

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes**Date: April 17, 2018****Place: Association of Washington Cities, Olympia, Washington****Summary: Agenda items with formal action**

Item	Formal Action
Meeting Notes - February	Approved

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
Signage for projects	Neil prepare draft motion for next meeting; confer with Dave Caudill about RCO standards
Final scoring criteria for coordinated pathway	Justin will bring to the May meeting
Regional organization involvement in coordinated pathway	Consider a method for regional organizations to weigh in for the next grant round; and consider how to coordinate with DOT projects
2019-21 watershed pathway solicitation	Justin will send letter to regional organizations asking about likely projects for next biennium

Board Members/Alternates Present:

Tom Jameson, Chair, WDFW	Steve Martin, GSRO
Paul Wagner, DOT	Dave Caudill, RCO - GSRO
Jon Brand, WSAC	Gary Rowe, WSAC
Justin Zweifel, WDFW	Casey Baldwin, Colville Tribe (on phone)
Steve Manlow, Council of Regions	Joe Shramek, DNR
Carl Schroeder, AWC	

Others present at meeting:

Dave Collins, WDFW	Christy Rains, WDFW
Cade Roler, WDFW	Ken Cousins, Earth Economics
Gina Piazza, WDFW	Don Ponder, WDFW
Neil Aaland, Facilitator	Wendy Brown, RCO
Gary Arndt, Stantec	Erik Schwartz, Mason County

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review

Meeting started at 9:00. Neil reviewed the agenda.

Public Comments

No comments were offered.

Old Business

Jon Brand made a motion to approve the minutes from February. Steve Manlow seconded. Approved with Joe Shramek abstaining (due to his absence from that meeting) and can now be posted.

New Business

Update on culvert injunction: Tom Jameson provided this update. The U.S. Supreme Court will hear this appeal tomorrow. An hour has been allocated. Tom reviewed the list of filings and noted that Justice Kennedy has recused himself. Paul Wagner said WSDOT is working as if the injunction is the law of the land.

Status update on 2017-2019 Funded Projects - Justin Zweifel provided this update. The original total award amount was \$16,783,000. The newest estimate for funded projects is \$17,909,000. The capitol budget included some reserve funding, so that can cover the overage. If anything is left over, that can go to the list of alternates. Carl asked about the column titled “real match”, with blank entries. Justin said some project proponents have not yet provided the match certification. Steve Martin wants the Board to celebrate the first project that starts work and is funded by the FBRB.

2019-2021 Coordinated Pathway Request for Applications – Justin provided this update and referred to a spreadsheet. The cover sheet summarizes the applications and information about them. 49 applications were received. Justin reviewed the reasons that some of them are likely to be determined ineligible. Justin reviewed the scoring criteria. The goal is to get them scored about a week before the next meeting in May. He also handed out the Request for Applications (RFA) along with the schedule. He will bring back in May the final scoring criteria.

Questions and comments included:

- Some of these are from applicants that were asked to re-submit
- Steve Manlow thinks it is important for the regional organizations to be able to weigh in on projects; Justin said that the May meeting is key for drawing a funding line, and thinks after that might be a good time to hear from them
 - Could be addressed with final application questions in May or June
 - Steve Manlow thinks there is value in weighing in before the line is drawn, and thinks this should be teed up for next grant round
- Gary wonders how the coordination with WSDOT projects can be achieved, and thinks that is missing an important piece
 - Paul thinks that is worth addressing for future grant rounds
- Steve Martin noted there was uncertainty in the past about how real this program was; now with funding, that question has been answered

2019-2021 Watershed Pathway solicitation – Justin reviewed this item. He asked how much flexibility there should be in this pathway. More work has been done and additional barriers have been found. Want to stay within the watersheds, but should additional sideboards be added?

Discussion points included:

- Dave thinks there are opportunistic projects that come along, and we should be open to that
- Justin suggested there should be some rules addressing flexibility
- Paul noted unforeseen things can happen, and the criteria must allow the opportunity for opening more stream miles
- Carl likes flexibility, but thinks it is important to stay within the same watershed and conform to regional plans unless there is a compelling reason, such as life/safety issues
- Justin wants to send a letter to regional organizations asking about likely projects for this upcoming biennium and ask for responses by June/July
- Carl thinks flexibility should be considered case-by-case but within the same watershed
- Some thought changes should not be allowed upstream of a full barrier

Casey thinks the letter to regions should state that we are asking for projects within already approved watersheds. It would help to summarize the existing list within their watershed. They should stipulate if there is a compelling reason to change. Cade noted we need the same amount of information as the coordinated pathway. Justin is concerned about the level of effort that would require. The Board felt this kind of change should be an exception.

Steve Martin suggested Justin come to the Council of Regions meeting next week and discuss this. The Board decided a formal vote was not necessary because this discussion has provided WDFW staff with the feedback they need.

Tribute signage – Neil reviewed the memo he had prepared for the Board and explained this came out of a discussion last spring about a way to honor and acknowledge Brian Abbott as well as providing information about the Board for the public. He noted the questions he has posed:

- Should funding for projects include a requirement for signage?
 - If so, should the signage be temporary or permanent?
- Should all projects be required to install signage, or just the first few?
- Who would be responsible for maintaining the signage, if permanent?

In general, Board members thought it was a good idea to require this, unless there is a compelling reason not to (such as a project at the end of a dead-end unimproved road). A requirement could be to have the applicants discuss where signage would be or provide a rationale for not signing. Regarding the longevity of the sign requirement, it was decided the Board could provide the signs, require posting, but not require ongoing maintenance – rather require an initial posting. Decision was to have Neil discuss with Dave Caudill, since RCO provides signs, and he will prepare a motion for consideration by the Board at their next meeting.

Updated barrier estimate – Justin explained this item. The new estimate was prepared in response to a request from the Attorney General's office. An existing estimate of 40,000 barriers has been used for a number of years. The Attorney General's Office wanted to know where this came from as it prepares for its argument before the U.S. Supreme Court on appealing the injunction for the culvert case. Justin handed out background information on the sources and explained the methodology. The new number is 18,224. This is the bare minimum and is probably greater.

Comments and discussion included:

- There is no plan to further improve the number as this would require physically walking all streams
- Joe Shramek said DNR is trying to get data on small forest landowners he wants to put his staff in touch with Justin as they have good related data in RMAP and other places
- Steve Manlow reminded the Board that RCO funds barrier assessments, and regional organizations may have additional information
- The number is salmon-focused

Justin noted the memo explaining this is on the website, and the layers are available.

LUNCH BREAK

The Board re-convened. The next agenda topic was:

Mill Creek flume – John Foltz from Snake River Board was here to review this project. It is a complicated project and they have submitted a portion of it for funding consideration by the Board – coordinated pathway list. John wants to explain the background, so the Board understands the project. He showed a

powerpoint presentation that reviewed the issues affecting Mill Creek for the stretch that goes through the city of Walla Walla. The creek is partially channelized due to flooding in the 1930s and goes underground for a stretch. Some improvement to the concrete channel for fish benefit has been installed.

Questions and discussions included:

- Cade wondered how many reaches below are barriers [there are some barriers]
- Is there a plan for the portion that's underground? [Not presently a great answer for this]
- CTUIR has done some analysis of options
- Trap and haul has been considered as an option
- Upstream habitat is in pretty good shape, this would open quite a bit
- Summer steelhead and bull trout are the focus here
- What happens to steelhead when they get here? [passability is poor]
- How much is left to do after this? [Some projects are in the president's budget that was just signed; rough estimate of \$15 million to complete everything which includes a weir, concrete flow, and two dams; might also include daylighting of some underground portions]
- The funding request is to fix the whole concrete channel, install passage items such as weir notching and a low flow channel

No action was taken as this was an informational item.

The meeting adjourned at 2:15 pm.

Next meeting: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 – @ Association of Washington Cities