

# CHEHALIS BASIN BOARD SUMMARIZED MEETING AGENDA AND ACTIONS

---

**Date:** February 2, 2023  
**Time:** 9:00 am to 3:00 pm  
**Location:** Hybrid meeting – Veterans Memorial Museum, Chehalis

ITEM	FORMAL ACTION	FOLLOW-UP ACTION
1. Approval of current Agenda and December 1 and January 5 meeting summaries	Decision: Current agenda approved; December 1 and January 5 meeting summaries approved	No follow-up action.
2. 2023-2025 Budget Planning	Discussion	OCB will distribute a 1-page budget summary that includes highlights of the Board's 2023-25 biennium funding request that can be referenced when speaking with legislators.
3. Director's Report	Discussion	OCB staff will research NMFS' response to an ESA petition in Northern California and Southern Oregon and report back if it is relevant to the Chehalis Basin Strategy.
4. Basin Perspectives: City of Centralia	Discussion	No follow-up action.
5. Erosion Management	Decision: Erosion management program framework approved	No follow-up action.
6. Local Action Non-Dam Alternative	Discussion/Direction	No follow-up action.
7. Skookumchuck Dam Phase II Results	Discussion/Direction	OCB staff and consultants will provide additional information at the March and April Board meetings, including more details on the EDT model and the viability of an off-channel water storage facility to protect downstream water rights. OCB staff will also inform interested members of the public about commenting opportunities.

ITEM	FORMAL ACTION	FOLLOW-UP ACTION
8. Aquatic Species Restoration Plan	Decision	No follow-up action.
9. Chehalis Basin Strategy Process Refinement	Discussion/Direction	Board members are invited to provide additional edits to the “umbrella question” defining their charge, due to Sam Imperati February 17, 2023.
10. Next Steps and Closing	Discussion	No follow-up action.

## Attendees

### Chehalis Basin Board Members

NAME	APPOINTING AUTHORITY	ATTENDANCE
Vickie Raines	Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority	Present
Edna Fund	Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority	Present
Jay Gordon	Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority	Present
Tyson Johnston	Quinault Indian Nation	Absent
Glen Connelly	Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation	Present
J. Vander Stoep	Office of the Governor	Present
Steve Malloch	Office of the Governor	Present

### Chehalis Basin Board Ex-Officio Members

NAME	AGENCY	ATTENDANCE
Michael Garrity	Department of Fish and Wildlife	Present
Alex Smith	Department of Natural Resources	Absent
Mark Gaines	Department of Transportation	Present
Josh Giuntoli	Washington State Conservation Commission	Absent
Rich Doenges	Department of Ecology	Present

### Board Staff/Board Guests Present:

- See Attachment A

## Welcome, Introductions

Chair Vickie Raines called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. and welcomed the Board, staff, and audience.

## Agenda and Meeting Summary Review

The Board did not have additions or revisions to the [February 2, 2023](#) meeting agenda.

**BOARD DECISION:** Agenda approved by consensus.

The Board did not have additions or revisions to the [December 1, 2022 meeting summary](#) or the [January 5, 2023 meeting summary](#).

**BOARD DECISION:** December and January Board meeting summaries approved by consensus.

## 2023-2025 Budget Planning

### Budget Materials

OCB Director Andrea McNamara Doyle provided an update on materials to support the Chehalis Basin Board's discussions with State Legislators about the Board's recommended \$73 million budget proposal for the Chehalis Basin Strategy.

- **Budget Handout:** OCB has developed a handout summarizing the Chehalis Basin Strategy budget proposal, which will be shared with Board members soon. One side of the handout will describe the budget request and the other side will have a map of completed, in-progress, and new projects. The Legislature has requested that materials like this be shared electronically.
- **2022 Year in Review:** The [2022 annual summary](#) of the Chehalis Basin Strategy's accomplishments has been completed and is available on the Strategy website. OCB will also distribute paper copies to key partners for distribution.

### Legislative Outreach

The only public testimony on the Chehalis Basin Strategy budget request that OCB has provided for this legislative cycle to date has been on the Aberdeen-Hoquiam North Shore Levee budget proposal. OCB Director Andrea McNamara Doyle shared an update about that previously. She also noted that there are two state legislative bills of potential interest to the Board, as follows.

- [S.B. 5157](#). There is a new version of what has been called the "big water bill," which includes changing the mission of OCB to include statewide flood management. A hearing has not been scheduled on it.
- [S.B. 5649](#). This bill proposes providing additional regulatory flexibility for floodproofing residential structures that are located in floodways, consistent with the overall goals of the Chehalis Basin Strategy. Nat is OCB's point person on this bill.

### Key comments and discussion topics included:

- Board members commented on their individual outreach to legislators about the budget requests. They indicated that no briefings have been requested, but they have received some indications of support and encouraged each other to continue outreach efforts.

### **FOLLOW UP:**

- OCB staff will distribute a 1-page budget summary that includes highlights of the 2023-25 biennium funding request that can be referenced when speaking with legislators.

## Director's Report

OCB Director Andrea McNamara Doyle covered the following items in her Director's report.

- **OCB Staff:** OCB has completed interviews for a new office manager and expects to have a new person by the next Board meeting.
- **Report to Legislature:** [House Bill 1154](#) from the 2019-20 state legislative session included a requirement that OCB submit a report on the final, long-term Chehalis basin strategy by January 2021. OCB submitted a status report to the legislature that year instead but intends to fulfill the legislative mandate by the end of this biennium.
  - OCB will characterize the strategy in 3 phases of implementation. All our work to date, including early implementation, pilot projects, and programmatic development is Phase 1. Phase 2 will be ongoing implementation and refinement of the strategy and will continue through when the Board has made its biggest decisions about the flood damage reduction roadmap, aquatic species plan, and funding strategies. Finally, Phase 3 will be the period of full implementation, monitoring, and adaptive management.
  - OCB will provide Board members with a chance to review the report but does not expect Board members to line edit it.
- **Federal Funding Strategy:** OCB has made progress on the Board's direction to assist with developing a federal funding strategy. OCB is in negotiations with a consulting firm that may be able to provide a menu of options to support the Strategy, such as tracking federal funding opportunities, matching projects with opportunities, creating an online dashboard for real-time management, coordination with Strategy partners, advising on funding strategy, and assistance with grant applications and supporting analyses.

### Key comments and discussion topics included:

- Board members expressed their appreciation for the work on the federal funding strategy and asked several clarifying questions. In response, Andrea McNamara Doyle noted that the costs to prepare grants will vary depending on the type of grant and the level of support requested, and that more funding than initially authorized may be required. She also noted that this funding support could support both flood and habitat projects, and could be "soup to nuts" support.
- A Board member asked about the status of the OCB and consultant team's work on climate change estimates and their implications for the Chehalis Basin Strategy. OCB staff noted that Jim Kramer is working with Ross Strategic on a summary of how other programs have used climate change modeling estimates and plans to organize a panel discussion for the Board, potentially in April, to share best practices on how major plans incorporate climate change.
- A Board member said that the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) recently received a petition to list Northern California and Southern Oregon Chinook salmon species under the Endangered Species Act and will be evaluating the [petition](#). The Board member requested that OCB research this and report back if it appears relevant to the Chehalis Basin Board's work.

### **FOLLOW UP:**

- OCB staff will research NMFS' response to an Endangered Species Act petition in Northern California and Southern Oregon and report back if it is relevant to the Chehalis Basin Strategy.

## **Basin Perspectives: City of Centralia**

City of Centralia Mayor Kelly Smith Johnston presented on a new vision for future growth and development of Centralia that was developed through an iterative process with the community. She said the City is committed to a basin-wide solution, and that the City Council has always affirmed a basin-wide solution when it has come before the Council. She added that she trusts the Chehalis Basin Board's process and the diversity of voices and decades of experience on the Board. Centralia's vision involves a blue garland of trails along waterways that connect to neighborhood hubs with human-scale development that is inclusive and welcoming. This is intended to make the community more attractive and connected, while also reducing congestion, mitigating flood damage, and accommodating growth.

Below is the link to the presentation materials:

- [City of Centralia Vision Work Presentation](#)

### **Key comments and discussion topics included:**

- Board members expressed their support and gratitude for the Mayor's leadership and the City of Centralia's vision work. They appreciated the framing around "hope," and noted that "if you build it, they will come."
- Board members also encouraged the City of Centralia to communicate with the Board as the City continues with its efforts to implement the Vision. There are many aspects of the Chehalis Basin Strategy, including the proposed dam and the Local Actions Non-Dam (LAND) alternative, that the Board is working on, and we can only be successful if we work together with partners.

## **Erosion Management**

Nat Kale (OCB) provided a brief overview of the erosion management program, which he presented on at the last Board meeting. The erosion management program has the following three objectives:

- Address urgent and imminent erosion threats to eligible structures and lands while also protecting and/or improving habitat conditions.
- Incentivize proactive projects that can address reach-scale erosion concerns for multiple landowners while also providing substantial habitat benefits.
- Provide technical assistance and resources to support basin jurisdictions to reduce future development of structures and infrastructure in erosion hazard areas

He said that the tentative budget for the program in the next biennium is \$850K, which includes support for two urgent/imminent projects, one reach-scale project, and the development of a guidebook for homeowners and contractors. He requested the Board's approval on the program framework.

Below is the link to the meeting materials:

- [Erosion Management Program Summary Memo](#)

**BOARD DECISION:** The erosion management program framework was approved by consensus.

## Local Actions Non-Dam Alternative (LAND)

Glen Connelly (LAND Steering Group Co-Chair) updated the Board on the January 19<sup>th</sup> LAND community workshop and a six-hour retreat the LAND Steering Group had on January 31 to debrief and discuss follow-up from the workshop. He noted that the Steering Group is starting to coalesce around one option, but more will be done to refine it and hold discussions with local organizations before presenting a recommended alternative to the Board in April. Alex Dupey (MIG) said over 80 people attended the community workshop. He reviewed key areas of feedback from the workshop that the MIG team would examine as the LAND option is refined, such as basin-wide impacts, upstream and downstream impacts, levee design and reliability, cost estimates, I-5 impacts, land-use recommendations, and maximizing the safe structures program. The Steering Group will be meeting twice in March, and then presenting recommendations to the Board in April. In addition to individual community meetings, there will be a webinar on the LAND on February 8, and the MIG team will also be circulating a public survey.

Below is the link to the presentation materials:

- [Key Take-Aways from the January 19 LAND Community Workshop](#)

### Key comments and discussion topics included:

- Board members attended the LAND community workshop and shared their perspectives on it. Some members said they were impressed with the number and variety of people who attended, thought the information was well presented given the time available, and felt that the discussions were helpful in clarifying issues. One Board member noted that the form used in the meeting was poorly designed in that people did not know enough to complete it.
- Regarding the LAND options under consideration, Board members expressed a range of comments and concerns, including the following:
  - These solutions seem the same as ones identified in the 1990s.
  - I-5 impacts should be addressed; the LAND options seem to make it a river channel.
  - The potential for downstream and upstream impacts of the levees and structural solutions needs to be examined more closely and any impacts need to be mitigated.
  - There could be more examination of ways to change the space and time that water is in the basin, rather than simply move water around. There was a project with the Chehalis Tribe in the Oakville area (Sickman Ford Bridge) that did this without causing downstream impacts.
  - Levees should be set back enough to achieve a more stable channel. There were also concerns expressed by local officials about the Chehalis River levees in Centralia.
  - The proposed diversion/bypass may not be feasible based on existing and planned development in the area, including a trailer/mobile home park.

- There is a need to connect the Safe Structures program outlined in the LAND options with the existing work of the CFAR program.
- Several Board members were surprised about the focus of the LAND options on the upper basin, rather than the entire Chehalis River Basin. Andrea McNamara Doyle (OCB) noted that this was the Board’s direction to the LAND Steering Group to focus primarily on the upper basin with a secondary focus on the whole basin.
- Andrea McNamara Doyle noted that the Board also had provided direction to the LAND Steering Group on I-5 and land use in its [October 2021 memorandum](#), which outlined planning assumptions and outcomes for the LAND alternative.
  - For I-5 and State Highways 6 and 12, the LAND Steering Group was directed to consider and coordinate with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) on plans for reducing flooding impacts to transportation infrastructure. The MIG team has been meeting with Devin Reck from WSDOT and will be scheduling time with others.
  - For land use, the Board’s 2021 memo noted the importance of floodplain management ordinances and building codes for protecting future development but indicated that the LAND alternative should focus on reducing flood damage to existing structures. The LAND alternative can still include land use recommendations within that context.

## Skookumchuck Dam Phase II Results

Merri Martz (Anchor QEA) provided a summary of previous (Phase 1) technical analyses of the Skookumchuck Dam, as well as a more extensive review of potential alternatives to future management of the dam conducted in the [Phase 2 Analysis](#) requested by the Board and completed in January 2023 (see also [Phase 2 Analysis Appendices](#)). Phase 2 included detailed hydraulic modeling of the reservoir, fish sluice, and Skookumchuck River downstream of the dam; development of the concept design for downstream fish passage; initial evaluation of potential benefits and impacts to flooding, habitat, water rights downstream from scenarios; and additional investigation and habitat modeling of the quality of aquatic species habitat upstream of the reservoir. Alternatives evaluated included future management of the dam following current operations, management for fish passage only, management for flood storage only, combined fish-flood management, and dam removal.

Merri Martz provided a comparison of how the alternatives performed in the models relative to fish abundance (steelhead, coho, spring chinook, and fall chinook), flood effects, water rights, and cost:

- For fish abundance, dam removal was predicted to have the best results for all four species, with the fish passage-focused management alternative also providing some benefit to steelhead and coho. Flood storage and combined fish-flood alternative provided mixed results for fish. Late century climate conditions complicate these results, since all fish populations will have negative effects from climate change.
- For flood effects, the flood storage only and combined fish-flood alternatives had substantial reductions in flood extent and depth, however these are predicted to provide less benefit in the late century with climate change. The dam removal alternative provided a small increase in

flood extent and depth, while the fish passage alternative provided no change to current conditions.

- With respect to downstream water rights, the fish passage only, flood storage only, and combined-fish-flood alternatives performed similarly with small but increased risk of water rights curtailments predicted in drought years. In contrast, the dam removal option is predicted to have a higher risk of water rights curtailments in drought years.
- Finally, for the estimated cost of these alternatives, the fish passage only alternative is predicted to be the least expensive, with the dam removal alternative potentially being the most expensive (if water rights compensation is factored into the total cost).

Below is the link to the presentation materials:

- [Skookumchuck Dam Phase 2 Analysis Presentation](#)

**Key comments and discussion topics included:**

- Several Board members expressed interest in investigating the potential for an off-channel water storage facility to protect downstream water rights across all alternatives and significantly lower the cost of the dam removal option.
- A Board member inquired about the likelihood of benefits to fish in the combined fish-flood management scenario, given that those benefits are conditional upon the reservoir being refilled. Merri Martz noted that the modelling did consider this factor, and used both 50% and 75% refill probabilities based on the reservoir's average annual refill timeline (filled by early April).
- One Board member shared concern that the model results seemed inaccurate (particularly relative to the spring Chinook performance under the dam removal alternative), and wondered why water temperature in the reservoir was not incorporated. The Board member requested more information on how the EDT model works. Nat Kale (OCB) agreed to provide additional information on the model at a future meeting.
- Nat Kale urged the Board to consider in particular the dam removal alternative given its significant benefits to fish and the fact that it would reconnect wood and sediment flows back into the river system, however noted that this option is currently opposed by TransAlta and the cities of Chehalis and Centralia given potential negative impacts for local communities. A Board member replied that the off-channel water storage concept could address that opposition.
- Given the level of interest in this topic across the basin, Nat Kale shared the option of inviting interested members of the public to provide comment at the March Board meeting during which Board members will hear more information about the analyses. Other options include written comment and prepared presentations from groups. The Board did not indicate a preference for gathering public comment.

**FOLLOW UP:**



- OCB staff and consultants will provide additional information on the Skookumchuck Dam analyses at the March and April Board meetings to further inform the Board’s decision in the April meeting. In particular, the team will provide more details on the EDT model, and will consider what kind of research can be conducted on whether an off-channel water storage facility could be a viable option for protecting downstream water rights.
- OCB staff will inform interested members of the public about opportunities to comment on Skookumchuck Dam alternatives for the Board’s consideration.

## Aquatic Species Restoration Plan

Celina Abercrombie (WDFW) briefly noted several recent products developed by the ASRP: the [2022 ASRP Annual Report](#) and the [new ASRP legislative handout](#) describing 2023-25 biennium program highlights. She also shared about several upcoming events, including a [ASRP Lessons Learned Workshop](#) on February 15 (virtual and in-person at Centralia College), and a [Chehalis Basin Film Festival](#) with two showings -- one in Centralia on March 3 and second in Hoquiam on February 25. Additional details are in the presentation link below.

Drew Meador (WDFW) followed up from the January Board meeting with additional information on the Satsop 2.5-5.0 project sponsored by the Grays Harbor Conservation District. The project, which had an original budget of \$3,591,987, is now seeking additional \$1,569,097 in funding (new total budget of \$5,161,084) due to inflation and design changes necessary to achieve a no net-rise floodplain permitting goal and related to embedding and increasing the size of engineered log jams. This increased funding would come out of the 2021-23 biennium allocation for ASRP projects, which still has unobligated funds remaining.

Below is the link to the presentation materials:

- [ASRP Board Presentation](#)

### Key comments and discussion topics included:

- One Board member asked how carryover funds are treated. Ken Ghalambor (Ross Strategic) clarified that any and all unobligated funds will be part of re-appropriation funds for the next biennium and will not impact the Board’s approved 2023-25 budget request for ASRP.
- One Board member asked WDFW staff responsible for reviewing ASRP project budgets to note requested project management costs moving forward and make inquiries with project teams if they look inflated. WDFW staff agreed to incorporate additional scrutiny in the review of future project budget requests.

**BOARD DECISION:** The Board approved by consensus the budget increase for the Satsop 2.5-5.0 project.

## Chehalis Basin Strategy Process Refinement

### Defining to Whom the Board is Responsible & Board Member Constituencies

Sam Imperati (ICMresolutions) reviewed the major tasks he is leading the Board through – i.e., affirming the Board’s overarching charge, establishing agreements on specific topics, and agreeing on process

protocols – as well as the elements of collaboration vs. conflict. In pursuit of the first major task, he led the Board through a discussion of each of the following questions:

1. To whom is the Board responsible?
2. What is your constituency/are your constituencies?
3. When you opine, which of the following is true?
  - A. I am speaking on my own behalf
  - B. I am speaking on behalf of my constituency/constituencies
  - C. I am recommending my constituency/constituencies support what I've said
  - D. Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Below is the link to the presentation materials:

- [CBB Process Refinement Presentation](#)

**Board members provided these answers:**

1. To whom is the Board responsible?
  - Vickie Raines: The Board is responsible to the Legislature and Governor's Office in order to fulfill its charge within a certain timeframe.
  - Jay Gordon: The Board is responsible to our community – first and foremost the people in the basin, two-three generations from now. People will be doing recovery on behalf of fish.
  - Michael Garrity: The Board is responsible to Chehalis Basin residents, Tribes, as well as to all Washington state residents since the Chehalis Basin Strategy is funded with state dollars.
  - Steve Malloch: The Board is responsible to the Legislature and Governor, to all people of the state of Washington now and for the next 200 years, and to non-human inhabitants of the basin (fish and other species).
  - Edna Fund: The Board is responsible to the Legislature, as well as anyone who asks the question of what it has done or will do.
  - Rich Doenges: The Board is responsible primarily to basin residents, but also holds a fiscal responsibility to all Washington state residents.
  - Glen Connelly: The Board is responsible to stakeholders and interest groups – people with direct interest in the watershed, not necessarily just residents.
  - J. Vander Stoep: I agree with others' comments and would add that the Board is responsible to Washington state taxpayers.
2. What is your constituency/are your constituencies?
  - Vickie Raines: Chehalis Basin Flood Authority, Grays Harbor County residents
  - Edna Fund: Chehalis Basin Flood Authority

- Glen Connelly: The Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation
- Jay Gordon: Chehalis Basin Flood Authority, the local farming community, and Washington State Dairy Association
- Michael Garrity: The statewide public, through the lens of WDFW’s mission (special attention to fish and wildlife and maintaining fishing, hunting, and other recreational activities)
- Mark Gaines: The travelling public, from within the basin as well as all users and interstate commerce travelling on I-5
- Rich Doenges: Current and future residents of Washington state through the lens of Department of Ecology’s mission; however, my role is to be neutral in this process.
- J. Vander Stoep: The people of the basin, as well as the Governor and Legislature
- Steve Malloch: The Governor and Legislature, and future generations of people and non-humans in the basin; while not officially representing it, I also channel the interests of the environmental community.
- Josh Giuntoli: Washington State Conservation Commission and the conservation districts it represents, and this Board (to provide information for decision-making)

3. When you opine, which of the following is true (multiple choice)?

I am speaking on my own behalf	1 member
I am speaking on behalf of my constituency/constituencies	9 members*
I am recommending my constituency/constituencies support what I’ve said	3 members
<i>*includes non-voting members</i>	

**Additional key comments and discussion topics included:**

- Several Board members noted that the group has made significant progress towards collaboration over the last 10 years, that they now have greater understanding and appreciation for the interests of others represented in the group, and that they recognize the final Strategy will require compromise.
- Sam Imperati offered several questions and comments during the above discussion:
  - The purpose of this exercise is to help Board members better understand each other.
  - Are there any responses that surprised you?
  - As processes come closer to their final outcome, the answer to these questions around constituencies – and the potential for posturing therein - can become more relevant to the discussion.
- Additionally, he observed that a healthy tension still exists. One Board member offered that this may be because “fish” efforts are well underway, while the large “flood” planning components are still in the process of evaluating options.

## Defining the Board's Charge

Sam Imperati also led Board members through a discussion to refine the “umbrella question” that more precisely defines the Board’s charge. The Board started with this draft prompt for refinement:

***How can we*** restore and improve native aquatic species and natural habitat, support tribal and non-tribal harvest levels, and protect cultural resources;

***While at the same time*** significantly prevent and reduce flood damage;

***Thereby*** creating a balanced and sustainable long-term strategy that supports the interests of all those who live, work, and recreate in the Chehalis Basin while simultaneously avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating any associated negative consequences?

In discussion, the Board provided the following edits:

<p><u>How can we work with and incentivize basin residents and partners to voluntarily</u> restore and <u>improve</u> protect native aquatic species and natural habitat, <u>support tribal and enhance tribal and non-tribal</u> harvest levels <u>[or: support self-sustaining, abundant, harvestable fish populations throughout their historic ranges]</u>, and protect cultural resources <u>in the face of a changing climate and population growth</u></p>		<b>Ken Ghalambor</b> ... Look to CBP goals <input type="text" value="@mention or reply"/>
<p><u>While at the same time</u> significantly prevent, <u>and</u> reduce, <u>and minimize basin-wide flood and drought</u> damage <u>flood damage from a changing climate to human and natural infrastructure, before the next catastrophic event</u></p>		<b>Ken Ghalambor</b> ... How do you know when you've achieved abundant, harvestable levels with climate change? Do we have to do more because of climate change and pop growth? February 02, 2023, 2:14 PM <input type="text" value="@mention or reply"/>
<p><u>[sense of urgency – from fish, flood, and funding perspective]</u></p>		
<p><u>Thereby</u> creating a balanced, <u>and</u> sustainable, <u>and implementable</u> long-term strategy that supports the net-interests <u>[recognition of personal, socioeconomic toll on people/communities]</u> of all those who live, work, and recreate in the Chehalis Basin while simultaneously avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating any associated negative consequences <u>as seen through the eyes of ASRP SC for aquatic species and as seen through eyes of FA for flood damage?</u></p>		<b>Ken Ghalambor</b> ... Does this belong here or with fish statement? <input type="text" value="@mention or reply"/>
		<b>Ken Ghalambor</b> ... Practical, legal, fundable, politically viable, etc <input type="text" value="@mention or reply"/>
		<b>Ken Ghalambor</b> ... Net-gain or net-benefit for both fish and flood <input type="text" value="@mention or reply"/>

### Additional key comments and discussion topics (not reflected above) included:

- Several Board members shared a great sense of urgency to address flood damage reduction for basin communities, as well as to finalize a comprehensive Strategy to fulfill the legislative mandate.
- A Board member noted that all efforts under the Chehalis Basin Strategy need to be voluntary, i.e., in collaboration with basin residents and private landowners, and should be incentivized to the extent possible.

- A Board member shared that in the Columbia Basin, the Columbia Basin Partnership created metrics for species abundance but chose not to use historical population numbers in their definition of abundance since those seemed unattainable within the modern context.

Sam Imperati will be dedicating time in future Board meetings to gain the Board’s approval of the final “umbrella question” defining their charge, to introduce an updated timeline and decision-making process, to start to define more specifically what success will look like for the Chehalis Basin Strategy, and to define clear roles for ex-officio members, OCB Director, and himself (the facilitator).

**FOLLOW UP:** On February 7, Sam emailed Board members an updated draft of the “umbrella question” defining the Board’s charge and asked Board members to send him additional comments/track changes by **12 pm, February 17, 2023.**

## Next Steps and Closing

Ken Ghalambor (Ross Strategic) thanked Board members for their participation and adjourned the meeting. The next regular Board meeting will be March 2, 2023 as a hybrid (in-person/online) meeting.

## Attachment A

### Board Staff/Board Guests:

*Those that participated virtually are noted with an asterisk.*

- Alex Dupey, MIG
- Alexandra Gustafson, Trout Unlimited\*
- Andrea McNamara Doyle, Department of Ecology, Director, Office of Chehalis Basin
- Anthony Waldrop, Grays Harbor Conservation District\*
- Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam\*
- Brian Stewart, Conservation Northwest\*
- Casey Hart, Ross Strategic\*
- Celina Abercrombie, Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Cheryl Vincent, Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority\*
- Col. (Ret) Ronald Averill, Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority\*
- Colleen Granberg, Department of Natural Resources\*
- Dan Scott, Watershed Science & Engineering\*
- Darrin Raines, Cosmopolis\*
- Diane Butorac, Department of Ecology\*
- Erik Martin, Chehalis Flood Control Zone District\*
- Frank Corbin, Flood Control Zone District Advisory Committee\*
- Grace Stiller, Grayland Resident, Burien Arts Association\*
- Jenn Tice, Ross Strategic\*
- Jess Helsley, Wild Salmon Center\*
- Kat Dickey, Department of Ecology, Office of Chehalis Basin
- Keith Douville\*
- Kelly Johnston, City of Centralia
- Ken Ghalambor, Ross Strategic
- Kylin Brown\*
- Lara McRea, Flood Control Zone District\*
- Larry Karpack, Watershed Science & Engineering\*
- Lauren Dennis, Ross Strategic\*
- Lee First, Twin Harbors Waterkeeper\*
- Lizzie Jespersen, Pyramid Communications\*
- Mark Glyde\*
- Merri Martz, Anchor QEA\*
- Nat Kale, Department of Ecology, Office of Chehalis Basin
- Nick Bird, City of Aberdeen\*
- Owen Sexton, The Chronicle \*
- Rob Gordon, Mayor of Bucoda\*

- Ruth Clemens\*
- Sam Imperati, ICM
- Scott Boettcher, Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority\*
- Shelby Thomas, Ross Strategic\*
- Tammy Domike, Citizens for a Clean Harbor\*
- Teri Wright, Wild Orca\*