

Fish Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes

Date: July 16, 2019

Place: Association of Washington Cities, Olympia, Washington

Summary: Agenda items with formal action

Item	Formal Action
Meeting notes from June 2019	Approved with corrections

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
Issue of Puget Sound/PSP participation	Consider reaching out again to PSP
WDFW staff perspectives on the watershed presentations and “lessons learned”	WDFW staff will meet and discuss; schedule for next meeting
Should the Board still offer two “pathways”?	Initial thinking is Board still offers two pathways but describes them differently; further discussion needed
Board strategy	Board liked Casey’s general approach; further discussion needed and developing a one-pager would be useful (still need a more detailed description as well)
Develop new “packages” of projects prior to legislative session	Some liked this; further discussion needed
Messaging	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Neil, Alison and Rachel will meet and have further discussions• Add an item to each agenda to discuss upcoming opportunities for engagement

Board Members/Alternates Present:

Carl Schroeder, AWC	Joe Shramek, DNR
Jon Brand, WSAC	Dave Caudill, RCO
John Foltz, COR	Jonalee Squeechochs, Yakama Tribe (phone)
Tom Jameson, Chair, WDFW	Casey Baldwin, Colville Tribes (phone)
Matt Curtis, WDFW	Paul Wagner, DOT

Others present at meeting:

Neil Aaland, Facilitator	Gina Piazza, WDFW
Dave Collins, WDFW	Christy Rains, WDFW
Alison Hart, WDFW	Cade Roler, WDFW
Aaron Peterson, Regional Fisheries Coalition	Steve Seville, David Evans & Associates

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

Public Comment: None.

Old Business

Meeting notes: The meeting notes for the June meeting were unanimously approved as corrected.

Staffing Updates: Tom introduced Matt Curtis, who is replacing Justin Zweifel.

Other Updates:

- Tom explained he is working with RCO on the funding for the new biennium. \$350,000 is coming from AWC to fund inventories. They are hiring 5 new people to assist.
- Neil mentioned WSAC is working on county inventories this biennium.
- Tom noted the annual meeting with northwest treaty tribes on culvert injunction project status is November 6 at the Lacey Community Center. FBRB members are welcome to attend, let Tom or his staff know.
- DOT and DFW were contacted last week about attending a 7/25 work session with the Legislative Joint Transportation Committee. AWC and WSAC are also participating.

Watershed Pathway – Lessons Learned

Tom reviewed the history of the watershed pathway, and reviewed the legislative language establishing the Board. In 2015 there was a solicitation to the salmon recovery regions – 7 of 8 of them. The 8th region in eastern Washington has no anadromous fish so they were not included. Puget Sound did not want to pick one HUC 10, nor did the Coast region. The Board used Intrinsic Potential modeling to choose those target watersheds. He noted that the Board was criticized by Joe Mentor in his white paper, saying there is not a strategy. Mr. Mentor thought prioritizing watershed pathways first was a problem.

Comments and questions included:

- Paul thinks the legislative testimony is only representing one voice, but it is worth looking at our approach to see if it can improve
- Jon wondered if there is a plan to get Puget Sound more engaged [Tom thinks there isn't a good answer to this; we've reached out and they have only partly responded]
- Carl said discussions with the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) happened early on; at some point we can re-engage
- Dave Caudill suggested we reach out again to them; some folks agreed

Regarding lessons learned, Paul said some people thought we should have a numerical approach, but that seems antithetical to the way we're worked. The "bottoms-up" approach used by the Board has worked. It's worth reaching out so people know what we're doing. Carl thinks there is a lack of understanding about what we're doing, and we're on the right path with the watershed approach. Dave Caudill agreed and thinks we have two good approaches.

John Foltz wonders if it's a communications issue, as well as a magnitude issue. He thinks we could do more on story-telling and communication. It would be good to have the regions explain and certify how these projects are the priorities. He also wonders whether the regions should be asked to weigh in on the coordinated pathway projects. Jon Brand noted that locals get a lot of pressure, which can affect what projects they proposed. He likes watershed projects because they are more objective.

Carl wonders about "unknowing" property owners. It would be good to get information out pro-actively about projects. He noted that cities will complete inventories this biennium. Tom said tax exempt bonds are the funding for the Board; this category is for construction. Current funding does allow us to develop new lists.

Neil expressed interest in hearing from DFW staff about their reaction to what we heard from the watershed presentations. We'll schedule that for an upcoming meeting. Dave Caudill said a tour in fall to highlight some projects is scheduled, including Chico Creek. Jon can help with presentation materials.

John Foltz wonders if we can consider re-naming the pathways; they don't send a clear message. Paul thinks we could explain the pathways differently for external messages. Dave Caudill said it can be presented as one strategy with two components. Alison said any ideas to simplify messaging would be good. There is interest from Board members in exploring this further, de-emphasizing "two pathways".

A break was taken from 10:35 to 10:50.

Strategy

Neil explained his summary document. He reviewed the first couple of years of meeting notes and pulled out any statements that seemed to reflect strategy. Casey also put together a document that looked at legislative principles. This document was e-mailed yesterday. He describes the funding pathways, using the manuals, and tried to lay out a strategy. The final section describes gaps; it needs more work but it a starting approach.

Comments and questions:

- Tom likes Casey's approach, it describes current strategy
- John Foltz also likes it. We need to define a problem/mission statement.
- Carl said the paragraph above "watershed pathway" could be revised to describe our new approach
 - Some of it might be too detailed, e.g. which regions participated
 - "Gaps" piece might be a separate item
- Carl wonders about the Intrinsic Potential modeling process and whether that could be applied to city and county inventories; it's a desk exercise with some field verification
 - IP looks at rearing potential
 - He's interested in looking about rapid inventory work on inventories for city and county entities
 - He also wonders if we should develop a broader set of packages around the injunction to bring to the legislature
- Tom noted DFW is doing \$300K of analysis toward Chinook; perhaps we can piggy-back on that
- Paul suggested we do a one page overview of the Board's strategy, before the next legislative session, that is more "bullet point" focused
- Paul made several comments about the "gap" issues:
 - How does everyone's work fit together?
 - How do we partner?
 - The idea of blurring the distinction between two approaches is good
- Dave Caudill said we have to be flexible, since others are working on this; the coordinated pathway achieves that
- Christy Rains said she has had a lot of opportunities to talk with external folks
- Casey agrees with a one pager but thinks we should first start with a more detailed document
 - We need to add "coordinate with other programs" to strategy
- Cal wonders if we want to bring forth anything different around funding package; do we need more mapping, etc.

The Board will have further discussion around the strategy.

LUNCH BREAK from 12:00 – 12:30

Strategy (continued)

Carl asked again about the idea of new packaging of projects for the upcoming legislative session. Could DFW do a mapping exercise around this to local potential packages? Let's have this as a topic the Board discusses in August.

John Foltz asked about a communication strategy, who we are targeting. Board members and Neil mentioned the earlier communications plan, which perhaps should be reviewed again. There was some discussion around the idea of the Board identifying culverts in need of repair and seeing if owners are willing to fix them. This might be part of the "targeted outreach" to be discussed with the next agenda topic.

The Board wondered if there are other forums we should target with information. Neil will send out an email with this question, and people will send back any ideas to him. One new venue might be the annual Infrastructure Assistance Coordinating Council (IACC) conference.

Messaging

Neil introduced this topic and reviewed the three questions being asked of the Board.

- How do board members see presenting this info to public for next round of proposals?
- How can we help the general public understand the value (of fish passage/the board's work/salmon recovery)?
- What actions can board members take to share the messages?

Dave Caudill asked about the earlier plans to develop a stand-alone web page, and about generally using more social media. Neil, Alison, and Rachel will meet again and discuss this. Perhaps a couple of Board projects could be selected and followed using social media. We should develop a timeline showing when projects are happening; Dave can help Alison with that. Alison wondered about asking Barbara from Triangle to come back and update the previous communication plan. The Board thought that, rather than doing that, we might have a structured conversation at a future meeting about communication.

John Foltz mentioned that he, on behalf of the Snake Region, will be meeting soon with OFM. He says there are an important entity to keep up to date. Carl agreed and said it is always good to brief OFM about the Board. John is willing to discuss the Board when he meets.

John also suggested that the Board meet and brief regional recovery regions. Their Boards tend to have a mix of members, including elected officials. A canned presentation of ten minutes could be developed and used. Neil noted it would be good to have other members, not just Tom, making these presentations.

Dave suggested that at every FBRB meeting we take five minutes to review possibilities to provide presentations/make connections. People agreed.

Next meeting: Tuesday, August 20, 2019 – Rainier Room, Association of Washington Cities