

**CHEHALIS BASIN PARTNERSHIP**  
**Chehalis Tribe “Lucky Eagle” Casino**  
**Rochester, Washington**  
**January 26, 2007**  
**9:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.**

**Approved Meeting Summary**

<p><b>MEMBERS &amp; ALTERNATES PRESENT</b>          Bonnie Canaday, Chair, Mayor Pro-Tem, City of Centralia          Terry Willis, Citizen, Grays Harbor          Terry Harris, City of Chehalis          Steve Craig, Department of Ecology          Lyle Hojem, Citizen, Lewis County          Art Lehman, Port of Centralia          Dick Stone, Mayor, City of Montesano (Alternate)</p>	<p>Richard Graham, Commissioner, Lewis County          Steve Kalinowski, Department of Fish &amp; Wildlife          Mark Swartout, Thurston County (Alternate)          Robert Fink, Mason County (Alternate)          Patrick Wiltzius, City of Chehalis (Alternate)          Mark White, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis (Alternate)          Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County (Alternate)          Kahle Jennings, City of Centralia (Alternate)</p>
<p><b>OTHERS PRESENT</b>          Randy Lehr, Grays Harbor College          Bruce Jones, Quinault Indian Nation          Kathy Jacobson, Chehalis Basin Ed Consortium          Glen Connelly, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis          Dave Rounry, Department of Ecology          Jerry Louthain, HDR</p>	<p>Jon Hare, Thurston WCB          John Kliem, Creative Community Solutions          Jim Hill, Citizen, Lewis County          John Mudge, Citizen          Jessica Tate, Recording Secretary, Puget Sound Meeting Services</p>

**GENERAL PARTNERSHIP BUSINESS**

**Welcome, Introductions and Roundtable Comments**

Chair Canaday called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

**Discuss and Adopt Draft Meeting Summaries for October 27, 2006 and November 17, 2006 Meetings**

The Partnership expressed satisfaction with the format and content of the minutes prepared by Puget Sound Meeting Services.

*The Partnership agreed to adopt the minutes of October 27, 2006 and November 17, 2006 as written.*

**Close Nominations for Officers and Elect 2007 Chair and Vice Chair**

Ms. Napier clarified that Bonnie Canaday is currently nominated as Chair.

*Ms. Napier nominated Mark White for Vice Chair. Mr. White accepted the nomination.*

*The Partnership agreed unanimously to elect Bonnie Canaday as Chair and Mark White as Vice Chair of the Chehalis Basin Partnership Committee (CBP).*

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Final Meeting Summary**

**January 26, 2007**

**Page 2 of 5**

### **SPECIAL PROJECTS**

#### **Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP) Workshop**

Mr. Kliem presented an outline of the workshop approach. The purpose of the workshop is to discuss alternatives and identify next steps for the CBP.

Members identified the pros and cons for each alternative. The four alternatives include:

**Alternative A:** Amend Milestone 3.1 to include Strategy 17 and 18 - Refine Entire IM 3.1 or Task 2 Only

#### **Pros**

Addresses Quinault Indian Nation's (QIN) Concerns  
Focuses on the Most Important Issue  
Group Agreed to Revisit This in a Timely Manner  
Instream Flow Is a Significant Issue – Must Start Now  
Important Issue - Deals with Members' Concern  
Begins a Vital Process  
CBP Begins to Address Instream Flows  
Already Agree It Is Possible to Implement – Let's Get It Done  
Better Resolution Sooner

#### **Cons**

Expensive and Controversial  
Could Delay Implementation  
Only a Small Part of What Must Be Done  
Disregards the Initial Planning Process  
Difficult to Solve and Will Divert Resources  
Focuses Work on Water Rights  
Could Cause Overlook of Issues Along the Way  
Lower Priorities Are Moved Higher  
Takes Away from Time to Complete Strategies 6-10

**Alternative B:** Begin Implementing Strategies 1-5 in 2007 – Decide Sequence Later

#### **Pros**

Begin Seeing Actual Results  
Leads to Faster Results  
Allows Group Focus on Implementation  
Focuses on Implementation Rather Than Planning  
Gets Work on the Ground Sooner  
Encourages other Entities to Begin Work  
Actual Outcome (Work)  
Takes Action on Highest Priority Issues

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Final Meeting Summary**

**January 26, 2007**

**Page 3 of 5**

### **Cons**

Delays Remaining Action Items  
Need to Address More Than Strategies 1-5  
Delays Action on Remaining DIP/WMP  
Delays Other Strategies  
Misses the Element of Alternative A  
Loses Sight of Other Strategies  
May Miss Opportunities to Impact a Real Issue  
Narrow Focus

**Alternative C:** Continue Work to Develop Strategies 6-10 – Could Include Re-prioritizing Remaining Strategies 6-18

### **Pros**

Adds Activities to DIP  
Allows Planning Effort to Continue by Working on Next Course of Actions  
Is In the Plan and Must be Done by the Entire Partnership  
Completes Planning  
Host Additional Workshops – Refine Remaining Watershed Management Plan (WMP) Actions  
Continue Planning to Coordinate Future Work with Existing Work  
Allows Multitasking  
Opportunity to Flush Out Details

### **Cons**

Delays Implementation  
Spreads Resources Too Thin  
Certain Issues Cannot Wait - Work Must Begin Now to Avoid Further Damage  
Could Delay Actual Work  
Will delay implementation  
Distracts Focus Away from Implementation  
Before Strategies 1-5 are Fully Developed?  
Slows Implementation

**Alternative D:** Any Combination of alternatives A-C

### **Pros**

Potential Implementation of WMP  
DIP in Action  
Allows for Maneuverability  
Reflects Actual Results  
Allows Implementation and Further Planning  
Provides Flexibility  
Keeps All Options Open  
Provides Important Alternatives

### **Cons**

Too Much Work  
What First?

## **Chehalis Basin Partnership Final Meeting Summary**

**January 26, 2007**

**Page 4 of 5**

Diverts Focus from Implementation  
Keeps All Options Open  
Could Spread Group Too Thin  
Could Lose Focus  
Spreads Resources Too Thin  
Time Consuming - Delay of Projects

The Partnership reviewed each alternative in terms of the pros and cons.

*The Partnership agreed to pursue Alternative B, while recognizing additional issues that may arise during the process. The Partnership will evaluate its progress in September 2007 and decide whether to continue moving forward or revise the course of action.*

Ms. Willis said she is excited to identify a course of action. This is probably the most difficult yet exciting step for the CBP.

Mr. Swartout agreed and indicated the study of instream flows should continue to be in the forefront if it is the decision of the Partnership. Clarifications within the DIP are warranted.

Mr. Harris expressed frustration with the amount of time it takes to achieve an accomplishment. However, it seems inevitable.

Mr. Jennings indicated the Partnership must continue to put forth realistic efforts on accomplishments and allow for adaptive management. There is no perfect course of action.

Mr. White indicated the Partnership has put forth great effort during the previous six months and is now beginning to make progress.

Ms. Napier agreed with the comments. The Partnership has many great ideas, but must decide upon priority and sequence.

### **Open Comments**

Mr. Swartout suggested utilizing a similar exercise to prioritize action during the next meeting.

Ms. Napier stated she would like to bring the Coordinated Water Quality Monitoring Plan before the Partnership for endorsement.

Ms. Napier reported the Department of Ecology would like to discuss Interruptible Water Rights with the Partnership.

Chair Canaday said she is unable to attend the March 2007 CBP meeting.

Mr. Swartout suggested the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife follow legislative activity in terms of water planning that could affect the Partnership. Mr. Kalinowski acknowledged the request.

**Chehalis Basin Partnership Final Meeting Summary**  
**January 26, 2007**  
**Page 5 of 5**

**Adjournment**

**There being no further business, Chair Canaday adjourned the meeting at 11:50 a.m.**

Prepared by Jessica Tate, Recording Secretary  
Puget Sound Meeting Services