

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes

Date: March 19, 2019

Place: Association of Washington Cities, Olympia, Washington

Summary: Agenda items with formal action

Item	Formal Action
Meeting notes from January 2019	Approved

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
Flowchart showing watershed and coordinated pathways	Post on FBRB website
Proposed signage for projects	Paul will discuss with DOT sign shop. Staff will look at example of “salmon superhighway” signage in Tillamook, Oregon. This will come back to April meeting
Using remaining funding of \$681,000 for design work for alternates or holding for cost increases	WDFW will reach out to alternates and see if design work is feasible; review at April meeting

Board Members/Alternates Present:

Casey Baldwin, CCT (phone)	Dave Price, NOAA
Jon Brand, WSAC	Joe Shramek, DNR
Dave Caudill, RCO - GSRO	Paul Wagner, DOT
Tom Jameson, Chair, WDFW	Jane Wall, WSAC
Amber Moore, PSP – COR (phone)	Justin Zweifel, WDFW

Others present at meeting:

Neil Aaland, Facilitator	Mike Kaputa, Chelan County
Evan Bauder, Mason County	Greer Maier, UCSRB
Wendy Clark-Getzin, Jefferson County	Aaron Peterson, RFEGs
Dave Collins, WDFW	Christy Rains, WDFW
Brian Combs, SPSEG	Cade Roler, WDFW
Larry Dominguez, KPFF	Loretta Swanson, Mason County
Alison Hart, WDFW	Richard V, USFS
Steve Helvey, GeoEngineers	Steve West, LCFRB

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 January meeting were unanimously approved as submitted.

Legislative update: Justin reviewed a handout showing the differences between the watershed and coordinated pathways. It will be posted on the FBRB website. He also reviewed a handout titled “coordinated fish passage investment strategy” and an agenda from the legislative briefing.

Tom reviewed legislative activity. He is trying to secure funding but getting pushback from the legislature on strategy. For funding, \$50 million requested including an additional \$15 million for future projects. Governor's budget included a total of \$25 million, drawing the line in the middle of project #51. Additionally, last minute cuts from the Governor's office results in cuts to the WDFW administrative costs. He noted that Jane and Carl have been pushing on getting funding for the Board.

Tom handed out and reviewed a white paper prepared by Joe Mentor, an attorney interested in the topic. Joe came down and met with WDFW to discuss an earlier draft of the paper. Tom reviewed the goals on page 14. He noted WDFW thinks there are about 19,000 barriers to salmon and steelhead. He pointed out page 19, task 3 says to provide adequate funding for FBRB program costs. The House is considering adding administrative costs. During the recent legislative work session, some thought the watershed pathway is too slow.

Tom wanted to demonstrate there is a strategy that just needs funding. Legislature is considering a different type of funding – “push” instead of “pull” funding. Not much word yet from the Senate side. There is some thought of moving funding to the transportation budget; Jane thinks moving funding to Public Works Trust Fund is not supported. Casey suggested that people who think the watershed pathway is too slow do not understand what limits the rate of implementation. Also, we designed watershed pathway to be a “push” from regional organizations to FBRB. He thinks it would be a mistake to change the watershed pathway if the change takes away the ability of the salmon recovery regions to implement their priority barrier projects. Dave Price thinks the Mentor paper creates distraction; Chico Creek is a great example of coordination and progress on the watershed approach among partners, including the FBRB, DOT, Suquamish Tribe, and Kitsap County, and perhaps could be showcased as such.

Watershed Presentations

Goldsborough Creek Watershed: Justin introduced the topic and the three presenters. This is a continuation of the review of the priority watersheds. Evan Bauder, Mason County reviewed the history of fish passage in the watershed. There are four basins in the system. \$6.54 million has been invested to address passage; 44 barriers addressed. Brian Combs continued the presentation and showed some specific projects being carried out. Loretta Swanson completed the presentation and discussed some current projects. She noted that WSAC provided funding for inventories a few years ago. It's been important to have FBRB funding. They are on track for project delivery; local partnership is important.

Loretta was asked about match. She explained that the only Mason County source is their road fund. There are limits on how much can be spent on a project outside of the right of way. Partners are very important. Cade Roler noted they are about 90% done with design and are working with the Technical Review Team. Paul asked how much time is needed for design; a minimum of two years.

BREAK 10:45 – 11:00

Lower Columbia: Steve West from the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board gave this presentation. He reviewed Ostrander Creek, and Delemeter/Arkansas Creek projects, in the lower Cowlitz Basin.

Questions and Comments included:

- What about summer chum? [Small population, not much known]
- Where are barrier numbers derived? [Not sure where the numbers came from]
- Is the problem barrier a triple box culvert? [Yes]
- Cade noted that the issue of railroads as a cultural resource can be difficult to address

- How is their strategy under the watershed pathway working? [Working out well for the lower Cowlitz]

Agenda was shifted to move “Signage for Completed Projects” as next item.

Signage for Completed Projects

Dave Caudill showed some examples of proposed signs. DNR offered some help in drafting them. Several comments were made, one that the text might be too small to be seen from fast moving cars, and the other agency logos could be distracting. Members generally agreed. It was suggested to look at the “salmon superhighway” signs in Tillamook, Oregon. Paul also agreed to talk with DOT’s sign shop. This will come back at the next meeting.

A break for lunch was taken from 12:00 noon to 12:30.

Continuation of watershed pathway presentations.

Upper Columbia: Greer Maier from the UCSRB gave this presentation, provided an overview of their watershed. Johnson Creek has been their focus, in the Okanogan watershed. Their secondary priorities are the Methow and Wenatchee watersheds. She reviewed data for these streams and rivers and said they have recently implemented a detailed inventory in the Wenatchee and plan to expand that effort to other watersheds in the Upper Columbia. They are thinking about where specifically to move next and have built a barrier prioritization tool to guide them.

Greer discussed the concept of barrier tiering and complexing - grouping barriers based on cost, feasibility, and salmon benefit consideration. Greer stated that the UCSRB would not pursue funding for barrier complexes with low cost-benefit. Tom and Justin added that they have attempted to clarify this point multiple times to interested parties this legislative session. Some have interpreted the RCW language that the FBRB “will prioritize opportunities to correct multiple barriers in whole streams” to mean that the FBRB will continue working in a watershed until every single barrier is corrected. Correcting every barrier in a watershed is not, and has never been, the intent of the FBRB.

Questions and comments included:

- For fish distribution layer, used the USFS layer
- Tom noted he and Justin have seen proviso language to have WDFW come up with a Fish Passage Priority Index (PI) for every barrier in the database; huge amount of work

Review of 2017-2019 projects

Justin showed a list of 2017-2019 projects. The Board has offered funding to Middle Fork Newaukum. This leaves \$681,000 remaining and not allocated. Alternates are shown at the bottom. We could begin funding design; could also keep the funding in anticipation of cost increases. He talked with Dave Caudill. If we used some of the remaining funding to start designs, that will free up funding for next biennium because all of the 2017-2019 alternates are also on the 2019-2021 funding list. He could reach out and see if design could get these projects going now. Tom suggested holding off any decisions till the April meeting and reach out now to alternates; Board members agreed.

Workplan Tasks

Neil explained we were going to start looking at tasks in the workplan. Two tasks are to look at the bylaws on an annual basis, and to consider Board membership on an annual basis. He noted that the Board approved an update last February 2018, but the final version had not been posted. He handed that out (and had e-mailed it last night). He noted that the only change since then was to add NOAA as a non-voting member. That addition will be made.

Regarding membership, Tom said Jeff Davis asked him to contact western Washington treaty tribes to see if they want to participate. He will do so after this legislative session. It had originally been hoped that the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (NWIFC) could participate and represent those tribes. Although the NWIFC has been approached in the past, they have not expressed an interest in attending the Board meetings. Also, with Erik Neatherlin selected as GSRO's new director, a replacement for Steve Martin will be sought.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:30 pm.

Next meeting: Tuesday, April 16, 2019 – Rainier Room, Association of Washington Cities