

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes

Date: May 19, 2015

Place: Governor Hotel, Olympia, Washington

Summary: Agenda items with formal action

Item	Formal Action
Meeting Notes	Approved with edits meeting notes from April 24

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
Draft Workplan	Neil will edit workplan as discussed and present another iteration at the June meeting

Board Members/Alternates Present/on the phone:

David Price, Chair, WDFW	Jon Brand, Kitsap County/WSAC
Julie Henning, WDFW	Brian Abbott, GSRO
Paul Wagner, DOT	Carl Schroeder, AWC
Jonalee Squeochs, Yakama Tribe	Gary Rowe, WSAC
Casey Baldwin, Colville Tribe	

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by facilitator Neil Aaland. Neil reviewed the agenda for the day. He then asked Board members and attendees to introduce themselves. A motion was made by Jon Brand to approve the April meeting notes as edited; Brian Abbott seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comments: No one present offered comments.

Updates on Legislative Session

David Price discussed two presentations that were made since the last meeting. First, he was asked to give a briefing to the Senate Natural Resources and Parks Committee. It was relatively short, and well received. Second, he gave a briefing to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB). The SRFB, similar to other groups recently briefed, was surprised at the number of barriers that exist in the state. Brian added that it was a good session for the SRFB.

Discuss Work Plan

Neil provided a general overview of the topic. A previous iteration of the work plan was on the agenda for the April meeting, but since the meeting adjourned early due to loss of quorum it was not discussed. Since then Neil met with Brian Abbott and Paul Wagner and substantially revised the draft. He explained the structure. The plan starts with mission and values, and is then followed by goals and sets of actions for each goal. He began reviewing each goal and its accompanying actions. A general comment was made that several of the goals don't really read like goals, and should be re-worded for the next iteration.

Goal 1

- Reflect the membership of other members of the FBRB
- For action B, change the date due to be ongoing
- Move the external communication actions to goal 2
- Add an annual review of the bylaws
- For Action D, need to consider how to determine when new members of the FBRB are needed

Goal 2

Action A: The Board discussed why an outside expert is suggested. Brian said that outside experts have experience that agency staff may not have, and using outside contractors has worked well for GSRO. Dave said he likes what GSRO has done for communication plans, and asked the Board what they would want in a plan. Neil reviewed the proposed contents listed in Action A. Comments and discussion:

- One purpose is to gain support for the Board's activities and build momentum; should also include implementers since we're going to need others involved in the program
- Need to specifically reach out to local governments and state agencies, want to generate some excitement
- Some of the suggested timelines don't mesh with legislative deadlines
- There are two pieces: developing a strategy and then developing products
- Paul offered several points to consider:
 - What groups do we want to connect with?
 - What are the messages – what do we want to communicate?
- Brian has offered to help find funding for an outside expert to prepare a plan; there was some interest in forming a subcommittee of FBRB members to help
 - Subcommittee volunteers include Carl, Jon, Brian, and Dave – Brian will take the lead in setting the first meeting, to occur before the next FBRB meeting
 - This will be placed on the agenda for the June meeting

Action B: Brian explained the format of the conference; there will be 4 sessions related to fish passage. Dave is attending on behalf of the Board.

Action C: The reporting requirement to the legislature relates to the permit streamlining directive. Discussion centered around reporting on other topics, and what a good due date would be. Members thought there should be two different legislative reports. The first would be for this October 31, 2015, and discuss all Board activities. The second would be for October 31, 2016, and discuss the statutory requirement. Brian suggested that a future agenda item should be a discussion on the permit streamlining piece; Paul agreed. Julie explained the intent of this item was to bundle project applications for federal permits.

Action D: Julie said WDFW has been keeping the Washington Forest Protection Association updated on the progress. Carl mentioned they have been very supportive; Ecology should also be included in communication. FBRB members agreed to keep this action.

Action E: Members discussed the kind of outreach that should be made to tribes. Julie suggested, and others agreed, that this should probably be moved under goal A as part of the communication strategy. Jonalee cautioned that the commissions don't speak for all tribes, and shouldn't be used as a surrogate for communicating with all tribes.

Goal 3

Neil introduced this goal by stating it was at the heart of the work of the FBRB. This goal is intended to focus on developing an entire strategy. The FBRB has had several discussions about a prioritization methodology, which is one component of an overall strategy. Dave liked the organization of this goal, with the actions presented in a table. The FBRB talked about action 10, which is developing a funding proposal for a grant program. There was some concern about the 2016 target date to develop a proposal. One thought is to ask for some pieces in the 2016 supplemental session that would allow a program to get started. Initial pieces could include identifying obvious barriers to remove, identifying information gaps, and some kind of a pilot program. Dave thinks we need to go in with a strong message that the FBRB is ready to go. The FBRB concluded that some pieces should be requested for the 2016 supplemental session and a broader proposal be prepared for the 2017-19 budget session. Dave said they would put a placeholder in during WDFW's June discussions on budget proposals.

Additional discussion on this goal:

- Item 6 (develop a plan to coordinate information sharing and coordination) is needed before the overall strategy is prepared
- Conduct broader outreach after the initial work with the salmon recovery regions is done
- Be sure to include local governments in item 1
- Why are the Associated General Contractors called out? Because some of their members are implementers of projects, and they have been supportive of the program
- For action 1, be sure to frame up questions that are additive to the process
- Need to discuss how to set the stage for action 1
- Will need an outreach strategy for each different group or category of groups

Goal 4

This goal relates to the WDFW database. Discussion centered on what this database actually addresses. Dave explained that it is information pulled together from other agencies, and sometimes the quality of information is lacking. Brian mentioned that RCO has the PRISM database, for projects, and there is also the habitat work schedule. Gary asked if the database would bring in data from other sources; the answer is yes. Paul thinks this item is bigger than WDFW. One question is what data is out there, and can the FBRB get it. This might need to be part of the outreach effort. Decisions were that this section should be re-vamped to be more of a general data and information goal, and WDFW should provide a more detailed briefing to the FBRB. Following that briefing, a subcommittee should be formed to further explore this topic.

Goal 5

This goal relates to the development of a grant program. There is a need to consider steps needed to develop a plan for a grant program. We also need to consider what the FBRB will do in the absence of a grant program; there is a lot that can be accomplished otherwise. Paul thinks there is a lot of value in developing a prioritization system even if there is no FBRB grant program; others can use this system. We should also gather information on other grant programs. A plan for developing a grant program should be prepared by the FBRB by the end of this summer. Considerations include what should be requested in the 2016 supplemental legislative session and in the 2017-2019 session.

Goal 6

This goal is about permit streamlining, at the federal and state/local level. Carl thinks, at the local level, we need to discuss how mitigation funding can be used for local barrier projects. There doesn't really seem to be an issue with actual state/local permits. The suggestion is to change this item from permitting issues to ability to use funding for mitigation. Julie said the federal item is already happening, and thinks there may be more steps to address regarding mitigation funding and local/state issues. The legislation only specified federal permitting. The decision was to change the local/state issue to mitigation, rather than funding, and leave the federal permitting piece in and acknowledge work is already happening on that.

Snake River Example

Justin Zweifel, WDFW, described how the iterative process for developing priorities has been working with the Snake River Salmon Recovery Board. They met a month ago with Steven Martin and the Snake River technical team. The region then re-worked and re-submitted their choices. They identified two areas: first is the tributaries above Little Goose dam, and second is several tributaries on the Grande Ronde River. One issue is the HUC 10 scale doesn't work well for the Snake River area. Justin thinks this is a good example of the iterative process between WDFW and a region.

Carl thinks this starts to tell a promising story, where to start discussions about barriers. In response to a question about the USFS, this information does not reflect their data. It only reflects WDFW data and data from the Walla Walla project. Dave said they'll continue to work with Steve Martin to update. This process is similar to what WDFW wants to do with other regions.

Brian mentioned that June 22 is the next meeting of the Council of Regions. Dave asked if he could be placed on the agenda. Gary brought up the draft letter to Lead Entities. On page 2, he wondered if the bulleted points are the only criteria. Julie said those are the key criteria. Carl thinks there should be more than the four listed. Julie said regions asked for limits; perhaps they can soften the wording.

Mitigation Pathway

Dave set the context. He said there are three different funding pathways for projects: grant pathway, coordination pathway, and mitigation pathway. Ultimately, the FBRB will have to decide on the grant pathway projects. The coordination pathways are the “opportunistic” projects. The mitigation pathway is the newer approach and relates to mitigation and the potential use of mitigation funding from other projects for barrier removal projects. We need to have more discussion about this. An additional consideration relates to HB 5997 currently being considered by the legislature, which relates to WSDOT projects. WDFW can develop a proposal for the FBRB in how the mitigation pathway might work. Paul thinks this is premature, since the bill hasn’t passed. If it passes, then we can discuss how to make it work. Carl agreed; the decision is to postpone the discussion till later.

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 pm.

The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for June 16, 2015.

Others present at meeting:

Neil Aaland, Facilitator	Justin Zweifel, WDFW
Cade Roler, WDFW	Larry Dominguez, WDFW
Jason Callahan, House Staff	Peter Clodfelter, House Staff
Stacy Polkowske, WDFW	