

CHEHALIS BASIN BOARD SUMMARIZED MEETING AGENDA AND ACTIONS

Date: June 1, 2023

Time: 9:00 AM, PST to 4:00 PM, PST

Location: Hybrid meeting – Fairfield Inn & Suites by Marriott, Grand Mound, Centralia
Washington / Zoom Online

ITEM	FORMAL ACTION	FOLLOW-UP ACTION
1. Approval of Current Agenda and May 4 Meeting Summary	Decision: Current agenda approved; May 4 summary approved	No follow-up action.
2. 2023-2025 Budget Planning	Discussion	No follow-up action.
3. Chehalis Basin Strategy Process Refinement	Decision: Board members indicated support for including in the OCB legislative report the timing for delivery of the integrated, long-term Strategy of Q4 2024 to Q4 2026.	Staff will invite Capital budget legislators to an upcoming Board meeting (timing: September, depending on availability). Staff will include a Strategy delivery date of Q3 2024-Q4 2026 in OCB's Report to the Legislature. Staff will provide quarterly budget updates to the Board during the 2023-25 biennium.
4. Climate Change Considerations for the Chehalis Basin	Discussion / Direction	Staff will return to a future Board meeting with a presentation that discusses advantages and disadvantages of options that consider climate change for the comparative analysis.
5. Local Actions Non-Dam Alternative (LAND)	Discussion/ Direction	Staff will present scopes of work to the Board for approval at the July meeting to advance next steps identified through the LAND process.
6. Community Flood Assistance & Resilience (CFAR)	Discussion	No follow-up action.
7. Skookumchuck Dam	Decision: Board members approved advancing Options 1, 2, and 3 and authorized scope	No follow-up action.

ITEM	FORMAL ACTION	FOLLOW-UP ACTION
	items totaling \$295K to include in a scope of work for Anchor QEA. The Board will consider other optional scope items at a future meeting.	
8. Aquatic Species Restoration / ASRP	<p>Direction / Decision: Board members approved \$725K of funding for the Mainstem Newaukum Phase 1 project.</p> <p>Board members approved the proposed next steps to advance understanding of non-native fish and pinniped predation.</p>	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	Excused
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	Present
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 9:00 a.m. and welcomed the Board, staff, and audience.

Agenda and Meeting Summary Review

Ken Ghalambor (Ross Strategic) provided an overview of the meeting agenda. The Board did not have any additions or revisions to the [June 1, 2023](#) meeting agenda.

BOARD DECISION: Agenda approved by consensus.

The Board did not have any additions or revisions to the May 4, 2023 meeting summary.

BOARD DECISION: [May 4, 2023 meeting summary](#) approved by consensus.

2023-2025 Budget Planning

At the May 4, 2023 Board Meeting, the Board approved their 2023-2025 spending plan. OCB staff were then asked to come back to the Board with a proposal for how to repurpose 2023-2025 funding to support \$560K for the Port of Grays Harbor Haul Road project. Ken Ghalambor (Ross Strategic) summarized OCB's approach, which included the following reductions from the Board's original 2023-25 spending plan to accommodate the Haul Road request:

- \$60K from Erosion Management Program
- \$150K from CFAR
- \$150K from LAND
- \$200K from the FRE/Airport Levee

Board member comments included:

- Vickie Raines expressed gratitude to Board members for agreeing to fund the Haul Road project.
- Steve Malloch acknowledged that the approach to funding the Haul Road project makes sense, yet reiterated the Board should encourage approaches that build future infrastructure out of the floodplain.

Chehalis Basin Strategy Process Refinement

Sam Imperati (ICMResolutions) gave a presentation that reviewed key upcoming substantive issues the Board will consider; provided an update on a call that he and OCB Director McNamara Doyle had with State Legislators in the basin; and reviewed several process questions for the Board's consideration about the long-term integrated Strategy. The key process decisions facing the Board include:

- What should be the delivery date for the long-term Strategy?
- What specifically is the Board comparing and how?
- What level of detail and information certainty is needed?
- What comparative analysis tool(s) will be used and how?
- What is the target date for these process decisions?

Follow Up from OCB Call with Legislators

Mr. Imperati reviewed themes from the OCB call with State Legislators Abbarno, Braun, and Tharinger, including a focus on the economic feasibility of a long-term strategy, limiting the amount of money spent on planning, wanting more information on the success of smaller flood and aquatic species projects, and support for a comparative analysis of packages. Based on this discussion, he sensed a need from the legislators of wanting good information they could use to promote or advocate the Strategy to colleagues, including what benefits would be delivered for the costs. Board members were asked about whether to invite these legislators to a Board meeting. Board member comments included:

- Steve Malloch noted that there is a difference between cost-benefit analysis and fiscal analysis – the cost of something is different than how we pay for it. The value of spring Chinook would be very hard to determine, for example.
- J Vander Stoep agreed and noted that identifying costs is the first step for determining economic feasibility, and that we need at least general costs and benefits to provide to legislators.

DECISION: All Board members present supported inviting these capital budget legislators to a Board meeting to discuss the long-term Strategy with the Board (timing: September, depending on availability).

Input on Process Questions Related to Strategy Date and Decision-Making Process

Mr. Imperati indicated that it was critical to identify a date or date range soon to include within OCB's Report to the Legislature about the Strategy. He noted that the Board could consider an "EIS track" or a "budget track" for determining the deadline, for example, but those are summary labels that could include other considerations.

Board member comments included:

- J Vander Stoep commented that other issues could be considered in the timeline, such as the recent petition for spring Chinook Endangered Species Act (ESA) listing and how elements of the Strategy (ASRP, LAND and FRE flood alternatives) could relate to that. He suggested that the "EIS track" could be seen as shorthand terminology for developing the flood and fish plan more broadly.
- As a follow up, Steve Malloch asked for more information about the timeline for further developing the LAND alternative design from its current, conceptual level. OCB Director Andrea McNamara Doyle and Ken Ghalambor (Ross Strategic) responded that this timeline is not yet available, but staff have identified initial steps for further scoping the LAND. Additionally, the full timeline would depend on decisions from the Board.
- J Vander Stoep said that it is important to answer a preliminary question about the LAND alternative, namely whether people in the Chehalis Basin believe it to be a beneficial flood damage reduction strategy, before completing any environmental review on it. He believes that the cost-benefit, comparative analysis could inform the answer to that question. Mr. Vander Stoep also clarified his comments from the last meeting: he did not intend to imply that the Board would decide on a flood strategy based on a cost-benefit analysis, but rather that it could inform how to proceed with environmental review.
- Michael Garrity stated that we are in an early implementation phase in the Chehalis Basin while we deal with process issues with the flood damage reduction approach. We are not ready to move forward with the LAND or FRE, but we can develop a structured framework for decision-making, which could provide more certainty and enable us to move away from an ad-hoc approach. We also need to be convinced that having a negotiated, integrated path forward is preferable to continuing each element on its own; that was true in Yakima and Walla Walla.
- Steve Malloch noted that the advantage of the Yakima and Walla Walla plans is that they have discrete elements that are less interrelated than the elements in the Chehalis

Strategy. However, the smaller pieces in the Chehalis Strategy that support the overall objectives could help make the other pieces (like the FRE or 20 miles of levees in the LAND) more “digestible.”

- J Vander Stoep proposed developing a decision tree to support the Board’s decision-making process, which could include items such as continuing analysis on whether there is zero net habitat loss from the proposed FRE, analysis of benefits and costs of the LAND and local projects, and other items.

Mr. Imperati posed a question to the Board about whether to stay the course with a siloed approach to providing data and policy information, whether to do a comparative analysis of FRE vs. LAND, or whether to do a comparative analysis including a combination of flood, fish, and dual-purpose actions.

Board responses included the following:

- Steve Malloch said that he wanted an integrated set of projects that work together to support flood, fish, and dual-purpose goals.
- Vickie Raines agreed with Mr. Malloch, noting it is important to examine the entire picture through packages of projects, whether we are building the FRE or levees or neither. If one approach is ruled out, we need to understand why and having a pool of projects will best serve us.
- Glen Connelly stated that we need the comparative analysis and a strategy for a comprehensive assessment. There is a package of things that we will do regardless and other options that we need more information on to make bigger decisions.
- J Vander Stoep said if we are thinking about starting with a lot of small projects, we need to make sure that they are delivering appropriate benefits for the investment. It does not look good to spend a lot of money on small projects that will only provide a small proportion of the overall benefits in the Strategy. This should be considered in our analysis of the packages.

Mr. Imperati asked the Board what level of detail and information certainty the Board would need for its decision making relative to that provided by an EIS.

Board responses included the following:

- Michael Garrity, J Vander Stoep, Steve Malloch, and Vickie Raines indicated that they would need “less than EIS” level of detail for the comparative analysis; other members did not comment on this topic. Mr. Malloch urged Mr. Imperati to consult with Quinault

Indian Nation Board member Tyson Johnston (who was not present) about this question.

Building from the suggestions about a decision tree, Mr. Imperati reviewed potential upcoming work to develop potential packages, draft decision trees, and identify what would be in the comparative analysis and benefit-cost analysis.

Board member comments and discussion included:

- Steve Malloch noted that there are many things that could prompt a need to change plans, such as the new ESA listing petition. When we develop the decision tree, it may also highlight more actions we need to take. He requested that OCB provide a formal check in on the budget every six months to review spending against commitments and adjust priorities as needed.
 - Edna Fund refined Steve’s proposal, suggesting quarterly budget reviews.
 - Ken Ghalambor (Ross Strategic) replied that quarterly budget updates can be provided to the Board.

Revisiting the question about the delivery date of the long-term Strategy at the end of the Board meeting, Ken Ghalambor (Ross Strategic) reported that Chair Vickie Raines proposed a date range of Q4 2024 to Q4 2026 for the Board’s consideration. This date range could potentially cover a period that would include publication of the final SEPA EIS for the proposed FRE and inform the budget for the next biennium.

Board member comments and discussion included:

Board members discussed the merits of the Chair’s proposed date range, the fact that the Strategy could be conditional or a version of the decision-tree, that there were still many uncertainties and unknowns related to the schedule, and that the timing of the Strategy delivery could have implications for communications with legislators.

DECISION: All Board members present indicated support for including in the OCB legislative report the timing for delivery of the integrated, long-term Strategy of Q4 2024 to Q4 2026. This range provides flexibility to the Board to make its decision about the long-term, integrated Strategy earlier or later in that period.

FOLLOW UP: Staff will invite Capital budget legislators to an upcoming Board meeting. Staff will include a Strategy delivery date of Q4 2024-Q4 2026 in OCB’s Report to the Legislature. Staff will provide quarterly budget updates to the Board during the 2023-25 biennium.

Below is a link to the meeting materials:

- [LAND Chehalis Board Presentation](#)
- [June Meeting Process Decisions](#)

Climate Change Considerations for the Chehalis Basin

Ken Ghalambor (Ross Strategic), Jen Hennessey (Ecology), Guillaume Mauger (UW Climate Impacts Group), and Larry Karpach (Watershed Science and Engineering) presented on climate change considerations for the Chehalis Basin. The presentation:

- Recapped the process used to estimate climate change impacts in the Chehalis Basin, noting that climate models constantly evolve, a wide range of methodologies and results have been used to inform decision-making for the Chehalis Basin Strategy, and uncertainty is to be expected.
- Previewed results from recent simulation and analysis of Global Climate Model (GCM) estimates, i.e., the climate ensemble. The 2021 and recent 2023 climate ensemble modeling results show some consistencies even though different modeling techniques were used, for both average and high-end peak flow scenarios.
- Reviewed how other organizations have approached similar issues. A “best practices” approach may be emerging among other organizations as they address uncertainty. This includes looking at community vulnerabilities in land use planning with tools such as Vulnerability Risk Assessments, opting to use mid- and high-range projections for planning and design, and using adaptive management and scenarios planning.

Climate change modeling relates to the Board’s process for developing a long-term strategy because:

- The Board will have to agree on how to approach assumptions regarding climate change, including potential new modeling of packages (combination of elements) for the comparative evaluation.
- Revised assumptions for climate change will require new hydraulic/hydrologic modeling and fish modeling of potential Strategy packages.
- New modeling will take time which may impact the timing of the Board’s decision-making process.

The Board will need to determine what scale of protection and level of risk are acceptable when using climate modeling to support long-term strategy decisions. The Board will have to make

decisions while recognizing the inherent uncertainty in climate modeling for elements and packages. They were posed with a number of questions for consideration about:

- Whether to complete new climate change modeling, incorporate new ensemble results, and/or use previously completed modeling to support decision-making.
- Whether to be consistent with climate change assumptions across all elements or use different assumptions based on the useful life of infrastructure/project (i.e., low, med, high & mid-or late-century)?
- Whether to use the emerging mid-range estimates and scenarios planning/adaptive management best practice for planning and design purposes.

Jen Hennessy (Ecology) also provided an update on the Climate Resilience Strategy Update E2SHB 1170 in which Ecology will lead an update to the statewide climate resiliency strategy by September 2024.

Board member comments and discussion topics included:

- Guillaume Mauger (UW Climate Impacts Group) and Larry Karpack (WSE) provided a number of clarifications, including:
 - It is hard to say whether the edges of projection ranges are less likely than the middle of the range, especially for precipitation.
 - There is a point of diminishing returns on investing more money into models and data when the change in results is minimal, the underlying uncertainty is the same, and there are constantly evolving models.
 - Evidence shows an increase in precipitation associated with storm events, not an increase in the number of storm events.
- Steve Malloch acknowledged the Board would be remiss to not plan for an increase in flooding due to climate change. The increased peak flow estimates provided are not outrageous and it is reasonable to incorporate these assumptions into planning and engineering analyses.
- Board members noted that the Climate Resilience Strategy Update E2SHB 1170 will be beneficial, but Ecology is likely to face questions regarding whether they will develop consistent agency-wide standards for how climate change should be considered for planning and environmental reviews.

FOLLOW UP: Staff will return to a future Board meeting with a presentation that discusses advantages and disadvantages of options that consider climate change for the comparative analysis.

Below are links to the meeting materials:

- [Climate Change Presentation](#)
- [Chehalis Climate Change Ensemble Modeling and Analysis](#)

Local Actions Non-Dam Alternative (LAND)

Ken Ghalambor (Ross Strategic) reminded the Board of their May discussion regarding whether the LAND Steering Group will continue to “own” the LAND process moving forward, or if the Board or another group should manage LAND and its relationship to other Strategy programs and elements moving forward. Mr. Ghalambor noted that MIG plans to schedule another conversation with the LAND Steering Group to discuss this issue and come back to the Board with a proposal of who the advisory group could be.

Alex Dupey (MIG) presented a series of near-term projects, programs, and policies to continue refining several elements identified through the LAND process, as well as supporting the Board’s upcoming comparative analysis. Tasks included:

- Complete a levee feasibility analysis, including coordinating with related transportation improvement projects already underway.
- Refine size and locations of interrelated structural interventions to improve downstream conditions and assess feasibility.
- Complete high level geotechnical analysis for the diversion/conveyance options.
- Initiate cultural resources consultation with affected tribes and the Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation.
- Update the 2017 structures database created for the mainstem Chehalis River and extend it to include structures in the Skookumchuck subbasin.
- Identify priority areas of at-risk structures where floodproofing and voluntary relocation services will be needed regardless of whether the LAND Structural Interventions or the FRE are constructed.
- Review local jurisdiction comprehensive plans and development codes to provide technical and best practice information related to floodplain management and flood damage reduction as part of their update processes.

Ken Ghalambor requested Board direction on moving these recommendations forward. The immediate next steps would be to develop more detailed scopes of work for Board approval that could be included in a future Request for Quotes and Qualifications (RFQQ) and a timeline

for completing technical studies to inform the Board's timeline for developing the long-term strategy.

Board member comments and discussion included:

- Because the major infrastructure elements of LAND are still highly conceptual, Board members cautioned MIG against suggesting OCB should begin trying to influence projects already identified within local capital improvement programs. There was concern that this could be seen as LAND acting as an independent body separate from OCB that pre-supposes certain levee or conveyance/diversion actions will be implemented.
- Board members supported and understood the need for more technical analyses to reach a point of having enough information to support the comparative analysis.
- Steve Malloch and Edna Fund noted there is some confusion on where LAND and CFAR overlap in responsibilities, especially regarding structure retrofits/acquisitions and floodplain management and land use issues. Future scopes of work should distinguish whether the work is meant to advance LAND, CFAR, or the broader Strategy. Other Board members agreed with this suggestion.
- All Board members present supported the development of scopes of work to advance work as described above, except for coordinating with related transportation improvement projects already underway.

FOLLOW UP: Staff will present scopes of work for Board approval at the July Board meeting, with clarifications on whether the tasks are meant to advance LAND, CFAR, or the broader Strategy.

Below are links to the meeting materials:

- [LAND 6/4 Chehalis Board Presentation final](#)
- [LAND Board Recommendations/Next Steps](#)

Community Flood Assistance and Resilience

Ken Ghalambor (Ross Strategic) acknowledged the upcoming retirement of French Wetmore and Jerry Louthain, after their longstanding support of the Strategy and its work to improve floodplain management and land use planning. Kat Dickey (OCB) provided updates on pilot projects and ongoing and upcoming CFAR activities. She highlighted:

- Ten pilot projects are underway to address challenges facing property owners in the Basin and understand what scaling up a program might take. The pilots began in Fall 2020 and bids will be released in July 2023. Contractor availability to implement projects is still unclear.
- Processes need to be set up to deliver a program for the basin and a CFAR workgroup is being created. Ongoing site visits, technical assistance, and outreach is a part of the broader CFAR program.
- A new round of projects and consultant transition is being discussed.
- OCB will be sure to prevent duplication of efforts between LAND and CFAR, and consider how elements of these programs should potentially merge, including how CFAR should be scaled up.

Board comments and discussion included:

- Steve Malloch noted that at some point the process will have to go from batches of projects to a pipeline process.
- French Wetmore noted that the challenge with a pipeline is not necessarily creating a process, but that funding comes in batches to support this work. Long-term, stable funding could support a pipeline process more than anything.

Below is a link to the meeting materials:

- [CFAR June Board Presentation](#)

Skookumchuck Dam 23-25 Biennium Activities

Nat Kale requested two decisions from the Board regarding next steps for the Skookumchuck Dam:

- Confirm Skookumchuck Dam options to continue analyzing
- Approve Anchor QEA Scope of Work for the 2023-2025 biennium.

Based on previous Board discussions, Mr. Kale presented three primary options to continue analyzing:

- Option 1: Lower impact modifications (fish friendly)
 - This would include modifying operations, improving fish collection, and improving the fish sluice. These actions would produce modest fish benefits, minimal flood damage benefits, and minimal impacts to water rights.

- Option 2: Expanded modifications
 - In addition to Option 1, this would include installing new 2,000 CFS piping, and direct piping to customers. These actions would produce moderate fish benefits, significant flood damage benefits, minimal impact to water rights, and potential spring Chinook benefit.
- Option 3: Dam removal with potential off-channel storage
 - This would include removing the dam and potentially building an off-channel storage facility. These actions would produce significant fish benefits, moderate flood increases, and potential impact to water rights.

Option 1 mostly benefits anadromous fish. Option 2 benefits anadromous fish and reduced flooding. Option 3 has the greatest unknowns; greatest benefit to fish, likely increase in flooding, possibly retains water rights. Mr. Kale acknowledged that OCB could add, drop, or pursue different options.

To advance analysis of the options above, proposed scope items totaling \$295K to include in a scope of work for Anchor QEA include:

- Stakeholder engagement support
- Water rights accounting (seasonality/volume of use downstream of dam)
- Off-channel reservoir conceptual investigation
- Concept design of direct piping to major water users
- Conduct upper Skookumchuck habitat/geomorphic survey
- Geotechnical initial review
- Summary memorandum

Additional optional scope of work items not being posed for current Board approval could include:

- Conceptual design of low-level outlet - \$60K
- Juvenile salmon survival study (reservoir and dam) - \$300K
 - A piece of this could be broken off to lower into the \$20K range using sensor fish to understand how safe the fish sluice and chutes are.
- Geotechnical field investigation - \$100K (placeholder)
- Detailed computational fluid dynamic modeling of low-level outlet and fish sluice together - \$65K
- Turbidity monitoring in the reservoir - \$48K

- Predator study in the reservoir - \$300K (placeholder)

Board member comments and discussion included:

- J Vander Stoep noted that piping is the only option that achieves significant flood benefits, and it intersects with LAND and other projects/proposals. If piping is installed, it should be considered how this will affect the need for building downstream levees. This would also need to be incorporated into a cost-benefit analysis.
- Jay Gordon noted he does not like Option 3 and thinks no more money should be spent on it.
- Michael Garrity noted it is important to keep Option 3 on the table because it will show a relative fish benefit compared to other options. He also suggested the optional juvenile salmon survival study is important to complete.

DECISION: Board members approved advancing Options 1, 2, and 3 and authorized scope items totaling \$295K to include in a scope of work for Anchor QEA. The Board will consider other optional scope items at a future meeting.

Below is a link to the meeting materials:

- [Skookumchuck Dam 23-25 Biennium Activities](#)

Aquatic Species Restoration Plan (ASRP)

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

At the May Board meeting Drew Mealor presented a request for funding the Mainstem Newaukum RM 8-9 Riparian Planting and Acquisition Phase 1 Project, which seeks \$725,000 of unobligated funds from the current biennium. He recapped the project, anticipated outcomes, importance for the ASRP, how additional funders are supporting the effort, and how the sponsor would need a new funding request for Phase 2.

DECISION: Board members approved \$725K of funding for the Mainstem Newaukum Phase 1 project.

Below is a link to the meeting materials:

- [ASRP June Board meeting Presentation](#)

Predation Takeaways, ASRP Board Subcommittee Discussion, and Proposed Next Steps

Celina Abercrombie (WDFW) provided follow-up on the non-native fish and pinniped predation discussions, shared a non-native fish study update, informed the Board of the discussion with the ASRP Board subcommittee on these topics, and requested the full Board's input on next steps identified by the Board subcommittee. Ms. Abercrombie acknowledged the Strategy needs to better integrate fisheries into its restoration and management approach for the basin. Staff, ASRP Steering Committee, and the ASRP board subcommittee are identifying the priority questions and actions that can support an integrated strategy.

Ms. Abercrombie noted that while we know more now than we did several years ago about non-native fish presence and predation in the Chehalis Basin, more work will continue to better inform this topic. Preliminary predation study results showed Chinook smolts are the most common salmonid sampled in bass stomach contents (estimated at 24-47%), but these results didn't speak to what other species were found in the sampled fish. On pinnipeds, very little information is known about pinniped predation in the Chehalis Basin as compared to Puget Sound and Columbia River. Finally, the Board subcommittee discussed what actions besides habitat restoration can be taken to support spring-run Chinook salmon, including a potential restoration hatchery be created for.

Next steps proposed to the Board included:

- Research derbies and related actions such as targeted trapping, with a July 2023 timeframe to inform the subcommittee.
- Identify restoration hatchery options for further exploration and research including preliminary feasibility for implementation, with an August 2023 timeframe to inform the subcommittee.
- Bring options back to the Board on what research can be done on pinniped predation, timing TBD.

Board member comments and discussion included:

- Michael Garrity noted that in places where conservation hatcheries have been developed, it tended to be to save a species from extirpation. There are potential risks and benefits to consider for restoration hatcheries.
- J Vander Stoep and Jay Gordon highlighted that even a reasonable estimate on pinniped predation impacts would be a first step to understanding if there is a need to focus on

pinnipeds or not. Obtaining this general estimate might not need years of money and work.

- Celina Abercrombie commented that the Suquamish Tribe is doing work to understand pinniped predation near their reservation and OCB can look at whether this is a possibility in the Chehalis.
- Jay Gordon provided a number of comments, including:
 - The Marine Mammal Protection Act has language that if evidence can be shown that mammals are out of balance with the ecosystem, actions can be taken to control their populations.
 - We cannot wait until there are only a few fish left to do a conservation hatchery. Lummi Nation has had a successful spring Chinook hatchery system.
 - WDFW could consider starting a bounty program to remove invasive fish like bass, rather than doing catch and release.

DECISION: Board members approved the proposed next steps to advance understanding of non-native fish and pinniped predation.

Below is a link to the meeting materials:

- [ASRP June Board Meeting Presentation](#)

Spring Chinook Endangered Species Act Petition

Andrea McNamara Doyle (OCB) provided a brief update that NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) will provide their first indication on the initial 90-day review of the spring Chinook ESA petition by August 2023.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Next Steps

OCB Director Andrea McNamara Doyle announced that she will be leaving OCB at the end of June 2023. Ecology Director Watson will be appointing an acting Director and begin the recruitment process for a permanent Director in consultation with the Board. Ken Ghalambor (Ross Strategic) thanked Andrea and Board members for their participation and adjourned the meeting. The next Board meeting will be July 6, 2023 at Montesano City Hall, WA.

Appendix A

Board Staff/Board Guests:

Those that participated virtually are noted with an asterisk.

- Alex Dupey, MIG
- Alissa Shay, Port of Grays Harbor*
- Alexandra Gustafson, Trout Unlimited*
- Andrea McNamara Doyle, OCB
- Anthony Waldrop, Grays Harbor Conservation District*
- Arthur RD Grunbaum*
- Bob Amrine, Lewis Conservation District*
- Brandon Parsons, American Rivers*
- Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam*
- Brian Stewart, Conservation Northwest*
- Cameron Kockritz*
- Casey Hart, Ross Strategic *
- Celina Abercrombie, WDFW
- Charlotte Dohrn*
- Col. Ronald Averill, Flood Authority*
- Dan Lawler*
- Diane Butorac, ECY*
- Donna Albert*
- Drew Meador, WDFW
- Erik Martin, Chehalis Flood Control Zone District
- French Wetmore, French & Associates
- Guillaume Mauger, UW Climate Impacts Group
- Grays Harbor Conservation District*
- Heather Page, Anchor QEA*
- Izzy Zucker, Pyramid Communications*
- Jen Hennessey, ECY*
- Jenn Tice, Ross Strategic *
- Jerry Louthain, French and Associates
- Jim Weber, Center for Environmental Law and Policy
- Jim Waldo, Chehalis Flood Control Zone District*

- Kat Dickey, OCB
- Ken Ghaleb, Ross Strategic
- Kris Koski, Port of Grays Harbor*
- Kylin Brown, Pyramid Communications*
- Lauren Dennis, Ross Strategic*
- Lee First, Twin Harbors Waterkeeper*
- Larry Karpach, Watershed Science and Engineering*
- Mark Gaines, WSDOT*
- Mark Glyde, QIN*
- Matt Dillin, Chehalis Flood Control Zone District*
- Matt Prociw, HDR*
- Merri Martz, Anchor QEA*
- Nat Kale, OCB
- Nick Bird, City of Aberdeen*
- Nicole Czarnomski, WDFW*
- Richard Pine*
- Sam Imperati, ICM
- Stevie Colson, OCB
- Shelby Thomas, Ross Strategic*
- Scott Boettcher, Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority*
- Tammy Domike*
- Todd Chaput, Economic Alliance of Lewis County
- Victoria Knorr, WDFW