



# *Chehalis Basin Partnership*

---

Meeting Summary – September 24, 2004

## **A. GENERAL PARTNERSHIP BUSINESS**

### **Introduction**

Chairman Spahr welcomed everyone and opened the meeting. Allan Borden introduced himself and is sitting in for Bob Fink from Mason County. Amy Williams from the Environmental Finance Center at Boise State University was also introduced. Thirteen of the Partnership's twenty-eight member organizations had a representative or alternate at the meeting. Seven additional citizens, alternates, or visitors were at the meeting. (See attendance list on the last page of this summary)

### **Steering/Technical Advisory Committee**

The September Steering Technical Committee meeting focused on a presentation and discussion of the "Plan-2-Fund" tool developed by the Environmental Finance Center at Boise State University. The Plan-2-Fund tool s being presented later at today's Partnership meeting.

### **Water Quality Committee**

A draft letter endorsing the TMDL Detailed Implementation Plan was sent out in the meeting packet for this Partnership meeting. The letter characterizes the concerns of various Partnership members. The Partnership approved the letter endorsing Chehalis Basin TMDLS.

### **Citizens' Advisory Committee**

The focus is on recruiting members that can actively contribute.

### **Other Business**

Operating Procedures: Changes recommended and discussed at the August Partnership meeting were incorporated into the version of the Operating Procedures mailed out in the packet for this meeting. One correction was made today - on page 25 the fifth paragraph was modified to say three **consecutive** monthly meetings. The Partnership approved the Operating Procedures incorporating this last correction.

Future Partnership Meeting Locations: Mark White has made arrangements for the Partnership to resume meeting at the Chehalis Tribe reservation starting October 22, 2004. There was a general discussion about the value of meeting at various locations at least a few times per year and the Partnership will consider doing so, perhaps once per quarter. Guy McMinds invited the Partnership to the Quinault Lodge and said he could take some members out on the Quinault River if they were interested.

## **B. SPECIAL PROJECTS**

### **Watershed Planning: Plan-2-Fund**

Amy Williams works for the Environmental Finance Center at Boise State University. The Environmental Finance Center is partially funded by the Environmental Protection Agency to

provide planning and implementation assistance to local groups that would otherwise not have access to this type of assistance.

Amy started her presentation by stating that "In pure public finance terms, watershed funding is one of the most difficult funding challenges." She then gave an overview of the Plan-2-Fund tool which helps groups identify goals, objectives, tasks, timelines, responsible parties and costs. Plan-2-Fund can be loaded onto a laptop computer and brought to meetings where it can be updated. At the end of the overview Dennis Rhodes (Centralia) said that he has worked extensively with project planning tools and it appears that the Plan-2-Fund system is a big improvement in making it easy for a group to create a project management tracking system.

Discussion points and comments:

- Funding at the national level for local communities and local projects is decreasing. More and more efforts like the watershed plan we just approved have to rely on local funding for implementation. This is what cities have had to do to implement comprehensive plans, water system plans etc.
- This is the challenge we are facing: Our plan s basically a skeleton and now we have to add meat to it if we want it to actually do anything. Plan-2-Fund is a structured approach that will help us transform our skeleton into actual tasks, priorities, dates and costs.
- The beauty of the approach we are being offered through Plan-2-Fund is that there is some capacity to modify it to meet our needs. There are limits to what it can do however. For instance there was a discussion about combining Plan-2-Fund with other tools such as Ecosystem Diagnostic Treatment (EDT). Plan-2-Fund s a planning tool and EDT is a technical habitat analysis tool. If you try to combine these two very different tools you can easily end up with something that is so complicated it won't work.
- We can use Plan-2-Fund to put detail into our implementation plan but there are still things the Partnership would need to do to make it work. For instance, a decision tool needs to be developed that will prioritize actions and it needs to be incorporated into Plan-2-Fund. Would the Partnership like the Steering/Technical Committee to spend some time on developing a decision tool? Prioritization should be done by the Partnership but the STC could begin discussion of various decision tools for the Partnership to consider.
- If we decide to move forward with Plan-2-Fund does that mean we are deciding to move forward with a Phase 4 implementation grant proposal to Ecology? No, the decision about Phase 4 will be made later. Plan-2-Fund can be used if we decided to pursue Phase 4 funding or if we decide to seek out other sources of funding.

### **Watershed Planning – Phase 3 Watershed Plan**

Lee Napier handed out the Technical Supplement to the plan and stated that "We are now officially done with watershed plan, and as a result we can no longer spend the remaining small amount of Phase 3 watershed planning money that is left over."

### **Watershed Planning – Implementation Options Including Phase 4 Opportunities/Requirements**

The Partnership was asked "Would you like to spend some time discussing Phase 4 at a future Partnership meeting?" The answer was "Yes, we want to understand Phase 4 requirements."

As a result of meetings held with the Departments of Ecology and Health we have been told that we can draft a scope of work for how we would like to approach development of a Phase 4 implementation plan. Ecology will review our draft and tell us if it is acceptable. In practical terms what Ecology is saying is that the first approved watershed plans will have the chance to determine what Phase 4 Detailed Implementation Plans will look like. Plan-2-Fund would provide us with the detailed information we need for the Phase 4 Detailed Implementation Plan.

Some Partnership members asked if those groups that have been contributing the staff resources that worked on preparing the plan will be able to continue to provide staff support for implementation. Others asked “When do we decide to adopt Phase 4 to access funding?”

There appears to be a general feeling that the Partnership should not jump into signing a Phase 4 contract too soon. The main reason is that we need to establish a good secure foundation before committing to Phase 4 so that we are prepared to use the entire twelve months available to actually develop the detailed implementation plan. The suggestion is that the Partnership continue to “evaluate” Phase 4 opportunities and begin work on developing a statement of work for Ecology to review. Some Partnership members have reservations about the requirements of Phase 4 and we need to continue to make sure their concerns are addressed.

There are also questions about what Ecology is expecting us to accomplish within the twelve months allowed for developing a Detailed Implementation Plan under Phase 4.

There was a request that at the next Partnership meeting an overview of Phase 4 and a discussion about the concerns members have be scheduled on the agenda.

The Partnership agreed it is interested in Plan-2-Fund as a tool to help guide development of a detailed implementation plan.

The final comment was that the Partnership needs to continue to exist so that it can stay involved in, and try to influence, processes that are often initiated at the state and federal level. Local governments and citizens need to have a forum where they can try to influence what those state/federal processes end up requiring and the community needs to be informed.

During the meeting a representative from the Quinault Indian Nation commented on their interests in the Chehalis Basin:

- The Quinault Indian Nation has reservations about how the existing Chehalis Basin Watershed Plan will address water use. They are interested in conservation, and they are very interested in how the state and federal governments will address instream flows.
- The “Bolt 2” court decision said there must be sufficient habitat to ensure that the fish tribes are entitled to harvest under the original “Bolt” court decision are actually available. If tools like Ecosystem Diagnostic Treatment (EDT), TMDLs and instream flows (there may also be other tools) can be integrated into the general statements in the current watershed plan so that it will restore fish and instream flows, the Quinault Indian Nation is interested in working with the Partnership. Such a plan could provide the basis for a settlement of the Bolt 2 court decision that satisfies both existing water users and the instream flow resources needed to support healthy fish populations. It is important to take the next step – to go from analyzing problems in general to identifying specific restoration sites and coming up with

specific restoration costs. [NOTE: EDT is a computer model that can tell you which investments in habitat will provide the best return for the amount invested.]

- If tribes sue over lack of flows to support fish that could result in a 20 to 25 year legal process. The Quinault Indian Nation believes that the costs of legal action could be better used for actual restoration actions and they believe it is better to address problems in a forum like the Chehalis Basin Partnership than in the courts.
- If the Partnership recognizes that there are problems with flows and numbers of fish the Quinault Indian Nation wants to work with you because we recognize that will help protect our fishermen. We are interested in actions that will solve the problems for both water users and for our fishermen.
- Plan-2-Fund looks like a good opportunity. When you start to match planning recommendations with finances to actually implement them, then you start to see daylight at the end of the tunnel.

**The next meeting of the Chehalis Basin Partnership will be held on October 22, 2004 from 9:00 to 11:30 a.m. at the Lucky Eagle Casino near Oakville.**

**Decisions**

- **The Partnership approved the letter endorsing Chehalis Basin TMDLS.**
- **The Partnership approved the Operating Procedures.**
- **An overview of Phase 4 and a discussion about the concerns members have about Phase 4 should be scheduled on the September agenda.**
- **The Partnership agreed it is interested in Plan-2-Fund as a tool to help guide development of a detailed implementation plan.**

September 24, 2004 Chehalis Basin Partnership Attendance Record	
Bob Beerbower, Lee Napier	Grays Harbor County
Allan Borden	Mason County
Bob Macleod, Mark Swartout	Thurston County
Mark White	Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis
Bonnie Canaday, Dennis Rhodes	City of Centralia
Bob Spahr, Patrick Wiltzius	City of Chehalis
Ron Schillinger	City of Montesano
Jim Haslett	City of Napavine
Jean Gayle	Grays Harbor Water District #2
Terry Willis	Grays Harbor County Citizen Representative
Jim Hill	Lewis County Citizen Advisory Committee member
Chanelle Holbrook-Shaw	Thurston County Citizen Advisory Committee member
Kahle Jennings	WA ST Department of Ecology
Guy McMinds	Quinault Indian Nation
Bruce Jones	Quinault Indian Nation
Lori Morris	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers