

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

---

CHEHALIS BASIN STRATEGY  
DRAFT EIS  
PUBLIC HEARING

---

6:00 p.m.

October 27, 2016

Montesano, Washington

Reported By:

Connie Church, CCR #2555, RPR, CRR

Certified Court Reporter

of

CAPITOL PACIFIC REPORTING, INC.

2401 Bristol Court SW, Suite C-103

Olympia, WA 98502

Tel (360) 352-2054 or (800) 407-0148 Fax (360) 705-6539

[www.capitolpacificreporting.com](http://www.capitolpacificreporting.com)

[admin@capitolpacificreporting.com](mailto:admin@capitolpacificreporting.com)

1 (Comments one-on-one to court reporter)

2

3 MR. YUNDT: My name is Michael Yundt. I grew up  
4 here, you know. And I'm familiar with how every summer  
5 the black bear and probably a dozen other things would  
6 migrate from the - come spring, they would come from the  
7 north hills, you know, and down - and they would cross  
8 what used to be a two-lane highway - it's a four-lane  
9 highway now - through Central Park. They can no longer  
10 do that, haven't for years. They get killed when they  
11 try it.

12 There was a black bear, the last count was one  
13 hanging around. Cars can see them on the hillside there.  
14 And then finally one day he showed up dead on the highway  
15 because they can't do it no more.

16 But if they - those two or three big canyons that go  
17 under the highway but are all filled in, dig them out and  
18 - dig them back out, you know, bridge over them, so that  
19 the black bear and a dozen other things can come and go  
20 from that summer . . .

21 The black bear were thick in the swamp come  
22 summertime. You couldn't go out there without - and walk  
23 the tracks behind the dump or anywhere east of there on  
24 the railroad tracks - you couldn't do it without seeing  
25 black bear. You couldn't do it, unless you were blind.

1           And now it's been many years since they've been able to  
2           do that. And you don't even see a black bear anymore.  
3           Once in awhile. I don't even like to hear about it  
4           because they think that's really neat. I remember when  
5           the black bear were thick because they could come and go  
6           from them north hills down into the swamp.

7                        On the south side of the Chehalis River, they still  
8           can because they can get across that highway. It's only  
9           two lanes. And probably at night they do that real easy.  
10          But they can't deal with that four-laner that's there  
11          now.

12                       But I think that would be neat. I heard about a  
13          place back east where they just did a big crossing  
14          project for wildlife. And I thought man, I gotta persist  
15          on this idea a little bit. Maybe we're willing to do  
16          something like that. That's about it.

17

18                                       \*    \*    \*

19

20                       MR. WHITE: Okay. We're going to get ready to  
21          do a little bit of an overview, introduction. So if we  
22          can kind of gather, get seated where you can, get started  
23          in about a minute, as soon as people get settled. We  
24          have some more seats right here, seats right here.

25                       I'll just go ahead and get started while people are

1 seated. Can you hear me okay back there?

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: A little louder.

3 MR. WHITE: Okay. How's this?

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's better.

5 MR. WHITE: That's too loud for me.

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I know. But that's what you  
7 need to do.

8 MR. WHITE: Okay. I'm Gordon White, Department  
9 of Ecology. Thank you all for being here, taking the  
10 time to come here and give us comments, your perspectives  
11 on the draft EIS. I'm going to give you a little bit of  
12 context and then Chrissy Bailey, our project manager for  
13 the EIS, will give you a little more detail on that.  
14 First of all I want to give you a little bit of context  
15 about why we're doing this.

16 I think many of you know that the Chehalis River  
17 Basin is at a key turning point. We've had many more key  
18 floods than we used to have in the Basin. We've also  
19 have a real downturn in aquatic species habitat, fish  
20 population in the Basin. As a result of that, the  
21 Governor and Washington Legislature has made it a real  
22 priority to create a comprehensive strategy that  
23 integrates both flood damage reduction and fish habitat  
24 protection and restoration across the Basin.

25 Under the direction of the Governor in 2014, the

1 Governor's Work Group, created the Chehalis Basin  
2 Strategy, which created a suite of actions that would  
3 reduce flood damage in the near term and restore habitat  
4 for aquatic species, considered both long and short-term  
5 projects. Some of the members of that Work Group are  
6 here tonight. And I won't make introductions for that  
7 tonight but several of them are here. Here are their  
8 names, right there. They represent many different  
9 interests across the Basin.

10 So the recommended suite of actions is known as the  
11 Chehalis Basin Strategy. And the strategy is a  
12 comprehensive and integrated approach to implementing  
13 flood damage reduction and aquatic species restoration.  
14 It's really important. This is what the EIS is really  
15 about is to examine how do integrated is it; how do they  
16 connect.

17 The Governor's Work Group wants to make sure that if  
18 they do a flood damage reduction project, it also would  
19 fit together with fish restoration, aquatic species  
20 restoration, and vice versa.

21 So response to the Work Group's request, Department  
22 of Ecology is preparing this draft EIS. It's in the  
23 draft stage right now. We're trying to assess both the  
24 effectiveness and the potential environmental impact of  
25 these different options that have been identified.



1 MS. BAILEY: I'm going to come stand over here.  
2 If anybody can't hear me at any point, just let me know.  
3 I'm going to basically walk through a little introduction  
4 about the Basin, a little bit of introduction about the  
5 problems, a little bit of information about the actions  
6 that you just saw in the video that Ecology evaluated in  
7 the EIS, and then a little bit about the outcomes of the  
8 studies of the EIS.

9 So the Chehalis Basin has got about 140,000  
10 residents. It covers portions of eight counties, but the  
11 vast majority of the Basin is in Lewis County, Thurston  
12 County and Grays Harbor County. It's about 80 percent  
13 forest, about five percent agriculture and about seven  
14 percent developed. It is - as the video described, it's  
15 one of the largest river basins in the state of  
16 Washington and it's also the most diverse basin in the  
17 state for amphibians.

18 There is a history of flooding in the Chehalis  
19 Basin. You can see from this slide that I-5 was closed  
20 multiple years during multiple floods and that the five  
21 largest floods have occurred since 1986. The 2007 flood,  
22 which is the largest flood on record, the monetary damage  
23 associated with that flood topped \$900 million. And the  
24 estimate of peak flows in a hundred-year flood event in  
25 this Basin have increased 33 percent in the last 100

1 years - I'm sorry in the last 30 years.

2           There's also a history of habitat degradation in the  
3 Basin. There are no federally listed ESA salmon species.  
4 However kind of ironically, historically the Basin has  
5 experienced a lack of attention and limited investment  
6 for that reason. The current habitat for various species  
7 is estimated to be - the productivity to be degraded by  
8 up to 87 percent and harvest of one species or another  
9 has been limited by poor returns over the last 30 years.  
10 And in the future, the projections are that conditions  
11 and habitat are predicted to be worse.

12           This slide shows the potential effects of climate  
13 change on salmonids. The University of Washington  
14 Climate Impacts Group did an evaluation in the Basin this  
15 biennium, and their work predicts increases in  
16 temperatures and decreases in summer precipitation, which  
17 would increase temperatures in rivers and streams, so you  
18 can see on the right-hand side.

19           For this effort, a model called EDT, Ecosystem  
20 Diagnosis and Treatment Model, was used. That estimates  
21 or predicts the number or the abundance of these five  
22 species in the Basin. And it shows what the habitat  
23 conditions - the number of fish that the habitat  
24 conditions could support under various scenarios. So  
25 what this is showing is the current habitat potential in

1 numbers of fish of these species and then the predicted  
2 change to that population from climate change.

3 So we just walked through two problems that have  
4 been documented in the Basin. And so the Environmental  
5 Impact Statement, the purpose and need statement that are  
6 associated with the EIS, it's a dual purpose strategy.  
7 So we really want to drive that point forward. You can  
8 read the purpose and needs statement up here. But the  
9 highlight is that none of . . . This is a dual purpose  
10 strategy so not one objective is more important than the  
11 other.

12 I also want to point out that the purpose of the  
13 actions that were evaluated is not to stop flooding.  
14 It's recognized that there's nothing that's going to stop  
15 flooding in the Basin. So the objective is to reduce  
16 flood damage. And there's recognition that the efforts  
17 to address one of these objectives will affect the other.

18 So the actions that are considered in the  
19 Environmental Impact Statement because it's a dual  
20 purpose strategy are two types. There's flood damage  
21 reduction actions and habitat restoration actions. The  
22 flood damage reduction actions are also broken into large  
23 scale flood damage reduction actions and local scale.  
24 We'll talk a little bit about all of those actions next.

25 And I also just want to reiterate that nothing is

1 decided at this point. These are just actions that were  
2 considered and studied and in the EIS. Again, the goal  
3 is to restore aquatic species habitat and reduce flood  
4 damage.

5 So there are a total of four local scale flood  
6 damage reduction actions that are evaluated in the EIS.  
7 You saw some of this in the video. But the first one is  
8 floodproofing. It's a bucket of floodproofing. That  
9 includes raising structures. It can include building  
10 walls or levees around structures that can't be raised.  
11 From our conversations with local governments in the  
12 Basin, there's approximately 75 percent of the  
13 residential structures in the floodplain could be  
14 elevated. So there are some structures that cannot be.  
15 This action also includes farm pads.

16 And then the local projects are primarily the types  
17 of projects that are on the Chehalis Basin Flood  
18 Authority's local projects list. So those are  
19 area-specific projects that are aimed at protecting key  
20 infrastructure, frequently-flood-damaged properties and  
21 restoring flood capacity. So that includes things like  
22 protecting wastewater treatment plants and roads and some  
23 floodplain reconnection projects.

24 The other two local scale flood damage reduction  
25 actions that we evaluated include land use management.

1           And that looks at - some recommendations have been made  
2           by a consultant working with the local governments in the  
3           Basin the past few years about how the local governments  
4           could change their floodplain regulations to maintain  
5           current flood - like the ecological processes that  
6           floodplains provide as well as to avoid future flood  
7           damage. So we evaluated those actions and the potential  
8           effectiveness of those actions in the EIS and then also  
9           considered flood warning improvements. There's already a  
10          really robust flood warning system in the Basin. And the  
11          improvements would expand the inundation mapping program,  
12          add new National Weather Service river forecast points,  
13          and implement a new hydraulic model in the lower Basin  
14          that would improve forecasts below Porter.

15                 So the large scale flood damage reduction actions we  
16          evaluated, there are five of those. The first two are  
17          essentially projects - they're called the I-5 projects,  
18          and that includes walls and levees that would be built  
19          along I-5 between Chehalis and Centralia primarily to  
20          protect the freeway. Another large scale action includes  
21          raising the existing levee that's around the  
22          Centralia-Chehalis airport.

23                 Another large scale flood damage reduction action we  
24          evaluated is the Aberdeen-Hoquiam North Shore Levee.  
25          This would provide coastal flood protection to Aberdeen

1 and Hoquiam or portions of the low-lying communities  
2 along the north side of Grays Harbor. This one started  
3 out as a local project on the Flood Authority's list and  
4 it grew significantly in scope and scale so the  
5 Governor's Work Group requested that it be added to the  
6 analysis as a large scale action.

7 Another large scale flood damage reduction action we  
8 looked at is called restorative flood protection, and  
9 that would reestablish the natural flood storage capacity  
10 in portions of the Basin by reversing the landscape  
11 changes that contribute to downstream flooding.

12 During the scoping process, which happened about a  
13 year ago - that's the process that kicks off the EIS - we  
14 asked the public what types of things we should study and  
15 what types of alternatives we should evaluate. And some  
16 of the feedback we got during scoping requested that we  
17 look at an action that would reduce flood damage through  
18 nonstructural land use actions combined with floodplain  
19 restoration and buying out willing landowners.

20 So in the treatment areas, the procedure this would  
21 follow or the way we looked at it would be buying out and  
22 relocating structures that wouldn't be compatible or uses  
23 that wouldn't be compatible with more flooding and then  
24 restoring those floodplain areas with natural features  
25 like wood and vegetation that would store and slow the

1 flow of water to reduce downstream flood stages.

2 The final large scale flood damage reduction action  
3 we looked at, as the video described, is a dam and  
4 reservoir. There are two different types of facilities  
5 that were evaluated. Both would be located about a mile  
6 upstream of Pe Ell on the main stem Chehalis River. One  
7 would have a permanent reservoir, as I mentioned, and one  
8 would be more a run of a river type facility that would  
9 only close when a major flood is predicted. So that  
10 would only hold water back temporarily during that flood  
11 event and the river would flow normally during regular  
12 conditions or smaller flood events. And the dam with the  
13 permanent reservoir would hold back water continuously.  
14 And in addition to reducing flood damage during the  
15 winter, the idea is that in the summer, the water from  
16 that reservoir could be released to provide more water  
17 and cooler temperatures for salmon and other species. So  
18 both dam facilities would include fish passage.

19 The final action that's evaluated in the EIS are  
20 aquatic species habitat actions. And so these are the  
21 actions that are designed to protect, improve and create  
22 sustainable ecosystem processes and functions that would  
23 support long-term productivity of native aquatic and  
24 semi-aquatic species at much higher levels of abundance  
25 than the conditions currently support.

1           So we contemplated both a high and a low level of  
2 effort for that. I'll talk a little bit about that as  
3 well. The Department of Fish and Wildlife is currently  
4 working on a plan. It's called the Aquatic Species  
5 Restoration Plan. Because we don't know the outcomes of  
6 that, for the EIS that's part of the reason we chose to  
7 look at kind of a low scenario and a high scenario.

8           Some of the actions that would be included in the  
9 aquatic species habitat action bucket would include  
10 things like restoring riparian habitat; restoring  
11 off-channel habitat; adding wood structures in the main  
12 stem and tributaries; reconnecting the floodplain;  
13 creating, restoring or enhancing wetlands; restoring bank  
14 erosion to naturally occurring rates; and removing or  
15 repairing culverts or other man-made structures that are  
16 barriers to fish.

17           So just an example again using the EDT outputs, this  
18 slide shows how those actions could increase salmon  
19 populations. So this is based on current conditions and  
20 just shows you that again the current average abundance  
21 using that model is about 265,000 salmon and steelhead,  
22 and the increases range from an 18 percent or about  
23 50,000 fish increase under the low scenario to about  
24 190,000 additional salmon and steelhead under the high  
25 scenario compared to current conditions. And we'll talk

1 a little bit about the factor that climate change plays  
2 in this future as well.

3 So before we shift into talking about some of the  
4 findings from the EIS, this is just a snapshot or graphic  
5 to help people visualize how each of those actions that I  
6 just walked through are combined into alternatives in the  
7 EIS. So this EIS, two things about it are a little bit  
8 different than a lot of other EIS's people might have  
9 seen. One is that it's programmatic so it's intended to  
10 look at a broad scale at a planning level of these  
11 actions and the combinations and the impacts and the  
12 benefits. So it's not a project specific EIS.

13 Another thing that we did, because decision makers  
14 could combine these actions into different alternatives  
15 than we did, we evaluated each alternative separately on  
16 its own and then also evaluated these combined  
17 alternatives.

18 So you can see Alternative 1 was the 2014 Governor's  
19 Work Group recommendation. Includes a dam and reservoir,  
20 the airport levee improvements, Aberdeen-Hoquiam North  
21 Shore Levee. And then all of the alternatives include  
22 both those four local scale flood damage reduction  
23 actions and restoration of aquatic species.

24 Alternative 2 doesn't include a dam but includes the  
25 I-5 projects to protect I-5.

1            Alternatives 3 and 4 - I talked a little bit about 4  
2            - both of those came out of the scoping process. And we  
3            were requested to look at essentially a more natural way  
4            to achieve flood damage reduction and then just look at  
5            what happens if you don't do any large scale structural  
6            flood damage reduction.

7            So I'll talk a little bit about the alternatives  
8            now. So every EIS or SEPA EIS is also looking at a no  
9            action alternative. And the no action alternative is  
10           intended to represent the most likely future expected in  
11           the absence of implementing any of those actions that we  
12           looked at. And so under the no action alternative,  
13           actions that address these problems in the Basin would  
14           continue but at reduced levels as compared to the current  
15           - the action alternatives.

16           So our findings were that the no action alternative  
17           would essentially maintain the status quo. There would  
18           be some localized improvements from the projects that  
19           took place, but those would be outweighed by the ongoing  
20           risk of major floods. And most of the significant  
21           adverse impacts that are identified under the no action  
22           alternative result from the projected impacts of climate  
23           change.

24           So some of the common beneficial effects that are  
25           common again to all of those action alternatives are here

1 on the screen. And you'll note that these are . . . I  
2 do this every time. I apologize. These are generally  
3 the actions that are in common to every action  
4 alternative. They share these actions. So that would  
5 include increases in salmon abundance and maintaining or  
6 improving conditions for other aquatic species.  
7 Floodproofing and local projects would reduce flood  
8 damage to structures and the contents as well as other  
9 land uses and infrastructure and roads. Land use  
10 management could improve the protection. Some of the  
11 proposed or the recommended actions could improve  
12 protection for new development within the 100-year  
13 floodplain or maintain floodplain function. And flood  
14 warning system improvements would definitely increase  
15 public safety.

16 So now I'm going to walk through some of the  
17 findings specific to the two objectives that I introduced  
18 at the beginning, the first being the flood damage  
19 reduction objectives. So again, this is just a snapshot  
20 of how these alternatives compare to one another with  
21 regards to achieving these objectives. There is a lot  
22 more detail in the EIS. This is a very high-level  
23 summary.

24 So some of the elements of flood damage that could  
25 be reduced by these various actions are listed there on

1 the screen. And so again, these relate to the flood  
2 damage reduction objectives, which included not only  
3 flood damage but also reducing disruption to various land  
4 uses and structures. And again, this is just a  
5 high-level summary that we're going to show next.

6 But the next slide shows basically the economic  
7 value or the benefit of the different alternatives for  
8 reducing flood damage in these various ways. Hopefully  
9 the colors can be seen. But this figure shows the total  
10 estimated reduction in flood damages over a 100-year  
11 period once all of the actions included in each of these  
12 alternatives were in place.

13 And so Alternatives 1 and 4 provide the greatest  
14 reduction in flood damage. Alternative 1 has the  
15 greatest reduced damage to structures and the contents,  
16 which are kind of in orange there, from reductions in  
17 flood levels from a dam.

18 Alternative 4 has significant reductions in damage  
19 to buildings and structures as well, contents, and then a  
20 large portion of that is reduced damage to crops because  
21 that alternative includes relocating existing land uses  
22 that are in the Basin in the areas above Chehalis and  
23 Centralia, out of the floodplain, and then also includes  
24 floodproofing.

25 Some of the other objectives, we're showing

1 transportation here to give you a snapshot of what the  
2 findings were. Some of the other objectives included  
3 access reducing - or maintaining access to critical  
4 medical facilities during floods, reduced disruption to  
5 transportation systems. And that includes local,  
6 regional and I-5. And so these - for Alternative 2 and  
7 Alternative 4, some of these impacts are before  
8 mitigation would be applied or could be applied. But  
9 this basically shows you how the different alternatives  
10 achieve or line up achieving each of those objectives.

11 So with regard to the restoring aquatic species  
12 habitat objectives, now we'll look really quickly at how  
13 some those alternatives compare. And so one thing to  
14 point out here that's - this is kind of a high-level  
15 summary for all those alternatives - is as I mentioned,  
16 there's a low and a high restoration scenario that we  
17 evaluated. Our findings are that the low restoration  
18 scenario generally does not result in an increase in  
19 salmon under any of the action alternatives, again  
20 primarily due to climate change. Alternative 4 is  
21 generally the exception, but the increases are still very  
22 low. They're lower than the lowest low for all the  
23 alternatives if you compare them to current conditions.  
24 And it's less than one-third of the high scenario when  
25 you look at climate change or include climate change.

1           So Alternative 1 reduces - excuse me - results in  
2 significant increases over predicted changes from  
3 climate, but the increases are less than the other  
4 alternatives. The adverse impact of a dam on local  
5 salmon populations, the populations that spawn especially  
6 above the facility would be reduced, and there would  
7 still be a significant adverse impact. Alternative 4, as  
8 I mentioned, does result in the greatest increase in  
9 salmon or projected increase.

10           These are just some slides that show a little - or  
11 kind of give you some numbers behind the estimates or the  
12 outlines I just gave you. And I just want to stress that  
13 these numbers are approximate. And so really this - what  
14 this exhibits is a sense of the magnitude of change. And  
15 so this is the change when you consider climate change.  
16 And so you can see that the habitat actions offset the  
17 negative results from climate change in many cases.

18           And actually I want to point out, too, the FRFA is  
19 the flood retention flow augmentation facility dam. The  
20 flood retention only facility would be very similar. The  
21 changes there under the low restoration scenario would be  
22 a three percent increase and under high a 48 percent  
23 increase.

24           And the benefits of the combined actions within  
25 Alternatives 2 and 3 haven't been modeled using EDT, but

1 they're anticipated to be similar to if you just  
2 implemented the aquatic species habitat actions and  
3 didn't include any of the large scale flood damage  
4 reduction actions.

5 So some of the results of the economic analysis:  
6 There was an economic analysis done last biennium. It  
7 was updated this biennium. It's attached to the EIS as  
8 Appendix C. This slide exhibits some of the costs or the  
9 costs associated with the action alternatives under a low  
10 restoration scenario. So these include the capital costs  
11 to implement the actions, annual operations and  
12 maintenance over a 100-year study period, interest during  
13 construction.

14 And so what you can see is the aquatic species  
15 habitat action costs are consistent across all of the  
16 alternatives because again, that's included in all of the  
17 alternatives. It's lower under Alternative 4 because  
18 there's recognition that the floodplain restoration  
19 associated with the flood damage action would occur in  
20 some of those areas and you wouldn't need to do  
21 restoration in those areas.

22 Alternative 1, the difference in cost between these  
23 two, the one on the left-hand side is a flood retention  
24 only facility. Right-hand side flood retention flow  
25 augmentation facility. Part of the difference in the

1 costs or the two biggest factors in the difference in  
2 those costs are fish passage facilities and then just the  
3 size of the dam.

4 Alternative 4, the high cost of that you can see in  
5 the dark blue there is associated with the acquisition  
6 and relocation of properties in the floodplain or uses in  
7 the floodplain.

8 And this is basically the same slide but with the  
9 high restoration scenario so you can kind of get a  
10 difference in the sense of the different costs between  
11 the low and the high levels of effort.

12 And then here are essentially the benefits, the  
13 economic benefits from reducing flood damage under each  
14 of the alternatives. And they're color-coded the same  
15 way those previous slides were color-coded so you can see  
16 that one of the largest benefits here again is the  
17 reduction from damage to crops. And under both of these  
18 is a relatively large benefit to structures, contents and  
19 inventories due to reduced flood damage.

20 And the aquatic species habitat restoration, this is  
21 a snapshot of the benefits. What these benefits show is  
22 so these are based on the changes in fish populations,  
23 it's the economic benefit under the low and the high  
24 restoration scenarios compared to no action, taking no  
25 action. And so this includes the commercial or sport

1 value per fish. It doesn't include nonuse values or like  
2 cultural use or cultural values. We're not assigning  
3 dollar amounts in this slide.

4 And this is just a summary of those last couple  
5 slides when you put them together and compare them  
6 against one another, the benefit cost ratios of the  
7 various actions under both the low and the high  
8 restoration scenarios.

9 So I'm going to leave it at that. And I'm going to  
10 pass it on to Fran to open the public hearing part.

11 MS. SANT: Thanks, Chrissy. Hi, everyone. My  
12 name is Fran Sant. I'm the hearing officer for tonight's  
13 hearing. I'm going to go over some informal rules and  
14 then I'll start the formal part of the hearing. And it  
15 is pretty scripted so if you see me staring down, there's  
16 a reason. I need to read the words I have on the script  
17 here.

18 First just some basic ground rules. You guys have  
19 all been really great. If you can make sure your cell  
20 phones are on silent. If you do need to take a call,  
21 please step out into the hall. Please hold down the  
22 noise, side conversations or anything like that. The  
23 court reporter is - needs to be able to hear, and she's  
24 also recording. So to get an accurate recording, it's  
25 helpful to keep noise down.

1           Please no distracting, disruptive or intimidating  
2 behavior. Please respect the rights of others to have an  
3 opinion even if you don't agree. Please use respectful  
4 language when providing comments or asking questions.

5           During the public hearing, I'm going to call you up  
6 in the order your name appears on the sign-in sheets. If  
7 you haven't signed in yet and you would like to sign in,  
8 we're still signing people up out in the lobby for  
9 testimony. I'll call you up, and I'll also cue up the  
10 person who's right behind you. So you'll hear me call  
11 the first name and then I'll call a second name and  
12 that's going to be the person coming up to give testimony  
13 right afterwards.

14           During the hearing, you may ask questions for the  
15 record, but staff will not respond to you. The public  
16 hearing is your opportunity to provide statements that  
17 will be included as part of the public record. I'm going  
18 to ask that you keep your comments to three minutes in  
19 length.

20           So that's the informal ground rules. If anybody is  
21 okay with those, we'll go ahead and go on to the formal  
22 part.

23           Okay. So now we'll begin the formal hearing which  
24 we will record for the public record. At this time, I  
25 will also read some information that is required for the

1 record.

2 I'm Fran Sant, the hearing officer for this hearing.  
3 This evening we are conducting a hearing on the SEPA  
4 programmatic draft EIS for the Chehalis Basin Strategy.  
5 Let the record show that it is approximately 7:10, 7:15 -  
6 7:05 - thank you - on October 27. And this hearing is  
7 being held at Montesano City Hall, Montesano, Washington.

8 Legal notices of this hearing were published in the  
9 Chronicle on October 13, 2016. In addition notices of  
10 this hearing were mailed by post to approximately 5,000  
11 interested people in the Chehalis Basin, sent by e-mail  
12 to 479 interested people on the project list. A news  
13 release was issued by the Department of Ecology on  
14 September 29, 2016. There have been posters posted all  
15 over the Chehalis Basin at approximately 25 locations.  
16 In addition, general notices of the hearing were also  
17 published in the following manner: Radio spots on KITI  
18 Live 95, a full page ad in the Chehalis Chronicle and  
19 digital and print ads in the Daily World.

20 Now I'm going to go ahead and get ready to open it  
21 up for testimony. Again, I'm going to call you up in the  
22 order that you signed up. Please remember that you have  
23 three minutes to speak. When you reach that limit, I  
24 will cue you to let you know that you are close to your  
25 time and we're going to ask you to wrap it up. If you're

1 not able to wrap it up, I will ask you to just stop.

2 So please be respectful of everybody wanting an  
3 opportunity. When you do come up to speak, if you could  
4 speak in this area of the room. That way you'll be  
5 adjacent to the court reporter. She can get an accurate  
6 recording. If you will be so kind as to state your name  
7 and city or county where you reside, that would be  
8 helpful. Thank you so much.

9 So the first person I have signed up to testify is  
10 John Penberth. And following John will be Stephen  
11 Willis.

12 MR. PENBERTH: I don't wish to speak at this  
13 time. Thank you.

14 MS. SANT: Are you John?

15 MR. PENBERTH: Yes, I am.

16 MS. SANT: Okay.

17 MR. WILLIS: I have no comments on the  
18 alternatives presented here.

19 MS. SANT: I'm sorry. You don't want to speak?

20 MR. WILLIS: No, I don't.

21 MS. SANT: Okay. How about Don Secena? No Don?  
22 He's coming. Great. And then following Don will be  
23 Terry Franklin.

24 MR. SECENA: Good evening and thank you for  
25 coming. My name is Don Secena. I'm the Chairman of the

1 Chehalis Tribe. I've been on the Work Group for two  
2 years, sat on several meetings, looked at alternatives.  
3 What's best for people, what's best for fish, there's a  
4 lot here to take in. And what's going to happen, it'll  
5 affect all of us, not just the Chehalis Tribe. It'll  
6 affect everybody who lives within the Basin. I think the  
7 decisions made will have to take a lot of consideration.

8 I mean I've got from the Chehalis people my marching  
9 orders. And water retention has to - we have to look at  
10 that really seriously. I mean what's the effect? How is  
11 it going to affect the fish? How is it going to affect  
12 the people in the valley, in the Basin?

13 The Chehalis people say no to a dam. That's what  
14 they say. And that's the message I gotta carry. I've  
15 sat with the Governor. I've relayed that message three  
16 times now. And he was . . . There was folks there. He  
17 had his staff there. So it's - it wouldn't be fair for  
18 me to sit at a table and say otherwise because that's  
19 exactly what the Chehalis people told me was, "We can't  
20 support a project that has a dam on it." That's my  
21 message.

22 MS. SANT: Thank you, Don. And following Terry  
23 we'll have Tim Dyeson come on up.

24 MS. FRANKLIN: Terry Franklin. I live in east  
25 Grays Harbor County. In about year 2000, I became

1 involved with the Chehalis Basin Partnership. Since that  
2 time, I have tracked money that we have spent on projects  
3 in the Chehalis Basin through the Partnership.

4 When they started talking about a dam and the  
5 federal government told them that they weren't giving  
6 permits for dams, they were just taking dams out, and  
7 then they went ahead and started pursuing doing a study  
8 to do these dams is when I stepped back and said, "I  
9 don't want to spend once a month coming to those meetings  
10 for this kind of stuff. This is not what I signed up  
11 for."

12 We have spent 220 million taxpayer dollars doing  
13 restoration work in the Chehalis Basin and doing  
14 bioengineering techniques using plants and other things  
15 to - natural things, more natural things to work in the  
16 Chehalis Basin. And Alternative 4 to me is great. But I  
17 can't condone a dam at all on the Chehalis. We've worked  
18 so hard on these fish runs and we need to continue. This  
19 work's gotta continue to go on for a long time to come  
20 because it's never going to be what it was, but we can  
21 make it better but not by putting dams in.

22 I would suggest that if you want to do something  
23 with I-5, I don't know about your levees. You could put  
24 it on stilts. If they have to stop for three days, you  
25 know, life goes on. That's all I have to say. Thank

1           you.

2                       MS. SANT: Thank you.

3                       MR. DYESON: Tim Dyeson. I live in Chehalis in  
4 Lewis County. I live on Jesse Creek, which flows into  
5 the Newaukum River which flows into the Chehalis River.  
6 And I'm here to speak out against Alternative 4. One of  
7 the - what the report says is that my property would be  
8 under 10 feet of water if Alternative 4 was enacted,  
9 which means I would have to be relocated. All of that -  
10 the entire North Fork Valley, the entire Boistfort  
11 Valley, Adna valley, Onalaska, would all have to be  
12 uninhabited. And this would destroy families. It would  
13 destroy communities.

14                      I am a professional who has chosen to live in a  
15 rural area for quality of life. And if I were to be  
16 bought out and relocated under this plan, I would not  
17 continue to live in the community, which would - it would  
18 for me be a real detriment to my family, but I think it  
19 would be a detriment to the community.

20                      The financial model that is laid out in the EIS for  
21 Alternative 4 is grossly underrepresented. You  
22 have . . . The costs associated with relocation are  
23 expecting the farmers are going to sell for assessed  
24 value, not market value, which I would never do. So I  
25 would make it, you know - no offense, but I'd make it

1 really expensive to be bought out. But you - the  
2 community would also lose every tax dollar that I put  
3 into the system, any local Farmer's Market I'm not going  
4 to anymore. I pay my local insurance premiums. That's  
5 not getting paid locally. All of my money would leave  
6 this state.

7 And one of the things about the Alternative 4 is it  
8 assumes that 100 percent of the people who are bought out  
9 will stay. And I think that's a misleading assumption.  
10 I don't believe that that will be true. I'd like to  
11 see . . . We did a . . . The report did a really good  
12 job of estimating how many fish will return, but it did  
13 nothing about estimating how many people will return. I  
14 love the fish but, you know, I have my priorities in a  
15 different order maybe.

16 So I'm suggesting that Alternative 4 is grossly  
17 underrepresented in terms of the dollars that it would  
18 cost, which means that when you have the last slide that  
19 you had - the last slide had the cost - the differentials  
20 between the cost and the benefit. And I do not believe  
21 that Alternative 4 is appropriately represented in that.  
22 So I would like to see additional work on the financial  
23 forecasting. Thank you.

24 MS. SANT: So we're going to have next will be  
25 Kim Figlar Barnes followed by Ron Figlar Barnes.

1                   AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm Kim Figlar Barnes. I live  
2                   in Elma, Washington. And I've been involved in this  
3                   process since the Flood Authority forum and I used to  
4                   attend the meetings until they got changed from evenings  
5                   to during the day. And I'm here to voice my opinion  
6                   against the dams. We're in an era of tearing dams down  
7                   and recovering fish habitat, not putting them up and  
8                   destroying habitat not just for fish, other wildlife  
9                   species, amphibians. All the organisms that would live  
10                  in those areas that would get flooded.

11                 But what really frustrates me about the dams is no  
12                 where in the report does it mention who's going to pay  
13                 for the construction, who's going to pay for the  
14                 operation, who's going to pay for the maintenance. The  
15                 early Flood Authority meetings said we, as taxpayers  
16                 living within the Chehalis Basin, would be responsible  
17                 for paying for those.

18                 So they're dams that aren't going to benefit the  
19                 entire watershed. They're specific for Lewis County  
20                 residents. And it still doesn't resolve all the flood  
21                 issues. And so why should other Grays Harbor residents,  
22                 especially down in Grays Harbor County, have to pay for a  
23                 dam that's not going to benefit them? If you live in  
24                 Ocean Shores and your property is getting washed away by  
25                 the ocean, are Lewis County residents going to pay to

1 help restore their property along the ocean? It's  
2 ridiculous. And that needs to be addressed in the EIS.  
3 I'm sorry. Nowhere does that mention who's going to be  
4 paying for these projects.

5 The other thing is the 2009 flood event that  
6 happened on the Newaukum River and it flooded I-5, how is  
7 that going to be addressed? You got the Newaukum. You  
8 got the Skookumchuck. You got China Creek. You also  
9 have Dillenbaugh Creek all helped contribute to some of  
10 the flooding along I-5, not just the mainstem Chehalis.

11 And one of the factors I haven't noticed in the  
12 report is poor forest practice management in the upper  
13 watershed. When is that finally going to be addressed?  
14 It's ridiculous. I mean the DNR landslide report that  
15 they published in November 2008 from the '07 storm just  
16 nails the problem right there, poor forest practice  
17 management. And we still have done nothing since then.  
18 And that needs to be addressed.

19 And lastly, Washington state overall has a lot of  
20 rivers with dams on it and there's an awful lot of ESA  
21 listed species. Please tell me what river system has a  
22 recovered ESA species in the state? We're going to be  
23 next if dams get put on the Chehalis.

24 And then at the end of your little report, you say  
25 oh, "More detailed environmental review including

1 identification of specific impacts and mitigation  
2 measures will be conducted when specific projects have  
3 been selected for implementation."

4 Exactly who will be selecting the specific projects  
5 for implementation? That needs to be addressed. That's  
6 all I have to say. Thank you.

7 MS. SANT: Following Ron, we're going to have  
8 Dan Wood come on up, or Don. I apologize. Dan.

9 MR. FIGLAR BARNES: My name is Ron Figlar  
10 Barnes. I live in Elma. And I'm not supportive of the  
11 dams. And I understand, you know, the frustrations for  
12 the farmers. Years and years and years ago I was working  
13 for Fish and Wildlife at that time and we flew over with  
14 one of the floods, you know, through the Chehalis. And  
15 tremendous amount of water, you know, through the system  
16 and surrounded some of the farms - the farms in this mid  
17 valley, lower valley. And you know, my heart - I wasn't  
18 like, "Ha, ha," you know. That wasn't anything that was  
19 funny.

20 But the dam . . . You know, Kim's right on.  
21 There's no system that has a dam on it in this state or  
22 just about anyplace else that doesn't have an endangered  
23 species associated with it. And the Skokomish . . . I'm  
24 a plan - well, environmental coordinator for the  
25 Skokomish Tribe. What we ended up doing is we ended up

1 taking out the dikes. We replaced a bridge span - small  
2 bridge span with a large bridge span. It cost \$13  
3 million to do that.

4 As you all know, the fastest flooded system in the  
5 state, if the rain cloud sneezes, the Skokomish floods.  
6 But with all the restoration work that we've done, that  
7 floodwater recedes really fast now. That 2009 and 2007  
8 flood there was six and a half feet of water in the  
9 valley, and it did not recede fast. It - that was before  
10 our restoration work. It stayed for weeks in the valley.  
11 And you talk about residents in that mid valley and upper  
12 valley? They couldn't get to their farms. They couldn't  
13 get to their homes.

14 But once we did the restoration and that water is  
15 moving out of the valley faster, that 2009 flood, which  
16 on record, we've had five record rainfall events in the  
17 last 10 years, and the last ones - the last three, have  
18 moved out of the valley really fast.

19 But I made abet with my biologist. So we're coming  
20 in to work in 2009. And he's like, "Ah, that water's not  
21 going to go anywhere."

22 And I said, "Yeah. You're right." I said, "You  
23 know, maybe it will."

24 Within 24 hours, that water was out of the valley.  
25 24 hours individuals were able to get back.

1           And the other thing, why . . . Well, sea level rise  
2           is going to cause issues anyway for everybody. Why is  
3           the aquatic species being harmed and - in the Chehalis  
4           Basin? There is no reason that I can see other than  
5           ditching, diking and whatever else. But . . . So  
6           anyhow, I don't understand that part of the report.

7           Time's over so I just think that if we're going to  
8           spend money, spend it to bring the fish back and try to  
9           help the farmers.

10           MS. SANT: So if we could have Dan --

11           AUDIENCE MEMBER: Dan is on his way back with a  
12           speaker system. Can we defer? And then we'll have a  
13           sound system.

14           MS. SANT: Sure we can. Great. How about  
15           Jonathan Meyer?

16           MR. MEYER: My name is Jonathan Meyer, and I'm  
17           from Lewis County. I'm actually the Lewis County  
18           Prosecutor. But that's not why I'm here tonight. I'm  
19           here tonight because in 2007, I had six feet of water in  
20           my basement. I'm also here because I'm an Aberdeen kid,  
21           graduated from Aberdeen, still have family that lives  
22           here in Montesano. So this is a very real issue for me.  
23           When I ran for office, this is one of the issues that I  
24           ran on.

25           It would be very easy for me to simply build a rock

1 wall around my house, call it a fence, and my house  
2 wouldn't flood anymore. But we truly need to look at a  
3 Basin-wide solution. That's why I'm here. I'm here to  
4 talk about Alternative 1 and talk out against  
5 Alternative 4.

6 So Alternative 1 is a true Basin-wide solution and  
7 the only one that satisfies the strategy which is stated  
8 to provide a safer future for people, a healthier, more  
9 resilient Basin for aquatic species and a reduction in  
10 the socio and economic costs associated with floods and  
11 degraded aquatic species habitat.

12 Alternative 1 addresses all of those. It will  
13 protect Lewis County. I'm not going to lie. That makes  
14 me happy. But it will also reduce flooding in Montesano,  
15 Aberdeen and Cosmopolis.

16 Alternative 4 does none of that. In fact,  
17 Alternative 4 would reduce flooding at my house by 1.2  
18 inches. So instead of six feet, I have . . . I didn't  
19 do very good at math at Aberdeen. But it's still six  
20 feet if we round up. Alternative 4 doesn't protect the  
21 people of the Basin. It moves people out of the Basin up  
22 onto the hill.

23 There's a reason we don't farm on hills. It's  
24 because the soil is not prime for agricultural use. It  
25 is estimated that it will cost 1.6 billion to buy the

1 land, the 21,000 acres it's estimated to take, for  
2 Alternative 4. That's at assessed value. You also have  
3 to take forest resource land. Both agriculture and  
4 forest resource land is artificially low when it comes to  
5 the assessed value. That's because the government wants  
6 to encourage people to go with their current use. If  
7 they're going to take this land, they're going to do it  
8 at market value. It's fair to say your 1.6 billion now  
9 becomes 3.2, if not higher. And I think that that's  
10 something that you have to look at.

11 Alternative 1 addresses the fish issue. It actually  
12 makes a marked increase to the fish runs. And I think  
13 that that is something that you have to look at.  
14 Alternative 1 does the most good for the most people.

15 When I came into office, I wanted to make sure we  
16 had a Basin-wide solution. Alternative 1 protects my  
17 family and it protects my family and friends here in  
18 Grays Harbor. And I encourage you to support  
19 Alternative 1. Thank you.

20 MS. SANT: Did Dan get back?

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Not yet.

22 MS. SANT: Okay. How about Rodney Youckton.  
23 And then following Rodney will be Kris Wilson.

24 MR. YOUCKTON: Good evening, everybody. Rodney  
25 Youckton. Just getting over a cold so I'll speak as loud

1 as I can. But like John Secena, I'm a Chehalis Tribal  
2 Member as well. My father, Mel Youckton, he's a local  
3 resident his whole life, including my grandfather,  
4 Clarence Youckton; on the Quinault side, my mother, Stevi  
5 Capoeman along with my grandparents Joseph, Theresa  
6 Capoeman.

7 It's a - the rivers are our lifelines. And how do  
8 we protect our lifelines? When the dam comes in, what  
9 happens to all of our communities that are struggling to  
10 have these different lifelines that protect us, that  
11 nourish us, give us our daily bread, our daily hope of  
12 what's happening to us?

13 I just feel that we need to have further discussions  
14 to talk about the different alternatives that's going to  
15 benefit the people, the salmon, steelhead, whatever it  
16 may be that's out there.

17 To me, the Youckton family, Chehalis Tribe, we're  
18 opposed to this Alternative 1. Thank you.

19 MS. SANT: And following Kris, Clarinda  
20 Underwood.

21 MR. WILSON: Hello. My name is Kris Wilson. I  
22 was born in Grays Harbor. I'm a forester, angler, white  
23 water kayaker. The river is pretty important to me. And  
24 a lot of people have talked about some things that -  
25 already that I was going to hit on. I'd like to look at

1 a couple different things maybe haven't been mentioned.

2 One is I saw climate change was mentioned a lot in  
3 the presentation. Now I'm not going to sit here and be a  
4 climate change denier or whatever. But a few events in a  
5 30-year span do not constitute a new norm in a geological  
6 moment.

7 Secondly, we talk about the economic impact to Lewis  
8 County and Centralia, Chehalis and flooding there.  
9 That's a total bummer. But the river's been there a long  
10 time and you chose to build there. If you want to get  
11 down to dollars and sense, our economy is directly tied  
12 to fish runs here.

13 And selling a dam as fish enhancement is absolutely  
14 ridiculous. I've never met a salmon - no salmon ever  
15 thought life got easier because a dam went in. Why not  
16 do some enhancement without the dam? I think there's  
17 things that can be done to help flooding.

18 I'm not necessarily for Option 4 either. I don't  
19 want to displace people's families. I don't want to buy  
20 people's land when they're forced to sell. I would be  
21 far more in favor of doing nothing than doing a dam or  
22 forcing people to leave their homes.

23 I think there's a lot of other middle ground, things  
24 that can be done. And I think we need to look at those  
25 things awfully hard. Thank you.

1 MS. SANT: Hi. Clarinda?

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.

3 MS. SANT: Great. And following Clarinda,  
4 Heather Walker.

5 MS. UNDERWOOD: Hi, everybody. I'm shaking in  
6 my shoes. Maybe you might not tell, but I am, and it's a  
7 hard thing for me to come up and speak to you. But my  
8 name is Clarinda Underwood. I'm from the Quinault Indian  
9 Nation. I am on the Council for our business committee.  
10 However, what I say here does not reflect anything for my  
11 Council and my governing body.

12 I just want to state the fact that I am a Quinault  
13 Tribal Member, just like the Chehalis Tribal Members. I  
14 am also part Chehalis. I can tell you some other Indians  
15 that I am, too, maybe five more. But I'm just saying I'm  
16 a Quinault Tribal Member.

17 My middle son was a Chehalis River fisherman. He  
18 worked even at the fish house there right there by  
19 Q-Mart 2. So he also fishes in the ocean. But as  
20 fishermen, as - I have grew up to watch people. We've  
21 had smokehouses and, you know, the traditions that we've  
22 had has all been surrounded around fish. And it's  
23 important to my people. It's important. It's been  
24 important to my grandparents and their grandparents. And  
25 I am seeing it happening with my own child that fish

1 means everything to them.

2 And I just want to also say that I cannot see a dam,  
3 you know, being built. We've been tearing dams down  
4 because of the harm that they've been doing to our fish,  
5 like the lower Elwha Dam. And why do we do that? It's  
6 because it's harming fish. And so my - my say on this is  
7 the restorative alternative. And I just believe that the  
8 State of Washington should help us and be able to fix  
9 both problems with Alternative 4, the restorative  
10 alternative.

11 And I'm really happy to be here to speak on behalf  
12 of my family, especially my family. And I have a lot of  
13 cousins fishing on that Chehalis River. And it means  
14 everything to me. And I just know that if we work  
15 together on this, you know, we have shared values, shared  
16 waters. And I appreciate you listening to me tonight.  
17 Thank you very much.

18 MS. SANT: And following Heather will be  
19 Al Zepp.

20 MS. WALKER: Good evening. My name is Heather  
21 Walker, and I'm a Chehalis Tribal Member. I live in  
22 Olympia, Washington. Rodney Youckton is my father. So  
23 he's already told you my family's been here since time  
24 immemorial. And archeologically speaking, we've been  
25 documented here for over 10,000 years, but we've been

1 here much longer because our people were created from  
2 this place for this place.

3 And I'm here to speak for myself from my heart to  
4 say that I adamantly oppose having a dam on the Chehalis  
5 River. Not only that, I have two other points that I  
6 need to make because I have several issues with the this  
7 EIS because it does not provide enough information to be  
8 able to make an informed decision by anyone. It looks  
9 impressive when it's over 1,300 pages. But it really  
10 doesn't say a whole lot.

11 In the Executive Summary on page 20, it says that  
12 there will be impacts to tribal resources, that it will  
13 occur, to our traditional cultural practices which we've  
14 heard a lot of tonight. And I'm just here to remind the  
15 makers and the decision makers, the ones that made this  
16 EIS, that under Article 6 of the Constitution, it says  
17 that agreements with tribes are the supreme law of the  
18 land and any adverse impact to Indian people, which also  
19 transfers to all of the other people around the Chehalis  
20 Basin, it's unacceptable.

21 As agents of government, there is a fiduciary  
22 responsibility to uphold the federal trust  
23 responsibility. And I do not see that anywhere in the  
24 EIS. Not only that, but also in the Executive Summary  
25 and throughout the entire EIS, it says that the cultural

1 and historic properties were not evaluated. And without  
2 such, an economic evaluation cannot be done. All of the  
3 numbers that we saw up here are garbage because it  
4 doesn't mean anything because all of the information was  
5 not presented there. So it does not take into account  
6 the 250 archaeological sites that are along the Chehalis  
7 River. It doesn't take into account the traditional  
8 cultural places that matter, where my family has been  
9 gathering their traditional resources since time  
10 immemorial. It doesn't talk about the mitigation that  
11 would have to be done in order to mitigate what would be  
12 done in these type of scenarios.

13 So none of the alternatives provide enough  
14 information. And to put this out there and have people  
15 make decisions based on this is completely unacceptable.  
16 And those are my words I have for you tonight.

17 MR. ZEPP: My name is Al Zepp. I farm down in  
18 Elma. I own a large farm. Been there all my life. And  
19 I want to thank these folks for spending so much time and  
20 our good-earned tax dollars for putting this together and  
21 having us all here. It's a good discussion.

22 Now where do you start? Now there's a lot of folks  
23 here against the dam. And I'm for it and I'm going to  
24 tell you why, several reasons. But in 1990, I was  
25 working in that watershed and that was one of the first.

1 We had '72 was a big one. '90 was a big one. '96 was a  
2 good one. 2007 was just as good. I've lived in  
3 that . . . My home - I'm not in a flood zone. I'm in a  
4 floodway. I own miles of river frontage. No one in this  
5 room sees as much water as I do.

6 And I really appreciate the Chehalis Tribe being  
7 here tonight. I've known the Youcktons. I know Mel.  
8 I'm disappointed with your position. I'd like to know a  
9 little more why this is hurting the fish. When I read  
10 through their thing and looked at it - I'm just a farmer;  
11 I'm from the seat of a tractor - it doesn't look like  
12 it's hurting the fish that bad. So I don't understand  
13 their position.

14 When I look at this thing . . . And I was in that  
15 flood event. They want to build the dam. I was working  
16 there in 1990. And I'll tell you what, when it started  
17 raining that day, you know, one of my truck drivers come  
18 in and said, "We need to get out of here." I'm not  
19 kidding you. We worked until about noon and you could  
20 barely get back to Chehalis. It was like being in Tahola  
21 - or not Tahola - like being in Amanda Park or the rain  
22 forest when it rains hard for an hour or so, for several  
23 hours straight. When those storms - they just dump.

24 Where these folks have done their diligence, that's  
25 not going to solve all the flooding issues. But it's one

1 area - that dam retention in that area . . . And I'm for  
2 a retaining dam because I'm a farmer and I think we need  
3 the water when we need it. That's a whole nother issue  
4 what dam we build if we ever build one.

5 But the whole thing is if you could have been in  
6 that, it's unbelievable. And it's been a problem in all  
7 those floods I listed, that area, whether it came in and  
8 landed on a bunch of snow that was sitting there or  
9 whether it came in for whatever reason and stalled.  
10 That's why they're looking at it so hard.

11 I thought we were past a lot of the fish issues I'm  
12 hearing here tonight. I am disappointed. Because the  
13 Puyallup Valley wouldn't be there. There's a lot of  
14 little mickey mouse valleys up around the town of  
15 Pacific. Those dams were built in the '30s for Christ's  
16 sake. We don't have engineers that couldn't build this  
17 now that would last two to three hundred years. We need  
18 a problem for our kids and our grandkids. This thing  
19 gets built, I'll be dead and gone. It isn't about me.  
20 It isn't about anybody in this room. We're talking  
21 generations out.

22 Option 1 is the only one. 2 and 3 are band-aids. 4  
23 is not legal. You couldn't do it in a million years.  
24 It's not . . . The Growth Management Act . . . Sorry,  
25 folks. There's just no way you could do Option 4. You'd

1 have so much - it would be a nightmare. So it's 1 or  
2 none. Build the damn dam or just take the money, put it  
3 in education. We're short on education. These folks can  
4 go help those folks. Forget it. And just quit pissing  
5 our money away - pardon my French - and do something.

6 MS. SANT: Are you Dan?

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: No. I was just . . .

8 MS. SANT: You'd like to sign up. Is Dan back  
9 in the room yet, Dan Wood? Would you like to come up,  
10 sir?

11 MR. WOOD: Sure. I apologize. I went to get a  
12 sound system.

13 MS. SANT: Thank you so much for trying.

14 MR. WOOD: But sounds like we don't need it.  
15 I'm Dan Wood. I'm speaking as an individual. I live  
16 here in Montesano. I lived in Brady during the '07 and  
17 the '09 floods. And I have had - I lived in a house that  
18 was put there a hundred years ago and that didn't flood  
19 to the degree that it flooded - has flooded recently.  
20 And there are parts of the property that had not flooded  
21 before I'm told. Of course, those were the people  
22 selling me the property.

23 And my family evacuated. I stayed in the house.  
24 And I had four feet of water around my house. It was a  
25 four-foot-eight-inch foundation so it didn't get into the

1 house because it had been elevated after a previous  
2 flood, from the '96 flood. And so I have lived through  
3 the impact of a flood.

4 I also when I was at Farm Bureau years ago hired a  
5 videographer to go into Lewis County after that flooding.  
6 And we did documentation of people where folks in the  
7 city had a log come through their house. Folks out in  
8 the country had entire - an entire dairy herd - several  
9 had entire dairy herds perish in that flood. And in  
10 fact, realized afterwards after seeing the footage -  
11 didn't notice at the time - but there were still dairy  
12 cows that were hanging on the fence line.

13 Saw nurseries and other plant farms wiped out. And  
14 the aerial views of the Chehalis area looked like . . .  
15 I've asked folks, "Where do you think this happened?"

16 And they said, "That must be Katrina."

17 "No. It was in the city."

18 And so whether it's the cities or the farms or  
19 whatever, the floods are devastating. And the reports  
20 are saying if we don't do something, it's going to get  
21 worse. So doing nothing, in my view, is not an option.  
22 Just protecting I-5, in my view, is not an option because  
23 that leaves the rest of the area vulnerable.

24 What I see as Alternative 1 gives us the opportunity  
25 for controlling too much water at times and making sure

1 we have enough water for fish at other times. And the  
2 enhancements I think are going to be good for fish. If  
3 it's not enough, we need to go back and fix that.

4 I heard a number of you speak about treaty rights.  
5 Those treaty rights have to be honored. And if that  
6 isn't in this Alternative 1, then more work needs to be  
7 done to do that. So my encouragement is to move forward  
8 with Alternative 1 but fix it in the process. Let's fix  
9 it now so that everything's taken care of. Thank you.

10 MS. SANT: Next up is Travis Torset.

11 MR. TORSET: Hello. My name is Travis Torset.  
12 I reside in Pacific County now, but I moved here six  
13 years ago from Skagit County, which also has a lot of  
14 issues with floods. And I think that building a dam is  
15 not the solution whatsoever. The amount of damage that  
16 would be done to the culture, the Native American culture  
17 alone, is enough to rule it out 100 percent, in my  
18 opinion.

19 The farmlands that would be affected with buying  
20 everyone out, I don't think that's a solution either. I  
21 think much more work needs to be done in discovering  
22 other ideas because the ones that are being proposed, I  
23 can't stand behind any of them without further cultural  
24 consideration to be taken. It just infuriates me, the  
25 thought of the damage that would be done to the

1 archaeological sites and . . . I guess that's about all  
2 I have.

3 MS. SANT: So I've called everybody up who's  
4 signed up to testify. Is there anybody else at this  
5 point in time that would like to come up and provide  
6 testimony?

7 Why don't you come on up, sir. We'll get you signed  
8 in and get you started. Anybody else? Because after -  
9 if I don't have folks signed up, then I'll formally close  
10 out the meeting. So I just want to make sure you have an  
11 opportunity to provide testimony if you'd like to.

12 Need to just put your name on there so I can just  
13 have it for the record.

14 This is Jay. Thank you so much, Jay.

15 MR. GORDON: My name is Jay Gordon. I'm a  
16 farmer. I get to watch Al Zepp's house flood. My  
17 family's been here 145 years, not as many as you, but  
18 it's seventh generation. I understand this valley not as  
19 well as tribes, never will. But I understand that as a  
20 farmer, my grandfather worked and was at a meeting that  
21 he talked about until the day he died after the '33 and  
22 the '34 floods where the community had a vote on building  
23 levees on the Chehalis and the vote was about 36 to 30 to  
24 not build the levees.

25 So for 85 years now, at least my family and this

1 valley has had a contentious fight about what do we do,  
2 whether it's local . . . Some of you remember the idea  
3 of let's dredge the hump at Chehalis and send the water  
4 down on us in the lower valley. Corps of Engineers spent  
5 \$18 million building a levee project around Chehalis and  
6 Centralia. It had eight holes in it. And they admitted  
7 in a meeting that some places the levee was over the '07  
8 flood and some places it was under the '07 flood.

9 I'm on the Governor's Work Group, proud to have  
10 served with the people, Junior, Don, Dave before him,  
11 Jay Vander Stoep.

12 Governor Gregoire brought a diverse group of us  
13 together and said, "You all have to agree. But you need  
14 to get past the fighting, forgetting, flooding, fighting,  
15 forgetting and flooding."

16 And these meetings it's been an honor to be part of.  
17 I guess a couple points that came out today, we put a lot  
18 of work in at the Governor's Work Group, at the Flood  
19 Authority. When we started, we uncovered 830 studies in  
20 this Basin. We've done a lot more. We don't have enough  
21 information in there? I appreciate hearing that.

22 Look at the do nothing option. Climate change says  
23 Spring Chinook is extinct in 20 years if we do nothing.  
24 That would be horrible. We have one of the last really  
25 unfettered Spring Chinook runs, no hatcheries. May be

1       some native genetics there to work with. Why can't we  
2       have a Chehalis Chinook on the tail of an Alaskan  
3       Airlines plane? We have a Basin that has the opportunity  
4       to produce a lot more fish.

5               This plan, as you heard early, is about reducing  
6       flooding and improving fish. And I give my neighbor Don  
7       - give my neighbor a lot of credit. He pointed that out,  
8       said it's gotta be more fish not less fish and less  
9       damage from the floods. We're not trying to stop the  
10       floods.

11              But if you look at climate change - and we've  
12       listened to the best that we can - we can look at the  
13       last 25 years since 1990. Five years five floods does  
14       not make a trend, but reasonable people would pay  
15       attention to five floods and say, "We get a 100-year  
16       flood every seven years. Maybe we have enough  
17       information upon which to act."

18              There are dams in the Chehalis Basin. There's one  
19       on the Wynooche and there's one on the Skookumchuck  
20       that's not mentioned. This dam, if it impairs fisheries,  
21       if it impairs tribal values, it will not happen.

22              MS. SANT: Jay, you're close on time.

23              MR. GORDON: We'll try and find another one,  
24       another alternative. But doing nothing means we have  
25       more flooding. My farmers, my neighbors, pick up

1           and . . . I don't know. We have less fish, I don't want  
2           that either. So we can't just say no. I mean we can.  
3           That's why we evaluated the option. Thank you.

4                       MS. SANT: Next up is Heather Rea.

5                       MS. REA: Hi. My name is Heather Rea. I live  
6           in Elma. When I was 16, the house I lived in was  
7           flooded, and it was a pretty devastating event. So I do  
8           have the compassion for people who are impacted by flood  
9           damage.

10                      But it seems like we are always creating damage and  
11           trying to mitigate damage and creating damage and trying  
12           to mitigate damage. I mean down in Chehalis, they just  
13           built a Wal-Mart in the floodplain on a big island. And  
14           how much water does that displace? Why are we talking  
15           about having new development in the floodplain at all?  
16           You know. Mistakes were made.

17                      We need to change the way we think about it. The  
18           river needs to flood to be healthy, to deposit sediment.  
19           And when you slow a river down with a dam, it does  
20           increase sedimentation. That's what we see on the  
21           Skokomish a lot of times. I've heard from people that  
22           live there that the riverbed has risen several feet from  
23           its original elevation. And then the river can't carry  
24           the water down.

25                      So I think that a dam is . . . You know, I'm not

1 personally against a dam. I think that when tribal  
2 people say they're against the dam, we should listen to  
3 them. I don't think it is a real alternative. I think  
4 it's just something we came up with because we feel like  
5 we can do it.

6 Can we do the things that are going to really  
7 matter, like restore most of the Basin to its original  
8 functioning old-growth forest state that can hold water,  
9 that will put water back into the atmosphere, will  
10 prevent sedimentation, which is a major contribution to  
11 flooding?

12 I just ask maybe that we can start to look at things  
13 in a different way, living with the river rather than how  
14 can we fix the damage that we intend to do to it. Thank  
15 you.

16 MS. SANT: All right. That's the last of  
17 anybody that's signed up to testify. Is there anybody  
18 else? This will be your last opportunity before I close  
19 the hearing?

20 MR. DIER: Sure.

21 MS. SANT: All right. Come on up. Go ahead and  
22 sign in just real quick there so I have your name for the  
23 record.

24 MR. DIER: All right. So mine name is Brady  
25 Dier. I live in Hoquiam. I work both in the city of

1           Montesano forest and the Hoquiam watershed. And what I'm  
2           hearing a lot is that we have two sets of choices or a  
3           set of choices that either people find one or the other  
4           repugnant. So when reasoning on that level of this  
5           choice is repugnant, this one isn't, try to keep in mind  
6           what values may be destroyed in each alternative.

7                     Alternative 4 we seem to think is repugnant because  
8           we would displace families that have moved in there, have  
9           tried to live their life there the way they would like  
10          to. But also under Alternative 1 with the flood  
11          retention facility, we're going to be wiping out cultural  
12          resources, cultural artifacts that - a little bit more  
13          ancient.

14                    So when considering these alternatives as repugnant,  
15          try to keep things in respective - or perspective rather.  
16          Thank you.

17                    MS. SANT: Anybody else change their mind?  
18          Okay. Are you sure? Okay. Now I have to go back to the  
19          script a little bit. Okay. All testimony received at  
20          this hearing as well as the hearing that was held last  
21          week in Chehalis, along with all written comments  
22          received at the hearing by mail or submitted online, will  
23          be a part of the official record for the draft  
24          environmental review.

25                    The comment period on this draft EIS closes on

1 November 14th, 2016. If you would like to send written  
2 comments, please remember that they must be postmarked by  
3 November 14, 2016. Please send them to the Chehalis  
4 Basin Strategy EIS, care of Anchor QEA at 720 Olive Way,  
5 Suite 1900, Seattle, Washington, 98104.

6 Written comments may also be submitted online to  
7 info@chehalisbasinstrategy.com.

8 The next steps are for the Department of Ecology to  
9 consider all the comments and prepare a final SEPA EIS.  
10 Comments received on the draft EIS will be included in  
11 the final EIS along with responses. If necessary,  
12 additional studies may be prepared for the final EIS.  
13 The final EIS is expected to be released in 2017.

14 On behalf of the Department of Ecology, thank you so  
15 much for coming. We appreciate your cooperation and  
16 courtesy.

17 Please let the record show that this hearing is  
18 adjourned at 7:53 p.m. Thank you.

19 (Concluded.)

20

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, CONNIE CHURCH, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, residing at Montesano, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were reported by me and thereafter reduced to a typed format under my direction; that the transcript is a full, true and complete transcript of said proceedings;

That I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any party to this action, or relative or employee of any such attorney or counsel, and I am not financially interested in the said action or the outcome thereof;

That upon completion, the original transcript will be securely sealed and served upon the appropriate party.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 31st day of October, 2016.

Connie Church



CONNIE CHURCH  
CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER  
CCR #2555