

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

**Date: July 10, 2014**

**Place: Rm 172, Natural Resources Building, Olympia, Washington**

### **Summary: Agenda items with formal action**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Formal Action</b>
Meeting Notes	Approved meeting notes from June 17, 2014

### **Summary: Agenda and other items and follow-up**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Follow-up Actions</b>
Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review	None
Ground rules/bylaws	Chair to prepare another iteration of ground rules and bring to August meeting
Board purpose/tasks	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. All Board members to review page 2-3 and provide email comments on tasks 7-15 to Julie by August 1.</li><li>2. On page 4, review “Values/Principals of a barrier removal strategy”. Please provide your thoughts by August 1 on the table as well as what information you would like to consider when developing a prioritization strategy for barriers</li></ol>
Legislative report this fall	Put on the August agenda for discussion

### **Board Members/Alternates Present:**

Julie Henning, Chair (WDFW)	Casey Baldwin, Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
Carl Schroeder, AWC	Jon Brand, Kitsap County/WSAC
Paul Wagner, DOT	Donelle Mahan, WDNR
Jonalee Squeochs, Yakama Indian Nation	David Price, WDFW
Brian Abbott, GSRO	Gary Rowe, WSAC

### **Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review**

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by facilitator Neil Aaland. Neil reviewed some logistical items, asked people around the table to introduce themselves, and then reviewed the agenda. A motion was made and seconded to approve the June meeting notes; motion passed unanimously.

**Public Comments:** Nobody present wished to offer any comments.

### **Follow-up items from first meeting**

#### *1. California Fish Passage Forum:*

Julie Henning reviewed their website and talked with the Chair to better understand the Forum’s objective and how they function. The website link is <http://www.cafishpassageforum.org/> which has a lot of information on it. Initially, to the

forum functioning the California Coastal Conservancy, a state agency, received \$750,000 in funding. . This funding was used to determine what barrier information has been collected and get it into a centralized location. They collected information from a variety of sources and got data on 12,000 barriers. There is an MOU signed by 5 agencies and entities. California is divided into four different regions for these purposes. Board members had the following comments and questions:

- What year were they formed? [In 1999, there was a directive to form; it was formalized by the passage of proposition 12]
- Do they still receive state funding? [They receive funding from a federal partnership; other funding is routed directly to each agency]
- What is their meeting frequency? [They met quarterly for a while; not as regularly now]
- We should track them but not delve into them in detail
- Did they do a prioritization? [Not sure; their projects seem more opportunistic]
- Does Oregon have anything similar? [No forum or board with a collaborative effort]
- Was it formed by their legislature? [Interested parties signed on to an MOU]

## 2. *Bylaws*

A draft was sent out for review and discussion. Comments on specific articles include:

### *Article 1: Name*

- Acronym of FPB could be confused with Forest Practices Board. It was decided that the board acronym would be FBRB

### *Article 2: Purpose*

- Some of the wording is confusing; It was decided to delete “which will include developing a methodology for correcting barriers” which will help reduce confusing.
- Review the last sentence in the purpose of the legislation

### *Article 3: Membership*

- Julie is continuing to discuss the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission’s participation on the board; they haven’t yet designated an official member

### *Article 4: Terms*

- Decide which members have 3-year terms and which have 4-year terms
- Need to address resignations

### *Article 5: Roles and Responsibilities*

- Clarify the intent regarding speaking for the Board, seems overly restrictive

### *Article 6: Meetings*

- Some thought there should be more than one opportunity for public comment
- Need to be able to establish a time limit if necessary

### *Article 7: Meeting Ground Rules*

- Discussion about posting materials on website; the agenda has been posted but not supporting materials
- It can be helpful to have all materials on website, but that means everything needs to be provided to WDFW 5 days in advance of meetings
- Some concern about having multiple drafts of documents on website
- One member commented about posting would be helpful to others wanting to get the materials that are e-mailed to members; Julie will research
- Information should be made available to public before the meeting to allow for meaningful public comment
- Do we need a conflict of interest section?

### *Article 8: Voting*

- Should identify key actions needing a vote on meeting agenda
- Clarify “key decision” and “formal recommendation”

- Chair wants to have vote on formal recommendations, other votes at Chair's discretion
- Need to clarify what constitutes a quorum
- One suggestion that a quorum should include at least one tribal member
  - If attendance is an issue, can make arrangements to vote from remote location
  - Julie will work on some wording for how to handle voting if members can't be physically present
- Consider having 5 votes needed for formal recommendations, other votes based on quorum

*Article 9: Amendments to bylaws*

- Need to clarify what an "active member" is (comment related to when an entity has not appointment their representative)
- Suggestion that this be established as a percentage of members

**Break: the Board took a break at 11:45 am and re-convened at 12:00 noon**

**Board Purpose/Tasks**

The Chair provided an overview of this item. This is intended to be a work plan and schedule for the next year. The goal of this discussion is to agree on a common vision about the legislation and what we need to accomplish based on it. Julie based each task on the language from the bill.

The Board started by reviewing the "Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board" Tasks document.

*Item 1: Add today's items to tasks*

*Item 2:*

- One key role is played by Lead Entities, with their work plans – do we need involvement from Lead Entities and regional boards?
  - GSRO represents them
- USFS has requested to be added as a member, will need to consider them at a later date (also Associated General Contractors has shown interest)
- Also consider Puget Sound Partnership's Salmon Recovery Council
- Julie will develop recommendations on adding new members
- Another comment was to have new members join sooner rather than later

*Item 3:*

- Need to further describe the task
- Good data is needed
- Need to take into account where all barrier projects have occurred and where investments are made, including federal and private
- What does it mean to have a "schedule"?
  - Schedule can be funding based
- This is the meatiest item in the whole table – what does this strategy look like at the end?
- Item 3 is a series of meetings and topics

*Item 4:*

- In the salmon world, the state is broken into regions based on ESU's (Evolutionary Significant Units)
  - Consider using that system to help prioritize
  - Good as long as this is a statewide framework
- Some members have a list of barriers

- Discussion around the structure for transportation planning; it probably isn't the best way to organize the Board's work
- Other related topics include anadromous fish, and the issue of upstream dams as barriers

*Item 5:*

- Sometimes barriers are fixed by counties or other entities and not reported
- Need some way to capture information on these fixed barriers

*Item 6:*

- This is a key product that the Board must deliver
- Railroads are a difficult entity in terms of removing their barriers
- Recommendations go to legislature and to interested parties
- Other entities should be included as appropriate – e.g. recommendations to SRFB, USFS
- Is there a report that should be provided to the Legislature this fall?
  - We'll put this on the August Board agenda for discussion

Julie asked members how we should address items 7 – 15, since we're running out of time. It was suggested each member would provide input to Julie on which items need more discussion. Initial comments were made about items 14 and 15. In addition, WDFW needs to develop some training for others related to the bill. Neil asked members to give any other input to Julie on which topics to address.

For the next meeting, Julie asked members to think about what information would be useful to the Board. She asked that members look at page 4, values/principles. Please e-mail her with types of information.

The Board confirmed that future meetings, for now, will be from 9:30 am till 3:00 pm. The next meeting will be at the Red Lion in Olympia. For future meetings, we will try to reserve room 172 in the Natural Resources Building.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 1:00 p.m.

**The next meeting of the Board will be Tuesday, August 19, 2014 at the Red Lion Inn, 2300 Evergreen Park Drive SW, Olympia, WA, 98502.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Others present at meeting:**

Neil Aaland, Facilitator  
 Jon Adkins, Exeltech Consulting  
 Melissa Erkel  
 Marc McCalmon