

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

**Date: April 19, 2016**

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

**Summary: Agenda items with formal action**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Formal Action</b>
Meeting Notes - March	Approved

**Summary: Follow-up actions**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Follow-up</b>
Communications subcommittee	Neil will arrange second meeting
Workplan	Neil will review and discuss items due at the May meeting
Criteria from coordinated pathway and applicability to watershed pathway projects	Consider applying broad criteria from the coordinated pathway to the watershed pathway projects and discuss
Match criteria	The Board will discuss again at the May meeting.

**Board Members/Alternates Present:**

David Price, Chair, WDFW	Steve Martin, Council of Regions
Paul Wagner, DOT	Carl Schroeder, AWC
Gary Rowe, WSAC	Jon Brand, WSAC/Kitsap County
Tom Jameson, WDFW	Dave Caudill, RCO
Neil Aaland, Facilitator	Casey Baldwin, CCT

**Others present at meeting:**

Dave Collins, WDFW	Dan Barrett, WDFW
Cade Roler, WDFW	Alison Hart, WDFW
Justin Zweifel, WDFW	Gina Piazza, WDFW
Matt Barnhart, Mason County	Brian Combs, SPSSEG
Alyssa Ball, HTC	Jason McCormick, YBFWRP

**Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review**

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Facilitator Neil Aaland. Neil noted that the agenda incorrectly listed the date for the May meeting; it will be on May 19, location is the meeting room at the Association of Washington Cities. A motion was made by Paul Wagner to approve the March meeting notes as drafted; David Price seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Casey noted that Justin and Cade made well-received presentations at the AFS Conference in Chelan.

**Public Comments:** Brian Combs, SPSSEG, spoke about the match requirements. He asked the Board to consider that match for a project on the FPBRB list be in the form of previously or currently funded projects in the same watershed. He cited an example of two culverts being repaired this summer, and would like to use those as match for FBRB projects proposed in the same sub-watershed. It is tricky if projects used as match must have been implemented during the same biennium. In response to being asked what was a reasonable timeframe, he suggested one year pre and post project timeframe be considered. Matt Barnhart, Mason County Public Works, also addressed the Board about match. They have culverts scheduled for removal in 2019, with stable funding.

**Communication Plan:** Neil noted that the communications subcommittee met and discussed the idea of organizing a tour aimed at legislators. He suggested the timing would be best in June or July; in August and September a variety of other tours are already being arranged for other programs and we should avoid competing with those. David Price noted the importance of tours, and would bring the WDFW legislative liaison into the discussion.

**Workplan:** Neil noted that the workplan has due dates for several items in June, including reviewing the bylaws, reviewing membership, and considering updates to the workplan. David Price thinks the watershed and coordinated pathways might take up available time for the next couple of meetings, and might need to push that off into July or so. Neil will come back to the May meeting with a list of tasks with due dates. Other comments:

- Funding for grant program might be 12 projects per region, plus \$35-\$50 million per biennium
- We need to be thinking long-term, perhaps a ten year strategy
- We might need to think about a two day meeting in July to complete the project proposal reviews and approval

### **Watershed Pathway**

Cade Roler, WDFW, provided an update and showed a PowerPoint presentation. He then reviewed the list of approved HUC 10 nominations:

- Coast (the Newaukum River): WDFW has met with the local subcommittee. For their priority #1 (Middle Fork and tributaries), working on cost estimates. For priority #2 (South Fork and 2 tributaries): field scoping done and Lewis County Public Works is working on cost estimates.  
Discussion:
  - Casey asked for a table to supplement the maps with project statistics including linear gain, percent passible, habitat quality, etc.;
  - Steve asked that criteria from RCW 77.95 be addressed in packages. Steve also likes idea of applying coordinated pathway criteria here; others were in support
  - It was noted that projects can be eligible elsewhere; if they receive funding elsewhere they can be taken off this list
  - These funding lists are complementary to FFFPP
  - Gary said, at the end of this process, he wants to know what entities are doing which projects
    - David Price said WDFW will include that information in written descriptions
  - Paul noted the Board needs to discuss general rules in operating a grant program
- Lower Columbia: The LCFRB approved their priorities this morning; Priority 1 is Delemeter/Arkansas watershed, Priority 2 is Leckler Creek watershed
- Snake River: The SRSRB nominated the lower Snake and Grande Ronde tributaries
- Yakima: Jason McCormick from the Yakima Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board made a presentation. Jason showed status of barriers, starting in 1980; there has been a lot of work, now they're focusing on upper watersheds. Their focus for the next 10 years is the Teanaway watershed, long term is Wilson/Naneum. Discussion points:
  - In a highly altered system like Wilson/Naneum with lots of upstream barriers, Casey thinks it's important to know if a subset of barriers proposed would add much to fish production without fixing more upstream barriers and providing access to the less altered habitat upstream.
  - Gary noted this basin isn't as far along in the FBRB process
  - Jason wanted to know if the Yakima could nominate both areas, the group didn't think that fit the Board's direction because they were separate HUC 10s and we told other areas they could only nominate 1 HUC 10.

- The group discussed the merits of working in the Teanaway versus the Wilson/Naneum and which area would have the most benefit. Casey thought the Wilson/Naneum had more potential to directly improve spatial structure in a way that was more meaningful for meeting recovery criteria. Steve agreed.

Gina Piazza, WDFW, updated on Puget Sound packages under development.

- Goldsborough (HUC 10 package #1): Downstream checks have been done. Package #2 (independent tributaries package): 7 projects are included in this package.
  - Dave Caudill supports including the independent tributaries package; he's not sure where else these would go
  - Other Board members agreed with Dave Caudill
  - Cade clarified that the independent tributaries were part of the same HUC 10 and so could be considered along with Goldsborough Creek and suggested their list be prioritized across both areas.
- Pilchuck River HUC 10: Met with local working group, all agree on not proposing Lake Stevens work due to a variety of concerns including invasive species. Their group wonders about phased approaches, with design first. Steve Martin thinks it's better to stick with projects that can be constructed sooner. Gina noted they have walked the Pilchuck, but not the second priority package.
- Pysht River Strait of Juan de Fuca Frontal HUC 10: forest landowners are willing to work cooperatively. One project has 60 feet of fill and would be pretty expensive to repair.
  - Upper Hoko: Carl thinks the FBRB should consider providing just a portion of the funding.
  - Next step is for WDFW to complete field scoping of their Priority 2 culverts and completed cost estimates.

Upper Columbia River Recovery Region: Their priority is the Okanogan River. Next steps are their final approval of the package, outreach, discussing US 97 barrier with WSDOT, and completing cost estimates. They have included a lower Johnson Barrier Package in Riverside, WA – need to check with WSDOT on their barrier. Questions and discussion included:

- Casey mentioned that the downstream barrier(s) were not blocking adult steelhead passage and therefore were not a local priority for restoration. He asked the group their thoughts on if those had to be included in the proposal.
- Carl asked if we are willing to let locals decide on what projects to submit for possible funding; Paul noted that locals suggested fixing barriers according to our priorities, but he is concerned about deferring too much to local interests when the legislation is pretty clear about downstream barriers.
- Casey agreed that in general we should stick to fixing all downstream barriers, but we need to be mindful of efficient use of funds and perhaps there could be some flexibility if it is clear that some important fish objectives can be met.

### **Coordinated Pathway Nominations**

Cade Roler wants feedback on the tier 2 ranking of the approved Top 30 project list. Cade informed the board that one of the projects on the Top 30 list was recently funded through another program. He asked if a new project should be added to the list of Top 30 projects in place of the funded project.

- David Price thinks it stays on this list, just to maintain the list – finding a new replacement project would take too much time; others agreed

Feedback on the ranking:

- Good to know cost per lineal mile
- Some extra information on the level of coordination would be helpful; a brief narrative
- Idea here is to support where other investments are being made
- Habitat quality is assessed using WDFW protocols when walking the streams

- Information on barrier severity:
  - Barrier status for some of the sites are changing for some locations due to field work/verifications
- Information on number of downstream barriers should be brought to FBRB
  - Gary thinks it's useful to understand the entire watershed
  - Casey suggested if a downstream barrier is found ask sponsors if they would be willing to include it in the package; if it can't be included the project falls off the list; others supported this approach
- Gary noted that we should consider the geographic scope of project locations and encourage more projects between Everett and Tacoma
- Steve suggested organizing the list by barrier owner, rather than project sponsor – Carl also would recommend this
- Carl noted his concern that there are very few city projects in the list; part of this might be that some city projects are in downtown areas and are very expensive; some have deferred adding such projects to the initial pending program until a better understanding is known of the criteria and other considerations including costs; this includes a project in downtown Walla Walla

**Introduction to a new tool for landscape-scale watershed assessments:** This item was postponed until the June meeting.

**Subcommittee update: Project match**

Cade Roler noted he worked with a subcommittee, and drafted some possible criteria based on that.

Discussion points included the following:

- Legislation requires match of 25% unless other match is stipulated; Casey thinks that is pretty high and suggested 15% along with fairly liberal match criteria so that it doesn't inhibit implementation of good but expensive projects
  - Cade noted this would be similar to other grant programs that practitioners are familiar with
- We need to discuss what to consider a "sub-watershed"; FBRB members think the HUC 10 is the right scale when considering projects that could serve as match
  - This can be re-visited for the next grant round
- General agreement for this first round on 15% match and barrier projects within the same HUC 10 can serve as match
- The group ran out of time to discuss the entire match proposal and will continue the discussion at the next meeting.

**Summary/Next Steps**

- Next meeting is May 19<sup>th</sup> at the Association of WA Cities
- Communication subcommittee will meet again prior to next meeting
- At the next meeting, consider applying broad criteria from the coordinated pathway to the watershed pathway projects
- Next meeting should include more discussion on match

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm.