

Implementation Strategy

The key to assuring the success of this Plan is implementation. This section presents a framework for the Detailed Implementation Plan that the state requires as a condition for accepting Phase 4 funding. The Partnership has not decided to undertake this challenge to realize the vision outlined in this Plan. The Partnership must determine the specifics of implementing the recommended actions in the Plan. Decisions will be made concerning:

- The priority of each recommendation for implementation
- How each recommendation will be implemented
- When actions will occur
- What jurisdiction(s) will be responsible
- What resources/funding will be used

Chehalis Basin Management Entity

The Partnership must determine the type of entity that can best oversee implementation of the recommendations in this Plan. During Plan development, the Steering/Technical Committee of the Partnership recognized the need for a coordinating body to oversee implementation of the agreements and measure the success of this Plan. These issues are briefly discussed in the *Management Framework Issue Paper* and *Measuring Success* section of this Plan. This section provides more detail on options for establishing this coordinating body.

While a final decision is not needed before the Plan is adopted, this Plan indicates the Partnership's preferred direction.

The Partnership is the entity that manages the Watershed Management Planning process while addressing other water resource issues in the Chehalis Basin, such as flooding. The Partnership formed in 1998 through an Intergovernmental Agreement among most of the governmental agencies in the basin and the Washington Department of Ecology. Since then, the Partnership has actively addressed Chehalis Basin water issues and has worked to support informational efforts for basin citizens on those issues. In 1999 the group undertook the development of this Watershed Management Plan under the Watershed Management Planning Act.

While the Partnership has successfully guided this planning effort, its present voluntary, non-incorporated organizational structure has limitations that preclude it from overseeing Plan implementation and long-term water resources management (unless it continues to be represented by a lead agency, which has drawbacks). For example, the Partnership cannot directly hire staff or consultants, sign contracts, or act independently as a management agency.¹ The Partnership, therefore, needs to evaluate the organizational

1. At this time, all contracts and staff are authorized through the Lead Entity, Grays Harbor County.

options available for water resources management and Watershed Plan implementation and determine the structure that will best serve these functions.

Another important consideration is that the management entity must include multiple interests at the table if it is to continue the broad participation and stakeholder representation pioneered in the Chehalis Basin by the Partnership. In addition to the initiating governments that currently participate in the Partnership (county, city, tribal, and state governments and water supply purveyors), other interests should continue to participate, including a port district, timber, agriculture and private citizens. Additional interests that should be considered for participation include:

- Federal agencies
- Business
- Fisheries
- Recreation
- Environmental
- Industrial
- Port districts

The Partnership should consider options for how best to manage the various water resources of the Chehalis Basin at different scales: basin-wide, by county, subbasin, or other geographic or jurisdictional unit. This consideration should include maintaining the existing Partnership structure. The options range from various types of districts, to a water conservancy board, to a council of governments.

Some of the district options focus on a specific area of concern, such as flooding, water or sewer service; such districts might not serve as an appropriate forum for addressing and implementing all components of the Watershed Management Plan. Other district approaches, such as a Water Resources District if the State Legislature establishes such an option, might be flexible enough to address all aspects of watershed management.

It is important to recognize that existing laws may not authorize the ideal entity that meets all of the needs of the Chehalis Basin. It may be necessary for the Partnership to recommend and potentially to sponsor legislation to allow formation of an entity that meets the specific needs of the Chehalis Basin.

Chehalis Basin Management Entity Recommendations

1. For the time being, the Partnership should remain the management entity, using Grays Harbor County as the lead agency. It will be responsible for completing and recommending this Plan for possible implementation.

2. The Partnership should develop criteria to determine the best organizational form for managing the water resources of the Chehalis Basin over the long term.
3. The Partnership should investigate types of legal organizations that could best meet these criteria and coordinate basin-wide water resources management over the long term.
4. The Partnership should also consider special purpose organizations or other entities that can handle water resources management on a smaller scale, for example at the county or sub-basin level.

Funding

Identifying funding sources and obtaining funds – for implementation of plan recommendations, infrastructure improvements, monitoring to measure success, data management, coordination and oversight, plan updates, etc. – will be important for successful water resources management in the Chehalis basin. This section lists several potential funding sources and suggests a combination of state, federal and local government funds as the best way to provide long-term support for work to ensure the waters of the Chehalis Basin remain healthy.

Chehalis Basin Watershed Funding

<i>Source</i>	<i>2003</i>	<i>2004</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>2007</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2009</i>	<i>2010</i>
<i>WA State ESHB 2514</i>	\$200,000	\$30,000						
<i>Wa State Phase 4 (HB 1336 funds)</i>		\$62,500	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$62,500	\$25,000	\$25,000	
<i>Match or In-Kind Funds</i>		\$6,250	\$12,500	\$12,500	\$6,250	\$2,500	\$2,500	
<i>Subtotal</i>	\$200,000	\$98,750	\$137,500	\$137,500	\$68,750	\$27,500	\$27,500	\$0
<i>Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)</i>	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$1,000,000	\$500,000	tba	tba	
<i>Subtotal</i>	\$700,000	\$598,750	\$637,500	\$1,137,500	\$568,750	\$27,500	\$27,500	\$0
<i>Potential Funding</i>								
<i>Local Funds</i>			\$25,000	\$25,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$100,000
<i>Ecology Grants (possible)</i>								
<i>Grants</i>								
<i>Total</i>	\$700,000	\$598,750	\$662,500	\$1,162,500	\$618,750	\$77,500	\$77,500	\$100,000

Descriptions of Funding Sources

WA State ESHB 2514

Funding for watershed planning in the Chehalis basin included \$100,000 for organization of the project; \$400,000 for the Technical Assessment and Level 2 portions of the project; and \$500,000 for the Plan development portion of the project. Some remainder of Phase 3 Plan development funds were be spent by October 31, 2003 when the Plan was adopted. These funds were intended to be used for the Plan approval process, including public meetings to gain citizen input and discussions on implementation that would occur before the Partnership obtained Phase 4 funds,¹ expected to be in late spring 2004.

The funding listed above does not include funding the Washington State Legislature made available in 2002 for “supplemental assessments” on water quality, water storage and instream flow levels. The Partnership applied for and was eligible for up to \$200,000 for each of these studies. Actual costs amounted to \$81,624.00 for the Storage study; \$163,130 for the Instream Flow study; and \$105,071 for the Water Quality study. The figures in the chart above include the amounts expended in 2003 on these studies.

WA State Phase 4 Funds (HB 1336) with Local Match

The 2003 Washington State Legislature passed, and the Governor signed, a bill that provides funding for implementation of watershed plans. This legislation has specific requirements for what must be accomplished with these funds, including a detailed implementation plan and an accounting of unused municipal water rights in the management area. The Phase 4 funding package includes:

- Up to \$125,000 per year for three years for WRIAs that include more than one WRIA, such as the Chehalis basin, and a 10% (\$12,500) required match, possibly as in-kind services.
- At the end of three years, up to \$50,000 for two years with a 10% (\$5,000) required match, possibly as in-kind services.

The legislation requires a 10% local match, in kind or actual funds, as shown in the chart.

Local Funds

In the long run, local governments in the Chehalis basin will likely need to provide funding to maintain the Partnership and to ensure the watershed program remains viable. This is especially important considering that several recommendations in the Plan are long-term and implementation will require ongoing funding. The Partnership will consider becoming a legal entity that is authorized to assess a fee to member agencies and to levy a tax to support Plan implementation.

¹ This assumed the Partnership would apply for Phase 4 funding.

The following actions are recommended:

- That the Partnership consider continuation as a legal entity
- That the Partnership consider formation of an Irrigation District or other type of entity that can levy fees for water resources management
- That the Partnership consider staffing water resources management, such as by hiring a water quality coordinator

To fund ongoing elements of Plan implementation, local funding sources will be needed. It is likely that these would be phased in over time and that the Partnership would provide ample lead time before a local government would be required to allocate funds. A sliding assessment scale for local jurisdictions could be based on population, water use, or some other basis.

Other Potential Sources

State Department of Ecology

It is highly likely that Ecology will make available specific grants that the Partnership could apply for in the future to support various water resource projects. These projects and purposes of grant funding will vary over time. Options might include evaluating municipal inchoate water rights and using surpluses for dedicated instream flow needs

Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)

The ACOE is currently working on two major projects in the Chehalis Basin: its Ecosystem Restoration Study and its Flood Damage Reduction Study. Funding will likely be available from this federal agency for habitat restoration projects as part of the former effort, around the year 2005 or 2006.

Other Federal Sources

A number of other federal funding sources exist for watershed projects, which EPA has compiled in the *Catalog of Federal Funding Sources for Watershed Protection*. The Partnership should use this catalog, available from the EPA's Office of Wetlands, Oceans & Watersheds, Ariel Rios Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave NW, Washington DC, 20460. It lists grant money available for projects in the following categories:

- Monitoring
- Pollution prevention and control
- Watershed and drinking water source protection
- Wetlands
- Wildlife

Other Grants

The Partnership can apply for grants from the State of Washington for projects recommended in this Plan. One example would be projects related to clean water (Centennial Clean Water Fund). Other sources exist to fund habitat restoration projects and public involvement/education work.

Should the Partnership wish to apply for these funds, it would have to become a legal entity of some sort. While it is likely that more grant funding opportunities exist for non-profit groups than for local governments or quasi-governmental agencies, acquiring and reporting on this funding can take a great deal of staff time. As of Plan approval, it appears that allowing governmental agencies to levy fees or taxes offers a good opportunity to supplement grant monies available for local government agencies.

Fundraising

The Partnership should consider options for fundraising to support volunteer and school programs throughout the basin for specific project areas, such as salmon education and stream restoration. A salmon barbecue could be held, for example, with music and salmon art work for sale by local artists as part of the event. Sponsorship for such an event would be needed, with a donation requested for participation. This is but one of several fundraising options that are available for enterprising local organizations such as the Partnership. Others include:

- Canvassing
- Capital Campaigns
- Direct Mail
- Major Donations
- Earned Income
- Grants/Grant-writing
- In-kind Match
- Membership Programs
- Planned Giving
- Prospect & Funder Research
- Special Events
- Sponsorships
- Telemarketing

Costs of Plan Implementation

These will be estimated during discussions.

Measuring the Success of the Chehalis Basin Watershed Plan

This is clearly a complicated issue given the fact that the watershed plan is not yet final, the many variables that impact water resources, and the uncertainty about future governance of and funding for watershed plan implementation. One way to approach measuring success is to ask the following two questions:

What happens to implement the plan itself?

1. The counties adopt the Watershed Plan.
 - Are they implementing it? (See page V-11 for a draft table, to track implementation and results.)
2. The CBP determines to constitute itself as a legal entity to oversee implementation of the Watershed Plan.
3. Whether or not a legal entity is created to oversee implementation of the plan, participating cities, counties, tribes and water districts take actions to implement specific recommendations in the plan.
4. A single legal entity (if one is created) or individual cities/counties/tribes/water districts or combinations of these entities send recommendations to state/local governments requesting actions that would benefit the basin and the agencies respond positively to these recommendations.
5. Funding is obtained by either the CBP (if it becomes a legal entity) or by member agencies to implement projects that benefit water quality, water quantity, instream flows, habitat, storage and prevent flooding.
6. Public outreach & information efforts raise awareness about water resources and encourage citizens of the basin to adopt behaviors that benefit water resources over the long-term? Possible measures of success would be
 - Ongoing informational outreach by CBP/member agencies on water resource issues (brochures, mailing inserts, stories in newspapers, presentations, speakers bureau)
 - Booth at county fair with information about how to take care of basin water resources

- Creation and distribution of a brochure on water resources;
- Maintenance of a website with information on what the average person can do to protect water resources;
- Distribution of a brochure highlighting the benefits to tourists and local citizens of healthy natural resources and the need to protect them over the long term

How can we measure success with respect to the specific elements in the plan?

It is important to track whether or not Plan recommendations are being implemented; it is equally important to measure the results of their implementation, to assess the effectiveness of specific projects. Are they having the intended beneficial results?

High-priority projects in the following categories should be tracked.

- **Water quality in the basin** – Determine first whether recommendations are implemented, then determine if actions have achieved positive results, for example, water bodies are taken off the 303(d) list, monitoring shows improved water quality.
- **Water quantity** – Determine whether recommendations are implemented, then determine if actions have achieved positive results, for example, cities, water districts and rural communities can meet service needs without impairing instream flows.
- **Habitat** – Determine whether recommendations are implemented, then determine if actions have achieved positive results, for example, the monitoring strategy is completed and implemented.
- **Instream flows** – Determine whether recommendations are implemented, then determine if actions have achieved positive results, for example, regulatory minimum flows are met.
- **Flooding** – Determine whether recommendations are implemented, then determine if actions have achieved positive results.
- **Storage** – Determine whether any recommended actions have achieved positive results (e.g. less severe flood damage in winter, higher stream flows during low flow months)

NOTE: The above examples are illustrative only. The detailed implementation plan would contain specific criteria by which to measure the success of Plan recommendations and their implementation. It's expected that the details of implementation, including responsibilities, schedules, and funding will be spelled out. For now, it is assumed that the CBP will become a legal entity to oversee implementation of the Plan. As such, it will track implementation and will produce a report on a regular basis (annually?).

All high priority recommendations for each element should be implemented for the Plan to be considered a success.

Tracking Results

Tracking should focus on implementation of high priority recommendations and the results of implementation. The following table could be a useful tool for tracking the implementation of recommendations, for assessing results, and for determining appropriate steps to take if the results are unsatisfactory or contrary to those expected.

Draft Table for Tracking Implementation of Recommendations in the Watershed Plan

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Implementation Strategy</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Schedule</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Steps to take if off-track (adaptive management)</i>

