Aquatic Species Restoration Plan Comments on Initial Document

February 8, 2018
Chehalis Basin Board

Requested Input from Board

- What do you like about the estimated outcomes for aquatic species? What questions/concerns do you have about the outcomes? What recommendations do you have for the outcomes?
- What questions/concerns do you have regarding the costs and magnitude of actions needed to achieve the outcomes?

Requested Input from Board

- What recommendations do you have for the investment needed?
- What questions/recommendations do you have for increasing the likelihood of implementation?

Requested Input from Board

- Are there additional issues that should be addressed in the next phase for development of the full ASRP beyond those identified in this initial document?

Comment Letters

1. Chehalis Lead Entity
2. Lewis Conservation District
3. American Rivers
4. Lewis County Public Works
5. Washington Coast Salmon Foundation
6. Jay Gordon

Like about Outcomes

- Multi-species approach
- Moderate and high results
- Restoration of wide range of ecosystems
- Identifying the necessity of monitoring throughout all phases of implementation
- Results are significant and address degradation from climate change

Concerns Regarding Outcomes

- Heavy reliance on EDT and model data
- Will removing more barriers increase the results?
- Liability of projecting potential increase in salmon abundance
- Need to account for benefits from reconnection of side channels
- Concern over use of historic condition
- Results don’t include other factors that can affect results (land use, flood actions, ocean conditions, etc.)
- Needs for Oregon Spotted frog and effects on other actions

Concerns Regarding Cost and Magnitude of Actions

- Comprehensive implementation plan is needed
- Costs and magnitude seem reasonable for results
- Costs are less to restore in Chehalis compared to other basins
- Extent of riparian area is 11,000 – 21,000 acres plus additional flooding from engineered log jams (ELJs)
- Strategies for restoration are so expansive that the goals may not be reachable and not well received by landowners

Concerns Regarding Cost and Magnitude of Actions

- Costs estimates for barriers may be low
- Level of compensation to landowners may affect viability of agriculture
- Prioritize actions and present ASRP actions in a scalable manner within moderate and high scenarios

Increase Likelihood of Implementation

- Outreach and engagement of landowners early and consistently
- Consider Lead Entity strategies for implementation
- Plan should be flexible enough to allow investment to take advantage of opportunities
- Addressing landowner and species needs for increasing potential of success
- Mixed bank-protection and habitat enhancement actions need to be considered as part of the tool-box

Increase Likelihood of Implementation

- Prioritize opportunities to integrate species restoration actions with flood reduction actions (Floodplains by Design approach)
- Protection effort at unprecedented scale will need to occur to meet the stated goals
- Early collaboration and integration with existing entities/organizations
- Need to consider Volunteer Stewardship Program and its relations to restoration needs

Increase Likelihood of Implementation

- Revisit the ASRP vision statement to incorporate elements that capture the unique value and character of Chehalis Basin ecosystems and communities
- Build institutional, community, and planning capacity to support implementation

Additional Issues that Need to be Addressed in Next Phase

- Cross check EDT results with existing habitat strategies
- Low flows and flow augmentation
- Effects of ocean conditions, hatcheries, and harvest
- Effects of estuary on abundance projections
- Upland land use and its implications for downstream fish habitat conditions, specifically the impacts of forest practices on stream and river hydrology

Additional Issues that Need to be Addressed in Next Phase

- Continue to utilize best available science in fleshing out the plan
- Effects of restoration actions on natural processes (channel migration, sediment transport, wood retention and recruitment, etc.) and subsequent benefits to aquatic species to be incorporated into the next phase of ASRP modeling
- How plan affects potential endangered species listings
- Consider additional funding options in addition to state capital budget

Requested Input from Board

- What do you like about the estimated outcomes for aquatic species? What questions/concerns do you have about the outcomes? What recommendations do you have for the outcomes?

- What questions/concerns do you have regarding the costs and magnitude of actions needed to achieve the outcomes?

Requested Input from Board

- What recommendations do you have for the investment needed?
- What questions/recommendations do you have for increasing the likelihood of implementation?

Requested Input from Board

- Are there additional issues that should be addressed in the next phase for development of the full ASRP beyond those identified in this initial document?

Board Member Response to Questions