

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes

Date: May 15, 2018

Place: Association of Washington Cities, Olympia, Washington

Summary: Agenda items with formal action

Item	Formal Action
Meeting Notes - April	Approved with one edit
Signage for projects	Approved
Combined work plan and communication plan tasks	Approved
Draft applications for 2019-21 Coordinated Pathway	Approved (all applicants will be invited to submit next phase of information)
Application requirements and evaluation process for final applications	Approved

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
FBRB logo/sticker for construction phase	WDFW and RCO work on this
Status report on workplan items	Neil will bring this information to next meeting
Legislative budget deadlines	WDFW will write up a schedule showing the legislative budget request deadlines.
Funding table	New funding table will be produced with a column showing new sites added and culvert re-assessments

Board Members/Alternates Present:

Tom Jameson, Chair, WDFW	Carl Schroeder, AWC
Paul Wagner, DOT	Dave Caudill, RCO - GSRO
Jon Brand, WSAC	Gary Rowe, WSAC
Justin Zweifel, WDFW	Casey Baldwin, CCT
Stacy Vynne, Council of Regions (phone)	Joe Shramek, DNR

Others present at meeting:

Dave Collins, WDFW	Christy Rains, WDFW
Cade Roler, WDFW	Ken Cousins, Earth Economics
Gina Piazza, WDFW	Zach Moore, WDFW
Neil Aaland, Facilitator	Curt Bennett, WDFW
Matt Miskovic, KPFF	Wendy Clark-Getzin, Jefferson County
Alison Hart, WDFW	Chris Fredley, WDFW

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review

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

Public Comments

Wendy Clark-Getzin from Jefferson County commented on the coordinated pathway and provided some context on the Thorndyke Creek project. They organized a local meeting to coordinate on this project.

Local organizations regularly discuss how to move forward on projects. 25 county culverts need replacing. The county appropriates \$275,000 each year for its capital transportation program which provides match for project applications.

Old Business

1. Approval of April meeting notes: Neil said that the minutes should be corrected to reflect that Carl be shown as present for the meeting. Paul Wagner made a motion to approve the minutes with that correction; Carl Schroeder seconded. Approved unanimously.
2. Tribute Signage: Neil reviewed the memo he prepared. Jon said most counties will post a sign during construction; Carl thinks we could provide a sticker for signage during construction, if implementers decide to post one in that phase and if they request one from the FBRB. Gary suggested adding an item 5 to the motion that the FBRB directs staff to review and provide a graphic for use by the Board. The motion with this amendment was moved by Paul and seconded by Dave Caudill. Motion carried unanimously.
3. Combining workplan with communication plan: Neil explained this had been teed up for approval last July, but the FBRB postponed that meeting (and further meetings) until the capital budget was approved. The communication subcommittee had recommended including the action items within the overall workplan and keeping the remainder of the communication plan separate as a historical document. Carl so moved, Joe Shramek seconded. Motion carried. Casey would like a status report on each item. Neil will come back to the next meeting with that information.

New Business

1. Initial review, scoring, and ranking of the Draft Applications for the 2019-21 Coordinated Pathway: Justin Zweifel led this discussion. He reviewed the spreadsheet and explained the columns and scoring sheet. There is a lot of back-and-forth between the department and applicants during the submittal process. The projects are divided into planning only and construction projects. One issue is the implications of funding design-only projects; does that mean there is an obligation by the Board to fund construction? Also, do designs only have a certain (limited) shelf life?

Discussion points:

- Casey asked about having the level of local coordination as a factor in scoring. Justin explained that this will be a consideration for the final application review. They will get more points in the review of Final Applications if they have a high level of coordination with any type of restoration project within the watershed (not just fish passage).
- Gary raised the issue of packaging projects and asked if applicants are encouraged to do this. He thinks for design-only projects, they should definitely encourage this. Justin said they are.
- Gary wondered about a point raised by Wendy Clark-Getzin; if they're relying on a project being completed that is on DOT's project list, is it good enough that it's on that correction list? Paul said if it's on the DOT 6-year plan, it is considered funded.
- All projects included in the coordinated pathway total \$19 million
- If match is a problem perhaps should consider 100% funding
 - There might be a "saturation" issue where not enough match is available
 - Legislation says match is 25% if not otherwise specified by the Board
 - Dave Caudill suggested asking applicants if they are prepared to provide the match
- Cade noted that approving design projects may set up a big construction request down the road

- Gary wonders if the Board should consider having a 6-year plan, more than just planning for the next biennium
 - Paul noted the Board has a longer view for the watershed approach

Neil asked if the questions being raised today affect this proposed list or are the questions for later discussion? Carl still has some questions about this round. Tom said we need a conversation about whether regions can shift their watersheds (for the watershed pathway). Cade suggested all current applicants on the list be asked to submit a final application; there was some attraction to this idea. Casey thought we should eliminate some projects that did not score well with a couple of criteria, such as combinations of low linear gain and multiple downstream barriers; why have them (and WDFW staff) do more work if they are not likely to be competitive? Since we only funded a couple of coordinated pathway projects the last time it seems unrealistic to include more than 10 or 15 projects in the next round of review.

Carl asked how the total linear gain compared to the first grant round; Cade thinks it is similar. Gary is interested in having planning projects discuss downstream or upstream project additions. The Board was also interested in adding an “accessibility weighted habitat” metric.

Jon moved to advance all projects on the list to the next phase but give a heads up to those with lower scores, and with the addition of the accessibility weighted habitat metric; Paul seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

2. Application requirements and evaluation process for the Final Applications – Justin Zweifel. This item is about the next step after applicants are asked to submit information for the next phase. We’ll ask for design documents, a cost spreadsheet, and responses to a list of questions. He referenced the evaluation criteria dated May 14 and reviewed those. Comments and questions included:

- Some criteria penalize areas like the Coast with no endangered species
- How do you determine cost effectiveness? [We did this last time; have to rank planning only projects separately from restoration]
- Would be good to see cost per lineal gain
- Add another score to add more value to linear gain
- Add 15 points for the “accessibility weighted habitat” criteria; support for this
- Gary wonders about geographic diversity
- Need to have some flexibility in the process

Dave moved to approve with 15 points added for accessibility weighted habitat and the caveat for process flexibility; Carl seconded. Motion approved unanimously.

3. 2019-2021 Watershed Pathway updates – Justin Zweifel. He sent letters and provided a copy of one. It says the FBRB is continuing down the list of previously approved projects, and there are some new requirements. It asks for information to go directly to the local Technical Review Teams (TRT). New projects are okay to submit if they’re in the same watershed. John Folts from Snake River may seek to switch their focal watershed to the Mill Creek watershed. The Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board is considering a move of their project to another within the same watershed to take advantage of recent ownership changes. The FBRB is comfortable with submitting that as a different project. Additional discussion points:

Justin asked the Board if they thought a project could be broken into three phases (instead of design and construction)? One project in Pilchuck needs an alternative analysis. Paul wonders about just funding an alternatives analysis; there is a lot of potential habitat gain and it's not an overly large funding amount.

4. Cost increase requests – Justin wonders how we will handle the requests for projects from the 2017-2019 list. The manual says preliminary designs must be complete before additional funding is requested. Do we want to consider all requests at once, or as they come in? He doesn't need a decision today but wants to hear FBRB viewpoints. Gary noted re-appropriation requests will go in with a next round request for funding. Tom said WDFW will put together a schedule based on the legislative budget request deadlines.
5. Other business – Christy Rains is doing staff interviews for positions; a new funding table will be produced with a column showing new sites added and culvert re-assessments.

Chair Tom Jameson thanked Gary Rowe, who is retiring, for his service to the Board.

The meeting adjourned at 2:15 pm.

Next meeting: Tuesday, June 19, 2018 – Rainier Room, Association of Washington Cities