



Aquatic Species Restoration Plan Initial Document: Responses and Plan for Developing Draft ASRP

March 15, 2018

Chehalis Basin Board

Requested Input from Board

- What do you like about the estimated outcomes for aquatic species? What questions or concerns do you have about the outcomes? What recommendations do you have for the outcomes?
- What questions or 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 or 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 draft ASRP beyond those identified in this initial document?

Comment Letters and Board Input

- Chehalis Lead Entity
- Lewis Conservation District
- American Rivers
- Lewis County Public Works
- Washington Coast Salmon Foundation
- Jay Gordon
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Comments/Discussion at Board Meeting in February

Developing the Draft ASRP Document

- Develop the full draft ASRP for anticipated public release in summer 2019
- The full draft ASRP will include:
 - Detailed actions and priorities for restoration and protection for aquatic species
 - Detailed actions for community planning, institutional capacity, and public involvement
 - New data and modeling from ongoing studies
 - More input from landowners and the community
 - Implementation plan and phasing
 - Monitoring and adaptive management framework



Comment Themes and Plan to Address Comments

Questions/Concerns About Outcomes

COMMENT THEMES	PLAN TO ADDRESS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Heavy reliance on Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment (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 historical condition• Results do not include other factors that can affect results (land use, flood actions, ocean conditions, etc.)• Needs for Oregon spotted frog and potential effects from actions such as a dam• If we do nothing, fish are in trouble• Consider specific actions to address low mid-century outcomes	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Improve models by incorporating new data and explain in more detail the assumptions and limitations of models2. Include more detailed explanation about potential salmon abundance numbers and how abundance varies annually and over longer cycles3. Re-evaluate the removal of fish passage barriers based on new culvert data4. Include modeled results of more specific actions such as restored side channels and floodplain wetlands5. Clarify that the ASRP does not aim for a return to historical conditions, but the historical reference helps inform the types of actions that could be most effective6. Account for potential effects from external factors (e.g., ocean conditions, future land use, harvest, hatcheries)7. Acknowledge potential species effects from flood reduction measures, but that analysis is occurring separately8. Emphasize the risk of no action9. Identify near-term actions that could improve mid-century results

Questions/Concerns About Cost/Magnitude of Actions

COMMENT THEMES	PLAN TO ADDRESS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comprehensive implementation plan is needed• Costs and magnitude seem reasonable for results, although total costs are large• Costs are less to restore in Chehalis than Puget Sound basins• Extent of proposed riparian area is large (11,000 to 21,000 acres), plus possible additional flooding from engineered log jams• Strategies for restoration are so expansive that they may not well received by landowners and then goals may not be reachable• Cost 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Refine restoration actions at a sub-basin or smaller scale to develop more accurate acreages2. Conduct ASRP-specific community outreach and incorporate feedback3. Incorporate feedback from Early Action reach design process4. Develop an implementation plan with phasing5. Develop and analyze scales between and below the moderate and high scenarios6. Develop options to improve agricultural viability via planning and protection strategies and phasing of implementation

Recommendations to Increase Likelihood of Implementation

COMMENT THEMES	PLAN TO ADDRESS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct landowner outreach and engagement early and consistently • Consider Lead Entity strategies for implementation • Plan should be flexible enough to allow investment to take advantage of opportunities • Address both landowner and species needs to increase potential of success • Consider mixed bank protection and habitat enhancement actions as part of the toolbox • 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/integration with existing entities/organizations • Need to consider voluntary stewardship program and relationship to restoration needs • 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 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Solicit input from larger group of stakeholders to develop and refine community planning, institutional capacity, and community involvement strategies and actions 2. Conduct ASRP-specific landowner and community outreach 3. Identify common elements in other plans/programs and avoid duplication, but coordinate implementation and increase capacity as appropriate 4. Identify multi-benefit actions

Additional Items to Address in ASRP

COMMENT THEMES	PLAN TO ADDRESS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross check EDT results with existing habitat strategies • Consider effects of low flows and flow augmentation • Consider effects of ocean conditions, hatcheries, and harvest • Consider how estuary conditions could affect abundance projections • Consider upland land use and implications for downstream fish habitat conditions, specifically the impacts of forest practices on stream and river hydrology • Continue to utilize the best available science in determining the plan • Incorporate effects of restoration actions to natural processes (channel migration, sediment transport, wood retention and recruitment, etc.) and subsequent benefits to aquatic species • Consider how the plan affects potential Endangered Species Act (ESA) listings • Consider additional funding options in addition to state capital and if there are any reliable federal funding options 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acknowledge and address (as data are available) other on-going habitat plans and factors such as hatcheries, harvest, estuary conditions, low flows, and upland land use 2. Explain how improvements to natural processes benefit species 3. Acknowledge the potential for future ESA listings, while developing the plan to reduce that potential 4. Emphasize the unique character of the Chehalis Basin and its importance both locally and regionally 5. Identify other funding sources (currently applying for National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration funding)