

Fish Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes

Date: February 18, 2020

Place: Association of Washington Cities, Olympia, Washington

Summary: Agenda items with formal action

Item	Formal Action
Meeting notes from December 2019	Approved with corrections
Meeting notes from January 2020	Approved

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
Issue of eligibility of dams – what does a correction look like?	Schedule another discussion
Potential staff needs if a larger funding package is approved	Discuss with RCO and work on a staff funding request
Issue of requiring post-completion inspections	Look at including such a requirement in the contracts for new projects

Board Members/Alternates Present:

Matt Curtis, WDFW	Dave Caudill, RCO
Jon Brand, WSAC	Jeannie Abbott, GSRO
John Foltz, COR (phone)	Paul Wagner, DOT
Tom Jameson, Chair, WDFW	Casey Baldwin, Colville Tribe (phone)

Others present at meeting:

Neil Aaland, Facilitator	Gina Piazza, WDFW
Alison Hart, WDFW	Kim Marshall, WDFW
Steve Helvey, GeoEngineers	Cade Roler, WDFW
Christy Rains, WDFW	Julie Grobelny, WDFW
Gabrielle Stilwater, WDFW	David Blue, Chinook Habitat

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review: Meeting started at 9:00. Facilitator Neil Aaland reviewed the agenda.

Public Comment: No public comment was offered.

Old Business

Meeting notes: The meeting notes for the December meeting were approved with corrections; the January meeting notes were approved as submitted.

Third funding package: Matt has found funding for a position, written a draft position description, and is waiting for internal approval. He thinks it will be about two months to receive approval.

Updates from Chair

- Tom said he and Kaleen Cottingham were interviewed by Dick Pust, a local Olympia broadcaster; will be broadcast around February 23rd by KXXO radio in Olympia.
- Legislative update: the budget proviso from last year is still alive (the one initiated by Joe Mentor and Will Stelle). He mentioned 2503, initiated by Reps. Barkhuis and Walsh. This puts Board in the coordination role dealing with case are corrections. Rep. Lekanoff re-started the proviso. Initially it appeared dead, but yesterday it may have come back to life. Tom is not sure this gives

the Board any advantage in its mission. Paul thinks the idea is to have DOT provide a list of barriers to the Board and get back a list that DOT will work on. This could cause problems with meeting the injunction requirements.

- Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (NWIFC) invitation: Tom summarized the request to NWIFC. He sent the invitation letter on January 28; has received no official response. He got a request from John Hollowood with NWIFC asking for contact information for tribal representatives currently on the FBRB. Casey has not yet heard from him.
- Rulemaking: Current effort is for fish passage and screening rulemaking, last week they received another assignment to include climate adaptive water crossings. The rulemaking timeline will now likely go into the next biennium.

Responses to RFP – Matt Curtis

Matt showed a powerpoint presentation for this topic. He summarized the applications received. There were 98 total applications, 39 for planning and 59 for restoration projects. This is a large increase over the last RFP. Miscellaneous notes/questions included:

- There is statewide geographic representation
- Chelan and Snohomish areas had the most proposals
- Need to have a policy discussion about whether applicants should be open to alternative designs
- One project (McDonald) proposes improving fish passage but not fully removing the barrier; Matt wonders about the appropriateness of this
 - Cade said they also want to update the screen
 - Casey is reluctant to fund improving a dam and wonders what purpose the dam serves
 - John thinks an alternatives analysis would be helpful; Casey agreed, need to justify why they're not removing the dam
- Naches River project to remove Nelson Dam, a big project with multiple funding sources
 - Asking for \$4 million from FBRB
 - City of Yakima request
 - Tom concerned about blurring the lines with SRFB
 - Casey noted we wanted diversion dams to be eligible; didn't define scale
 - Matt thinks there may be reasons for FBRB to be involved
 - Dave Caudill said manuals don't limit projects to a transportation nexus
- The projects will be ranked and scored by the March FBRB meeting
- Jon thinks the projects should be related to transportation, per the statutes
- Casey noted current eligibility criteria says dams are eligible
- Dave Caudill wonders about only paying for fish passage portion
- Paul said barriers associated with transportation work should be the focus
- John said in the future, the transportation nexus should be reflected in scoring; it's still fair for FBRB to consider other barriers but shouldn't make other projects ineligible
- Paul suggested asking them to parse out the fish passage component; others agreed

Break was taken from 10:45 – 11: 00. Discussion then continued.

- Berwick Creek is a multi-part project with two culverts
 - 1 is 100% passable; other is 67% passable
 - Project consolidates two culverts/access roads into one
 - These two are linked, okay to consider as one project
- Gilliam Creek is a tidegate project with restoration; part of a Puget Sound NTA
 - Casey thinks we're not far enough along in our thinking to address tidegate projects
 - Paul wonders about the fish benefit; doesn't seem to offer much
 - Total removal might be worth it, but that is not this scenario

- Cade mentioned a project on Lyon Creek, where they want to increase the size of the structure – to allow for future bike trails, etc.
- Coal Creek in Bellevue – phase 1 will address flooding problems. Remove controls and build a roughened channel; there is good habitat upstream and Christy noted it is transportation related
- Great Dane Creek in a county park; want to build a roughened channel around a dam within a Snohomish County park. The Muckleshoot tribe wants the dam removed; pond apparently only has an aesthetic purpose. Casey is not supportive of maintaining the dam.
- It was noted there are around 5 tidal crossing projects; WDFW has no guidelines for these. The projects have been sized using bank full width; this is not how we'd like to see them designed
- Regarding guidance for tidally influenced areas, the Board should look to a greater standard
 - Seek to get as much passage as possible; don't have clear standards for now, put in more funding for design

Lunch break: A 10-minute break was taken.

Continued discussion on RFP.

- Cade noted one more project, Chumstick Creek on the Upper Columbia. An alternative design is proposed, wood feature in a channel. He supports the proposal; it saves money and maintains passability. Will maintain the structure's passability.

Final comment from Matt: he wondered whether we should draw a line somewhere based on funding. Board members thought we should go big, request whatever amount we get applications for (after removing ineligible projects). It's important to show the need.

Use of Existing Funding – Dave Caudill and RCO Examples

This discussion started at the previous FBRB meeting with a project that had left over funding and wanted to do some repair; project experienced some storm damage. Dave noted that the RCO contract language does not address this situation. Leftover funding goes back into a general funding pot; alternates can be funded out of that money. Can also fund cost increases or scope changes. Paul noted that his contracts stay open for three years to be sure they function as designed. Christie said there is no formal post-installation monitoring program; she thought at the very least there should be a post-construction visit. For next update of manual, could include a form that provides for post-installation and several other visits, could upload into PRISM. John thinks we could at least require for new project applications.

Engagement with NRCS

Tom presented this topic. It comes from a question that Carl had about coordination with NRCS on potential funding. Tom explained that NRCS has some grant funding for agricultural lands from the farm bill. There is the possibility of funding passage projects. His staff has worked with NRCS for 7 years, has assessed a number of sites. NRCS won't pay for designs, and these designs have been more costly than expected. Tom wants to reduce the number of those projects as a result. He noted that tribes can sponsor projects, either on or off reservation, and they aren't bound to the same project limits as our landowners. He also noted that NRCS came to the last annual case update meeting. Paul noted this seems like a "limitless" potential amount of money, and we need to monitor it.

Upcoming Opportunities for Engagement

FBRB members noted the following opportunities:

- County engineers meeting in June
- Conservation District meeting in June – Leavenworth
- AWC annual meeting in June

Wrap-up/Next Steps

- Tom noted that the proviso will be a focus if it passes
- John suggested working with RCO to address capacity needs related to RFP; may need more staff
- Paul thinks we should return to the discussion on eligibility of dams – what does a correction look like?

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 pm.

Next meeting: Tuesday, March 17, 2019