Jami Lund

Summary says:
the project would reduce flooding in the basin but with climate change, flood risks would persist during extreme conditions in the mid and late century. The analysis also found that the project would place additional burdens on salmon and other aquatic species and their habitat, even with the fish passage and other mitigation measures. Over the last century, salmon populations in the Chehalis basin have declined due to a variety of factors including habitat loss, increased water temperatures and low stream flows.

The project could also affect archeological sites and cultural resources for nearby Tribes.

My comments:

I'm reluctant to believe that your speculation about late century conditions are reliable.
Even if they are, mitigation of the flooding at so low of an environmental cost is likely worth it.
The value of making more land productive and useful for positive things related to human flourishing weighs heavier than the speculation.

Regarding fish, your own analysis suggests declines absent this structure. It is likely that preventing massive earth relocation in spawning streams is among the actual causes for poor fish runs. Add to that predation (unaddressed by the state), fish passage correction by removing culvertys (also unaddressed by the state), excess takes from tribes/sportsmen/commercial, and it seems the fish runs are impacted by factors independent of a rare seasonal water retention facility.

Is "COULD affect archeological sites" a hat-tip to tribes who are invited to veto any action on flood mitigation? Again, silting out areas with customary practices and obfuscating heritage artifacts seems an equal or even greater threat if flooding isn't managed.

It seems that the value of keeping topsoil in its current habitat-enhancing locations is a value which hasn't been factored in. What is the consequence to running topsoil downstream and ultimately into the sea? Preventing these kinds of flood events have environmental values which aren't being factored in. Likewise, surface toxicity being more likely to find its way into streams during flooding events. Has the facility been credited with saving environmental factors such as these, or are you only working to identify speculative negatives?

I think the facility holds promise and should not be halted by the speculation of the report.