

# CHEHALIS BASIN BOARD SUMMARIZED MEETING AGENDA AND ACTIONS

**Date:** May 4, 2023  
**Time:** 9:00 AM, PST to 4:00 PM, PST  
**Location:** Hybrid meeting – Veterans Memorial Museum, Chehalis Washington / Zoom Online

ITEM	FORMAL ACTION	FOLLOW-UP ACTION
1. Approval of Current Agenda and April 6 Meeting Summary	Decision: Current agenda approved; April 6 summary approved	No follow-up action.
2. 2023-2025 Budget Planning	Decision: Board members approved the 2023-2025 Capital Budget spending approach.  Board members approved \$560K in funding for Port of Grays Harbor Haul Road project.	OCB staff will report back to the Board on the source of 2023-25 funding for the Haul Road project.
3. Chehalis Basin Strategy Process Refinement	Discussion/Direction	Board members will consider the advantages and disadvantages of deciding on the integrated long-term flood reduction strategy before one or more of the EIS's are issued and review the ten-step decision-table process from Mr. Imperati's presentation appendix.
4. Local Actions Non-Dam Alternative	Discussion	MIG will present more detail on recommended LAND next steps and associated timing at the June Board meeting.  OCB staff will engage with MIG and the LAND Steering Group and come back to a future Board meeting with a proposal on how decisions could be made on the LAND moving forward and a draft timeline for when a refined viable LAND alternative would be ready to support the Board's decision-making process.
5. Skookumchuck Dam	Discussion	OCB staff will ask the Board to direct OCB staff to obtain a scope of work from Anchor QEA to complete high- and possibly medium-priority next steps at the June Board meeting.
6. Forest Practices / Hydrology Study	Discussion	No follow-up action.

ITEM	FORMAL ACTION	FOLLOW-UP ACTION
7. Aquatic Species Restoration / ASRP	Discussion	Board members will send any follow up questions on the Newaukum RM 8-9 project to WDFW before the June meeting.  ASRP staff will come back to the Board at a future meeting with specific questions and considerations for continuing to explore the impacts of pinniped and non-native fish predation in the Chehalis Basin.
8. Directors Report	Discussion	No follow-up action.
9. Public Comment, 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	Present
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	Excused
Mark Gaines	Department of Transportation	Present
Josh Giuntoli	Washington State Conservation Commission	Present
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 9:10 a.m. and welcomed the Board, staff, and audience.

## Agenda and Meeting Summary Review

Ken Ghalambor (Ross Strategic) provided an overview of the meeting's agenda. The Board did not have additions or revisions to the [May 4, 2023](#) meeting agenda.

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

The Board did not have additions or revisions to the [April 6, 2023](#) meeting summary.

**BOARD DECISION:** April 6 Board meeting summary approved by consensus.

## 2023-2025 Budget Planning

### Capital Budget Update

Ken Ghalambor (Ross Strategic) provided updates on the final 2023-25 Capital Budget appropriation for the Chehalis Basin Strategy (CBS). The final budget totaled \$70 million, with \$66.1 million for Board-approved projects to: (a) protect and restore aquatic species habitat, (b) reduce flood damage, and (c) advance integrated multi-benefit projects and \$3.9 million for OCB and Board operations. The Board has discretion to allocate amounts among the three major funding categories with approval of 6 of 7 voting members, specific projects must be approved by at least 6 of 7 voting members, and up to 1.5% of the \$70M appropriation may be used by RCO to administer contracts. The final budget also included a separate \$18.5M appropriation to Department of Ecology for the North Shore Levee project, with intent language for an additional \$17.5M in 2025-27.

Mr. Ghalambor noted that OCB is confident the \$3M difference between the previously Board approved \$73M budget and final legislatively approved \$70M budget can be covered through:

- Unobligated and unspent 2019-21 funds
- Unobligated and unspent "Reserve" 2021-23 flood damage reduction funds
- Cost savings from other 2021-23 flood damage reduction funds, primarily from delays completing the SEPA and NEPA EISs

Key comments and discussion topics included:

- Ken Ghalambor acknowledged that this approach exhausts most, but not all, unobligated 2019-21 and 2021-23 flood damage reduction funds.
- Jay Gordon suggested it is important for the Board to have some "wiggle room" for unanticipated spending needs that arise over the course of the biennium.
- Andrea McNamara Doyle (OCB) agreed with Jay's comment and noted that last fall the Board decided to not set aside a specific amount of 2023-25 funding for emergency needs or new opportunities that may arise, but it is something the Board should consider for future biennia.
- Ken Ghalambor (Ross Strategic) added that historically over the course of a biennium some spending priorities shift, which can open up funding for new or emerging needs.

**BOARD DECISION:** Board members approved the 2023-25 spending plan approach.

Below is a link to the meeting materials:

- [2023-2025 Budget](#)

## Haul Road Budget Request

Nat Kale (OCB) reviewed the new \$560K budget request for haul road. The Board previously funded a temporary repair to stabilize the bank and protect an exposed high-value utility main. Now the project needs \$1.63M to construct a permanent solution to fix the erosion problem and continue to protect the utility corridor. The Port has secured funding for \$330K from non-Strategy sources. The Flood Authority has additionally indicated a willingness to fund \$740K from 21-23 and 23-25 funds. The Port is asking the Board to fund the remaining \$560K.

On behalf of the Flood Authority, Chair Vickie Raines spoke to the funding request. She highlighted that this funding would complete the project, and if not provided, there is concern that erosion will continue to grow and lead to loss of the utility corridor, with extremely negative consequences for the Port and its tenants. In addition, the proposed solution is fish friendly and fully permitted. Chair Raines requested the Board defer to OCB staff to determine where to find the \$560K from the 2023-25 budget to fund the project, including potentially from the Flood Control Zone District, Local Actions Non-Dam Alternative (LAND), Community Flood Assistance and Resilience (CFAR), and/or erosion management program.

Key comments and discussion topics included:

- Steve Malloch noted that this is a good example of historical infrastructure constructed in a place it should not be and the importance of encouraging local governments to build future infrastructure out of harm's way.
- Chair Vickie Raines noted this facility was built many years ago and the area now provides employment, training facilities, and commerce. This specific situation could not be avoided, and it would be a waste to not continue to fund the project with how much has been spent on it so far.
- Glen Connelly suggested that funds used to pay for the Haul Road project would be best coming from the flood damage reduction side of the budget.
- Michael Garrity noted there is approximately \$50K in unspent 2021-23 funds for "All-H" aquatic species action that could potentially be used to support a portion of Haul Road funding.
- Ken Ghalambor (Ross Strategic) added that Anthony Waldrop (Grays Harbor Conservation District) said they have an RFQ out for consultants to facilitate a stakeholder process to develop an investment plan for Chehalis River Mile 13-20, which includes the stretch of the Haul Road project.

**BOARD DECISION:** Board approved \$560K in funding for the Port of Grays Harbor Haul Road project.

**FOLLOW UP:** OCB will report back to the Board on the source of 2023-25 funding for the Haul Road project.

Below is a link to the meeting materials:

- [2023-2025 Budget Development Worksheet – PoGH Haul Road](#)

- [PoGH CBB Supporting 2023-2025 Budget Development Worksheet -Haul Road](#)

## Development of a Long-Term Integrated Strategy Approach

Sam Imperati (ICMResolutions) revisited several concepts related to the process for the Board to develop a long-term integrated Strategy. Sam's presentation focused on key process decisions and why decision making is difficult. Some of the key process decisions facing the Board include:

- What are the key upcoming substantive issues?
- Long-term strategy delivery date?
- What are you comparing and how?
- What level of detail and information certainty is needed?
- What is the target date for your process decision?

Mr. Imperati acknowledged that no process decisions are expected to be made during this meeting and that he will talk off-line with Board members about suggestions and feedback for the process. He also reviewed some common psychological traps and biases that can occur in decision-making processes as well as an overview of why *group* decisions tend to be more difficult.

Some of the key upcoming substantive issues the Board needs to consider include next steps and implementation considerations regarding the LAND, FRE, ASRP, Skookumchuck dam, climate change/modeling, and benefit-cost analyses. Toward this point, Mr. Imperati posed the following questions: Does the Board want a comparative benefit-cost and socioeconomic/E.J. evaluation of the LAND and FRE? Of relative costs and flood benefits, or should it include modeled impacts to aquatic species through EDT and/or NOAA life cycle modeling, etc.? When?

Board member discussion specific to the benefit-cost analysis questions included:

- J Vander Stoep noted that in summer 2021 the Board agreed to fund the LAND process, with the expectation that a preliminary recommended LAND alternative would be ready by summer of 2022, and that there would also be a high-level benefit-cost analysis to help the Board understand if the LAND and/or FRE are feasible and then the more exhaustive questions Mr. Imperati was raising would follow. The longer multiple processes are considered, the longer it takes to make a decision. J's understanding is the Board already agreed to evaluate these alternatives, so it makes sense to get a new consultant onboard now to begin the background work required.
- Steve Malloch commented that the LAND is currently not developed enough where an economic analysis can provide an honest assessment because there are too many outstanding questions and assumptions. The more we understand the variety of options being considered in the LAND's overall approach, the more we will be at a point to know what to analyze for the LAND. Mr. Imperati's questions can help the Board identify what needs to happen in order to complete the evaluation.
- Tyson Johnston noted that he did not recall the purpose of the benefit-cost analysis being to definitively decide if either LAND or FRE should halt further analysis, and that the LAND needs

time to reframe itself. The LAND is not currently comparable to the FRE, given only one year of analyses for LAND. In addition, the FRE is still completing its mitigation realignment and updated project description and has an outdated cost estimate. Mr. Johnston would like to confer with staff on what was agreed to months ago on this subject.

- Ken Ghalambor (Ross Strategic) clarified the goal of the benefit-cost analysis was not to necessarily eliminate one or another option. Mr. Imperati is highlighting that if there is going to be a comparative evaluation for the CBS, the Board needs to consider if they are just looking at LAND and FRE or a broader set of Strategy work elements.
- Michael Garrity generally agreed with Steve and Tyson and encouraged developing a broad road map for scaling and phasing of implementation before doing a benefit-cost analysis.
- J Vander Stoep clarified the Board did not say a benefit-cost analysis should definitively decide if either LAND or FRE should halt further analysis. If the LAND needs more time to narrow in on specific proposals they want analyzed, he supports this provided there is a reasonable time estimate. The Board should remember that we are on “borrowed time” and maintaining our legislative and funding support is in jeopardy without us ultimately developing a recommended long-term strategy.

In response to the conversation about benefit-cost analysis, Mr. Imperati noted that the real question is not necessarily “if,” but “when, how, and what to include” in the analysis. Mr. Imperati recommends beginning the process to identify a consultant to support the benefit-cost analysis in the near-term, especially since changing variables will change the result.

Regarding the long-term strategy delivery date, Mr. Imperati suggested three possible tracks, one tailored the potential timing of the final SEPA and/or NEPA EISs for the proposed FRE, another tied to the biennium budget schedule, and/or another yet-to-be identified track the Board may be interested in. Mr. Imperati reviewed a high-level schedule to illustrate the potential timeline related to the EIS and biennium budget schedule tracks. Mr. Imperati was planning to discuss advantages and disadvantages of deciding on an integrated long-term flood damage reduction strategy before or after one or more final EIS is issued but decided to postpone the topic for a future Board meeting. The Board’s “homework” is to consider the timing of options presented about when to begin process deliberations on the long-term strategy.

Mr. Imperati then previewed what an approach could look like for a future comparative analysis. This includes agreeing on a process for the benefit-cost analysis work and teeing up initial alternatives for comparison (but not picking an alternative), of which the Board would complete preliminary scoping exercises followed by a Board retreat/charette to create 2-3 packages for comparative evaluation. From there the Board could choose to conduct a comparative analysis with benefit-cost work in partnership with a Board sub-committee, then preliminary results could be presented to the Board for analysis and next steps. Decision tables could be used to help objectively compare and evaluate the packages and a sensitivity analysis can be used to weigh categories and develop scoring. Factors can be rated equally or weighted differently due to relative importance. Scores from this process would support Board deliberations.

Mr. Imperati noted that this approach can work because it is focused on the integrated part of the Strategy, combines policy and technical approaches, compares alternatives systematically, considers all perspectives, is iterative, highlights pros and cons for each alternative, and is collaborative.

Mr. Imperati concluded by noting that another way to frame the timing question is: does the Board want to make long-term decisions at a regulatory level (i.e., dependent on EISs), or a policy level with a potential “what-if” or provisional strategy? He noted that it is preferable if the Board decides how to pursue this process by the June Board meeting or soon thereafter. The longer the Board waits, the less time there is to execute the agreed upon process. This discussion will continue in the next Board meeting, but the Board can watch and listen to videos from the presentation appendix that describe this process in more detail.

**FOLLOW UP:** Board members will consider the advantages and disadvantages of deciding on the integrated long-term flood reduction strategy before one or more of the EIS’s are issued and review the ten-step decision-table process from Mr. Imperati’s presentation appendix.

Below is a link to the meeting materials:

- [Development of L-T Integrated Strategy Approach](#)

## Local Actions Non-Dam Alternative (LAND)

Alex Dupey (MIG) presented on potential next steps for the LAND Alternative based on feedback during the April Board meeting. Suggestions for next steps included supporting local near-term projects, programs, and policies through political support, financial support, technical assistance, or other identifiable actions. This included:

- Engaging in existing projects with a LAND relationship, e.g., critical road and bridge projects identified in the in Lewis County Transportation Improvement Plan, South Scheuber Road/ West Connection, Pearl Street Bridge replacement, and Reynolds Road improvements.
- Establishing foundations to support an early action package including improved conveyance, channel diversion, and Mellen Street bridge relocation by:
  - Updating structures data
  - Identifying the extent of permitted development
  - Identifying acceptable downstream rise and duration goals
  - Modeling diversion and flow improvements to meet downstream goals
  - Refining infrastructure costs with utility data and property data
- Developing an expanded understanding of CFAR/Safe Structures needs and scaling considerations.
- Organizing a working group to develop an Upper Chehalis Basin Community Resiliency Plan to increase capacity and coordination among public agencies.
- Creating an ASRP/LAND Working Group to identify potential synergies between the two programs.
- Supporting local governments in updating comprehensive plans and applying best practices for reducing future flood damage.

- Updating flood maps within upper basin communities and completing audits of all development codes in the basin related to floodplain development.
- Completing near-term technical studies including:
  - Levee Feasibility Analysis
  - Geotechnical analysis for the diversion/conveyance options
  - Cultural resources consultation
  - Update structures database
  - Structural intervention refinements to improve downstream conditions.

Mr. Dupey noted that these potential next steps have different timelines, e.g., levee feasibility analysis could take nine months while a structures analysis could happen in a few months. Many of the technical studies could be completed in six to nine months. At the next Board meeting, MIG can provide more detail in terms of the length of time needed to complete different actions.

Key comments and discussion topics included:

- Board members discussed the need for better understanding how LAND and CFAR may work together in the future. OCB Director McNamara Doyle noted the June Board meeting will include a CFAR update and touch on the issue of linkages between CFAR and Safe Structures.
- Steve Malloch suggested caution in saying that the LAND alternative is a basin-wide program, but agreed that LAND elements have basin-wide credibility.
- J Vander Stoep requested MIG produce a 1-2 page summary of all the alternatives considered for this effort, and why options were decided to be carried forward or not.
  - Alex Dupey responded that a traditional bibliography was included in the document produced for the April Board meeting, but that LAND also added or considered new combinations of elements that had not been considered before, e.g., the levee system or scope of the diversion. MIG was not planning to develop a formal alternatives analysis of what did not go forward with and why, but will look at how other previous analyses informed what came to be in the LAND.
- Board members discussed whether the LAND Steering Group will continue to “own” the LAND process moving forward, or if the Board or other group should manage LAND and its relationship to other Strategy programs and elements moving forward.
  - Steve Malloch suggested that it’s the Board’s responsibility to determine whether the current conceptual LAND plan is something the Board wants to further pursue. An approach has been laid out, and some immediate next steps have been identified. Sam Imperati’s process should help the Board determine what should proceed regarding process decisions and determining a refined and tangible LAND alternative.
  - Ken Ghalambor noted that staff will engage with MIG and the LAND Steering Group and come back to a future Board meeting with a proposal on how decisions could be made on the LAND moving forward and a draft timeline for when a refined viable LAND alternative would be ready to support the Board’s decision-making process.



- Michael Garrity suggested that LAND may help communicate on-the-ground actions OCB has already been doing, such as CFAR or local flood projects.
- Glen Connelly acknowledged there are many unanswered questions and more refinement need for the LAND alternative, but the work to-date is a good high level first step to look at a comprehensive plan.
- Jay Gordon acknowledged that Interstate-5 is still an issue that needs to be addressed through LAND or some other means.

**FOLLOW-UP:** MIG will present additional detail on recommended LAND next steps and associated timing at the June Board meeting. OCB staff will engage with MIG and the LAND Steering Group and come back to a future Board meeting with a proposal on how decisions could be made on the LAND moving forward and a draft timeline for when a refined viable LAND alternative would be ready to support the Board's decision-making process.

Below is a link to the meeting materials:

- [LAND Presentation](#)

## Skookumchuck Dam

Nat Kale (OCB) presented recommended next steps related to the Skookumchuck Dam. First, Merri Martz (Anchor QEA) reported on new modeling of potential dam removal effects on temperature in the Skookumchuck river. Thermalscape temperature data from the Newaukum River was used at a similar elevation as Skookumchuck Dam, and then they adjusted temperatures moving downstream (e.g. temperature increase) at the same rate as occurs with existing Skookumchuck River temperatures. After that, the EDT model was reran to compare fish benefits with likely increased water temperatures with dam removal.

Mr. Kale noted OCB's recommendation that the Board request a scope of work from Anchor QEA that fits within the Board's previously approved \$575K allocation for Skookumchuck Dam work in the 2023-25 biennium that best addresses the values and interests expressed by Board members and public comments received on the Phase 2 report. In summary, staff recommends the scope of work for the 2023-25 biennium should include the following:

- Continue facilitating stakeholder dialog with OCB staff
- Perform additional water rights accounting
- Assess the habitat and water temperature upstream of the reservoir, and revise the EDT model with the new information
- Analyze the feasibility and rough cost of off-channel storage and direct piping of water
- Begin geotechnical work to assess the stability of the dam and surrounding area

These analyses will improve the Board's understanding of the impact of three alternative futures for the dam on water rights and on anadromous fish – a fish-focused alternative that keeps the dam and augments fish passage; a fish/flood alternative that augments fish passage and increases discharge capacity to enhance flood management; and an off channel storage alternative that removes the dam and constructs an alternative reservoir to maintain the water right.

Key comments and discussion topics included:

- The proposed off channel reservoir would still be in the Skookumchuck basin, and it would be an off-channel reservoir.
- TransAlta has been part of the Skookumchuck Dam conversation since the beginning, and has expressed general openness to any option to support fish and flooding, as long as their water rights are maintained. The proposed hydrogen facility poses some unknowns.
- Michael Garrity posed several comments. His understanding is that the potential off-channel proposal would allow significant steelhead benefits. He is also curious about completing a fish survivability and passage efficiency study, predation assessment in the reservoir, and turbidity analysis.

Regarding next steps, Nat Kale noted that at the June Board meeting he will ask the Board to direct OCB staff to obtain a scope of work from Anchor QEA to complete high- and possibly medium-priority next steps, and those should inform the three options that seem to have the most traction: fish/flood (potentially with direct piping), fish only, and dam removal with off-channel storage. Completing these actions should help Board members over the course of next biennium make recommendations on their preferred option for the Skookumchuck dam.

Below are links to the meeting materials:

- [Skookumchuck Dam 2023-2025 Biennium Recommendations](#)
- [Skookumchuck Template EDT Next Steps](#)

## Forestry Study

Nat Kale (OCB) summarized the outcome of a study requested by OCB and Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR) in 2018 to quantify the effects of timber harvesting on streamflow regimes, including both peak and low flows in the Upper Chehalis River Basin as affected by timber harvesting practices using Best Management Practices (BMPs) and further to consider such effects under projected climate conditions. A research proposal was developed that required access to Weyerhaeuser Company property (the major upstream landowner) to install 3 streamflow gauging stations with co-located hydrometeorological stations for model forcing, calibration, and validation data. Initially Weyerhaeuser participated on the study design team which suggested a willingness to support the effort. After review of the initial study proposal, Weyerhaeuser declined to provide site access or data for the study and their team member left.

Principal investigator John Stednick suggested two ways the project could be carried forward, one is to move forward with a study design similar to the current Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research (CMER) program using the Independent Scientific Peer Review (ISPR) process., which would be a long and politically and technically complex undertaking, and would likely result in a significantly altered, statewide study design. Another approach would be much longer-term, and could start now by identifying alternative areas to collect data from streamflow gauges and co-located hydrometeorological stations, to be complimented with the existing data being collected by the Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority. Staff could work with those already collecting data in the basin, to set up a future data set.

Key comments and discussion topics included:

- Glen Connelly requested the Chehalis Tribe be apprised as any discussions move forward about monitoring plans.
- Steve Malloch and J Vander Stoep expressed disappointment that the study ended the way it did.
- Rich Doenges suggested reaching out to DNRs adaptive management program to determine if similar studies have been done that could be informative to the Chehalis Basin.

Below is a link to the meeting material:

- [Forest Hydrology Study Wrap-Up Report](#)

## Aquatic Species Restoration Program (ASRP)

### Pinniped Predation

Nate Pamplin (Director of External Affairs at WDFW) presented on pinniped predation of salmon in Washington, specifically regarding California sea lions, Steller sea lions, and harbor seals. Mr. Pamplin discussed salmon predation and pinniped removal efforts in the Columbia River basin with a focus on Bonneville Dam; a study on pinniped diets and ongoing projects in the Puget Sound, including population control interventions, recommendations of the Southern Resident Killer Whale Task Force, and findings of a report from the WA State Academy of Science.

Key comments and discussion topics included:

- Jay Gordon asked why there was no coordination with Canada mentioned in the presentation? Mr. Pamplin responded that he is aware Canada is exploring pinniped removal options and he recently spoke to Canadian Parliament to discuss efforts in Washington.
- J Vander Stoep asked whether pinniped predation is a significant factor in the Chehalis Basin, and if yes, how significant? Mr. Pamplin responded that there is currently not enough information to answer the question and at least a three-year study would be required to better understand what is occurring in the basin.

### Monitoring Program Updates

Victoria Knorr (WDFW ASRP Program Manager) presented on the ASRP's monitoring and adaptive management sampling proposal for the 2023-2025 biennium. She defined monitoring as "to evaluate the effects of actions that restore habitat and re-establish natural processes that form aquatic habitats through time" and adaptive management as "...a structured, iterative process of robust decision making in the face of uncertainty. It aims to reduce uncertainty over time through system monitoring." Feedback loops to inform future actions include an annual science feedback loop and 5-year policy feedback loop (2021-2026). The three major sampling programs to monitor ASRP activities include status and trends, project effectiveness, and hypothesis testing/data gaps. The ASRP Technical Advisory Group (TAG) serves the ASRP Steering Committee by helping use science to inform decision making, and their primary charge is supporting monitoring and adaptive management. Other topics the

TAG will address in the coming biennium include the estuary ecoregion and protection and restoration prioritization and sequencing.

Key comments and discussion topics included:

- Regarding the estuary strategy, the Phase 1 ASRP document from 2019 did not have priorities for estuary restoration actions to the same level of detail as the rest of the Chehalis Basin, largely due to the fact that the estuary is an ecologically unique area. A draft estuary strategy is anticipated in winter 2023. Once the estuary ecoregion is developed to the same level as the other ecoregions in the 2019 Phase 1 document, ASRP will look at a prioritization and sequencing lens to know where science is directing to make the best investment. Board members can pose questions on the estuary strategy to the ASRP subcommittee or Victoria Knorr.
- Board members discussed the need to better understand the impact of predation on salmon by pinnipeds or non-native fish like bass, including in the estuary. It is still unclear whether pinnipeds are a major impact on salmon in Grays Harbor. Celina Abercrombie (WDFW) clarified that exploring the impacts of non-native predation will continue in the 2023-25 biennia. There is no pinniped predation work for ASRP currently planned, and there is clearly an information gap. ASRP staff committed to come back to the Board with specific questions and considerations for addressing this issue.
- Jay Gordon noted that Tribes may have a better ability to act quickly under the Marine Animal Protection Act as it pertains to pinniped and non-native fish removal. If data is developed, it needs to feed into how we move to actionable information on bass and pinnipeds.

## **Newaukum RM 8-9 Riparian Planting and Acquisition, Phase 1**

Drew Meador (WDFW) presented on the ASRP project approval process, status of the ASRP project budget, and overview of the Mainstem Newaukum RM 8-9 Riparian Planting And Acquisition, Phase 1 project. The goal of this presentation was to provide the Board time to ask any clarifying questions before being asked to approve \$725,000 in funding for the project at the June 1 Board meeting. The project includes:

- Reach Scale restoration of 1.4 miles along the Newaukum River including agricultural conservation easement, riparian restoration, invasives management, instream design
- Agricultural Conservation Easement will permanently protect property further development, and will place a portion of the property into habitat use. Threat from proximity to freeway and golf course.
- Riparian plantings and invasive management will increase cover to reduce temperature, increase channel stability, increase habitat diversity, and increase long term habitat diversity by providing large wood material inputs.
- Concept-level instream design for potential ELJ installation to create wildlife habitat, in particular summer holding pools for spring Chinook.

Anticipated project outcomes include:

- 132 acres of agricultural conservation easement, with 25-50 percent of the acreage being placed into permanent riparian habitat and the remainder in agricultural use.
- 1.4 miles of instream habitat protected by easement
- 11.95 acres of invasive treatment and planting
- Concept Design for 2,200 feet of instream structure

Board members and staff welcomed the participation of the Washington Farmland Trust in this project, expressing gratitude that the group is engaging in the Chehalis Basin Strategy work.

**FOLLOW-UP:** Board members should send any follow up questions on the Newaukum RM 8-9 project to WDFW before the June meeting. ASRP staff will come back to the Board at a future meeting with specific questions and considerations for continuing to explore the impacts of pinniped and non-native fish predation in the Chehalis Basin.

Below are links to the meeting materials:

- [ASRP Slides](#)
- [Pinniped Predation](#)
- [ASRP M&AM 2023-25 Rollup](#)
- [MS Newaukum RM 8-9 Acquisition](#)

## Directors Report

Andrea McNamara Doyle (OCB) provided the following updates:

- The federal funding strategy work group held their first meeting in April. Their purpose is to help identify, support, prioritize, and secure federal funding opportunities for the CBS. The work group includes partners from several elements of the CBS. OCB's consultant team from ICF developed a tracking system for funding opportunities and to share resources and the work group will discuss the best ways to use ICF's resources to leverage promising opportunities.
- An acquisition work group held their first meeting in May. This group will help shape a new OCB program designed to support and scale voluntary floodplain acquisitions across the basin.
- The HB 1154 legislative report will be submitted to the Department of Ecology Government Relations Office. It will then go to the Office of Financial Management and Governor's Office, with a final report to the legislature by the end of June.

## Public Comment

- David Ortman commented via chat: The CBB should not operate as a slush fund for Port of Grays Harbor projects that should not be in the floodway in the first place. Also a fallacy is that "a small number of people are expected to come to agreement around the table on billion dollar plans and projects and then defend it to the death against public review and comment which comes only after the "decisions" have been made. This has been a major flaw in all similar workgroups, taskforces, etc., involving the Department of Ecology over the decades."

- David Ortman provided a verbal public comment, paraphrased: “I have been spending 50 years trying to protect, preserve and restore areas in Grays Harbor. Do not switch agenda items last minutes, shortening public comment period. I am disappointed this continues to be allowed to happen. The makeup of the Chehalis Basin remains a concern with limited number of mostly agency people and it is disappointing the Port of Grays Harbor uses the Chehalis Basin Board as a slush fund for Haul Road. The Forest Practices Study presentation was a major disappointment. Weyerhaeuser refuses to cooperate because of the limited scope of review. Weyerhaeuser is having a Board meeting Friday May 12<sup>th</sup> and you can ask them about their refusal to cooperate. In addition, there appears to be no review of a 1979 Corps of Engineers Grays Harbor widening and deepening study of distribution of upstream sediment transport that permits the Wynoochee and Satsop sub-basin erosion due to logging at a rate ten times higher than in Oregon in 1933. You should request the Seattle Corps District occasionally show up at these meetings and provide a copy.”
- Terri Wright submitted via chat: Is Whoosh technology being considered for the Skookumchuck - is it applicable where the dam is? <https://www.whooshh.com/>. OCB provided a presentation where a Thurston hydrologist stated that if we quit logging, we wouldn't need a dam: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z2eHSdyY8Lk&t=9s>. Kevin Hansen's presentation starts at 23:52.

## Next Steps and Closing

Ken Ghalambor (Ross Strategic) thanked Board members for their participation and adjourned the meeting. The next meeting will be a hybrid (in-person/online) meeting on June 1, 2023 at Fairfield Inn & Suites by Marriott, Grand Mound Centralia.

## 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\*
- Bob Amirine, Lewis Conservation District
- Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam\*
- Brian Stewart, Conservation Northwest\*
- Carol Schultze\*
- Casey Hart, Ross Strategic
- Celina Abercrombie, WDFW
- Chris Conklin, WDFW\*
- Cindy Bradley, OCB

- Colleen Granberg, Department of Natural Resources\*
- Col Ronald Averill, Flood Authority\*
- CSherin\*
- Cynthia Carlstad, NHC\*
- Daniel Iacofano, MIG\*
- Dave Rogers, MIG\*
- David E. Ortman\*
- Diane Butorac, Department of Ecology\*
- Drew Meador, WDFW
- Erica Britney\*
- Erik Martin, Chehalis Flood Control Zone District
- Heather May\*
- Heather Page, Anchor QEA
- Jeff Wilson, WA State Senator
- Jess Helsley, Wild Salmon Center\*
- Jerry Otto, HDR\*
- Jim Waldo, Chehalis Flood Control Zone District \*
- Jim Weber, Center for Environmental Law and Policy
- Julia Zelman\*
- Karen Allston, Quinault Indian Nation\*
- Ken Ghalambor, Ross Strategic
- Kris Koski, Port of Grays Harbor\*
- K. Tennyson\*
- Kylin Brown, Pyramid Communications\*
- Larry Karpach, Watershed Science & Engineering\*
- Lauren Dennis, Ross Strategic\*
- Lee First, Twin Harbors Waterkeeper\*
- Mark Gaines, WSDOT
- Mark Glyde, Quinault Indian Nation\*
- Matt Dillan, Flood Control Zone District
- Merri Martz, Anchor QEA\*
- Nat Kale, Department of Ecology, Office of Chehalis Basin
- Nate Lewis, WA Farmland Trust
- Nate Pamplin, WDFW
- Nick Bird, City of Aberdeen\*
- Nicole Czarnomski, WDFW
- Randy Raymond, Parametrix\*
- Sam Imperati, ICM

- Scott Boettcher, Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority\*
- Shelby Thomas, Ross Strategic\*
- Stephen Lyle, Bucoda
- Stevie Colson, OCB
- Stevie Hinton, Tulalip Tribes\*
- Tammy Domike, Citizens for a Clean Harbor\*
- Teri Wright, Wild Orca\*
- Todd Chaput, Economic Alliance of Lewis County
- Victoria Knorr, WDFW\*