Centralia*

Chris Stearns*, *Thurston PUD*

John Weidenfeller', *Thurston PUD*

Dusty Guenther', *Boistfort Valley Water*

Jan Robinson*, *Chehalis River Basin Land Trust*

Jaron Heller*, *City of McCleary*

Lauren MacFarland', *Quinault Indian Nation*

John Bryson*, *Quinault Indian Nation*

Paula Holroyde*, Citizen, *League of Women Voters Thurston County*

Bob Johnson*, *Natural Resources*

Chris Lunde', *Port Blakely*

Jason Walter*, *Weyerhaeuser*

Caprice Fasano', *Quinault Indian Nation*

Terry Harris*, *City of Chehalis*

Brian Shay*, *City of Hoquiam*

Mike Noone*, *WA Dept of Ecology*

GUESTS

Jill Van Hulle, *contractor to Grays Harbor County*; Joel Massman, *contractor to Quinault Indian Nation*; Bob Amrine, *Lewis Conservation District*; Zainab Nejati, *Thurston County*; Tom Culhane, *Ecology*; Chanele Holbrook, *Citizen*; Jim Pacheco, *Ecology*; Mark Mobbs, *Quinault Indian Nation*; Jill Anderson, *City of Chehalis*; Thom Woodruff, *Capitol Land Trust*.

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

Mr. Harris started the meeting with a brief introduction and welcomed everyone.

Ms. Harma assembled the meeting and took roll.

Ms. Carlstad checked to see if everyone participating got their name called for member participation and introduced Mr. Harris for the meeting summary approvals for June and July.

2. Approval of June and July Meeting Summaries

Previously, there was a recording failure of the June meeting and the notes were put together later. That meeting summary as well as the July meeting summary were given to the members prior to this meeting.

Mr. Harris asked if anyone participating had any questions or concerns on either of the June or July meeting summaries. No one responded and both meeting summaries were approved.

Mr. Harris moved the meeting over to Ms. Carlstad to go over the draft Watershed Plan Addendum review and plan approval process.

Before moving onto the next topic, Ms. Carlstad mentioned that there were some typos in the July meeting summary that will be corrected prior to posting on the CBP website.

3. Draft Watershed Plan Addendum Review and Plan Approval Process

Ms. Carlstad opened with information about how to get a copy of the Plan Addendum. The Addendum itself was emailed to everyone. That email also had a link to download Appendix A and the project summary sheets. She mentioned if anyone did not get that link to please reach out to her.

Ms. Carlstad recognized the great team effort from everyone. She reflected on Mr. Hansen's wisdom about getting going on the projects early. She stated it had taken a lot of time to get projects together with a lot of change and ongoing work and thanked everyone again for the team effort.

Ms. Carlstad moved onto the Chehalis basin watershed management plan update. She mentioned she had sent out a PDF form of this presentation for people to use for their internal briefings.

- Ms. Carlstad stated that the draft Addendum was distributed on August 26, 2020 and that comments will be due back to herself and Ms. Harma by September 16, 2020, and that they will work to compile those and identify substantive topics that require CBP discussion for their next meeting.
- During the next meeting, all will go over significant comments received on the Addendum, the CBP will provide direction on how to address comments, and NHC will deliver a revised draft to the CBP by October 7, 2020.
- By October 16, 2020, approval or identification of issues will need to be resolved for CBP members. Ms. Carlstad mentioned that this draft will need to be ready to be approved by October 23, 2020 to submit to Ecology.
- The goal is to submit the final plan addendum to ecology by October 30, 2020.

Ms. Carlstad opened the floor for questions. No response was reported.

Ms. Carlstad reviewed that the purpose of this work is to comply with streamflow restoration law and detailed requirements that apply to the Chehalis basin. The requirement is to create the 20-year projected consumptive use from new permit-exempt domestic well connections and to identify projects that offset impact from streamflow and provide net ecological benefit (NEB) to the basin. The goal is to achieve a locally approved plan to avoid legislatively-required Ecology instream flow rule-making. Ms. Carlstad reminded folks that this addendum is to supplement the 2004 Watershed Plan; it does not to replace it.

Ms. Carlstad then stepped through various pieces of the addendum and showed results of the work. She started with the subbasin delineation which is guided by watershed boundaries from the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) watershed assessment units (WAUs) and following subbasin boundaries within the Chehalis and as a logical starting point. From there, some

adaptations were made by the demand forecast work group to the subbasins to better suit the work to be done. Two primary drivers for that were:

- Projected permit-exempt well densities (example: Scatter Creek having a small subbasin area, but high forecast of consumptive use).
- Practicality of lumping areas with few permit-exempt wells (example: Chehalis headwaters, Satsop, and others). Many of these headwater areas are forest land and national park land. Ms. Carlstad said there are very few exempt wells in those areas, so it did not make sense to break them up into smaller units.

Ms. Carlstad then moved onto the topic of permit-exempt well projections. She reminded participants about the variance in projections for the many subbasins. Ms. Carlstad discussed the methods used being single family residential building permits from 2008-2018, Office of Financial Management (OFM) forecasts, and Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC) forecast.

She discussed the cross-check of the projections with actual well permit data, having two years of data from each county. A well log spot check was done in water service areas both city and private/PUD water service areas to ensure capturing permit exempt wells that are drilled in those service areas. Knowledge from well drillers and environmental health specialists in Lewis County indicated where groundwater quantity and quality were poor. This was also cross-checked with land capacity per zoning. To give a capacity on how things could potentially grow, Ms. Carlstad mentioned that they had looked at county comprehensive plans where they existed (Thurston, Lewis, and Mason counties).

Ms. Carlstad reviewed the permit-exempt well distribution from 2008-2018. The highest density of permit-exempt well development has been within the Black River, Scatter Creek, Skookumchuck, and the Newaukum subbasins.

Ms. Carlstad then showed the consumptive use estimates map to show distributions around the basins that correspond with projections for new permit-exempt wells. Ms. Carlstad went over the projections for indoor and outdoor use. She mentioned that the indoor calculations of 60 gallons per person per day were calibrated to the average number of people per home in each county, while the outdoor calculations were based on irrigated yard size. The yard size used was equivalent to 0.074 acres of irrigation, which was determined by the average irrigated yard area at a subbasin level.

Ms. Carlstad then moved on to the topic of streamflow impacts. She mentioned the lack of ability to do site specific studies, because of a lack of information about gaining and losing reaches, and the lack of time to complete this planning effort. As a result, conservative assumptions were made that include the following:

- Consumptive Use = Streamflow Impact.
- Total subbasin consumptive use affects all streams within a subbasin equally along the entire length. This assumption is more protective of streamflow because this assumes there would be an impact since there is no certainty where wells will be located. Also, for example, there was uncertainty about which streams will be impacted and by how much.
- Pumping impacts were steady state or spread evenly throughout the year. This was a major assumption since pumping is greater for outdoor than indoor use if someone is irrigating a yard, which is a likely case during the summer season. This assumption applies

where most permit-exempt wells were located 2,000-3,000 feet from the nearby stream. The impact is spread throughout the year. As a result, this assumption was not protective of stream flow. For example, if one had a small stream that was water quantity limited and had a high concentration of permit-exempt wells, that impact may not fall into steady state assumption (note that those areas have not been identified).

Ms. Carlstad opened the floor for questions. No responses were reported.

Ms. Carlstad continued with her presentation and reviewed a map showing the project distribution, which included projects that were used to provide water benefit and habitat benefit only. The project types include the following:

- Beaver Dam Analogs (BDAs)
- Conservation/Land Acquisition
- Fish Passage
- Floodplain Storage
- Groundwater Recharge
- Stream and Riparian Restoration
- Water Infrastructure Improvements
- Water Right Acquisition

Overall, there is a good distribution with these project types shown. Basin-wide projects were not displayed in the map because they were mostly conceptual and could be applied in multiple locations within the basin.

Ms. Carlstad displayed a map showing the consumptive use estimate versus the estimated water offset from the suite of projects within the subbasin. Ms. Carlstad conveyed there was a nice match up of projects that provide water benefit in the higher consumptive areas. Ms. Carlstad mentioned that Mr. Noone pointed out that almost 70% of projected new permit-exempt water use was in the Black River, Scatter Creek, Skookumchuck and Newaukum subbasins. Ms. Carlstad mentioned that the water offset projects exceed consumptive use in all the subbasins shown which is a good thing. She then briefly overviewed other ecological benefits, primarily from habitat projects. Ecological benefit criteria from habitat projects include the reach length restored, riparian/upland area protected, and habitat reconnected (primarily fish passage to upstream habitat through barrier removal). There are 59 of these habitat projects with a combined restoration of 121 miles of reach length, 2,180 acres of upland areas protected, and 38 miles of habitat reconnected.

Ms. Carlstad mentioned that they wanted to communicate projects with a high likelihood of being implemented and provide stated benefits. She presented a certainty rating for the projects based on sponsor commitment, level of project development (both towards certainty of implementation), and level of analysis and supporting science for claimed benefit (towards certainty of benefits). Ms. Carlstad stressed that input is still needed from the offset projects work group as this rating system was a late addition to the plan addendum.

From the presented table, if there were high certainty of benefit, but low implementation certainty, it is not likely to get done. In totality, this list of projects would provide 1,841 acre-feet per year of offset water if all projects were implemented (this number is over three times the consumptive use estimate). Ms. Carlstad discussed that with the high estimate, there was a good buffer such that if a couple of the projects do not get implemented, the offset goal should still be met. Ms. Carlstad called attention to the TransAlta surface water right acquisition from the

Skookumchuck River being one very large project among the list of projects with a high certainty of implementation and high certainty of benefit.

Ms. Carlstad brought attention back to the tight schedule and opened the floor for questions and comments. The following feedback was reported:

- Mr. Stearns requested to go back and look at the highest certainty projects slide. Ms. Carlstad asked if he had a question regarding anything on this slide.
- Mr. Woodruff stated that this was an awesome document and he had learned a lot from it. He then asked about the project ID numbers on the chart and why there were separate ones for Thurston County (TC #91 for example). Ms. Carlstad responded that the TC stands for Thurston County and that they had their own project numbering system prior to this that they kept on there for consistency. As for the project ID numbers, Ms. Carlstad pointed out that there was more information in Appendix B. For each project there is a summary sheet that describes them. She noted that there will be a lot of reformatting and filling in of missing information on those summary sheets but at this point they can be used to inform people of the next level of detail for all the projects.
- Ms. Harma mentioned that TC #91 is a conceptual project and is working with Ms. Nelson to more fully describe it.
- Ms. Fasano stated she appreciates work that has been done with this plan and understands project work is ongoing. She had many questions about estimated offset value for each project and plan comments in September will reflect that. Ms. Fasano wanted to make sure there is a conservative approach taken on this work.
- Mr. Amrine wondered if he can still add projects to this list. Ms. Carlstad responded that it was not too late to add to the list but questioned what type of project he would like to add. Mr. Amrine said that he has four fish passage projects, one that was included already and three new ones, some of which include the use of BDAs. Ms. Carlstad responded that those would help, and added Ms. Fasano's point from earlier, that it was important to have site specific analyses to feel more confident on water benefits.
- Mr. Stearns commented about his uncertainty with the accuracy of the estimated population growth projections based on the ongoing census and how they were used in the calculations. He mentioned the increased growth in Thurston counties will lead to the extensive growth to adjacent counties in the long run. Ms. Carlstad responded that this concern links directly to the implementation and the adaptive management need for this plan. Ms. Carlstad mentioned that in doing the projections for permit exempt wells, there was a level of conservatism that covered rapid growth and concentrated growth areas. It will be important to look at those more specifically as they emerge and think more about the impact to the streams in the rapid growth areas versus how the project suite does or does not address the impacts will be important to the adaptive management portion of the plan.
- Mr. Harris asked Ms. Carlstad if there was a possibility of looking at this in a red-line version to keep track of changes as they go, specifically to the low, medium and high rankings on the chart from earlier. Ms. Carlstad responded as edits and changes are made, they will be able to see these against the original addendum. On October 7th, a clean fresh copy and a markup copy showing changes will be given out. These will be summarized separately for ease of review.

- Ms. Holbrook asked in the text box if they know if critical areas zoning in Thurston County help constrain sprawl or development with exempt wells, and has that been incorporated? She followed this up by wondering if critical areas zoning has helped or hindered long term planning with regards to sprawl and the exempt wells. She noted that if they cannot tap into city water or set wells, then they are sprawling further into areas deemed critical. Ms. Carlstad responded with background on Thurston County projections. The projections for Thurston County were developed by the Thurston County Regional Planning Council (TRPC), and they incorporate a very parcel specific model for likelihood to develop or redevelop, based on factors such as critical areas, zoning, employment centers, transportation routes, etc. Those were developed at a parcel level for the likelihood to develop or redevelop. Ms. Carlstad summarized and answered yes to her question. Ms. Nelson added in about critical areas that the code is considered with projection done by TRPC. Ms. Holbrook responded that things are happening in the south county that were not supposed to, which raised a red flag for her. Ms. Nelson responded that the critical areas ordinance laid out in what instances you can have a permit-exempt well and what one needs to meet to do that. She discussed the process to update it which could possibly lead to opening the critical areas ordinance and had considered whether this group should look into this later on during plan implementation. She followed it up with research needs to be done and considered for the CBP to look at it. Ms. Holbrook continued that things have changed faster than expected. She discussed that between hard surfaces and consumptive use, the impacts have changed dramatically in areas where she thought they were not going to be impacted. This event has showed her that things can change rather quickly. Ms. Carlstad replied that the south Thurston County area of watershed is most rapidly changing and vulnerable for low flows and loss of streamflow. She suspects it would be a prime focus for monitoring and adaptive management.
- Mr. Stearns commented that the PUD's relationship with Thurston County is evolving. There will be a new county commissioner and there are many more water systems within the county in rural areas that will continue to grow. He conveyed that as their relationship grows, hopefully people will realize that there are more systems being coordinated. He added that in the long run it will be wiser to add onto systems rather than depending on exempt wells with shallow aquifer and changes during times of the year. Ms. Carlstad asked Mr. Stearns if he knew the depth of the wells and if they are pulling from surface water or deeper existing aquifers? Mr. Stearns answered that the data on the depth is okay; if you drill too deep you hit marine sediments, which is not good for water supply due to their saline nature. He mentioned that the difference between the north and south county is about the depth of aquifer and capacity. Water in the south region of the county is very vulnerable. Ms. Carlstad responded Thurston PUD provided water use data for over 200 Group B systems which was a great base to compare calculated consumptive use with those systems since they are similar in nature. She also noted they vary quite a bit where some systems showed around 200 gallons per day per household, while other were greater than 400 gallons per day per household. Mr. Stearns closed by noting that the water rights attached to those systems vary quite a bit too.

Ms. Carlstad opened floor to the rest of the members attending for comments or initial reactions. No response was reported.

Ms. Carlstad repeated review details from the email sent out with the draft addendum, that comments are to be kept to the topic rather than address grammar and style. She welcomed everyone to send their feedback in whatever way was easiest for the participants. As of now, Ms. Carlstad mentioned everyone is welcome to comment, but as for the approval process, it will be

limited to Partnership membership only. She mentioned that if there are major comments not from the Partnership, it will be left for the Partnership to decide if it is something they want to act on or not.

Ms. Carlstad asked one last time if anyone had final thoughts on this topic. With no responses reported, Ms. Carlstad released all for a ten-minute break.

4. Implementation Phase Planning

Ms. Carlstad welcomed everyone back from their break. She welcomed Ms. Harma to discuss the implementation phase.

Ms. Harma presented on the implementation and adaptive management requirements. She discussed that the Streamflow Restoration law (RCW 90.94) was silent on implementation obligations and requirements, and more about Ecology and planning groups getting out planning ideas. However, Ecology's review will investigate the certainty that the plan will be implemented and will want to see high probability that the projects in there will be implemented. She discussed that this law itself establishes funding this plan enables the local planning units, such as the CBP, to say how they want to use the \$500 permit-exempt well fee.

Ms. Harma outlined the implementation tasks, which include the following:

- Working with project sponsors to implement offset projects, cultivate sponsors, develop projects, support for acquiring projects. This is to really bring their ideas into a reality.
- Track new permit-exempt wells basin wide and compare against projections.
- Collaborate with basin monitoring programs to monitor project effectiveness (For example, the use of BDAs from one of the proposed projects will help to fill a data gap).
- Identify and work to fill key data gaps.
- Integrate learnings from regional and statewide studies to improve outcomes and project designs.

Ms. Harma discussed the Salmon Recovery Portal as the tracking tool to track salmon recovery projects around the state. The use of this tool allows the following:

- Tracking progress towards meeting project and plan goals.
- Assessing project's role in meeting salmon recovery goals.
- Alignment with salmon recovery projects funded through other sources.
- Accounting for streamflow benefits from non-salmon recovery-related projects.

Ms. Harma stated that essentially one can track projects they were going to do and how they were doing.

Ms. Harma then discussed the adaptive management and how it is defined in the NEB guidance. It basically states that they will learn as they go, and the work will improve as they learn. She identified that the resources needed to carry out next steps of the plan are funding for

administrative support, which the plan requests from the state, and states that member organizations may support the work as appropriate. Basically, nothing will happen if no one is there to move it along.

Ms. Harma then reviewed discussion the CBP had on this topic at its June meeting. The poll response from that meeting included the following:

- CBP should lead implementation and adaptive management.
- Opportunity to incentivize quality of projects and support project sponsors.
- Members contribute in the way they are able.
- Work together to request financial support from state for administrative needs.

For general thinking after this plan is adopted by everyone in October:

- Renew shared interest and commitment to basin.
- Project entry into Salmon Recovery Portal so members are empowered to see what is happening in local jurisdictions.
- Work plan for projects and helping sponsors align with projects they would like to implement.
- Need to identify key data gaps and compile scientific information as it comes through.
- Communication with CBP membership.

Ms. Harma then kicked this off with outreach to the group, and thanked members for their hard work so far. She opened the floor to questions.

- Mr. Mobbs asked about when monitoring is expected. He mentioned that is needed to adaptively manage and measure success. Ms. Harma replied that the law itself does not require monitoring but agreed that it would be beneficial to be effective. She said monitoring is not in the plan other than one project using USGS to identify areas that are sensitive to development of permit exempt wells. Ms. Carlstad asked if Mr. Mobbs has more to add to his question. He added that even though there is no monitoring requirement, he doesn't believe the Partnership will have an effective adaptive management program if they did not know if project implementation work and to only know if they work is by monitoring. Ms. Carlstad responded that she expected that there would be a collaboration with the Chehalis Basin strategy on monitoring.
- Ms. Carlstad mentioned the recent addition of the USGS project and invited Ms. Harma to talk more about it. Ms. Harma became interested in the idea, after talking to USGS, about furthering knowledge about hydraulic continuity in basins that are most vulnerable. This first step would be to focus on better identifying whether these are gaining or losing reaches in the watershed. She added that the knowledge of this will help target where to locate certain types of projects such as managed aquifer recharge, water in the floodplain, and where it will come out in stream.

- Ms. Van Hulle had a question about implementation within the plan about funding structures such as the \$350 from the \$500 well fee and how Grays Harbor County is shepherding this funding mechanism. Ms. Harma responded that currently is how it is structured since Grays Harbor County is the current fiscal sponsor. Ms. Carlstad responded that she does not know if it required for Grays Harbor County to play that role, but it makes sense since that they are currently playing the role of fiscal agent.

Ms. Carlstad asked Mr. Noone to provide details about the fiscal mechanics. It was an idea as an option for bridge funding for administrative support. Mike responded that fees collected by county or cities are sorted by WRIA and that the law specifies it is to be used for stream restoration efforts within the WRIA in which it was collected. He discussed that it is not explicitly spelled out how those fees are used; however, this entity or others could recommend the rule be changed to have funds transferred directly back into planning efforts within the WRIA. However, Ecology cannot guarantee it. Other WRIsAs involved in streamflow restoration planning are interested in this rule change, which makes it likely that Ecology will consider the rule change.

- Mr. Stearns had a question for both Ms. Harma and Ms. Carlstad. His first question regarded a lot of people not realizing there is a moving goal post with all things happening statewide (ex, requirement to fix all culverts in the state) and was wondering if that figures in when you open up a new habitat or new projects where those blockages were at the culvert replacements in salmon projects? Ms. Harma replied that this related to salmon recovery more broadly and the state was putting money in to open up state transportation department fish passage barriers, but was not required to coordinate with partners to do recovery work upstream or downstream of those and that it was more voluntary to get maximum benefit.
- Mr. Stearns' second question asked for Ms. Carlstad to comment on what she would suggest was changing the most, mentioning BDAs as an example of a rapidly changing project, seeing that a lot of projects are going through different phases and are transforming over time as more people do them and they get more sophisticated. Ms. Carlstad responded that since she works in various areas with many communities as a consultant, she has seen a lot of effort being placed on how water can be stored and how it can provide the most benefit for all the multiple uses. She discussed that there are some super interesting research and implementation work going on in the Chehalis area, BDAs being one of those. She mentioned that this is trying to change the paradigm from beavers being a nuisance to beavers being helpful in habitat recovery. BDAs may be a transitional type of project where beavers will come in and do the work, or maybe a BDA is the long-term solution to engineer and control more precisely. Ms. Carlstad stated that another example in the Chehalis is alluvial water storage that Grays Harbor Conservation District has been doing. She said that right now, science is unclear to claim a streamflow benefit, but it makes intuitive sense to improve the system. She added that managed aquifer recharge is uncommon and expects to see more of that.
- Ms. Carlstad called attention to Mr. Lunde's question in the chat and welcomed him to verbalize it. Mr. Lunde responded that after repairing fish barriers for years in the forest lands he has had a few projects where they make the repair and downstream there was a road barrier. He wanted to throw this idea into the into conversation that they need to look downstream rather than upstream. Ms. Harma added that continued collaboration and discussion is important, which Mr. Lunde agreed with. Ms. Carlstad added in that she appreciated that comment a lot and they would not have heard if it were not for his or Mr.

Walter's participation and she loved having their point of view on things as managed forest landowners.

- Mr. Harris jumped in to address Mr. Mobbs' concern about follow up monitoring on adaptive management from earlier in the meeting. He stated that first and foremost, the legislature created what they consider results or programs which bring results and often, they look two blocks down the road rather than two miles. He mentioned it will be up to the Partnership and outside partners involved in this to make sure implementation and adaptive management takes place. Mr. Harris mentioned it was important to ask for revenue or resources to get it done and there was no sense in pouring something down a funnel without having a jar underneath. Ms. Carlstad added that she thinks the Partnership's initiative will lead to funding.

5. Plan Addendum Progress Reports

Ms. Carlstad moved onto the plan and addendum public/elected official engagements. She noted there has been liberal use of the road show presentation.

The completed briefings to different groups in the basin are as follows:

- Quinault Indian Nation Natural Resources Committee
- Lewis County Chapter of Realtors
- Ocean Shores
- McCleary
- Chehalis River Basin Land Trust
- Port of Grays Harbor
- Thurston County League of Women Voters
- Grays Harbor County
- Aberdeen
- Thurston PUD
- Thurston County
- City of Chehalis

Briefings scheduled:

- Centralia

Ms. Carlstad welcomed people to reach out to schedule something and get the word out about the plan addendum.

Ms. Anderson thanked Mr. Harris and Ms. Harma for briefing the Chehalis City Council earlier this week.

Ms. Carlstad closed and turned the call back over to Mr. Harris for announcements and public comments and good of the order announcements.

6. For the Good of the Order / Public Comment

Mr. Harris mentioned that the next meeting was set for September 25, 2020, which appeared to be the day some folks are on furlough. He requested that Ms. Carlstad and Ms. Harma speak with those folks between meetings to fill them in.

Mr. Harris opened the floor to comments from all on things happening in their communities.

- Ms. Van Hulle mentioned how the TransAlta water rights transaction was arranged for public notice and are running it in three newspapers: The Chronicle, The Aberdeen World, and The Olympian. She discussed that the notice was unique because it is a trust water transaction and they are running what was called a 'dual notice'. Running both intents to put approximately 28,000 acre-feet into trust and filing a mitigation water rights application for TransAlta. All 28,000 acre-feet are going into trust and TransAlta will write itself a check back from the water bank to cover use of water occurring at the end of this year through when they continue ramping down the next five years.

Ms. Carlstad asked Ms. Van Hulle to describe a trust water right and what it means. Ms. Van Hulle elaborated that there are different types of trust water banking; this one establishes a formal water bank. She discussed that for it to work, it basically is two parts where they were formally changing use of the water right and place of use. She discussed at the end of the process that water right is deeded back to Ecology, not by allocating water rights, but by mitigation shares. This trust water agreement is assuming that the water partnership would remain permanently in trust for instream flows, different from if someone bought it to irrigate with. It is a change application, modifying the water right to make it suitable for these purposes. Ms. Carlstad asked about the time duration. Ms. Van Hulle responded that it was permanent, and the goal was to have water right banked and in place by end of year to match TransAlta's needs.

Mr. Stearns added to this with a comment about the great public interest in what is happening with water in Lewis County, especially the Cowlitz Basin, and it gathered people's attention about water. He said he would not underestimate interest in what they are doing here as a group. He expects to be dealing with a lot of water issues and would be surprised if the legislature were not interested in the work too. Ms. Van Hulle responded that as they get to the finish line, she believes there will be more outreach on behalf of TransAlta regarding what they are doing and what opportunities it presents for the downstream community. Mr. Harris mentioned that TransAlta has been a huge community supporter throughout this process and specifically thanked them as well.

- Ms. Harma discussed the possibility of releasing of a press release when the Plan Addendum is approved to let the community know what is in the plan and highlight the projects within each town, hoping to get a quote from each of those counties.
- Ms. Harma asked Mr. Noone, as they gear up for implementation, to look at projects they want to foster and go for the next round of Ecology funding. Mr. Noone responded that he is uncertain about the timing of the next grant run. He mentioned it could be next year or two years down the road. There are arguments for both sides. If this plan is adopted in February, then all projects in the Plan Addendum will get preference points under this grant program. Ms. Harma followed up with her earlier question to Mr. Noone and asked about the application if it was 2 years out. Mr. Noone responded it is yet to be determined and that they look to see when it would be the smartest and best for applicants for grant availability since there are a lot of other grant programs in Washington. He mentioned that they had thought about aligning their grant with others so applicants applying can also apply a portion of the grant through other entities. He added that October is a better

time for availability or announcement to occur, but a decision has not yet been made. He said Ecology is in the middle of scoring the grants received during the current round and those announcements are expected mid-September or early October. Thought about the next round will follow.

- Mr. Stearns thanked everyone for getting everything running on time and completed when scheduled. He has seen other watershed groups getting their plans finished, so there is competition. Mr. Harris agreed. He mentioned folks on these committees have done a tremendous job. He mentioned that it was the time to win budgeted dollars for operation of the Partnership. Mr. Harris said they do not need a lot to keep this organization going, but the dimes will count if we can get them from different partners than in the past.
- Ms. Holroyde mentioned that since it was election time it might be nice to have a photo opportunity with the legislature that is helping to fund these projects. It will be both beneficial to them and us. Mr. Harris agreed. Mr. Harris mentioned if they knew any legislative folks to send any photos to Ms. Harma.

Ms. Carlstad said a big thank you to the entire team. She mentioned that they were so diligent and responsive in the last month outing this watershed addendum together. Mr. Harris agreed and said thank you as well.

AJOURNMENT

With there being no further business, Chair Harris adjourned the meeting at 11:32.

NEXT MEETING: September 25, 2020