

Whatcom County Business and Commerce Committee
Meeting Notes
January 23, 2023

Voting Members Present: Ryan Allsop (Committee Vice Chair), Paul Burill, Pamela Brady, Clark Campbell, Brad Rader, Sarah Rothenbuhler (Committee Chair), Chris Trout

Voting Members Not Present: Debbie Ahl, Pete Dawson, Casey Diggs, Andrew Gamble, Troy Muljat, Bob Pritchett, Dana Wilson

Nonvoting Members Present: Small Cities Representative Jori Burnett, County Councilmember Tyler Byrd, Mayor Seth Fleetwood, Don Goldberg, Eva Schulte, CJ Seitz, County Executive Satpal Sidhu, RB Tewksbury

Nonvoting Members not Present:

Public Present: Ken Bell – POB Commissioner, Henry Bierlink, Lance Calloway, Jane Carten, Barbara Chase, Wendy Christensen, Citizen (no name given), Dan Dunne, Chris Elder, Chris Erdmann, Jessie Everson, Peter Frazier, Heather Flaherty, Rob Fix – Executive Director, Port of Bellingham, Kaylee Galloway – Whatcom County Council, Braden Gustafson, Darell Hillaire, John Huntley, Jon Hutchings, Frank Imhoff, Jay Julius, Kathy Kershner – Whatcom County Council, Rob Lee, Erika Lautenbach, Kim Lund, Steven Malloch, Lynn Murphy, Kendra Norton, Jennifer Noveck, Guy Occhiogrosso, Scott Revell, Anna Robbins, Andrea Ruback, Lyle Sorenson, Danielle Squeochs, Gina Stark, Tom Tebb, Jack Timmons

January Agenda

Introductions / Administrative business / Comments welcome from the Public (5 min)

- Committee Chair calls meeting to order
- Committee Member Introductions
- Approve December 2022 minutes
- Invite public to participate along with Committee members during Q&A sessions

Discussion regarding bylaws amendments (20 min)

- Review of 2023 Business Commerce Roster & Meeting Schedule
- Review of Business Commerce Bylaws
- Chair/Co-Chair Nomination/Vote
- Recommendation to County Council to add Construction sector position

Water: Yakima Basin Integrated Plan Partnership (30 min)

- Background & Lesson Learned
- Q&A (15 min)

Childcare: Update / Summary by Childcare Subcommittee Co-Chair Clark Campbell (10 min)

- Q&A (10 min)

Yakima Basin Presenters

- Tom Tebb, Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River, Director
- Danielle Squeochs, Ph.D. – Yakama Nation Water Resources, Hydrologist
- Steve Malloch – Consultant to American Rivers

- Scott Revell – Roza Irrigation District Manager
- Wendy Christensen - US Bureau of Reclamation, Program Manager

DRAFT

Sarah Rothenbuhler: All right. All, we're going to get this meeting going. If anyone wants to grab some chairs up at the table, you're welcome. (Laughter.) Thank you, to everybody who's here or online. I don't anticipate that we will have a quorum today. So we'll push through a housekeeping as best we can. I'll begin by calling us to order, Clark, you mind getting us started?

Clark Campbell: Yes. Clark Campbell, representing outdoor recreation and Gear Aid.

Eva Schulte: Eva Schulte, representing Whatcom Community College - Higher Education.

Gina Stark: Gina Stark, Port of Bellingham Economic Development division.

Pamela Brady: Pam Brady, BP.

Brad Rader: Brad Rader, agriculture and GM of Rader Farms.

Port Commissioner Ken Bell: I'm Kathy Kershner. I'm Whatcom County Councilor and a new representative this year.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Do we have any committee members on Zoom?

Chris Trout: Chris Trout with Wood Stone Corporation, Manufacturing.

CJ Seitz: CJ Seitz, Higher Ed, Western Washington University.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: RB?

RB Tewkesbury: RB Tewksbury with Market Works.

Jennifer Noveck: We also have Jori Burnett from Small Cities.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Great. Thank you, Jori, for being here. RB and Pam are new committee members as of February 1st. So, welcome. You've already been approved by the County Council. And I think we'll do an official motion in February when we have quorum. How's that sound? But if you do want to do any extra projects, join all the subcommittees, take meeting notes, anything between now and then, you're welcome to. (Laughter)

Pamela Brady: I'll have to step away from the table, should have read the fine print (laughter)

Sarah Rothenbuhler: You can't. (Laughter.) And it's wonderful that you're here. Just a reminder that this is a meeting that is open to the public, and we really would love to hear what you all have to say for any topics that we have on the table. So thank you, thank you. We'd love your participation. So I believe we are through. Jennifer, our housekeeping we can do without quorum?

Jennifer Noveck: Yes. So I think the only thing from administrative business is for everyone to note that we have posted and have sent around the 2023 meeting schedule, so we'll be sending out invites for those. But just so you all are aware the schedule is posted on the committee's website and you'll be receiving outlook invites for those meetings as they happen.

Don Goldberg: As well as Mayor Seth. But can I just ask one quick thing?

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Yes, you bet.

Don Goldberg: So welcome, everyone. I just want to remind everybody that the grants that we've been trying to get for the disaster of last year in North County finally came through. And those grants are open right now at the Commerce Department. They're \$10 million worth of flood grants, \$40,000 dollar maximum grant. So if any of you yourselves, or know of anybody that is in need of a grant that was affected by the floods of 2020, that funding is available now, and it's the first of its kind in the state. So we'd love to take advantage of it.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: And hopefully we'll learn from the Yakima group and we can move past the having the floods.

Don Goldberg: Exactly.

Whatcom County Council Member Kathy Kershner: Can I ask a question, is that for businesses?

Don Goldberg: This is the first time for businesses. So this is - FEMA covers residential, but there's no money for businesses. So this is the first time the state has had a grant for businesses affected by a disaster.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: I think we lost - our damages were maybe 70,000. But flood insurance is going to cost you maybe 20-30,000 annually. So most businesses are in a bit of a crux. So again, back to remedying the flooding like other communities

Don Goldberg: And what's really unusual about this one is it's not only the physical damage, it's also business.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Loss of business for sure. Could you double check? We may have a quorum with Ryan here. We need to have six or seven voting committee members here?

Don Goldberg: I believe yes with 13 total members.

Jennifer Noveck: We just have one voting member online.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Everyone stand up. (Laughter)

Don Goldberg: One, two, three, four, five. So we're at six.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Well we're close.

Clark Campbell: Yeah.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: (Group motioning to another attendee) He's not on the committee, but he sure is a great contributor. We're eyeballing you for a future committee member. (Laughter) So we are a little bit early. We have let our group know that it would be about 11:20. Tom, I see you on there- would the Yakima group mind letting us know if you're all here and we could do some introductions? Or we'll jump to another topic if you're not all here yet.

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: Yeah. I'm not sure that we're all here. I'm looking for Danielle Squeochs with the Yakama Nation and Wendy Christiansen with Reclamation. I do see Scott Revell and I do see Steve Malloch. I'm not sure if we're missing anybody else, but probably allow you guys to go ahead and have your business and I'll text those other folks, make sure we get on the call.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Thank you for being here. And we might just take 12 minutes to celebrate being early. (Laughter) Clark, do you mind . . . I'm going to have you straddle the Yakima Water presentation.

Clark Campbell: Yeah, I can be flexible there. So, Clark Campbell, representative for Outdoor Recreation. And I got tasked with being the subcommittee chair for the child care issue. (Laughter)

Sarah Rothenbuhler: And task is a strong word

Clark Campbell: Once the ballot measure was put on the ballot, I was involved in a number of the working group sessions on that. So just as an attendee on it and as a representative from this group, as an official county appointed board, you're not allowed to take a position on it while it was being voted by the public. As you might recall, it passed November - narrowly, but passed. So that's now become a program that's funded. When it began to be a valid measure, prior to actually passing, the health department had to get going pretty quickly on an implementation program because there was a whole bunch of stuff it was going to need to happen on a really fast timeline. I think the deadline for it being submitted to county Council is early March in terms of its draft, its final plan. So they had to figure out what the fund was going to generate, then figure out what their priorities were and what the strategies were to support those, and then what the funding allocation was going to be for each strategy. So when I was involved with a lot of the stakeholders in that group, I think there was a lot of really good work that was done. My feedback, particularly with regard to the transparency of how the funds would be distributed and ingested, scoping out what the project priorities are going to be, drafting off of the work that was done by the Whatcom County Children and Family Wellbeing Task Force. So a lot of this foundational work was already in

place. It was just a matter of getting that now and then allocating it well. Now you got a pie. It needs to be divided up and there's a lot of stakeholders that have a stake in that pie, right? So a lot of public processes where you're trying to build that on consensus.

The concern I think I have is that the primary deliverables of the ballot measure get funded sufficiently to deliver the impact with a visual result quickly enough. Right. So long story short, on the 10th, I got a letter sent out from the Health Department with the 60 page implementation plan document. I thought it went out to all members. It may have just come to me. I've read the whole thing. But then under the challenge for this group is they wanted to give feedback on a Google doc as of last Friday, and I was like, Wow, it's going to take a long time for me to read it, for me to get my head around it, and then to give constructive feedback. I've done that and I can do that on behalf of Clark Campbell, the representative for child care to the committee. But if we're going to do this as a way of something that the whole group reviews and votes on, that's going to take a little longer process. So long story short, I think my input on it is there's two primary priorities that are being funded under the. Adding of early learning and care supported by six very clear strategies. There's another secondary priority of supporting vulnerable children supported by four other strategies. All of them are well thought and all of them could be funded and they have taken a view as to how to fund each of those. But what it ends up doing is taking what's about an \$11 million per year funding and spreading that pretty thin. So my concern is that's not going to have the primary impact, which if you look at if you go back to the ballot measure, the primary goal that was stated was held Children's Fund is a dedicated, flexible and accountable local fund that will expand high quality, affordable, early learning and child care to help children of all backgrounds and or kindergarten ready to learn. So that's the that's the bold text of the ballot measure. And then there's a lot of other things that I would say are probably adjacencies as opposed to directly focusing on on providing more, more slots, greater capacity with greater affordability, with good quality for kids 0 to 5. What that means is anything that's not that is outside of scope from what was being voted on and approved as a ballot measure. So what I would like to do is to first and foremost kind of reread that statement and then narrow aggressively the scope of the draft implementation plan and the dollar allocations to deliver on that promise.

So I've kind of given two big areas that that came out of the working group sessions. And one was it really we could you're not going to build your way out of this problem. So we did have LEED certified platinum facilities all over the county, and it wouldn't add a single additional spot slot or child care, at least certainly not in the first three years of the plan to do that is is to just the primary goal and the trying to challenge. I would say that most of the current providers have is just being able to hire staff and these are staff that need to be certified and trained. So you're asking somebody with a certification and training to take a job for 16 to \$17 an hour. There's a lot of other better jobs out there that don't require that they pay more or require less certification. So the only way to get that elevated is going to take public funds. So my sense is some form of workforce subsidy could take up as much as \$3.5 to \$4 million of that 11 million per year to move the meter, enough to be able to hire, enough to have the impact, enough for what voters thought they were getting this measure.

So it means that, long story short, and I'm kind of summing up here, the two things I am recommending is: Narrow project funding scope of the six strategies to the six strategies supporting priority goal number

one, which is early child early learning and care, and then reallocate the funds for strategies one through six with roughly 60% of those total funds going to strategies three and four.

And those three and four were, provide early learning care subsidies for children without from ALIS families. So that's focusing primarily on people that are below 200% of the federal poverty level. To me, that point will really address a lot of the issues under supporting vulnerable children. So you can kind of just take those dollars and move them back up. And then point four is, promote the expansion of the early learning and care workforce. And again, that's back to workforce subsidies and enable them to be that market rate. If you compare it to, say, a para educator at the Bellingham Public Schools District, that's probably a \$20 to \$21 an hour job with full benefits. That works nine months out of the year. So if you're if you're trying to get a track, people, that's probably the bare minimum is \$20 to \$21 an hour. And what we heard from Boys Club, Girls Club and a lot of the other groups was they can't afford to do that and stay profitable, particularly with the reimbursement dollars they're getting at the state level. So we've got to fund that fund now can go to kind of hit those two primary goals, which is workforce stabilization subsidies and subsidies for ALIS. Then take the rest of the fund and implement the other four strategies underscoring early learning and care. And just do that for the first two years. Anything else beside that to me is kind of mission critical. So there you go.

Paul Burrill: Thank you for going to that condition. Of course. Quick question. So you've mentioned it zero five years of age with this program going to be concentrated on. If I recall the previous presentation, that's the most expensive, you need the most caregivers for each child at that point. Would that possibly lead to some latitude for the companies that are private and private companies to be more profitable from the ages five and up?

Clark Campbell: Well, if you think about this is public education, there's your primary child care right there. So when I look at this from a business and commerce perspective, too. So from a business perspective, closing the gap that we have with being able to get staffing means getting both men and women available to work, available to work. One of the biggest reasons people are not coming to work right now is because lack of childcare either affordable or they just can't get it due to availability. And so the focus of zero to five is really focusing on that pre-K level.

Ryan Allsop: Well, to answer, if I recall correctly, zero to 2 is the least profitable and 3 to 5 is the more profitable for child care providers or 3 to 6. Because 0 to 2 they have a higher ratio of staff to student requirements. Bellingham public schools doing their own care also, which is going to hurt the private sector or not also which is great but it also hurts them when they take the profitable portion of our kids out.

Clark Campbell: So that's the only thing I would say, is I do have a draft letter that I like to be able to distribute. I can't do that due to restrictions on our committee. I probably need to send it to Jenn and have her send it to the members. This isn't like, we're not doing a formal presentation or proposal to the County Council. This is just so that we can get our feedback logged and given to the Health Department

implementation Project Management team. I'd love to hear back from this group on whether or not you feel like I'm off base. At this point, all I can speak to is, this is my personal perspective.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: We may well have time to review/respond after this presentation. Thank you for all your work on this. How are we doing group from Yakima?

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: I think we're all ready. We're missing one member, but I think we can cover it, so. If you just let us know when you're ready.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: We are ready for you. Jennifer, can you pull up that PowerPoint or will Tom and his team share the PowerPoint?

Jennifer Noveck: They should be able to share their screen, but let me know if you can't, Tom.

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: All right. Let me see what I can do here.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: And then, Tom, would you like me to give a brief introduction, or do you want to introduce your team?

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: I will do that. Steve Malloch, do you have this presentation?

Consultant to American Rivers, Steve Malloch: I've got it. I can start it.

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: All right. Thank you. Okay, well, first of all, I just want to express our appreciation for the opportunity to talk a little bit about the base and integrated plan to this group. We very much appreciate the opportunity to talk about our work. We're very proud of our work. I think we have on the on the call here today, we have myself, Tom Tebb with the Department of Ecology Service, the director of the Office of Columbia River. I've had this position since 2015, and our office is responsible for implementing the Basin Integrated Plan. On the call also today, we have Scott Revell with the Roza Irrigation District. You want to introduce yourself, Scott?

Roza Irrigation District Manager, Scott Revell: Sure. I've managed the Roza Irrigation District since 2014. Our district has a junior water right. So we are cut back during drought years. If you have wine in your house or you have beer in your refrigerator, you probably have Roza grown wine grapes or juice in your house. Our district has about 72,000 irrigated acres and about 1,000,000,005 in total crop value.

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: Great. Thank you, Scott. And I'm going to turn to Steve Malloch. Steve.

Consultant to American Rivers, Steve Malloch: Sure. Thanks. I'm Steve Malloch. I'm a consultant to American Rivers. I've been working on the Integrated Basin Integrated Plan since essentially its inception, either for American Rivers or for other conservation groups. The Yakima Basin Integrated Plan is kind of an interesting one for a conservation group because we've taken it on as a bit of an experiment on how to really do conservation in a climate changing world. And that means we've got to widen our view and embrace things that we might not have in prior years. You'll see it's a big piece that we're all working for. Thanks, Tom.

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: Thank you Steve. And Wendy Christiansen with the Bureau of Reclamation is our partner, our co partner with the Yakama Nation Department of Ecology, sort of as the governments that help manage the work. Wendy?

US Bureau of Reclamation, Program Manager, Wendy Christiansen: Good morning, everyone. I'm Wendy Christiansen. I'm the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project manager. I'm also a civil engineer, I've worked for the Bureau of Reclamation for 32 years. I've been working with this group since 2009, and I've been the manager since 2016. So we're very committed. Reclamation is very committed to the water resource planning that we're doing as part of the Basin Integrated Plan and committed to implementing portions of the plan. We have legislation that was passed in 2019 and it's an important component to the restoration in the basin. Thanks for having us.

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: Yeah, thank you. Thank you, Wendy. And I'll just do one check. I don't know if Danielle Squeochs with the Yakama Nation - are you on? I don't see your name in the participant list, but Danielle Squeochs is with the Yakama Nation. She holds a doctorate in hydrogeology and geology. She's also a participant on our executive committee and many of our subcommittees. It's unfortunate Danielle is not on our call today, but she may join a little bit later. I will go ahead and get started. I wanted to touch just quickly on an overview of what we're going to talk about today. We're going to talk about the basic integrated plan status, give you an update on some of the habitat watershed protection work we're doing, where we are on our surface water storage element. We also have quite a bit of agricultural water infrastructure in the basin and we're looking to maximize the efficiency of that infrastructure. So we'll talk about structural and operational changes. And of course, as part of the integrated plan, we've committed to provide fish passage at all the major reclamation reservoirs in the basin, and then we'll have an opportunity for some lessons learned. We've been at this for some time and we continue to learn. We continue to work as a team and move forward. Next slide. So for those of you who may not be familiar with where the Yakima basin is, it is right in the middle of the central Washington lower part of central Washington. The Yakima Basin is roughly a little over 6000 square miles.

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: It has over 464,000 irrigated acres as a result of the Yakima irrigation project, which was a reclamation project that the state of Washington requested the Department of Interior back at the turn of the century. The Project Yakima project has five major reservoirs with a little over a million acre feet of storage capacity. However,

it also has irrigation delivery contracts of 2.3 million acre feet. So right there you can tell that snowpack is a critical piece to our ability to provide water for those agricultural and fish needs. The basin has suffered severe droughts over our historical record. You can see there in 92, 94, 2001, 2005, 2015, and just more recently in 2019. This basin was second only to the Snake River in terms of salmon production. So it has significantly reduced fishery that we're trying to bring back. And of course, we're trying to do that while protecting our agricultural economy, roughly about a \$4.5 billion economy. Next slide, please. So the plan is built really on seven key elements. The elements here are shown geographically as well as graphically. Each of the seven elements here are represented in color. And what we're showing you in the lower part of the graphic is just where those variety of projects are and how and where they fit in the context of the seven elements. I'll just quickly read those to you. As I mentioned, reservoir fish passage, surface water storage, habitat, enhanced conservation of uplands and other types of property and land groundwater storage, enhanced water conservation, a lot of work we're doing there.

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: And of course, structural and operational changes and water market reallocation. We're looking at significant water market reallocation. We have a small market that we're trying to figure out how to sort of scale it up for a larger agricultural needs. Next slide, please. So the goals are fairly simple really for the integrated plan. We're going to restore and enhance the environment with fish and wildlife, including fish passage at the dams. We are going to provide water supply during drought years for irrigation districts, like Scott's, that are prorated depending upon the availability of water on any particular year at 70% of an operational supply. We also want to really improve the efficiency and adaptability of the water management within the basin. We think there's opportunities there and we're looking at some projects there. And then of course, we want this all to occur while we sustain our economy and the environment in which we live here. Next slide, please. So we do this really in a group much like yours. You know, we have a variety of federal agencies here that are listed here. We have, of course, as I mentioned, our partner in this work, Yakama Nation, couldn't do this work without their support. We have a variety of state agencies listed here, Ecology, Ag, Fish and Wildlife and of course, DNR. We have all of the local governments at the county level involved, all three of the of the major counties, Bent, Kittitas, Yakima and of course, the city of Yakima.

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: Irrigated agriculture is represented here, as with the major irrigation districts. You can read those there, what we call Kennewick Irrigation District, Kittitas Reclamation District, Roza Irrigation District, Sunnyside Valley Irrigation District, and of course, Yakima, Tieton. There are many other smaller types of districts and irrigation companies, but these are the major ones. And then our stakeholders American Rivers, the Yakima Basin, Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board, Yakima Basin, Stearns Alliance, and of course, Trout Unlimited. Next slide. Thank you, Steve. So what are we accomplished here? More recently, we've really moved the needle on a couple of elements here. You can see in fish passage, we completed an important fix to the sunny side dam there at Parker to protect some juvenile out migrating salmon. We modified some sluice gate there that had to have a curtain that kind of shunted the juveniles fish away from the intake for the canal. We're in construction for some major projects that clean fish passage, which we'll show you some slides here later. The Nelson facility, which was once called Nelson Dam, it's no longer a

dam. It's now being re-engineered in a way to provide not only irrigation water but fish passage and flood protection and a lot of work on the roads. And we will, Scott will speak to speak to that in design as it relates to fish passage for some of the other facilities include Tieton, which maybe folks might know as Rimrock area, Clear Creek, and then towards the mouth of the river and the Columbia River.

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: There is a causeway on Bateman Island that we hope to remove, and we've been working with the Corps on that. And then of course, we're looking at the water diversion for the Yakima Irrigation, for the Wapato irrigation project on the Yakama reservation. Water supply projects here. You can see we've provided over 58,000 acre feet of conserved water. We've already almost complete with the clean pool raise, which is another 14,600 acre feet of available water supply for fish. And we're in the design and engineering review process as well as this review process for the Tier two EIS for the Kachess drought relief pumping plant that Roza and others are working on. And of course, Habitat, you saw some of the the graphic, the previous graphic. We have over 40 restoration projects and over 62,000 acres acquired in terms of habitat and lands. Yakama Nation has a major water conservation plan modernization plan that we'll be working on. There's great opportunities with the Bureau of Indian Affairs' Wapato Irrigation Project, and we've also worked with the NRCS on the RCP grants and are making some major strides around work there. So in all we have between the Federal government and the State Government since 2012 2013, roughly, we have invested over \$600 million to date and we're just really now starting to hit our stride. So I'm going to turn it over Steve, if you could pick it up from here.

Consultant to American Rivers, Steve Malloch: You bet. Thanks. So I'm going to talk about habitat. And when we talk about habitat in the integrated plan, it's more than just restoration projects. It's fish passage on the smaller facilities. It's also land acquisition. Our overall goal is to get to harvestable self-sustaining populations of all of the inhabited fish in the basin. That includes the the various salmon species, some of which were extirpated from the basin and then reintroduced steelhead and bull trout, which are both ESA listed. And so our goal is to get beyond sort of the ESA recovery approach, but really to get to robust populations. We've got work going on, restoration work in most of the major reaches of of the Yakima and its tributaries. And, you know, we really look at what we do based on what's needed in a particular place. In some cases it may be the classic large wood could be floodplain restoration and enhancing floodplain function or could be passage. One of the kind of interesting features of what we're doing is this watershed lands element where we're buying land, where it really serves multiple purposes, both for fish and hopefully water supply. I'll talk in a minute about one of the big ones, but I just have to say, we've got we've got more than 60,000 acres acquired and a number of major acquisitions scheduled for federal fiscal year 23.

Consultant to American Rivers, Steve Malloch: We got funding to do some really big ones. So ultimately we know that the water comes from someplace. It doesn't just immediately show up in the rivers. So forest health and the issues around climate impacts to forests, fires, the need for thinning. All of that is part of what we're looking at. One of the really sort of key, key jewels in our restoration agenda was the Teanaway Community Forest. For us, this is 55,000 acres of land that had been in private forest holdings. Forestry is pretty much completed and the owner was looking to develop it, which was a big

problem for Kittitas County, where this where this property lies was a high value target for restoration and and the work for our species. So there was there were years, more than a decade, of effort to buy the Teanaway Forest. And it wasn't until the Yakima Basin Integrated Plan came along that really a mechanism, mechanism worked. The state budget in biennial budget in 2013 really pivoted. The capital budget pivoted around this Teanaway Forest acquisition. What we're doing on the land is treating it as multiple, multiple use. It continues to have grazing. Recreation has grown immensely in that property. And at the same time, we're working on really restoring it for for its fishery values. This is a big, now public piece of property, that is multiple use.

Consultant to American Rivers, Steve Malloch: It's owned by DNR, but it's managed as a community forest for for purposes beyond just revenue or classic DNR school trust lands. It is it is a community forest and is designed to really support the values of the community. Going from the upper reaches of the of the basin, in the Teanaway Community Forest, to the very lowest reaches: This is Bateman Island. On the far left the Yakima River comes in. The darker water on the right is the Columbia River, the McNairy Pool, and the Yakima originally would have flown flowed around Bateman Island. But at the very bottom of the screen you see a causeway mark that is an earthen causeway built probably to get cattle to graze over on Bateman Island. And it blocks the flow of the Yakima River around the lower downriver part of Bateman Island that backs the area labeled Yakima River Delta up, makes it a big, warm pool that is in the summer, lethal to to salmon. It also is a great refuge for predators. And so the predators just sit there. And as the smolts that we are producing out of the Yakima flow down, they just get snapped up. The warm water in the summer blocks sockeye that migrate, adult sockeye migrating upstream, can can totally block them in a in a hot summer. So this is removing that causeway and getting the flow of the Yakima River around Bateman Island is a really important part of our fishery strategy.

Consultant to American Rivers, Steve Malloch: The Corps of Engineers is in the tail end of a an 1135 process. We anticipate a preferred alternative to be released publicly later this month, and we're hoping that the pervert alternative that ultimately selected is removal of that causeway. There are community issues. The Bateman Island is used for recreational purposes. Birdwatchers love it. And so one of the issues is access to Bateman Island. Another issue is that the two tribes that that are interested in Bateman Island, the Umatilla and the Yakima have concerns about cultural resources on the on the property. Going back up to the upper reaches of the basin. Bull trout are one of our two ESA listed species is a very big deal for the Yakima project as a whole. We have an innovative MOU, multiple agencies working on a variety of kinds of of habitat and and access projects for both trout. I think we'll talk about fish passage a little bit, but I'd like to draw your attention to the South Fork Tieton passage that would be into Rimrock and be useful for both salmon and steelhead, as well as allow bull trout out of the basin. And then above that there's Clear Creek Reservoir and Reclamation is working on passage on that right now.

Consultant to American Rivers, Steve Malloch: One of the really sort of signature projects of the last couple of years is the city of Yakima Nelson Dam. If you look, you're looking downstream on the Naches River, just above the city of Yakima, where the whitewater starts. In that in that riffle, there was a channel spanning concrete dam there used for diverting irrigation water for both originally farming and then City of

Yakima. There was a fish ladder that proved to be pretty ineffectual as part of a really innovative project, the county of Yakima, that that is responsible for. Flood management wanted that dam out it traps sediment and has actually exacerbated flooding. The dam was deteriorating, so it needed to be replaced. And the result is going to be a roughened channel style diversion, looking just exactly like you see it in that picture. No big hunk of concrete, just what amounts to a pool and riffle system with a new diversion system on the right. This is an innovative project because it it will really help the city of Yakima improve its water supply reliability and and reduce flood risk and provide really great access for fish moving both upstream and downstream. That's been in construction since July of 21. It's all but done. Should be substantially complete in February with final completion in April. Scott. You're up next.

Roza Irrigation District Manager, Scott Revell: Thanks Steve. Water supply is a very important part of the integrated plan. You saw we have five irrigation districts in our work group. A couple of us fall in that pro-ratable category, which means the drought, our water supply is reduced and it's been down to as low as 37% a couple of times in in the past ten years during droughts. And part of the plan strategy is to increase the reliability to make the best use of the water that we do have while we're also developing these storage. And so you can see from those projects we have three primary surface water storage projects and a groundwater component. The plan includes two off channel dams, which is pretty unique given that some of our partners are working very hard to get dams removed. And and in the right circumstances, we were able to pull together a plan that included new new off channel storage. The first project is the Kachess drought relief pumping plant, which can move (Advance the slides one, please.) If you've ever been up to Lake Kachess you know it's a very deep lake. It's about 400 feet deep in places. And we're going to we can draw it down up to about 80 feet.

Roza Irrigation District Manager, Scott Revell: And this would be like an emergency situation so that the participating districts could use it to get up to 70% supply. But but not beyond that. So that would leave about 250 vertical feet in the in the lake at maximum drawdown, very technically complex to build a floating pumping station. Let's slide down to the next slide here. So this you can see from this view, there's the existing outlet works. You can see the old channel, which is the Serpentine channel there. Before the dam was built in 1910, we built a floating pumping station out at the end of that channel and it would go up and down about 152 vertical feet. So in an alpine environment of this nature, there are lots of pumping stations. They just don't go up and down like this. So some of it's groundbreaking technology, but we've been working on it for several years. We're in the midst of an environmental review. The second stage of that review, you can see from the aerial photo, this is, I believe, back in about 2015 when the pool was down at the lower end of the current active pool. I think Wendy is going to take the Slide 19.

US Bureau of Reclamation, Program Manager, Wendy Christiansen: Thanks, Scott. So we also part of our tools in our toolbox are groundwater manage, aquifer recharge. And we've looked around the basin. There's potential opportunities for groundwater storage in the upper basin with Reclamation district. Again, some of these are using our existing facilities to deliver water to areas and spread the water out on the ground and have it infiltrate in. The acquisition also has several ongoing groundwater studies and they are operating the top and expand in the same manner where they are spreading water out on the ground and letting it infiltrate at various times during the year. We also are looking at various pilot studies.

One in particular is is again a to task. But we we've also looked at Rose Irrigation District and other parts of the basin that make sense to do this work. There's lots that goes into it because we need to do wells and monitoring to make sure that the water that's being spread out on the ground, how that is then interacting or making its way back to the river. But the hypothesis here is that we think that infiltrated water usually becomes comes back into the river cooler, and that can be advantageous. Next slide. So we're going to move on to some of the structural operational changes element, as well as the fish passage element of the integrated plan. Going to the next slide, Reclamation has five reservoirs, actually six, if you count Clear Creek. One of our key reservoirs in the upper basin is Cle Elum. And at this reservoir we have two projects. One is the project where we would actually be able to raise the reservoir three feet to store an additional 14,600 acre feet for in-stream flows for fish.

US Bureau of Reclamation, Program Manager, Wendy Christiansen: The extra three feet only occurs in May, June, July time frame. Typically the reservoir fluctuates over 100 feet. And in order to show that we've stored the additional 14,600 acre feet, all we need to do is raise the radial gates, which we've done, and then we're providing for shoreline protection to mitigate any impacts to the shore from the additional three foot rains. So you can see here the radial gates in the upper right hand corner. Like I said, those have been modified to accommodate the three extra feet. And there's nothing that needed to be done to the dam. There are several areas of shoreline protection, as you can see in circles around the basically the right side of the roads for the east side of the reservoir where homes are. And we're just making sure that there is not any impact to structures or private property like. So then moving on the other project, that Cle Elum dam and reservoir is called Fish Passage. This is a really large project. Reclamation remodeled this to be able to be certain that we could get juvenile smolts out of the reservoir in a volitional manner. So under their own forces. You can see the dam and the spillway located sort of in the center. The in the foreground is the juvenile fish passage with intakes that go out into the reservoir. It's a multi level intake system where it'll work over 63 feet of fluctuation. The fish will go into one of these intakes, which is basically a tunnel that goes into a structure and then around what we call the helix, which is akin to the parking lot structure in SeaTac, where it kind of goes around and around and eventually flows into a tunnel that transports the smolts downstream of the spillway.

US Bureau of Reclamation, Program Manager, Wendy Christiansen: And then right downstream of the spillway, you see what we call the adult collection facility. The returning adults will come back up the Cle Elum River and they'll be a mini fish ladder into a collection facility that the adult fish will be trapped and hauled into the reservoir and then they spawn above there. There's lots of spawning that can be seen. We are partnered with the Nation and State Fish and Wildlife on a reintroduction program. Reclamation and Ecology have shared in funding the project, which is over about \$200 million. But again, it works with Reclamation Facility and our other commitments to continue to provide water for irrigation, supply and flood control, among other uses. So you can see here a key piece of the fish passage is what we call this secant pile vault. Within the vault is a gate structure and a helix chamber. So you're looking down on the left. That's the gate structure. And on the right, you're looking into the helix structure. Those square cutouts, they're basically where the pipes will come through to enter the helix that kind of goes round and then eventually into the tunnel entrance. That's at the very bottom. And this in the second shaft is 120 by 90 feet, and then it's about over 100 feet deep. So it's a rather massive structure to be able to

get the fish out. They'll be about 400 CFS flowing through the structure at full capacity. And again, we expect this to really help with getting the fish out earlier in the season.

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: Right? Yes.

US Bureau of Reclamation, Program Manager, Wendy Christiansen: Thanks.

Tom Tebb: Thanks, Wendy. I think this is the opportunity for each of us, I think, to maybe kind of reflect on maybe what we've learned a little bit. And I'll. I'll start off. I would just say that when we started planning and did the plan back in 2012, 2013, I mean, we had a large vision and I think we we've largely stuck to that vision. But I think how you get to those goals in some cases, you know, we've had to adapt and and try things a little differently. The other thing I would mention is we've grown to really know each other, trust each other. We we travel a lot trying to support the plan, whether that's back to Washington, D.C. and talk to our congressional delegation or whether that's a trip to Olympia or even groups speaking to groups like yours. We've had the opportunity to talk about the Basin integrated plan internationally as well. I know myself, I've been I was asked to speak about this plan at the United Kingdom Irrigation Association as well as down in New Zealand. I know that Wendy Christensen with the Bureau has spoken at World Water Day, I think in Brazil, and there's been other presentations that we've had from other members of the of the group. We I think we traveled to Western Colorado and actually spoke to some upper Colorado folks about the integrated plan.

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: And also we have spoken to numerous water associations and various conferences. So what I would also say is that that that each party really is trying to really advance their interests, but recognizing that their interests really will be partially met, not fully met. And I think recognizing that we none of us get everything that we want, but we do get something out of this plan. And doing nothing was truly not an option. This is not about new agriculture. This is about sustaining what we have and making the system environmentally protective and enhancing those species that we've lost. So I will also say in terms of education and outreach, you know, the projects like this, a 30 year strategic plan, often are more than in a political cycle and or even a funding cycle. And it takes a lot of time and energy to continue to reeducate sort of the next group of elected officials and leaders in our state, as well as in our congressional delegation. It's been a pleasure to work on this. This has absolutely been the highlight of my 32 year career with the Department of Ecology. I'm committed to this work. I'm committed to this team, and I will allow them to also reflect on some lessons learned.

US Bureau of Reclamation, Program Manager, Wendy Christiansen: Thanks. And I see Danielle has been able to join us, so I'll just go and then Danielle after this to give Danielle a little time to get oriented. I am so for reclamation. Certainly this is important work. As we mentioned before, I think where we have successes is that when we originally started and we continue to have awesome participation from all the groups that Tom mentioned earlier, earlier in the presentation. But we did that by asking the agencies to select folks that could speak for their agency and could participate. When we first started, we met every two weeks and I think what that did for the group was provide a common understanding of what the

problem statement was and where we had issues and where we could work together. Plus, it also gave us a very good foundation of who was participating, why they were participating. We basically looked at the need here to have folks that manage water resources or managed resources that were impacted by droughts so that we had just that common basis of folks that could help us move and be solution oriented to move this forward. We don't meet every two weeks. Now, obviously we have quarterly update meetings, but even at those quarterly worker meetings, we have a lot of interest from the public. Probably 20 or so members of the public join us each time. It's been really amazing to be part of this and to see the participation from folks. And I'd also just say lessons learned is that it's been even when I went to Brazil with the World Water Forum that Tom mentioned, water issues are universal. Either you have too much or you have too little and it's not in the right time and the right place. And so these are always things that are going to need to be worked on, I think, with a group and have clarity from the group as to what the actual need is and what. . . Yakima basin of some seven months, and that has really worked well for us. Not sure if I'm breaking up or not.

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: Yes. Thank you, Wendy. Welcome, Danielle. If you're willing to reflect on your perspective and that of the Yakama nation and lessons learned with the integrated plan. We greatly appreciate and thank you for joining us today.

Yakama Nation Water Resources, Hydrologist, Danielle Squeoachs, Ph.D.: Thank you, Tom. And thank you, everyone, for this opportunity to be here really, Truly with regard to lessons learned, I'm glad to have the option or opportunity to be able to share a little bit. One of the things that I've seen in the position that I have at the accommodation is that there is a long history of failed watershed planning efforts in the Yakima Basin. And I think that it's always really important to note that it's not just legislation, it's not just a plan being given to you and being told that you need to fix the problems. I think what's truly unique about the work that we're doing in the Yakima Basin is that it is collaborative, it's respectful. And many of the times that I've seen watershed planning efforts fail, it's really a checkbox where people who are working together are really just doing it for the sake of checking a box, as opposed to all being in it to work through and solve, solve problems and not just their own problems. I love working alongside Tom Tebb and Wendy Christensen, as well as our irrigation district partners. I don't know many places where irrigators can speak to fish issues and those who care about fish can speak to irrigation issues. So thank you. That's what I have to share. I'm happy to answer any other questions.

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: Thank you, Danielle. We're going to go to Scott Revell and then Steve, and then we'll take questions.

Roza Irrigation District Manager, Scott Revell: Yeah. One thing I can't emphasize enough is the group really has built trust over a long time. And it wasn't like that ten or 15 years ago. We spent 43 years in litigation and then just ended it. In some ways, it helped that we had gone through this water rights adjudication but it lasted for decades. It was unpleasant. It was exceptionally expensive. Our lawyer will tell you we sent all four of his kids to college on our one case, and he's not joking. But now we have a common interest and it really took people risking and getting to know each other and trying to work together. The Yakima Nation and the irrigation district's interests overlap more than you might have

expected. And when that got figured out, people began to communicate better and more effectively. And trust was slowly built. And so that to me is probably the main, main takeaway.

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: Thank you, Scott. Steve.

Consultant to American Rivers, Steve Malloch: Thanks. I have a couple of comments. The first is don't underestimate the role of leadership without some people who are really willing to take risks and bring their organizations along. I think if we would have continued in the mode of adjudication, fighting and trying to win...ultimately that didn't work for decades and probably would not work going forward. All you have to do is look around the West and see other entities that are really trying to win rather than find ways of pragmatically and cooperatively come up with solutions that everybody can live with. That takes leadership. It takes courage. It takes getting out of the positions that you might be well entrenched and are into and are very comfortable with. And it takes optimism. You know, you have to see that there might be a better future, even though it's different than what you had anticipated. I really would like to echo Danielle's and actually everybody's comment- We own this. When we have conflicts, we don't go to the legislature to get a legislative fix. We don't go to Congress to get a congressional fix. We don't go to the courts to have the court tell somebody else to do what we want them to do. We try to work it out ourselves and come to come to solutions that we all can live with. And that, I think, is at the heart of the trust that we've built. And it's the heart of our success.

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: Thank you, Steve. We're happy as a group to take some questions. I'm not sure how much more time we have on the agenda, but thank you again for the opportunity to talk about the Yakima Basin Integrated Plan and we'll take questions if there are some.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Thank you all so much for being here. You all are inspiration for water and all other topics our communities are struggling with. How about 10 minutes for Q&A. Thank you.

Brad Rader: I had one question. Thank you for the presentation. I love the spirit of collaboration. Taking the lessons that you have learned through this, do you believe that for a community like ours, that we can model it in order to get to where you are now? Adjudication is already proven to be a divisive process, we need water, we need more passage for our fish and fish and ag for our state. Is it important that adjudication take place or can it be circumvented and we go straight to the fix instead of . . .

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Paying for more attorney family member college tuitions while more fish are depleted.

Brad Rader Yes.

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: Well, I'll take a first crack at that question. And thank you for the question. You know, the act of adjudication that's got

referred to as over a 40 year process and over \$40 million, at least from even the states investment in that process. And while the integrated plan process began, while the adjudication was still underway, really after tribal and major claimant rights were addressed, I think that allowed sort of a sense of, okay, we think we know what we got and that allowed folks to kind of move forward in the integrated plan. I wouldn't say it's part and parcel a requirement, but I would say that it was helpful to have the major claimants understand really what they had. But again, in the adjudication process, it's an adversarial process. It's not conducive per se to the collaboration that we ended up evolving to. But it really provided, I think, a recognition that alternative was really not moving the basin forward, other than knowing maybe giving you a sense of certainty of what your water rights were. So moving the basin forward really was the integrated plan and the collaboration that really came from a recognition that doing nothing really wasn't going to serve the basin, was it going to serve the fish issues? It wasn't going to serve the agricultural issues at play. So I'll stop there and let others on the team respond.

Roza Irrigation District Manager, Scott Revell: Well, definitely there's more than more than one way to go about it, in our case and probably had to happen. The adjudication started in the 1970s, but it was a precursor was a lawsuit between two irrigation districts after the 1941 drought, which resulted in a federal consent decree in 1945. That is the basis by which decisions are made today. We've spoken to others in the Whatcom, the Skagit/Nooksack area, and, you know, there could be more than one way to go about it. Sounds like a lot of the ag industry there. They either don't have water rights or they don't have paper to back them up. And it's seems it's a very contentious issue. But, Tom, at least I think Tom accurately described it. We got far enough through the process where everybody had a pretty good handle on what they had or at least what they thought they had. And I think that at least in the Yakima, was that was the right launching point.

Port of Bellingham Commissioner, Ken Bell: You talked a little bit about leadership to break the logjam. Can you describe for me that process and what. Leadership actually stood up to break? Because if we are stuck in a cycle of adjudication. Who specifically stepped in and which parties were the leaders in that effort?

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: Well, I'm going to start this, but there's others that can finish it. I would say there was two major leaders that were unexpectedly working together. There was the Roza Irrigation District and there and their manager at the time, Ron Van Gundy, who Scott now is working in that position, and Phil Rigdon with the Yakama Nation. These were two entities and those individuals were great leaders in the basin in their respective right, but they also saw an opportunity that the current sort of strategy around this notion of a very big reservoir, really singular use called BlackRock was just too expensive and really not what the basin needed. And I'll stop there because I think Scott and Danielle and. . .

Roza Irrigation District Manager, Scott Revell: The there was a large reservoir proposed in 2008 went to a 2000 Environmental Impact Statement. The tribe and the irrigation district worked together to prepare a joint comment letter on that environmental impact statement. And there was a lot of legwork that went into that. That comment letter went out on tribal letterhead and also included the Roza Board president's

signature on the bottom. So it was a one of a kind type arrangement. The Yakama Indian Nation has, I think a little less than half of their water rights are similar to Roza's. So we actually are in the same boat. But I can tell you those discussions started in a parking lot and we were fortunate that we had people who were willing to take big risks in their career. And in Ron's case, he worked for the district for 50 years, and when he passed away in 2017, the Natural Resources director, Phil Rigdon from the Yakama Nation came and spoke at his funeral, and he joked a little bit about the fact that it wasn't that long ago that, you know, the tribal staff was told 'don't talk to the irrigation district staff'. And he joked a little bit about, hey, don't tell his tribal leadership that he's speaking at a irrigators funeral. And he was he was only half joking when he said that. But, you know, in hindsight it's easy to look back and say, well, yeah, times used to be very, very different. They really weren't allowed to be seen out in public together. I would not underestimate the role that Derek Sanderson, who was the Tom's predecessor at the Columbia River Ecology and our current State Ag Director, played.

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: Yeah, thank you.

Roza Irrigation District Manager, Scott Revell: You know, people willing to do the hard work, do the analysis, but also not afraid to take a big swing and try and fix a big problem. And so that the amount of massaging along the way, I mean, every time we'd have these meetings, there were a lot of pre meetings and there were a lot of post meetings to break down, you know, okay, what did we hear? What did we not hear? You know, my favorite part of this whole thing is when we were walking in the capital about six or seven years ago and the American Rivers representative, this is our fifth, sixth or seventh, eighth trip, I don't know randomly turned around as we were going up these marble stairs and said, Scott, you know, we five years ago, we would have thought you irrigators were all just crazy. And I said, 'Well, Michael, this is Michael Gerrity, who's now with State Fish and Wildlife, 'That really makes me feel good because five years ago we thought all you enviros were crazy.' I like to tell that story that really is an insight into what getting to know one another can do. And, you know, we reached a point where both Steve and Michael have come over and fished with me and my boat and salmon fished out in the Columbia and had a little beverage. And, you know, that never would have happened ten years ago or 20 years ago.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Danielle?

Yakama Nation Water Resources, Hydrologist, Danielle Squeochs, Ph.D.: Yeah, I'll add in. Scott, thank you. I think you characterize that history really well, and it really took vulnerability in leadership. So, you know, the risk that Phil Rigdon took, the risk that Ron Van Gundy took in terms of having the conversation and initiating and stepping forward and saying 'What's going on isn't working, we need to figure out a pathway.' And that was at a time where Roza, Yakama Nation and many other entities were only communicating through their legal staff. That was a tremendous risk for the nation and for tribal leadership to step behind and sign that letter because it was pretty unprecedented in our area. And so, yes, and Derrick saw it. Derrick saw what it was that risk and supported it and moved the action forward and in a really unique way because of his understanding of the loss. It took very creative people and also some really good facilitators that helped us have those really hard conversations.

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: Excellent point.

Consultant to American Rivers, Steve Malloch: I'd like to support everything that people have said. I mean, it's just not possible to overstate the role that Ron and Phil played. However, that was the start. That's not the finish. Since then, I would say all of the other players in this process have had a time where they had to go out and take a take a hard look at what they are doing and where this was going and convince their organizations to stick with it. I just, I mean, leadership started there, and boy, it required leadership and hard decisions in lots of places. The other comment that I'd like to make, it goes to the adjudication question. You know, if you've got a pot of money and a lot of people in with their hands in that pot of money, it really helps to have an accounting system so that people know how much of that pot is theirs. If you have land, it really helps to have a surveying system and land record system so that people know what is theirs. And we really needed that for the for the water rights in the basin. And I suspect that other places need something like that. Does it have to be an adjudication? I don't know. That's the process we have. If you could reach a settlement, that would probably work too. But that's that that would require leadership.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Brad.

Brad Rader: Trying to get my words together here. Stupid camera keeps staring at me. (Laughter.) I just appreciate the time you guys have taken to tell the story because I'm only one. I'm the token farmer in the room. And with this, this thing I will call it impending that could rip our community apart. I really appreciate how you communicated the leadership, the courage that it takes. I personally feel the weight of the agricultural industry, there aren't many of us that are willing to come to these meetings and talk. And I'm sure it's the same for tribal and cities and other entities. And so you set the bar. I sure as heck hope that we can learn from what you did. And I think this is the second time this talk has been given. It might take ten more times for us to get it through our heads, but I heard it. And the projects you guys have done have been amazing. I don't think the fish in this area have 40 years to wait. I know the farmers don't. Without the assurance of water and I know the cities don't and the PUD does not. Legal fees are not what they were in the eighties and nineties. So I just think for this group to put this together. Thanks for I know Sarah took a lot of time to do this.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: I came across a quote, and I'm sorry if it comes across cheesy, but there's a Susan B. Anthony quote that I just came across this weekend and just what we've learned about you all. It's "Careful people, always casting about to preserve their reputation, position and social standing, can never bring about reform". And you all are shining example- instead of worrying about your positions, you worried about your community. Hopefully we can learn from you and move down that path as well.

Brad Rader: I think we just need to keep working on it. It's going to take it's going to take time. It's going to take a lot of us just putting our paper aside and figuring out what how is it going to work?

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Would anyone be interested in us flying you out here every two weeks? (Laughter)

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: Well, I would like to maybe reciprocate and offer you some of a group of you. Or all of you, for that matter, if you're interested. We'd love to show you around the Yakima Basin and some of the work we're doing and what can be possible with collaboration. I mean, we are doing some major capital projects up and down the basin and we have many more to go. So it's for me, it's like I said, it's been the highlight of my career and it's really encouraging and gives me optimism for the future. Unfortunately, I'm going to have to jump off. I've got to catch a flight over to Olympia. I have to testify on a bill tomorrow. But I want to thank my Yakima Basin Integrated Plan Team members. They can stay on, I think, for a little bit longer and maybe answer any questions you have. Thank you again. We look forward to more engagement with your with your group.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Thank you.

Washington State Dept of Ecology, Office of Columbia River Director, Tom Tebb: Thanks, you all.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Clark.

Clark Campbell: Yeah, I want to thank you. This is really interesting to see the elements of the plan and how the plan came together and how the different stakeholder groups have found a way to work. It seems like the answers that we're hearing that we're not seeing a clear alternative to adjudication. You can skip straight to plan implementation without some basis of that. I guess the question I have is any tips or advice on how to turn 40 years and 40 million like suddenly ten years and 10 million sounds like a great deal.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Or 4 months, instead of 40 years.

Clark Campbell: I don't know if there's any advice you would give in terms of what it took to get tribal and stakeholders to be part of this and feel like an equal partner and to get those groups to split apart? Or is the fight just necessary to get to the resolution part and the legal thing?

Eva Schulte: And I think we heard the nation was really the leader thoughtfully and collaboratively. I'm curious, in addition, if I can take your time, having gone through the process the last how many years, who should have been at the table earlier? And is there anyone else that's missing that you've identified now that you wish was there?

Jennifer Noveck: And I just wanted to log before anyone answers that Satpal and Danielle have their hand up as well.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Thank you.

Yakama Nation Water Resources, Hydrologist, Danielle Squeochs, Ph.D.: Well, I'm happy to try and answer that question. Is that okay? In the order? Okay. So let me just touch on the adjudication side of

this, because each basin is independent and I really think that each specific area needs to come to the conclusion as to whether or not that's the right approach. I will say in the Yakima Basin, the adjudication oftentimes are a little bit like splitting the baby. You know, there is a lot of people that came out of the adjudication as real winners. In some cases, there were some things lost. And I think it's important to be upfront about that. That's not a critique of the adjudication. It's just a natural part of the process. I think that the Yakama Nation in a lot of ways has expressed concern about other adjudications. With that said, it gave us a tool and it gave us an equal starting point. Do we agree 100% that it was all right and it came out to the best that it should have been? No. But at some point, you have to put those fights behind you and start moving forwards. Now, in terms of specifically identifying who should have been at the table, really, truly one of the problems with the watershed planning efforts that I've seen in the past was that the Yakama Nation, a tribal nation, was very much treated as a stakeholder and not a government to government relationship. And I think that that layer of respect is very important in understanding that tribal nations are sovereign nations. And without that, I think any tribal engagement was very difficult. Now, as far as other parties, I think that many of our environmental partners weren't really immediately there, but they've been very fundamental partners in moving some of these major strategies forward. I think we still have work to do in our basin in terms of engaging more directly with municipalities and leadership within the city governments. We do really well with the commissioner level, but I think that in individual cities and helping them understand how we're working to solve problems that they well, hopefully we're working to solve problems that we foresee for municipalities. But I think we need more direct engagement with municipal governments. So hopefully that answers your questions.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Thank you. Satpal?

Whatcom County Executive Satpal Sidhu: I just have a very quick comment that thanks for everybody getting together and sharing this. We are at this stage in Whatcom County is that we need to build that trust. Like I've said a few times, we don't have a water deficit. We have a trust deficit. And trust comes only after making bold decisions. And making sacrifices on all sides. If we can all get together with that in mind, it can happen. Thank you.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Thank you. I did have a quick question on the goals with the fisheries. Is there a benchmark as far as what you're trying to accomplish on bringing the fish back?

Yakama Nation Water Resources, Hydrologist, Danielle Squeochs, Ph.D.: I think I think we've got a pretty good. So it's for the fisheries restoration goals is self sustainable harvestable populations. And that's really the goal. It's not an ESA listed criteria. We've recognized that in order for there to be success, the bar is far higher than like ESA. And so that's what we're working towards.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: And how far are you on that path, would you say you're at 10%? I don't know how best to phrase that.

Yakama Nation Water Resources, Hydrologist, Danielle Squeochs, Ph.D.: It's always a good question. I think that at this point we're putting one foot in front of the other. The runs today were better

than the runs in the eighties. Still not good enough. And I think that we are also one of the things I've heard touched on this is we're still learning. So as we've solved problems in the basin, specifically problems in our headwaters, we've realized and identified other issues that need to be solved lower down in our systems. And so every day we're putting one foot in front of the other, identifying the biggest issue and trying to solve it. I, I don't think in my career it will be done, but we're getting, I see major things. I see sockeye in the basin that weren't there 15 years ago. I see all sorts of fish being reintroduced to streams where they weren't. And so, you know, it's sometimes it's daunting to take a look at the future, but you just have to look at the successes. And I think we have a lot of those that we can point to.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Thank you. Time is of the essence for our fish.

Roza Irrigation District Manager, Scott Revell: Yeah, I would add kind of depends on the species and what you compare it to. We've the irrigation districts have had a fish biologist since the early 1980s, and now we have a mix of a team of consulting biologists. But to be able to speak knowledgeably on the water quality issues, on all manner of the salmon life cycle, whether it's rearing or spawning or when they're out migrating to the ocean, we are getting a better handle on the temperature impacts and the predation impacts that happen in the bottom of 40 or 50 miles of the river. We also know that we don't control the things that happen outside of the basin. So for every fish that leaves the hits the Columbia River, we've got major predator problems to get them to the ocean. And then when they get to the ocean, that's actually the most dangerous time in their lives for some of the species. So we can only control the things we can control. But we have had massive success in opening up some previously blocked headwaters. You really need to come over and take a look at the Clay Island Fish Passage facility. I mean, it's a 200 million, one of a kind arrangement and there's no other facility like it in the world. And so when those little sockeye start going down backwards in a couple of years, as they go down that helix and head out to the ocean, hopefully they'll have better ocean conditions than we've had in the past. But that really could be a game changer. And that's only one species. And quite frankly, steelhead and bull trout, which are the ones that are ESA listed, are the ones that cause us the most that constrain things from a regulatory standpoint. So.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Thank you. I think we are at a point where we should wrap up. And I just want to circle back to Clark real quick. You good? Feel right to everybody? (Murmurs of agreement) Thank you so much again. And hopefully we will be visiting you, thank you for the invitation.

Yakama Nation Water Resources, Hydrologist, Danielle Squeochs, Ph.D.: Thank you for the opportunity to be here.

Consultant to American Rivers, Steve Malloch: Thanks for having us. And Tom. Tom was absolutely right. We give great tours, so come visit.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Thank you. Thank you. And if we circle real quick, maybe Clark and maybe Jennifer could help. I've always really good at figuring out the efficient but improper public meeting way to

get things done. So I want to make sure we're doing things in compliance. But Clark you have to put some thoughts together on a letter and a recommendation...

Clark Campbell: And I'm going to treat it not as the letter at this point. It's draft feedback based on my involvement with the group. And then what I think would be constructive for the health department in terms of the first two years of the plan. So that's what we're commenting we've been asked to comment on.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: And if we could get that in front of all of us in time, perhaps we could...

Clark Campbell: And I'm open to changing it. So it reflects the view of the group as opposed to just mine. I've done kind of the tough work of reading the 60 page document and I can forward that on to everyone who wants to read that.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: And you've always been accommodating with time for questions...

Clark Campbell: And I will say I did run it by Debbie Ahl, she was not able to be here she's in Ireland this week and she did get some comments on it and I tried to incorporate what she had.

Jennifer Noveck: Yes so this is Jennifer. If you send me your feedback notes, I can send that out to the committee members and we can't do comments over email or voting over email, but they can send their feedback to me directly and we can incorporate that into the document. And if you want to have a vote on it, we can do the vote in February. Or we could also. Alternatively, if we need to have a vote and February is not is too far in the future, we could have a special meeting specifically for a couple of these administrative issues if needed.

Clark Campbell: Well, my sense here is a vote is more toward what we would be doing to give feedback directly to the County Council. The challenge we have is that you're asked to get comment on a Google doc that's last, right? So they have a very tight time frame in which to finalize the plan to get it scoped and and get all the applications dialed for a final deliverable to the County Council by March. So I just want to be conscious of the project management team's timeline. And I guess what I'm asking is, is there a way to go faster than wait for another meeting and do a formal vote and everybody raise their hand?

Jennifer Noveck: So I think the fastest way would be to send your comments out to everybody. And then again, everybody could have the opportunity to send their feedback to me and I can collect the feedback as feedback from individual committee members versus something that was voted on or a letter.

Clark Campbell: I think that's probably more appropriate. Again, we're just trying to get something to back to the group. And in summary, a lot of really good work was done, the task force had been involved with this prior to the ballot measure, did a lot of good foundational work.. And so that that work is coming through. Now looking at it from a business and commerce lens, there's a lot of things that they've done in terms of the metrics of how to measure whether what they're doing is having its intended impact. Then

the one measure of success for this for me is in 2032, if this were to come up for renewal, would the vote be as close as this vote, or would it pass? Because by a wider measure, because people saw value in it? And so to me, that means you got to get some quick wins, the impacts have to be visible and they've got to be big. And you don't. . . You have a limited amount of money to do that.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: So could we make a goal to get back to you, get back to Jennifer by the Wednesday.

Clark Campbell: I can send an attachment for that. Yeah. I don't want to interrupt the processes they got. They've got, they've got educated people that have been heavily involved with it. There's been a lot of good feedback. They're asking us to get on it.

Whatcom County Council Member Kathy Kershner: So can I ask for something real quick? Tomorrow at the council meeting, we've got a resolution in front of us in support of adjudication funding in the Washington State 2023 to 2024 biennium. And I don't know if this group has seen that. I would recommend that through the timeline that we look at it, and we get back to the council. From Council Member Donovan and the WHEREAS is actually have been revised and look like we're asking for money from the state for the adjudication process. We are asking for the legislation to provide funding for the county to provide a filing system for all participants in the adjudication process. And we want the County Council also to support parallel collaborative solution process and strongly encourages the legislature to fund this in 2023 2024. So it looks like we're looking for money for adjudication and also for the settlement process. Is there and / or option, a solution that will support the solution table here? We're looking for the funding for that as well. We're doing both on a parallel basis. If there's any problems or changes, it can let me know. I'll bring them up tomorrow.

Brad Rader: What's the most effective way to communicate without being brushed off?

Whatcom County Council Member Kathy Kershner: You could send a message to Council and it goes to everybody.

From audience: How do we get our comments read

Whatcom County Council Member Kathy Kershner: You can also individually email each member. I don't know what the other council members do. I would say that they open their emails. I know we've got Councilor Kaylee Galloway with this today. So they're aware of this.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Thank you for bringing it to our attention.

Port Commissioner Ken Bell: All right. Yes. Just want to put it in perspective. And at some point, Heather, you need to call me for a cup of coffee. I'm Covid free. (Laughter.) Tax assessments for this levy is higher than the port's. So it's an important thing. And if you also look down the list of elected officials for budgets of this nature, almost everybody has elected representative. And you look at the cemetery

districts and you look at the people who are levying this kind of an appropriation. So it's really important. This bill does not have an elected body and it goes to court and the courts work. Cemetery districts, library districts all have elected representatives to oversee those funds. So we're leaving it up to a board. And I just think it's important that this feedback be brought back and that the intended income level, it was just a 50-50 vote. Yeah. So there are some things that we're going to be critical of, and I just want to make sure that those are all addressed because it's a boatload of money.

Ryan Allsop: But I think it's also important to know that 90% of it is actually to management. And so that's basically almost \$1,000,000 a year of that nine going to actually be just the people, the staff and the consultants to advise on it. Versus going to child care itself. So I think it's really important to keep that in check.

Port Commissioner Ken Bell: And that definition is pretty blunt. That's a different thing at the age of one and two versus the ages of five. And you said that the primary impact would be early ages. So how this is going to roll out, how it's going to be spent. Thank you.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Thank you. What is your recommendation.

Port Commissioner Ken Bell: Somebody is going to step up with. Fred pointed out it's a parking lot discussion. It is a discussion between friends who already have respect for each other. They can sit down and say, how do we break this logjam? How do we get through this? We love you. You love us. How do we solve this. That's the discussion that happened to come on. I heard that loud and clear. Where does that happen here and who does it?

Sarah Rothenbuhler: So what about tomorrow? If those funds get allocated. Does that march us down a path of the adjudication? Does that build a bunch of momentum to 40 years of adjudication/ fighting?

Port Commissioner Ken Bell: That's a question for county.

Whatcom County Council Member Kathy Kershner: I believe that the state's already made a decision that adjudicated this going forward. So it isn't like this resolution decides that if this resolution basically asks for the legislature to find it on Whatcom County and then to fund a solution table at the same time.

Ryan Allsop: So it's concurrent, the action is to be equally funded?

Whatcom County Council Member Kathy Kershner: I don't know if that's how it wound up.

Clark Campbell: Is there a specific ask that it be funded?

Whatcom County Council Member Kathy Kershner: Fully funded.

Clark Campbell: Not with a dollar attached to it. Yeah. I guess the challenge again, this is a tough one. But what I didn't hear from the presentation today is, oh yeah, here's the quick off ramp that gets you straight to implementation of an integrated plan.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: I think it would have been done.

Clark Campbell: It's not there. There's no offramp. There's. You got to go through it. I'm just like, How do we go through this without it being 40,000,000 and 40 years?

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Well, it would be, as Brad's point is, in the eighties and nineties.

Clark Campbell: And if we have to do it, how do we fund it so that the stakeholders that are being forced to go through that process have support? Right.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Right.

Clark Campbell: So that's that's the our view of your request.

Port Commissioner Ken Bell: One other key point, if we go down the road of adjudication, if we're going to spend double the money and we're going to have twice the animosity, we spend those same funds to reach out and do something collaboratively, we're going to create goodwill. It'll be an entirely different environment. So if we go down the road of adjudication, we are we're going to we're committed to a path of more money and more animosity and on the path of trying to break that mold and go into the collaborative. We're going to we're going to create goodwill along the way and not the animosity when you're talking about public clients.

I think a lot of the decisions about the farmers and the communities that are crushed, literally crushed in the meantime, because public money is one thing and individual money is another. The small part will be our immediately own the largest ones. We'll have any ability to defend that water and ultimately help with the rehab.

Port Commissioner Ken Bell: But it did not take an elected official logjam. It did not count. Exactly. Did not make a state representative. It took a group of people who were directly impacted to start to work together to bring it upstream. Came from the bottom up. It didn't come from the top down.

We're working on exact same thing with tribes and coastal management. We're trying to get through the logjam of public tribal public entities talking to elected officials. Nothing's happening. We're trying to go straight through essentially fishermen telling our handlers what will happen because we're going over it is creating animosity, creating fighting. When all of us friends in a parking lot of scotch and cold beer works. And it really does. And they try.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Well. So really, what would be good for us is to reach out to each of the county council members and if we so feel recommend only supporting the solutions table or one that is evenly split or something.

Whatcom County Council Member Kathy Kershner: Well, what I would recommend is that you look at the resolution and then repeat that depending on where you are on the campus and and the adjudication process has been legal as requested by the tribe, and it has been decided by the state that that will be a process that we go through. And so we aren't arguing that we're what we're asking for is now that we've decided that and to fund all the people that are impacted by that process and at the same time fund the solutions table, which is the settlement, the more friendly approach, the parking lot approach.

Clark Campbell: If I hear you correctly, we're not being asked or being told by the state this is going to happen. And what you're asking, because that's a foregone conclusion, is that it be funded adequately so that the people impacted, that that impact is minimized and it goes faster.

Whatcom County Council Member Kathy Kershner: But we want to make sure the resolution passes.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Maybe it would be an example for saving money. Okay, on that great note. Thank you so much for being here. We sure appreciate you being here. And we will see you in February.

Next meeting: Tuesday, February 21, 2023 11-1230pm
Hybrid Meeting- In-person encouraged and Zoom option available