

**Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes**

**Date: February 16, 2016**

**Place: Washington State Association of Counties, Olympia, Washington**

**Summary: Agenda items with formal action**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Formal Action</b>
Meeting Notes - January	Approved
Request from Council of Regions for a position on the FBRB	Request approved and Steve Martin appointed; name of alternate requested
Ranking criteria for watershed pathway	Approved with note that these are a starting point

**Summary: Follow-up actions**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Follow-up</b>
Communications subcommittee	Neil will arrange and staff
Workplan	Continue implementing; will come back to FBRB in May or June for update

**Board Members/Alternates Present:**

David Price, Chair, WDFW	Joe Shramek, WDNR
Paul Wagner, DOT	Casey Baldwin, Colville Tribe
Gary Rowe, WSAC	Jon Brand, WSAC/Kitsap County
Neil Aaland, Facilitator	

**Others present at meeting:**

Justin Zweifel, WDFW	Larry Dominguez, WDFW
Cade Roler, WDFW	Stacy Polkowske, WDFW
Laura Till, WDFW	Zack Martin, Mackay Sposito
Alison Hart, WDFW	Devona Ensmenger, Wild Salmon Center
Michael Blanton, WDFW	Jacob Anderson, Washington Salmon Coalition
Dave Collins, WDFW	Gina Piazza, WDFW

**Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review**

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Facilitator Neil Aaland. A motion was made by Paul Wagner to approve the January meeting notes as drafted; Dave Price seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**Public Comments:** Devona Ensmenger, representing the Coast regional salmon recovery organization, asked the Board to consider approving four watersheds as focus areas rather than just one (Newaukum).

**Adding a New FBRB Board Member**

Dave reviewed a letter received from the Council of Regions (COR), the organization that represents the Regional Salmon Recovery Regions. They have asked for a seat on the FBRB and have suggested Steve Martin, director of the Snake River Regional Recovery Organization, as the member. Dave moved to add that position and to appoint Steve, Casey seconded. The motion was approved unanimously, and also requests that the COR also appoint an alternate.

**Watershed Pathway**

Stacy Polkowske, WDFW, provided an update and mentioned some questions she is hearing. She reviewed the workflow timeline. There was some discussion on the map being used to present this information. Various points included:

- A term different than “shoreline” should be used when referencing stream reaches, since that has specific regulatory meaning under the Shorelines Management Act.
- Show current and potential anadromy, in a linear fashion (and show a dot at the end of anadromy)
- Keep showing the break between “fish” and “non-fish” [distinction between portions of a stream that host fish]
- Provide a vicinity map

Stacy also reviewed funding packages under development for the Newaukum watershed. Casey suggested that we should document what we know about downstream barriers (and assumed lack of such barriers); perhaps a check box where locals verify no downstream barriers. The description should add the proposed structures for the barrier fix, if known. In general, the FBRB would like additional clarity on the barriers proposed for fixing and what is gained by fixing that barrier. Paul suggested removing the dots indicating “passable”; don’t need to know that. Keep the “repaired” sites noted.

Gina Piazza, WDFW, reviewed Puget Sound packages under development. The specific packages are not yet narrowed down to the extent the Coast is. For the Pysht watershed, the target areas are primarily wetland complexes, so acreage is identified in addition to lineal gain. They have two packages at this point, and are weighing which is the top priority. Casey noted that these seem more like floodplain restoration, not lineal gain.

The Board was asked if acreage is helpful:

- Dave thinks it is helpful, but as additional information
- Paul thinks it is useful as a descriptor
- Casey thinks we need to evaluate the proposals based on lineal gain; acres are not a metric to evaluate
- Gary wonders where acreage would be utilized at all

The Board decided that lineal gain is the most important, and acreage is a useful descriptor.

Gina then discussed Goldsborough Creek and Pilchuck watershed. Dave noted that the leadership in WRIA 14 is changing, and this might be a challenge. Nine culverts are identified in the Goldsborough Creek watershed. In the Pilchuck watershed, they have narrowed down to Little Pilchuck Creek and Catherine Creek. WDFW is attending a local Technical Advisory Group (TAG) meeting on March 1.

Dave Collins, WDFW, addressed the Columbia River regions. There is not much to discuss at this point, as they have more work to do. For the Snake, Yakima, and Upper Columbia regions, they are still in the scoping process.

### **Coordinated Pathway Nominations**

Dave Price noted that WDFW has struggled with this approach. There are more challenges in doing scoring of projects. He suggested that the FBRB might consider large scale quality measures in the future, but that WDFW needs to focus on considering quality on the subset of projects that rank high enough in the initial ranking to receive a field visit. In the future WDFW will try to develop a more comprehensive and statewide quality assessment tool.

Cade Roler provided this update for WDFW. He provided a brief process overview. A solicitation was sent out, and WDFW used several filters to review submittals, including:

- Is the project on an anadromous stream?
- Are there downstream barriers
- Are there nearby recently fixed barriers?

244 sites were nominated and 110 qualified after this initial review. He passed out a handout on ranking criteria (dated February 15).

Dave asked how FBRB members feel about the weighting. Discussion points included:

- For project bundling, Gary asked that a map be included, and note the number of barriers in each package
- Gary thinks the criteria is helpful, thinks the Board will need to make adjustments to criteria over time
- Jon also likes the criteria
- Paul thinks the scoring is an overall good framework, and wants to look at cost and gain; the amount of funding will drive decision-making
- Joe Shramek said the value of criteria and core is to produce a list, and then we just go down the list with available funding
- He supports where we've started with criteria but thinks we're missing the key economic criteria to make a final decision
- Paul thinks we could do a low/medium/high cost categorization; e.g. under \$50,000/under 200,000/over 200,000

The FBRB is okay with the criteria with Paul's additions. The Board also decided that criteria #4, relating to downstream barriers, should be taken out; it's an "on-off" question. Other changes to the criteria:

- #5 is capped at total of 4 points, and take out "stock"
- Need to define #7 better; could use Lead Entity priorities instead of this
  - Also include bundles of costs for packages

Dave is interested in a list of at least 30 projects.

Casey moved to approve the ranking criteria; Jon seconded. The motion was approved, with a note that these criteria are approved as a starting point.

A short break was taken for lunch.

Dave brought up the request from the Coast Region, made during the earlier public comment period. He noted that the Board deliberated on the number of watersheds when they decided to select the Newaukum watershed. He asked if the Board would like to discuss. Casey noted that we had to limit the number of nominations from each region. After discussion, no change was made from the earlier decision.

### **Funding Picture**

Dave noted that two FBRB members key to this discussion, Carl and Brian, are not here. This is not an action item but we need to start having this discussion. There are two pieces: near term and long term funding.

Near term funding: a list of projects must be developed for legislative approval. This involves a lot of work by WDFW; their rough budget estimate is \$300,000 to mobilize. Carl has offered \$100,000; Dave is meeting with DOT to try and bring funding from them. Gary has been working with Carl, and said counties will put \$100,000 of "study money"). It's likely that Rep. Cliburn will include the final \$100,000 in the House transportation budget. Dave will meet with partners to discuss implementation.

Long term funding: this is the issue of how we fund the actual project. Dave is thinking about who will administer the funding. There is some guidance in the statute; WDFW doesn't think it is the agency who will manage funds. TIB and RCO are both described as possibilities in the legislation. In terms of funding sources, we should look at whether federal funds and local funds are an option. FBRB members had the following questions or comments:

- Gary suggested that all options need to be on the table, and we need to start thinking about educating the legislature
- Paul thinks we should consider funding this as part of the state's obligation to salmon recovery
- Gary thinks if a list is created, it is submitted to the legislature for approval

- Dave wonders about the level of funding; he's been thinking about long term funding of \$10 million per salmon recovery region, totaling \$60 million
  - He also is thinking about scheduling tours to get legislators and others out in the field
- Gary wonders about the large water bill from last session, and is thinking that some outreach to include fish barrier removal in this bill might be useful

### **Communications Strategy**

Neil and Dave provided a quick update on this; Neil will be pulling together a subcommittee meeting to start implementing.

### **Workplan Status**

Neil referred to the status of the workplan and the table showing this. The Board reviewed the table and had the following discussion points:

- Assessing needed resources: WDFW has done the first phase, need to determine resources needed to implement the program
  - Will need to develop a request by this summer for the 17-19 biennium
- Annual report on DOT and DFW coordination – Paul is willing to do a presentation to the FBRB addressing the intersection of activities
- Presentation to FBRB on database and training – Dave thinks we can do this in either December 2016 or January 2017

Dave suggested that we should re-visit the workplan and tasks in May or June to consider updating it.

The meeting adjourned around 1:30 pm.

**The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for 9:00 am to 1:30 pm Tuesday, March 15.**

\*\*\*\*\*