

Fish Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes

Date: January 21, 2020

Place: Association of Washington Cities, Olympia, Washington

Summary: Agenda items with formal action

Item	Formal Action
Meeting notes from December 2019	Approved
Extend invitation to NWIFC for two tribal positions	Approved

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
Contract language allowing use of remaining funding for repair/maintenance if project still open and funding remains	Dave Caudill will provide language for consideration
Idea of developing a third type of barrier removal package	Subcommittee met to discuss; Matt has funding to hire a 6-month position to work on identifying potential barriers for a package
Summary of projects submitted to the Board from the RFP	Matt will send summary to Board members

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
Dave Collins, WDFW	Iris Kemp, LLTK
Steve Helvey, GeoEngineers	Cade Roler, WDFW
Christy Rains, WDFW	Julie Grobelny, WDFW
Gabrielle Stilwater, WDFW	John Aslakson, public
Matt Miskovic, KPFF	

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review: Meeting started at 9:00. Facilitator Neil Aaland reviewed the agenda. Tom introduced Gabrielle Stilwater, who will be in charge of rule writing for fish passage and screening. Matt introduced Julie Graboney, a new scoping biologist.

Public Comment: No public comment was offered.

Old Business

Meeting notes: The meeting notes for the December meeting were approved.

Other Updates from Chair

- Tom said he and Kaleen Cottingham will be interviewed this Saturday by Dick Pust, a local Olympia broadcaster

- 70 bill analyses were done by the habitat division so far for the legislative session, which is in its first week. Last week a fish passage information session was held in the House. DFW, DOT, AWC, WSAC, and GSRO provided information. Tom said Carl mentioned the challenge in getting funding for inventories. Jane gave the same message for counties, briefed on county inventory status. 75% of cities in the case are now done. Counties are not near as complete, need another \$1 million or so to complete.
- Tom mentioned several bills of interest to the FBRB, HB 2503 and HB 2549.

Report on Approval of new PSP Near Term Action

Christy Rains provided this information. The request was submitted a year ago to the Puget Sound Partnership. There are three phases. Phase I is gathering and digitizing corrected stream locations in Puget Sound, have over 20 years of data. Phase II is providing Dept. of Ecology Updates to National Hydrography Dataset (NHD). Phase III is to create a new prioritization tool for Fish Passage web map. Joe noted that DNR has an EPA grant to get alignment of their data determining the end of fish use in streams. It's a pilot over the next two years, Klickitat and Kittitas counties.

Report from Ad Hoc Subcommittee: Other Potential Funding Packages

Neil mentioned the FBRB has been discussing for several meetings the idea of having a different type of funding package for barrier corrections, in addition to the watershed and coordinated pathways. Tom said last session the Board's strategy was being commented on. He noted there is another desktop exercise going on at WDFW to look at chinook prey species. They are creating an inventory of all known barriers to Chinook, not a prioritized list. Matt thinks they have funding to have person do this additional work for the FBRB. This would look at publicly owned barriers. He needs to write up a position description and do hiring.

Hood Canal Bridge Issue

Iris Kemp from Long Live the Kings presented this topic (see PPT). She provided a timeline of the Ecosystem Impact Assessment Plan. This occurs over 4 years at a cost of \$2.2 million. Phase I goals include water quality, Steelhead mortality, and one other. She reviewed the initial hypothesis and then explained how the bridge serves as a barrier. Fish use the top of the water column when they migrate out to sea. When the bridge is encountered, it is seen as a concrete wall. They move back and forth seeking an opening and during this time are open to predation. 83 to 85% of mortalities show a "deep dive" behavior. This probably means they were eaten, and the dives are by the predators. Most get eaten by warm-blooded predators. In phase II of the work they'd like to consider potential impacts to other salmonids, assessing the bridge's impacts to chinook and chum.

Near-term solutions to reduce mortality are needed, such as putting "rounded edges" on the t-shaped structures on the bridge. Consider long-term solutions that replace or significantly alter the bridge. Current status: phase 1 reporting and phase 2 planning; \$275,000 supplemental budget request

Questions and comments included:

- Are pontoon modifications being considered? [as part of long-term solutions discussion]
- Cade noted nothing is being done for predator control right now
- Are any additional studies of adults migrating into Hood Canal? [No, they have a proposal to tag returning chum]
- John Foltz asked about a timeline for replacing the bridge [Paul said about half was replaced 10 years ago; there is regular maintenance of the opening mechanism]
- Tom noted we're funding barrier removals in the system and the bridge is a partial barrier
- Do any tribes have the right to harvest seals? [not aware of any]

- Is NWIFC aware of this issue? [LLTK has worked with Port Gamble S’Klallam, and Jamestown S’Klallam is aware]
- Matt noted the issue of “rounding the corners” and wonders about funding for design – have they thought about costs? [They’ve asked a consulting firm currently under contract to look at that]
- John Foltz asked if we’re supporting their legislative requests [Tom is interested in the “rounding of the corners” proposal, Board is open to helping improve passage around bridge]
- Paul says this is a significant problem but wonders about the fit with Board responsibilities
- John is supportive of this work; scale and timing need to be addressed

Break was taken from 11:05 – 11: 20.

Expanding Board Membership

Tom explained there was legislative interest in addition western Washington tribes to the Board. The Board has previously added members, including the Council of Regions as a voting member and NOAA as a non-voting member. When the Board was formed in 2014, an overture was made to NWIFC to be a member. They declined at that time. During this current legislative session there has been some interest through Rep. Lekanoff (Skagit County). She’s indicated two western tribes want to join. It’s important to note the Board cannot decide specific individuals but can offer positions to governments or organizations.

Comments and questions:

- Paul remembers offering a position to NWIFC at the beginning
- Joe asked if the proposal would be made to the NWIFC? [Yes, they would be asked to provide names of two members from two different tribes along with alternates]
- This will increase required quorum from 5 to 6
- Would be important to have someone familiar with salmon restoration projects

A motion was made by Jon Brand to have the chair of FBRB invite the NWIFC to designate two tribal representatives (and alternates) from two different tribes to become voting members of the FBRB. Dave Caudill seconded. The motion was approved unanimously. John Foltz asked that the letter to the NWIFC capture the discussion about members helping with the success of the Board’s tasks.

Lunch break: A 15-minute break was taken from 12:05 – 12:20.

Summary of RFP Results

Matt presented this topic. He said the deadline brought down their server. They have not yet reviewed all the submittals but have looked at 87 with another 9-12 remaining to clarify with applicants. There is a good mix of city, county, and private culverts. The majority are culvert projects. The total funding requested will be between \$50-\$75 million. He can send out a summary to the Board. Cade noted that there are some lessons learned, will be suggesting some changes for next time. The WDFW team will continue to review and do eligibility check. Matt asked at what level is the Board comfortable with asking for funding. Board comments indicate they’d be comfortable with the full amount requested. Once the review is done, staff will ask for full applications – due by May 15.

Upcoming Opportunities for Engagement

None noted.

Discussion Topics

Matt had several items he wanted to discuss with the Board.

1. Can the Board approve funds for project repair or maintenance? This is brought up by the Newaukum project. After recent completion, several storms came through and caused damage. They had some funding left over, so they are wondering if the leftover funding could be used to

repair damage. Cade thinks this makes sense on a project by project basis where funding is left over.

Board comments included:

- Joe wants to check what the contract says
 - Jeannie said the use of capitol funds can be tricky around these kinds of issues; might need to look at the appropriation language
 - Tom added that he asked Paul how DOT handles this; they don't consider a project complete until the first winter is over
 - Dave noted that so many things can happen
 - Joe thinks this is simple since the project is not closed and there is still funding; we'll need to be clear about this in future contracts
 - The Board contracts right now do not address this kind of situation
 - Dave Caudill will provide some example language to the Board around this issue
2. Where does the Board draw the line on funding required project elements that fall outside of fish passage improvements? There is a potential project for a dam removal. The dam also provides intake for local jurisdiction water supply; if removed two new wells would be needed.
- Dave thinks the question is does this need to occur to get passability
 - Joe says can't remove the dam without the wells; it's different if it's "nice to do" versus the project won't happen
 - Matt wonders if staff can decide what to include in an application or if the Board needs to decide
 - Joe would like to see these if they're relatively infrequent
3. Does the Board want to move 17-19 funds to alternates now on the funded 19-21 project list? Tom has approved this type of funding twice. Dave Caudill talked with RCO's CFO; must go in order of the LEAP list. Tom is comfortable with doing this, but question is how long can we wait – how long to make the decision? Cade would like to wait for one more construction season before this funding is moved; Dave suggested working with individual project managers.

The meeting adjourned at 1:25 pm.

Next meeting: Tuesday, February 18, 2019