

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes

Date: August 21, 2018

Place: Association of Washington Cities, Olympia, Washington

Summary: Agenda items with formal action

Item	Formal Action
Meeting notes from July	Approved with attendance correction
How to submit the lists to the legislature	Motion approved with several conditions

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
Intertidal barriers	Presentation to FBRB this fall
“Lessons learned” discussion	Schedule for September
Ask regions to explain their priorities	Develop list of questions to ask regions for September meeting

Board Members/Alternates Present:

Tom Jameson, Chair, WDFW	Carl Schroeder, AWC
Paul Wagner, DOT	Dave Caudill, RCO - GSRO
Jon Brand, WSAC	Joe Shramek, DNR
Justin Zweifel, WDFW	Casey Baldwin, CCT
Jane Wall, WSAC	Steve Manlow (phone)

Others present at meeting:

Dave Collins, WDFW	Christy Rains, WDFW
Cade Roler, WDFW	Nathan Falkenburg, WDFW
Gina Piazza, WDFW	Neil Aaland, Facilitator

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review: Meeting started at 9:00. Neil reviewed the agenda. Jon asked that intertidal barriers be discussed at an upcoming meeting. Justin said they were planning a presentation to the Board on that topic this fall.

Public Comment: No comment was offered.

Old Business:

Approval of July meeting notes: moved and seconded to approve with one attendance correction (Steve Manlow was present). Motion passed.

2019-21 Capital budget review: Justin reviewed the final prioritized list. It includes 75 barriers within 60 projects. Total net gain is 156.45 miles. Funding required for all projects is \$26,436,378. It was noted that no match is required for design-only projects less than \$200,000.

The Board discussed the package and the process. Paul thought it was a good process but only a small number of projects and wonders why. Justin said some were received after the deadline; the need is still there. Jane suggested asking for more funding for administration and use that to market the program. Justin said WDFW staff also looked at the 17-19 funding proposal, contacted applicants, and asked if they wanted to re-apply. The ones that said yes are at the bottom of the page as an “alternate” list. WDFW didn’t feel comfortable including them with the other projects since the others did more work to re-apply.

RCO does not want to submit a budget request without a Board-approved project list attached. Carl prefers that the Board ask RCO for a higher amount anyway, and allow RCO to say no.

The Board continued to discuss the request amount. Jane thinks it is not unusual for the legislature to appropriate lump sums. Carl asked if there is an estimate being provided for future biennia needs; that is not included for this submittal. Paul asked about having a continuously open grant round; Justin would like to have that discussion as part of an upcoming “lessons learned” agenda item in September.

Casey asked about providing capacity funding to the regional entities, since the Board is relying on them to vet projects. Jon wonders if the regions are adequately communicating with their implementers. Carl is intrigued with how we prime the pump. Steve Manlow said sponsors do lack capacity to do initial footwork and work with property owners, others. We need to give more attention to this. Steve Manlow said for the last cycle it was really helpful to have WDFW liaison persons to help out.

Tom provided some information about how WDFW is organizing around these issues. Originally, there was going to be a salmon recovery director in the Director’s office, but funding issues came up. WDFW has a \$30 million shortfall they’re trying to manage. He’s not sure about being able to fund regions and lead entities in this way. Steve Manlow is going to tee this up for the next Council of Regions meeting.

Justin asked how lists will be submitted. The Board decided to develop and approve a motion to document this. They decided to request \$50 million in anticipation of more projects coming in and perhaps another grant round. The motion is:

- Move to request \$50 million, including 60 projects and also the 6 bottom (alternate) projects numbers 61-66;
- Include an estimate of funding needs for future biennia as information to the legislature;
- Indicate that the Board plans to use unspent funds for cost increases; and
- Authorize the additional funding to be used for another grant round.

Carl moved, Paul seconded. The motion was approved with the RCO representative abstaining.

A break was taken at 10:45. The Board re-convened at 11:00.

Discuss recommendations to improve fish passage from federal ownership (including funding):
Dave Price was not present, so this item was tabled.

Watershed pathway project updates: Justin discussed the Pilchuck projects, of which 2 are now on indefinite hold. One is a dam owned by a homeowner’s association. Some of the HOA members are unwilling to sign the Landowner Acknowledgement form. Another project is on hold due to a private landowner who wants an HPA and project design for an unrelated project before allowing the barrier correction on his property. There is an upstream barrier on the project list. Stream has coho, steelhead, and cutthroat.

Middle Columbia: all Board-approved projects have now been submitted for funding consideration in the 2019-21 Capital Budget request - more Watershed Pathway projects will need to be identified in the near future.

Upper Columbia: each watershed has their own group for implementing projects. All Board-approved projects have now been submitted for funding consideration in the 2019-21 Capital Budget request - more Watershed Pathway projects need to be identified in the near future.

Snake: switched to Mill Creek.

There are 36 watershed projects still included in the binder. Some watersheds need to put forward another watershed or more projects within their approved watershed as projects are completed. Justin is thinking about having each region come to the FBRB and discuss their priorities. If we do this, Steve Manlow thinks we should come up with some key questions to ask the regions. Have them drafted for the next meeting, then go and invite. Casey thinks this is especially good for areas where the next option is not clear. Carl wonders if it would be better to ask regions to identify more than one watershed; Justin thinks that would be a good discussion.

Orcas: This topic was added at Carl's request. Information in the news media is pointing to Orcas not having enough food, which is salmon. Tom noted that three FBRB members are involved in aspects of the Orca task force. Workgroups include prey availability; vessels; and contaminants. Justin looked at the project list and saw that 14 of 75 barriers that will be corrected benefit chinook, a preferred species for Orcas.

Tom summarized an article from the Puget Sound Institute. A map was included showing the range of Orcas; they go as far south as San Francisco Bay area. The goal is to get a plan to the governor by the end of October. Orcas are on the endangered species list. The article didn't discuss fish passage issues. Tom wants the Board to have this information in case questions are asked. Casey added that if they find some high priority barriers that aren't funded yet, might direct some funding to them. The Board might think about an "emerging priority" category for future grant rounds.

Steve Manlow noted the regions and lead entities have been asked to look at the chinook issue relevant to projects. Might wait to have that process finish before the FBRB does a review, see what comes out of the prey workgroup.

A lunch break was taken at 12:05; the Board re-convened at 12:35.

Review and update workplan: Neil led this discussion and worked from the "workplan tasks" list. For today, he wants to get general discussion on current and future tasks, and then he will come back with proposed revisions to the workplan. Items discussed include:

Bylaws: these were reviewed spring of 2017. A focused revision was adopted earlier this year. Good to reach out to tribes again regarding membership; Tom and Paul could talk with them. Carl not sure it makes sense to work through NWIFC as we did first go-round but think about individual tribes. Casey thinks January might be a good time.

WFPA as member of FBRB: they were very involved in adopting the initial FBRB legislation but haven't indicated a desire to be members. Tom thinks they are going to focus on RMAP.

Prioritization methodology: Justin thinks we might want to re-visit what the Board's priorities are and review the methodology depending on the funding received. Paul wonders about getting a fixed amount of funding and then gear the work toward that. Joe likes "review and refine" since the FBRB is a maturing program.

Information hub: FBRB needs to understand the needs. We also need to be sure WDFW has enough administrative funding to implement the program, including this. Is this part of developing an FBRB website? Discussion indicates this is correct. Neil is to come up with a task description that includes both. Paul would like a broader discussion – here's the issue, some options, etc. Carl agrees that a summary is needed.

Training: there has been some work done, previously by Justin and now Christy Rains is coordinating this. Neil will confer with Christy to understand what is happening. She doesn't think there are any gaps.

DOT: Paul will share with the Board, at an upcoming meeting, information on DOT's plans for barrier corrections.

Local/state mitigation funding availability for barrier corrections: There was an Ecology work group on this headed by Lauren Driscoll. It was determined this is possible but the funding available would be minimal. A bank would need to be set up in every county. This does not seem feasible.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 pm.

Next meeting: Tuesday, September 18, 2018 – Rainier Room, Association of Washington Cities