

CHEHALIS BASIN BOARD SUMMARIZED MEETING AGENDA AND ACTIONS

Date: September 30, 2020
Time: 9:00 am to 1:00 pm
Location: WebEx online meeting

ITEM	FORMAL ACTION	FOLLOW-UP ACTION
1. Consent September 30 Special meeting agenda	Decision: Current agenda approved	No follow-up action.
2. Chehalis River Basin Flood Control Zone District: Proposed Flood Retention Facility	Discussion	OCB staff will provide an updated memo highlighting the similarities and differences between the Draft SEPA EIS and Draft NEPA EIS and addressing the questions that were asked by Board members during the September 30, 2020 Board meeting.
3. Next Steps for Responding to Governor's Letter	Decision: 1. Consensus approval with all thumbs up for the revised assumptions and outcomes for the Local Actions Program. 2. Consensus approval with all thumbs up for the Board response to Governor Inslee's July 22, 2020 letter. 3. Consensus approval to cancel October 1, 2020 meeting given Board approval at this meeting for response to Governor.	OCB staff will solicit more comments from Board members on the backgrounder document and bring a revised draft to the Board for future consideration.
4. Proposed 2021 Board Meeting Dates	Discussion	OCB staff will develop memo for Board approval with proposed 2021 meeting dates.
5. Next Steps and Closing	Discussion	No follow-up action.

Attendees

Chehalis Basin Board Members Present:

- Vickie Raines, Chair, Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority
- Edna Fund, Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority

- Jay Gordon, Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority
- J. Vander Stoep, Office of the Governor
- Steve Malloch, Office of the Governor
- Tyson Johnston, Quinault Indian Nation (QIN)
- Glen Connelly (alternate to Harry Pickernell), Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation

Chehalis Basin Board Ex-Officio Members Present:

- Rich Doenges, Department of Ecology
- Stephen Bernath, Department of Natural Resources
- Michael Garrity, Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Josh Giuntoli, Conservation Commission
- Bart Gernhart, Department of Transportation

Board Staff/Board Guests Present:

- See Attachment A

Welcome, Introductions

Chair Vickie Raines called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. and welcomed the Board, staff, and audience.

Consent Agenda

The Board did not have additions or revisions to the [September 30, 2020 Meeting Agenda](#).

BOARD DECISION: Agenda approved by consensus.

Chehalis River Basin Flood Control Zone District: Proposed Flood Retention Facility

Jim Kramer (Facilitator) introduced Bob Thomas and Brandon Clinton, US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), who discussed the Corps' Draft NEPA EIS findings and conclusions for the Chehalis River Basin Flood Damage Reduction Project. The Draft NEPA EIS considered the applicant's (Chehalis River Basin Flood Control Zone District or FCZD) proposed project and feasible alternatives that would achieve the project purpose and need. The Draft NEPA EIS evaluated impacts using quantitative and qualitative analysis. The scope of review was determined by the extent of federal control and responsibility over the project and is meant to support a Corps decision on whether to approve, approve with modifications or conditions, or deny the permit application. No federal permit decisions can be made until after the NEPA environmental review process is complete.

The Draft NEPA EIS included a two-stage alternatives screening process based on project objectives. The Corps considered 61 possible alternatives, and from those, three alternatives carried forward:

1. The No Action Alternative
 - No flood retention facility or Airport Levee Improvement
2. Alternative 1 (Applicant's proposal)
 - Flood retention facility with potential for future expansion (FRE Facility)

- Airport Levee Improvements
3. Alternative 2
- Flood retention facility without potential for future expansion (FRO Facility)
 - Airport Levee Improvements

Brandon and Bob (Corps) provided a high-level overview of the EIS study area, and probable adverse impacts and mitigation identified in the Draft NEPA EIS. The Corps will be accepting public comments on the Draft NEPA EIS from September 18 - November 17, 2020 and will hold two public online meetings on October 8 and 14, 2020.

Jim Kramer (Facilitator) introduced Heather Page (Anchor QEA) who provided a comparison of the similarities and differences between the Draft SEPA EIS and Draft NEPA EIS. This included an overview of the environmental review process, the alternatives screening and selection process, and the key similarities and differences between the Programmatic SEPA EIS and Project-level Draft SEPA and NEPA EISs analyses and findings.

Below is a link to the presentation materials:

- [NEPA DEIS Presentation](#)
- [NEPA-SEPA Draft EIS comparison Presentation](#)

Key comments and discussion topics included:

- The Corps reminded the Board that they will be working with the FCZD to consider the adequacy of any mitigation proposals within the Final NEPA EIS prior to issuing a record of decision. The Draft NEPA EIS does not comment on the adequacy of mitigation measures.
- The Corps noted that more information on the alternatives screening process is highlighted in appendix D of the Draft NEPA EIS.
- Board members discussed and requested more information on the following questions regarding the Draft NEPA and Draft SEPA EISs:
 - For NEPA, what is the fish distribution basin-wide versus in the upper basin to support the findings for the basin-wide EDT numbers, e.g., whether or not the majority of fish impacts are in the area of Rainbow Falls to Above Crim Creek because that is where the majority of fish are distributed/located?
 - In what areas did the NEPA and SEPA hydraulic modeling analysis occur and why, and where did “diminishing effects” occur? Did the hydraulic modeling analysis for NEPA go further downstream than Chehalis and Centralia for analyzing peak flood reduction?
 - Were assumptions related to vegetation management within the reservoir the same in SEPA and NEPA?
 - Were impacts to the Pe Ell wastewater treatment plant considered in either the SEPA or NEPA analysis? If so, what were they?
 - How far downstream do water quality impacts extend in the SEPA and NEPA analysis?
 - Is the dam considered a barrier to fish passage in the NEPA EIS and what is the definition of “juvenile salmonids”?
 - What standards were used in SEPA and NEPA to determine whether Marbled Murrelet habitat was impacted (e.g., Forest Practices Rules)?

- What are the differences in flooding of I-5 between NEPA and SEPA?
- What is the rationale for not including climate change in the modeling for NEPA?
- How does the analysis of habitat connectivity compare between the draft EISs? Was there a deeper dive under NEPA?
- For the EDT results for SEPA and NEPA, summarize fish population numbers (in addition to percent).

FOLLOW UP ACTION: OCB staff will provide an updated memo highlighting the similarities and differences between the Draft SEPA EIS and Draft NEPA EIS as well as addressing the questions that were asked by Board members during the September 30, 2020 Board meeting.

Next Steps for Responding to Governor’s Letter

OCB Director McNamara Doyle summarized the latest round of changes to the Local Actions Program outcomes that the Board discussed in previous meetings. Additional revisions to the draft proposed assumptions and outcomes for the Local Actions Program included:

- Adding context for how the placeholder percentage reductions listed in the outcomes would be determined and used in the future, based on additional technical and operational feasibility information as well as a future cost/benefit analysis
- Better explaining how the future flood conditions being used for planning purposes compare to current and historical flood events and levels
- Refining language related to transportation outcomes

OCB Director McNamara Doyle previewed a draft response developed for the Board to respond to the Governor’s July 2020 letter regarding next steps for the development of long-term strategy. The response to the Governor included background information, objectives for the next phase of work, and the Board’s structure and process for developing long-term strategy recommendations by March 30, 2021. The Board was reminded that the content included in the response was based directly on previous Board decisions and discussions.

OCB Director McNamara Doyle previewed the content of a draft “backgrounder” handout intended to be included as an attachment to the response to the Governor. It is also intended to later be shared more broadly, as a communication piece with partners, stakeholders, communities, and the legislature to increase understanding and awareness of the Strategy.

Below is a link to the materials related to the response to the Governor:

- [Proposed Final Outcomes for Evaluating Flood Damage Reduction from Local Actions Program](#)
- [Draft Board response to Governor Inslee’s July 22, 2020 letter](#)
- [Chehalis Basin Strategy Background Handout](#)

Key comments and discussion topics included:

- Board members confirmed that they want the Board-approved Local Actions Program outcomes memo to be attached to the response to the Governor.
- Board members were supportive of the content in the draft response to the Governor.
- Board members generally agreed that the backgrounder handout is helpful and effective but had suggestions for edits throughout regarding how elements of the strategy are characterized.

- Board member Tyson Johnston (QIN) provided a number of specific suggestions for improving the backgrounder handout including:
 - The document should mention the Quinault Indian Nation has treaty fishing rights throughout the basin.
 - The document omits the opposition to the proposed flood retention facility project by the QIN and Chehalis Tribe.
 - The findings of the Restorative Flood Protection alternative are confusing and incomplete, based on what the QIN understand those findings to be.
 - The document states that local projects on their own are not enough to protect against flood damage. This may undermine the Local Actions Program evaluation before the Board has a chance to understand what the program can accomplish to reduce flood damage.
 - The document characterizes fish and wildlife as overwhelmed by the 2007 and 2009 floods; QIN does not think that statement aligns with the science.
- Board members agreed the backgrounder document does not need to be included as an attachment to the response to the Governor and suggested the handout be refined over the next several weeks.

FOLLOW-UP ACTION: OCB staff will solicit more comments from Board members on the backgrounder document and bring a revised draft to the Board for future consideration.

Before asking for the Board’s decisions on the local action program outcomes and response to the governor, Jim Kramer (Facilitator) reminded the Board of its consensus decision-making approach documented in the Board Handbook, acknowledging that if the Board is asked to make a decision and Board members do not share their exceptions, it is assumed there is consensus approval.

Board member input on decisions could be interpreted in two ways:

- Consensus means Board members fully endorse the decision moving forward and think there has been sufficient discussion and support.
- Board members give a “thumbs up,” which means they fully support the decision; “thumbs sideways,” which means they have some questions or reservations but are still willing to support the decision; or “thumbs down,” which means Board members do not support the decision.

The Facilitator reminded the Board that, in any decision-making situation, OCB staff want to hear Board members’ concerns, questions, or reservations to understand if the decision should be modified before asking if Board members are willing to move forward with a consensus decision. If Board members are ever divided on a decision, meeting summaries will reflect that on the record and document the differences of opinion. The handbook also provides that if there are instances where consensus cannot be reached, a member may initiate a vote by making a motion, and the meeting summary will include the outcome of the vote, as well as the pros and cons of the different alternatives for which consensus could not be reached.

Over the next several months, Board members will be asked to make a number of decisions in order to develop their recommendations on a long-term strategy and it is important to acknowledge there may be differences of opinion, and both voting members and ex-officio members should be provided ample time to be heard.

BOARD DECISION:

- Consensus approval with all thumbs up for the revised assumptions and outcomes for the Local Actions Program.
- Consensus approval with all thumbs up for the Board response to Governor Inslee's July 22, 2020 letter.
- Consensus approval to cancel October 1, 2020 Board meeting given Board approval at this meeting for response to Governor.

Proposed 2021 Board Meeting Dates

Based on prior Board discussions, OCB staff proposed to continue holding regular Chehalis Basin Board meetings on the first Thursday of each month during 2021. Board members also discussed the need to likely have additional Board meetings in the first quarter of 2021 as they develop their recommendations on a long-term strategy. OCB Director McNamara Doyle also noted that Board meetings will likely need to continue being held online until at least summer 2021.

FOLLOW UP ACTION: OCB staff will provide the Board a memo with proposed 2021 meeting dates for decision at a future Board meeting.

Next Steps and Closing

Jim Kramer (Facilitator) reminded the Board of an additional special Board meeting on November 4 as well as the regularly scheduled Board meeting on November 5, 2020.

Attachment A

Board Staff/Board Guests:

- Adam Teepe
- Andrea McNamara Doyle, Washington Department of Ecology, Director, Office of Chehalis Basin
- Ann Costanza, Anchor QEA
- Arthur Grunbaum, Friends of Grays Harbor
- Bob Thomas, US Army Corps of Engineers
- Brandon Clinton, US Army Corps of Engineers
- Brent Bower
- Brian Stewart, Conservation Northwest
- Carol Lee Roalkvam
- Carson Coates, Office of Congresswoman Jaime Herrera Beutler
- Celina Abercrombie, Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Chrissy Bailey, Department of Ecology, Office of Chehalis Basin
- Cindy Bradley, Department of Ecology, Office of Chehalis Basin
- Cindy Hansen, Orca Network
- Claudia Yaw
- Colleen Granberg, Department of Natural Resources
- Colleen Suter, Chehalis Tribe
- Curt Hart, Department of Ecology
- Dave Bingaman, Quinault Indian Nation, ASRP Steering Committee
- Diane Butorac, Department of Ecology
- Erik Martin, Chehalis River Basin Flood Control Zone District
- Gordon White, Department of Ecology
- Heather Page, Anchor QEA
- Jennifer Hennessey, Governor's Office
- Jessica Helsley, Wild Salmon Center
- Jim Kramer, Kramer Consulting (Facilitator)
- Joe Ben Walker
- John Robinson
- John Henricksen, OneVoice
- John Hungerford
- Kathy Schaeffer
- Ken Ghalambor, Ross Strategic
- Kim Marcotte, Anchor QEA
- Larry Karpack, Watershed Science and Engineering
- Lee First, Twin Harbors Water Keepers
- Mara Zimmerman, Coast Salmon Partnership
- Miranda Plumb, US Fish and Wildlife Service
- Rona Spelleccacy, HDR

- Ron Averill, City of Centralia representative on the Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority
- Scott Boettcher, Staff to Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority
- Sue Joerger
- Trent Lougheed, City of Chehalis
- Tye Menser, Thurston County Commissioner