

# CHEHALIS BASIN BOARD SUMMARIZED MEETING AGENDA AND ACTIONS

---

**Date:** February 18, 2021  
**Time:** 9:00 am to 12:00 pm  
**Location:** Zoom online meeting

ITEM	FORMAL ACTION	FOLLOW-UP ACTION
1. Consent February 18 meeting agenda	Decision: Current agenda approved	No follow-up action.
2. Approach to Board Report on Long-Term Strategy	Direction	OCB staff will provide the Board a more detailed set of questions and considerations on different Strategy work elements to inform their deliberations on 2021-23 budget recommendations and the long-term strategy.
3. Next Steps and Closing	Discussion	No follow-up action.

## Attendees

### Chehalis Basin Board Members Present:

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

### Chehalis Basin Board Ex-Officio Members Present:

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

### Board Staff/Board Guests Present:

- See Attachment A

## Welcome, Introductions

Chair Vickie Raines called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. and welcomed the Board, staff, and audience.

## Consent Agenda

The Board did not have additions or revisions to the [February 18, 2021 Meeting Agenda](#).

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

## Approach to Board Report on Long-Term Strategy

Below is a link to the presentation materials:

- [Board Long-Term Strategy Presentation](#)

Jim Kramer (facilitator) provided the Board with an overview of upcoming Chehalis Basin Board and public meetings, highlighted the significant progress the Strategy has achieved from 2012 to present, and reiterated the Board's finding that there is no single, simple solution to meet the dual goals of improving aquatic species habitat and reducing damage from major flooding disasters.

OCB Director Andrea McNamara Doyle then highlighted the major adjustments to the overall strategy that occurred during 2020, including (1) the Chehalis Tribe and Quinault Indian Nation's opposition to the proposed flood retention facility based on impacts in the Draft SEPA EIS and their assessment that impacts would be greater than estimated in the Draft SEPA EIS, (2) the project proponent's (Chehalis Basin Flood Control Zone District) view that the Draft SEPA EIS' findings were conservative in that they did not consider avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures, and (3) the July 2020 Governor Inslee letter requesting that the Board define a process and timeline for developing and evaluating a basin-wide non-dam alternative to reducing flood damage; continue evaluating the ability to avoid, minimize and mitigate dam impacts; and by March 2021, recommend next steps for the Chehalis Basin Strategy.

In response to the Governor's request, the Board developed objectives that should be addressed in their response. They also approved planning assumptions and measurable flood damage reduction outcomes for a Local Actions Program and created two Local Actions Program Advisory Groups to provide OCB and the Board with constructive input from both technical and policy implementation perspectives.

## MAJOR CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Jim Kramer (facilitator) presented five major issues that cross over the strategy and will require Board consideration and feedback, including (1) a need for additional information to determine long-term actions for flood damage reduction given the current level of analyses, (2) considerations regarding planning assumptions for flood events and damage, (3) an additional evaluation of the Skookumchuck dam for potential benefits for aquatic species and flood damage reduction, (4) floodplain acquisition opportunities, and (5) community outreach and engagement.

## SKOOKUMCHUCK DAM CONSIDERATION

Jim Kramer (facilitator) introduced Merri Martz (Anchor QEA) who discussed options for additional evaluations of the Skookumchuck dam for potential benefits for aquatic species and flood damage reduction. Preliminary modeling estimates (based on habitat assumptions, not field data) suggest that removal of the dam would result in an estimated 10% increase (211) in spring Chinook populations basin-wide. Potential options for future analyses include studying (1) existing dam plus operational modifications, (2) modified dam plus operational modifications, and (3) dam removal. Board members

were supportive of OCB staff developing work plans and budgets for these options for Board consideration.

Key comments and discussion topics included:

- Board members acknowledged that additional analyses on the dam could be valuable and potentially address both flood damage reduction and aquatic species restoration objectives.
- Board members are interested in understanding what the future of this facility could be as Trans Alta phases out.
- Board members are interested in understanding options for operation management during winter/fall months in such a way that allows the facility to provide flood protection downstream during flood events.
- Board members are interested in seeing analyses of how aquatic species benefits could be realized with the current structure in place as well as with removal.

## **ASRP**

Jim Kramer (facilitator) introduced Emelie McKain (WDFW), who provided the Board a summary of information on the Aquatic Species Restoration Plan (ASRP) to support Board decision-making on a long-term strategy. Three program options have previously been presented for Board consideration. The following near-term ASRP funding strategy options were also presented, which differ in the pace at which the program will be implemented:

- The “level implementation” would have three, two-year funding cycles with \$33M in each biennium, totaling \$100M over six years. This would achieve up to 40 miles of currently occupied core habitats enhanced and up to 3,600 acres of riparian and floodplain restored and protected.
- The “slow ramp up” would have \$33M in funding for the ’21-23 biennium, and would increase the following two biennia, totaling \$125M. This would achieve up to 50 miles of currently occupied core habitats and up to 4,200 acres of riparian and floodplain restored and protected.
- The “fast ramp up” would follow the same model as the slow ramp up funding strategy but increases the total cost to \$150M. This would achieve up to 65 miles of currently occupied enhanced and up to 5,100 acres of riparian and floodplain restored and protected.

The ASRP Steering committee provided recommendations for evaluating ASRP program implementation at 5-year (2026) and 10-year (2031) intervals. Evaluation metrics would include:

- Landowner willingness outcomes
- Project implementation pace
- Project actual costs compared to projected costs
- Project effectiveness monitoring outcomes
- Status and trends monitoring outcomes

Key comments and discussion topics included:

- Board members were reminded of the implementation planning efforts that were conducted in 2020, which identified certainty of sustained funding as one of the biggest concerns when considering ramping up capacity in the Basin and region.

- Board members encouraged the ASRP Steering Committee to advocate for funding that they deem necessary to accomplish the goals identified in the ASRP but not to become discouraged if that full level of funding is not obtained.
- Board members were reminded that the current modeling for all three scenarios assume restoration is complete, and benefits are fully realized, beginning in the first year of plan implementation.
- Board members acknowledged the efforts of the ASRP Steering Committee and staff to develop the information presented at the meeting.

## **FLOOD RETENTION FACILITY AND AIRPORT LEVEE IMPROVEMENTS**

Due to time constraints, Jim Kramer (facilitator) quickly reviewed slides on the proposed flood retention facility's benefits; impacts; avoidance, minimization, and mitigation efforts; and tribal, agency, and Flood Control Zone District perspectives. Jim then introduced Shane Cherry (HydroGeoLogic), who provided an overview of modeling performed to assess the sensitivity of water temperature changes to vegetation management for the proposed flood retention facility. The purpose of the modeling was to understand the relationship between vegetation, shade and temperature over a range of conditions to understand what could be gained from vegetation management in the 850-acre inundation zone. Vegetation is represented in the model by tree height and canopy for each model segment and left/right banks and the model version and inputs were the same as those used in the analysis for the Draft SEPA EIS. The preliminary results and findings show that different vegetation scenarios result in different water temperature impacts, both under existing conditions and with climate change. Using the updated vegetation scenarios, predicted changes in water temperature from the facility are less than what was included in the SEPA EIS. The Flood Control Zone District is continuing to work to investigate influences on water temperatures in coordination with state agencies. The tribes have also been invited to participate.

Jim Kramer (facilitator) then briefly provided an overview of potential pathways for additional evaluation of the proposed flood retention facility for the Board's consideration, including:

1. District develops and refines avoidance, minimization and mitigation (AMM) analyses in collaborative process with agencies and tribes
2. SEPA and NEPA EISs finalized with new information from District and additional technical studies, addresses tribal and public comments
3. District prepares preliminary permit application materials and supporting plans, e.g., finalize draft HPA/Aquatic Species Mitigation Plan for permitting, finalize draft Wetlands Mitigation Plan, develop draft AMM plans for recreation, land use, cultural resources, etc.

OCB staff will continue discussing this topic with the Board at future meetings to determine what additional information the Board needs to evaluate potential next steps for the proposed flood retention facility.

## **POTENTIAL WAYS TO ADDRESS DAMAGE FROM ACCELERATED BANK EROSION**

Jim Kramer (facilitator) highlighted potential ways in the near-term to address damage from accelerated bank erosion, including developing initial maps for up to 100 miles of high priority area and developing an erosion management approach to evaluate reach-scale opportunities for reducing erosion damages

while protecting and enhancing habitats and ecological processes. Long-term options include identifying one or more pilot subbasins to outline how to develop a pilot technical assistance program for landowners with relative cost and staffing needed for a program (in coordination with staff from OCB and WDFW), and the potential to complete CMZ delineations in high priority areas. In March, the analysis of the 100 miles of erosion areas will be available for Board consideration in determining the potential magnitude of an erosion program, priorities, and potential projects and focus areas.

## **POTENTIAL APPROACHES TO PROTECT HIGH VALUE STRUCTURES AND CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE IN HIGH PRIORITY AREAS**

Jim Kramer (facilitator) highlighted potential ranking criteria that can be used to evaluate structural options to protect high value structures and critical infrastructure within the Basin. Fourteen sub-areas in the Basin have been preliminary identified and prioritized based on five ranking criteria. Additional consideration has been given to the WSDOT I-5 walls and levees and US Army Corps of Engineers Twin Cities Levee proposals.

The Board will discuss this issue in more detail at a future meeting to identify what additional information they would need to consider whether to support additional evaluation of structural analyses for the top tier of priority areas, including levees/walls to protect I-5, Centralia, and Chehalis.

## **FLOODPLAIN ACQUISITION PROGRAM**

Jim Kramer (facilitator) highlighted the potential purposes and approaches of a Floodplain Acquisition Program. The Board will discuss this issue in more detail at a future meeting to identify whether OCB staff should develop a work plan and budget to design an acquisition program for Board consideration.

## **2021-2023 BIENNIUM BUDGET PROCESS**

OCB Director Andrea McNamara Doyle reviewed preliminary assumptions regarding the Board's 2021-23 budget recommendation based on Governor Inslee's proposed \$70M budget. The scale and range of actions that would be considered for flood damage reduction and aquatic species restoration will likely be consistent with previous biennia. Further allocation considerations could be made due to the number of actions that are now being proposed that provide dual benefits for flood damage reduction and aquatic species restoration.

**FOLLOW-UP:** OCB staff will provide the Board a more detailed set of questions and considerations on different Strategy work elements to inform their deliberations on 2021-23 budget recommendations and the long-term strategy.

## **Next Steps and Closing**

Jim Kramer (Facilitator) reminded the Board of their next regularly scheduled Board meetings on March 4, 18, and 22, 2021. There will also be an additional Office of Chehalis Basin Public Meeting on March 9, 2021.

## Attachment A

### **Board Staff/Board Guests:**

- Anne Reese
- Andrea McNamara Doyle, Department of Ecology, Director, Office of Chehalis Basin
- Brandon Parsons, American Rivers
- Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam
- Brian Stewart, Conservation Northwest
- Celina Abercrombie, Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Chrissy Bailey, Department of Ecology, Office of Chehalis Basin
- Cindy Bradley, Department of Ecology, Office of Chehalis Basin
- Curt Hart, Department of Ecology
- Christina Riley, LECET/LIUNA
- Col Ron Averill, City of Centralia
- Colleen Granberg, Department of Natural Resources
- Colleen Suter, Chehalis Tribe, ASRP Steering Committee
- Dave Bingaman, Quinault Indian Nation, ASRP Steering Committee
- Diane Butorac, Department of Ecology
- Deken Letinch
- Emelie McKain, Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Emil Pierson, City of Centralia
- Erik Martin, Flood Control Zone District (FCZD)
- Frank Corbin, Flood Control Zone District Advisory Committee
- Heather Page, Anchor QEA
- Jared Ross, LIUNA
- Jim Kramer, Kramer Consulting (Facilitator)
- Jim Waldo, Consultant to Flood Control Zone District
- John Robinson, Consultant to Flood Control Zone District
- Ken Ghalambor, Ross Strategic
- Kirsten Harma, Chehalis Basin Lead Entity
- Krestine Reed
- Kris Koski, City of Aberdeen
- Lee First, Twin Harbors Waterkeeper
- Larry Karpack, Watershed Science and Engineering
- Mark Glyde, Quinault Indian nation
- Mara Zimmerman, Costal Salmon Partnership
- Merri Martz, Anchor QEA
- Nat Kale, Department of Ecology, Office of Chehalis Basin
- Pete Krabbe
- Richie Myer
- Rona Spelleccacy, HDR

- Scott Boettcher, Staff to Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority
- Shane Cherry, HydroGeoLogic
- Shelby Thomas, Ross Strategic
- Tammy Domike
- Vince Panesko

## Public Comment:

### **Frank Corbin (FCZD Advisory Committee)**

“Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the group. It was apparent in last night’s there was a lot of concern out there for the fish, and I just wanted to put a plug in there for a fish hatchery or something to that affect in the Governor’s report. As well as all future presentations and comments, because we are going to be in a world of hurt if we don’t get the support of the environmental community. Even I myself are fond of fishing and would like to do everything we can to support the re-introduction of fish into the waterways of the Chehalis Basin. In addition, I am concerned about the frequency use of the term dam because a dam in the mid of people, represents Bonneville Dam, Grand Coulee Dam; the complete stoppage of rivers in the natural state. In this particular facility that we are talking about is a free flowing water restriction feature that only is activated in catastrophic flooding. I would like to encourage the use of the term Flood Retention Facility or Flood Retention Structure to more accurately reflect the type of structure that we are proposing to build. This will go a long way in our communications efforts. Now with the document that is being presented today will be a great when delivering a report to the Governor’s Office and will be a great first step to those ends.”