

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes

Date: April 24, 2015

Place: Governor Hotel, Olympia, Washington

Summary: Agenda items with formal action

Item	Formal Action
Meeting Notes	Approved meeting notes from March 20

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
Request to LEs to prioritize HUC 10s	Julie will send draft to FBRB members for comment and then send to LEs
Draft Workplan	Neil will contact individual members of FBRB and prepare a final draft for review at next meeting

Board Members/Alternates Present/on the phone:

David Price, Chair, WDFW	Donelle Mahan, WDNR
Julie Henning, WDFW	Brian Abbott, GSRO
Paul Wagner, DOT	Carl Schroeder, AWC
Jonalee Squeochs, Yakama Tribe	

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by facilitator Neil Aaland. Neil reviewed the agenda for the day. He then asked Board members and attendees to introduce themselves. A motion was made by David Price to approve the September meeting notes; Paul Wagner seconded. The motion passed unanimously. It was noted that Jon Brand and Gary Rowe had a conflicting meeting and could not attend.

Public Comments: No one present offered comments.

Updates on Legislative Session

Carl Schroeder said they have been working on funding, and there is some in bill 5997. It’s in the same form as discussed at the last meeting. The bill is in House Rules.

Dave Price and several other FBRB members made a presentation to the House Agriculture and Natural Resources committee. The presentation was well received. Committee members seemed surprised at the number of barriers.

Developments on the Statewide Strategy

There are three components of this agenda item. The first one is reviewing the size of a HUC 10 with a Puget Sound focus. There is still some confusion about what a HUC 10 includes. Justin Zweifel from WDFW presented some slides and discussed this topic. He showed a slide of Puget Sound HUC 10s, overlaid with Lead Entity boundaries. There are 120 HUC 10s within the Puget Sound Recovery Region, including Hood Canal.

Questions and comments included:

- The maps of Puget Sound HUC 10s are available from USGS as a shape file
- The maps don’t reflect forest service barriers
- Green dots on the map show pass able streams, red dots have barriers

The next component for discussion is the proposed Puget Sound criteria for selecting HUC 10s, which is the main part of this agenda item. WDFW needs to get comments and approval from the FBRB so it can begin working with Lead Entities (LEs). One potential criteria DFW presented was the possibility of

using escapement data. The relevant of escapement is low numbers could mean there is not a lot of potential for that stream; but it could also mean barriers should be removed. The numbers can tell you if there's a population and how healthy it is. There are limitations to this, the lack of data collected. It's of limited value for scoring criteria but might be of use in allowing entities to choose high priority watersheds in individual project areas.

Cade Roler took over the presentation and this point. He discussed proposed criteria 1 – Intrinsic Potential (IP) model. He reviewed how WDFW has used the model, and showed as an example the Lower Nooksack River. The information for the IP model is available statewide. This doesn't take into account known barriers; that information gets added after HUC 10s are chosen. Some concern was raised that we need to know this before the selection; Julie said we need to get to the HUC 10 level before we can add barriers and other specific stream information. Cade explained how the IP criteria could be scored among multiple HUC 10s and how the percentages could be calculated.

Questions and comments:

- This seems like a reasonable first cut
- The Board might be more interested in the habitat amount than in the percentage; the absolute mounts
- Don't want to disadvantage the large HUC 10s
- Some discussion around not picking focus areas, but putting the strategy on specific sites
 - The Legislature told the FBRB to develop a strategy
 - Carl mentioned the proviso funding is predicated on having the Board help direct funding to appropriate areas
 - Paul is concerned about over-thinking a "grand scheme"
 - Need to be both strategic and opportunistic
- Julie thinks we should circle back to this next month; they'll send out information to LEs providing guidance

Criteria 2: "Shovel ready." Get some sense of how many projects within a HUC 10 have been scope. This presumes all HUCs may have this information available.

Criteria 3: temperature. Dave wondered if this should be a factor, since not a lot of distinction here. Donelle thought there's a little bit of value. Cade suggested this would not be used as a standalone; it's a coarse-scale item used in conjunction with other information.

Criteria 4: Limited impervious surfaces. Some concern from a city's standpoint; most impervious surfaces are in cities. Just be sure having impervious surfaces doesn't exclude too much. Paul thinks at the HUC level probably want more work in lower levels of impervious surfaces; helps inform the whole picture. Dave thought this factor should only be considered when comparing between HUC 10s.

Criteria 5: Steelhead spawning habitat. Idea is to supplement the IP model; this is based on mapped streams. Cade said he would overlay this information on IP and see where they match. FBRB members thought this would be good information.

Criteria 6: Healthy riparian habitat. This is time-intensive, involving fieldwork. It took a week to do this in WRIA 1. It probably would not take as long for others. Would do this on the nominated HUC 10s, not on all. Comments and questions:

- Buffer distance of 150 meters can be adjusted
- Could be a surrogate for temperature and other attributes of stream health
- Could consider doing land use; would pull away from cities
- Areas further up the watershed would score higher
- Dave thought this could overlap with temperature and impervious surface
- This helps inform those criteria
- Perhaps ask for an estimate from LEs – a qualitative narrative

- Is there a coarser scale, such as looking at and use designations?

Conclusions for this discussion: WDFW can move forward with the request to LEs to nominate HUC 10s. Need to think about the “auxiliary on-ramp”, AKA the opportunistic projects. WDFW will send a draft around before sending this to Lead Entities.

The meeting adjourned at noon – several people could not come back after lunch and the group would no longer have a quorum.

The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for May 19, 2015

Others present at meeting:

Neil Aaland, Facilitator	Justin Zweifel, WDFW
Cade Roler, WDFW	Larry Dominguez, WDFW
Marian Berejikian	Cleve Steward, Hart Crowser
Alison Hart, WDFW	