

FBRB Grant Manual

Lead Entity Recommendations

May 24th, 2017

Lead Entity Regions



Lead Entity Review Process

- The Lead Entity Coordinator for Thurston County, Amy Hatch-Winecka, agreed to distribute the draft FBRB grant manual to all of the Lead Entities.
- Amy sent it out on May 17th with a deadline for getting the board comments by May 22nd at noon.

Chehalis Basin Lead Entity

Kristen Harma

- Align the timing of the FBRB solicitation and project review with the start of the SRFB process, roughly Feb-Mar of each year, and align site visits to occur in May, or be flexible to hold these at the same time that Lead Entities do site visits, and send your reviewers out on our field tours
 - Your recommendation for aligning the timing of the FBRB schedule with that of the SRFB process makes sense and only needs slight tweaking what is in currently in the manual. I think it is also possible, especially in the Chehalis, to align field review days to improve efficiencies.

Chehalis Basin Lead Entity Kristen Harma

- Use individual RCO review panel members already evaluating each LE's SRFB projects to evaluate the FBRB projects, if possible
 - The FBRB Technical Review Team will work independently from the SRFB Review Panel. This is for several reasons: consistency across the state, autonomy as a new grant program, FBRB criteria may likely be different than SRFB, in addition we have no money for the SRFB review panel. The FBRB is fish passage specific program needing a fish passage specific review team, however the manual describes the option for consultation or participation of other stakeholders/experts if and when needed.

Chehalis Basin Lead Entity

Kristen Harma

- Regarding the proposed FBRB schedule, -Request for site visit --> do that a little earlier so that we can schedule site visits to coincide with our SRFB site visits in early May
 - Done
- Regarding evaluation criteria, I would recommend aligning your criteria to be as close as possible to that which will be developed for the Chehalis Basin. At the very least, allow for strong weighting towards funding FBRB culverts for correction that are based on use of our criteria.
 - We are open to reviewing and considering the evaluation criteria that was developed for the Chehalis Basin. The FBRB will be discussing and setting the FBRB evaluation criteria for the next grant round later this summer/fall.

Chehalis Basin Lead Entity

Kristen Harma

- Additional Recommendations: In your Manual, there should be a section in this manual about Army Corps of Engineers permitting. Ideally, the FBRB would be able to secure an agency agreement with the Corps for a timely permitting process for its barrier correction projects.
 - The FBRB will add some language about the Corps Nationwide permit criteria for water crossing projects in the permitting section with an informational link. WDFW is considering a WDFW/USACE liaison position to facilitate the permitting of the FBRB and Chehalis projects. However, the Corps will not enter into any sort of agreement that gives special attention or consideration to an agency or proponent.

Hood Canal Coordinating Council

Alicia Olivas

- I would like to have additional clarity around the role of the regions and the associated lead entities in the process. The manual states that each pathway is solicited through the regions which provided their priority watersheds (in 2015 their priority HUC 12) to the FBRB. Are the priorities of the region considered in the process?
 - Yes, the priorities in the Salmon Recovery Regions are considered in the Watershed Pathway process. They really drive the Watershed Pathway.

Hood Canal Coordinating Council

Alicia Olivas

- During the 2015-17 Biennium, the FBRB solicited the Salmon Recovery Regions to nominate a priority watershed in their area where fish passage is a significant limiting factor for salmon recovery. The FBRB received and accepted nominations from The Snake, Upper Columbia, Middle Columbia, and Lower Columbia recovery regions. The Puget Sound (11 of the 14 Lead Entities) and Washington Coastal (4 Lead Entities) recovery regions submitted watersheds but did not prioritize them. Therefore the FBRB selected priority watersheds in these regions based on a technical analysis and recommendation by WDFW.
- For the Puget Sound Recovery Region, 11 of the 14 Lead Entities submitted nominations, however they did not work with each other to give the FBRB a prioritized ranking for the region (which would have been preferred by the FBRB). The Hood Canal Coordinating Council provided a nomination letter (attached) where you nominated the Tahuya River – Frontal Hood Canal Watershed. The FBRB assigned WDFW to do a prioritization analysis based on the Intrinsic Potential Model to rank the 11 nominations and accepted the top 3 watersheds as FBRB priorities. The Tahuya ranked 7 out of 11.

Hood Canal Coordinating Council

Alicia Olivas

- After the watersheds were approved, WDFW fish passage division staff worked closely with each Lead Entity/SRR to identify the fish passage priorities in each of the approved Watersheds. They developed different priority packages that were presented to the FBRB and ultimately approved. In developing the priority packages, project sponsors were also identified. With the expected amount of money from the legislature (\$19.7M), the top 1 or 2 projects will be funded in each approved Watershed. The expectation for future funding rounds is to continue correcting the projects that have been identified in the Watershed Pathway packages.
- The Coordinated Pathway will be open to everyone (local governments, tribes, CDs, etc.) across the state. Last grant round most of the submissions came directly from cities and counties. Project sponsors applying for the Coordinated Pathway may work with or independently from the Lead Entity/SRR process. I think this will vary across the state.

Hood Canal Coordinating Council

Alicia Olivas

- Is the region just passing along the solicitation for sponsors to apply for grants as they see fit regardless of regional priorities. I am assuming that the region or the lead entity is not the project sponsor.
- If there is a role for the region in which they determine and indicate the priority watersheds, please include the Hood Canal region as a "region" and not only a lead entity. If the regions (and associated lead entities) have a role in the priority watershed selection, then I appreciate the timeline of the process which would allow for review of the projects within the lead entity grant round.
 - Please see the explanation and background above on how the priority watersheds in the Puget Sound Recovery Area were selected.
 - The future FBRB grant round schedule aligns with the SRFB/LE grant round.

Hood Canal Coordinating Council

Alicia Olivas

- The manual does not indicate whether the lead entity will be submitting projects, only sponsors. In this case, I assume the process will be independent of the lead entity process.
 - In future grant rounds, it is anticipated that the project sponsor submit projects through PRISM. As mentioned above, in the Watershed Pathway the project sponsors will be identified by collaborating with the SRRs/Lead Entities of the approved Watersheds.
- My underlying concern is that although Hood Canal is a lead entity for Puget Sound, it is also a lead entity for Hood Canal as well as a recovery region. The FBRB accepted nominations of priority watersheds from 6 of the 7 recovery regions. Is the intention to do the same in 2017-2019 biennium? Because the process from last biennium ranked lead entity submittals from each region, Hood Canal was not viewed as such and the submittal was ranked with the Puget Sound region.