

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes

Date: March 21, 2017

Place: Association of Washington Cities, Olympia, Washington

Summary: Agenda items with formal action

Item	Formal Action
February meeting notes	Approved

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
Work Plan	Revise and bring back
Communication Plan	Revise and bring back
FBRB website	Okay to start work on this
Next iteration of grant manual	Revise and bring back to April meeting for approval as a draft

Board Members/Alternates Present:

Tom Jameson, Chair, WDFW	Steve Martin, Council of Regions
Paul Wagner, DOT	Dave Caudill, RCO
Casey Baldwin, CCT (phone)	Gary Rowe, WSAC
Stacy Polkowske, WDFW	Jonalee Squeochs, Yakama Nation (phone)
Steve Manlow, Council of Regions	Jon Brand, WSAC
Joe Shramek, DNR	Carl Schroeder, AWC

Others present at meeting:

Gina Piazza, WDFW	Neil Aaland, Facilitator
Dave Collins, WDFW	Alison Hart, WDFW
Pam Gunther, Hart Crowser	Jan Rosholt, Parametrix
Kevin Jensen, McMillen Jacobs	

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. Facilitator Neil Aaland reviewed the agenda.

Public Comments

Nobody present offered comments to the Board.

Follow-up Items

1. Approval of February meeting notes: Paul Wagner moved to approve, Carl Schroeder seconded. Meeting notes approved unanimously.

Legislative and budget updates

Gary Rowe discussed the brown bag briefings he held. There was good participation. Afterward, the House Transportation Committee set up a full work session. That audience was very receptive, they asked good questions. Carl and Paul were also there. Paul agreed that it went well. There were questions regarding the connection to private barriers, fixing private barriers; mixed comments on private barriers. Carl noted that they had questions on the status of permit streamlining. Gary then explained we only have the Senate transportation budget so far. The House transportation chair seems very interested in providing funding. There is some interest in providing a lump sum rather than funding a specific list.

Tom said on Friday he was called by a representative from the city of Lake Forest Park. He reminded the Board the city had previously asked for reconsideration of their list of projects. The Board chose not to

alter the funding list. WDFW went up during the winter to work with their staff and provide technical assistance.

Tom noted the legislation asked FBRB and WDFW to look into permit streamlining. He and Dave Price met with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) on Friday at Ecology. Tom referenced the brief 90-day construction window, which is between July and September 18. The COE was supportive of the need for streamlining, and said passage corrections fall under a general permit. However, reducing the time needed for a cultural resources assessment is difficult. WDFW is considering creating a position at the Seattle District office, funded by the Chehalis project. The current federal hiring freeze means this cannot be done yet.

Questions and comments from the Board included:

- Might be able to deploy a WDFW employee with the COE
- Tom noted the COE can no longer rely on JARPA forms for the review process; they need OMB approval for forms included on their website and JARPA does not have this approval
- DOT highways division is working on a programmatic permit
- Some FBRB funded projects might require mitigation; for example, there might be a wetland that was formed by a blocked culvert
 - Can make a case that this does not apply if the road improvements created the wetland
- Other forms we use with the COE are the ESA form and the 4D limits process; these forms are useful and help streamline
- We should reach out to DOT and understand the scope of this
- Wonder if we are supposed to look at wetlands above roads and consider whether they should be retained

Carl noted that the Senate budget includes \$250K to work with cities to identify city barriers; hope to see that in the House budget. Gary saw some similar language in the Senate Transportation budget. Paul noted that regional general conditions came out for nationwide permits; put stipulations on design.

Communication Plan

Neil provided this update. The communications subcommittee met on March 17 and reviewed the table of actions. Neil updated the table and this update, along with the older version, was in today's packet. He reviewed the updated table and any changes recommended by the subcommittee. Comments and suggestions included:

Item 1 – Develop a compelling story: the subcommittee suggested packing the information, including videos, and distributing. Ideas for additional videos included why are some culvert fixes so big; why is there such a narrow construction window; why does construction take so long? Paul noted that projects can run into competition for contractors. Other questions included partial barriers, and how many barriers are still out there.

Item 4 – Meet with the SRFB: Dave Caudill suggested getting on the formal agenda periodically; things ebb and flow around fish passage with the SRFB. Other thoughts in conjunction with the SRFB:

- Scale projects are fewer, now seeing bigger projects
- Consider some outreach to the Chehalis Basin project
- Look at the strategy part; the charge is to look at passage in strategic ways; think about a larger strategy in conjunction with the SRFB
- Might also consider engaging with LEs on strategy
- We used the Intrinsic Potential model in Puget Sound, if that has value want to consider how else to use it
- Stacy thinks this speaks to the value of the watershed pathway. Steve Manlow liked that process, thinks it is a good model. Steve Martin agreed.

Item 5: Establishing the FBRB as a resource: Stacy responded to the item about an FBRB website, noting the current website is deeply embedded in the WDFW site and hard to find. She has a rough estimate of \$15-20,000 to do a stand-alone website. This should be in our strategy. Dave Caudill agrees this would be

good to have. He wondered who we are targeting, then we'll know how to design. Paul thinks it would include both general and specific information; he suggested highlighting a "project of the month". Others liked these ideas.

Item 8 – Seek state funding in 2017 session: This is being worked on now. Carl asked if others are asking to weigh in; Steve Martin said yes, there are others. Dave Caudill noted that CDs are engaged.

Item 9 – Proactively build relationships with media: Neil explained that not much has yet been done on this. Gary mentioned that Julie Henning did some initial work. Stacy noted that the WDFW media office needs to be involved. Gary reminded the Board of a positive story from the Tacoma News Tribune; we might want to get back with those reporters. Paul suggested doing a press release when funding is approved. Alison said a joint press release with other interested parties would be good.

Item 10 – Engage with national organizations and federal agencies: Steve Martin thinks there might be an opportunity to coordinate more with BPA; those funds leverage SRFB funds. He said the Nez Perce Tribe has also participated in his region.

Item 11 – Designate a lead board member for communications subcommittee: Neil mentioned that Carl was initially so designated. Gary thinks we should bring people in from organizations. We should also compile a list of potential events.

Neil will make revisions based on these comments and bring back a revised communications work plan.

Grant Manual

This agenda topic was introduced by Stacy and Tara Galuska (RCO). A PowerPoint presentation was shown to explain the contents. The draft manual reflects statutory direction and adopted FBRB policies. Tara explained that RCO has other grant manuals, some of which are incorporated into the FBRB program by this draft manual. The PRISM system will be used to manage grants. This will be a partnership between RCO and FBRB.

Initial discussion focused on the Technical Review Team (TRT) envisioned as part of this process. It was clarified that the TRT would use a ranking process developed by the FBRB, and reflect a ranked list back using that process. The Board was also interesting in local knowledge being part of this; Steve Martin was glad to see that the TRT would use existing regional staff. FBRB members would like to see more discussion about the roles of the FBRB and the TRT. It was suggested that the terminology should be that the TRT scores projects, and the FBRB then ranks them.

Joe suggested that a draft manual could be offered to the Lead Entities for their review. There was some interest in that. Jon suggested that additional clarity is needed on eligible projects.

Section 2 is application information. There is more explanation needed around the distinction between the watershed and coordinated pathways. Clarity is also needed on how projects are moved from one pathway to another. The match guidance is included in the manual.

Casey thought it was unclear if the manual was for all projects or just for projects that had been prioritized for funding. It seems like there needs to be clear separation in PRISM for project proposals that want to be considered for the next round of coordinated pathway and those that have already been determined to be at the top of the priority list and we are just using PRISM as a mechanism to get the contract and funding to them.

For funded projects, Jon asked about two-year agreements. Kitsap County has a hard time getting projects done within 2 years; he suggests the timeframe be three years. After discussion, the decision was to use three year agreements.

After a lunch break, discussion continued. Stacy reviewed the appendices. These appendices include approved watersheds, match guidance, and the amendment request authority matrix. Casey sent in some comments on the authority matrix; he suggests more authority should be with the Board.

The Board discussed circulating this for comment. They agreed on a process where the next iteration comes back to the Board in April. A version will be approved at that meeting for circulating as a draft for comment, and at the May meeting the board will review comments received and approve the manual. It was suggested that the Salmon Coalition be tagged to help coordinate review; Amy Hatch-Winecka can be contacted to see if she can assist.

Presentation of Work Plan Updates

Neil reviewed the table of updates to the work plan. He will update the larger work plan based on today's discussion and bring back for approval in April. Comments and discussion points:

- Remove the item to "review Puget Sound/Coast process"
- Add: "discuss two pathways and decide whether/how to offer that for next round"; timing is Summer 2017
- "Delegation of authority" matrix – add for Spring 2017

Alison handed out some draft logo designs for review by the Board.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:00 pm.

Next meeting: Tuesday, April 18 @ Association of Washington Cities