

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

**Date: July 17, 2018**

**Place: Association of Washington Cities, Olympia, Washington**

**Summary: Agenda items with formal action**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Formal Action</b>
Meeting notes from June 19	Approved with spelling correction
Coordinated pathway project list	Approved with two amendments – two projects moved to different priority based on location of downstream barriers.
Whether to combine the watershed and coordinated pathway lists for submittal to the Legislature	Motion approved to combine the two lists and set a system for combining
Snake River Board request to change their watershed pathway project and watershed	Motion approved to change to Mill Creek

**Summary: Follow-up actions**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Follow-up</b>
Consideration of recommendations to NOAA	Contact Dave Price to see if he wants to discuss at a future agenda
Discuss lessons learned from grant round	Schedule for an upcoming agenda

**Board Members/Alternates Present:**

Tom Jameson, Chair, WDFW	Carl Schroeder, AWC
Susan Kanzler, DOT	Dave Caudill, RCO - GSRO
Jon Brand, WSAC	Joe Shramek, DNR
Justin Zweifel, WDFW	Casey Baldwin, CCT (phone)
Steve Manlow, COR	

**Others present at meeting:**

Dave Collins, WDFW	Evan Lewis, King County
Cade Roler, WDFW	Dan Calvert, PSP
Gina Piazza, WDFW	Sheridan Paulus, WDFW
Neil Aaland, Facilitator	Alison Hart, WDFW
L. Davis	Dan Barrett, WDFW
Wendy A. Clark-Getzin, Jefferson County	John Foltz, SRSRB

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review

Meeting started at 9:00. Neil reviewed the agenda. He is not sure that Dave Price will be attending. When we get to the NOAA agenda item, if Dave is not present we will move that item off to a later time.

**Public Comment:** No comment was offered.

**Old Business:** Approval of May meeting notes: moved and seconded to approve with one spelling correction. Motion passed.

**Recommendations to NOAA Fisheries:** Item deferred until Dave Price is in attendance.

**2019-2021 Coordinated Pathway Request to Legislature:** Justin Zweifel led this discussion. All applications were received by end of June. Staff has been doing field and office review. He reviewed the columns on the spreadsheet and the scoring assigned. Tom Jameson discussed the Lyon Creek project This includes the old Ballinger automotive site in the Lake Forest Park area. Carl noted it would be good to better capture surrounding issues for this and similar projects. This has the highest cost per mile for all projects on the list.

Steve Manlow asked at what point projects are split up and considered separately. Justin thinks it depends on the applicant, sometimes it didn't make sense for applicants to group projects due to capacity issues. We should discuss at a future meeting the impacts of bundling projects. Carl wondered why the draft score was included in the spreadsheet. Included because it reflected several things not included in the final score. Joe noted that one project on private land was removed because it had been funded by FFFPP, and asked if any of the remaining private projects were on the FFFPP "waiting list" but unfunded by FFFPP in the current biennium? Dave Caudill said that one of the six private projects was on the FFFPP list (FBRB ID 11 "Trib to Grader Cr." in the Solduc/Hoh WRIA).

Justin said the goal for today is to approve this list. He noted there are several different projects on Scammon Creek that ranked differently – FBRB ID numbers 29,30a and b, and 31. Project 31 is downstream of the other three Scammon Creek projects but is ranked lower than those 3. The Board has the ability to move projects to a different ranking if they think that makes sense. Cade thought that the ranking differences might reflect an application that was not filled out as well. A similar situation exists with King Creek projects 13 and 14. Project 13 (ranked 25) presents a barrier to 14 (ranked 23) but is ranked as lower priority.

A motion was moved and seconded to move Scammon creek FBRB project ID 31 (ranked 22) above FBRB project ID 29 (ranked 12) in the priority list, and to move King Creek FBRB project ID 13 (ranked 25) above FBRB project ID 14 (ranked 23) in the priority list and approve this amended list. The motion was approved unanimously.

Casey wondered about project 39 (ranked 7) with 8 partial downstream barriers. Justin and Cade explained there has been work on that stream. The sponsor is working to route the stream around two large ponds which are thermal barriers. WDFW is supportive of this project; Casey agreed.

Another issue are the projects ranked 29-35. They have less than ¼ mile of habitat. Should the Board even be recommending these? At what point does the Board recommend not funding? Susan said it would be helpful to see the overall habitat gain if all barriers were corrected Casey wonders about packaging Lyon Creek with others and come back next year for funding. Tom explained that there was a direct appropriation on this project that funds most of the design, and they are asking for enough to complete design. Joe suggested we have the discussion about not approving the bottom tier of projects as part of a "lessons learned from this round" discussion following approval. The general sense of the Board was agreement.

Casey thinks the scoring system works; the Board needs to have some discretion as discussed today. Susan agreed, as did Dave Caudill. It's a relative list, projects might score differently next time as compared to other projects.

**2019-21 Legislative Request: Should coordinated and watershed pathways be combined in one list?**

Tom Jameson led this discussion. He reviewed Mark Doumit's op-ed in the Seattle Times, and a letter from WSAC and AWC to the Governor and legislators about the need for more funding. There is a lot of attention being paid to fish passage. Rep Wilcox proposed, during the supplemental budget session, an

additional \$50 million/year for fish passage. Tom noted that the current estimated total project cost for the approved Coordinated Pathway project list and the anticipated Watershed Pathway proposals is around 24.8M\$. He wonders about the strategy of asking for more funding than we have proposed projects.

Discussion points included:

- If we receive more, could ask for projects in the coordinated pathway
- There are a number of projects that local governments didn't apply for
- Dave Collins thinks if there was more money there would be more projects from his area
- Carl said OFM wants to see something like a 10-year projection of funding needs; thinks we should ask for \$50 million per biennium
- Jon thinks we should consider using more funding for inventory work
- Dave Caudill said the RCO legislative liaison is not as comfortable asking for more funding than identified projects

Message on this is that there is a lot of need coming our way shortly.

Tom then went to the topic of the two lists. He reviewed related discussion from past meetings. In 2016, the Board chose to combine the two lists for the legislative submittal. This was done as follows:

- We compared the net habitat gain of each of the #1 ranked projects from all 8 approved WP watersheds and the #1 ranked project from the CP list.
- Those projects were ranked 1-9 from most net gain to least.
- Then we compared the net habitat gain of each of the #2 ranked projects from all 8 approved WP watersheds and the #2 ranked project from the CP list.
- Those projects were ranked 10-18 from most net gain to least.
- And so on.

Discussion points included:

- This is no longer a brand new program
- Carl thought we should combine the lists
- General sense is to combine the lists
- Casey suggested reversing how we did it last time, this time starting with watershed project then coordinated pathway – he thinks the watershed projects are a higher priority
- Carl agreed with Casey, the watershed projects reflect local priority
- Joe is okay with that, thinks that is another topic for “lessons learned” discussion

Three motions were developed;

1. A motion was made and seconded to combine the two lists; motion approved unanimously.
2. A motion was made and seconded to make the watershed projects a higher priority within each grouping, or round, of project listing; motion approved unanimously.
3. A motion was made and seconded that, within the list of approved watersheds, to select the order of watersheds by random choice, then reverse that order for group 2, and continue in that way. The motion was approved unanimously.

[NOTE: See results of combining the lists at end of these notes]

LUNCH BREAK

**Request to switch Snake River Board project in watershed pathway to Mill Creek flume.** John Foltz from the Snake River Board presented this topic. This is their formal request to switch the designated watershed from Snake/Grand Ronde to Mill Creek. He presented this in April to the Board and received feedback that it is better as a watershed pathway project. Tom explained that staff went out and looked at

the proposed project. They followed the stream to assess habitat. They are all in support of the request. The local WDFW regional staff also agree with this shift. Tom was initially uncertain but after considering all of the information is supportive.

Dave Collins reviewed background information and plans. He thinks it is a solid design. The habitat is good, out of town is a pretty intact watershed. Cade agrees. Gina noted this watershed was originally proposed as a focus, but it didn't meet the connection to transportation related barriers item in the statute.

Questions and discussion points included:

- Are there any other potential issues? [the underground section raises some concern, but the project still makes sense]
- What is the gain for the proposal? [about 50% improvement in the concrete channel; it's a partial barrier]
- Is the city committed to addressing 12 bridges? [they are working on those]
- The project refers to a federal GI study, which can lead to potential federal funding – would be good to bring in Dave Price and NOAA on this project
- Is the federal congressional delegation supportive? [Yes]
- There are two related line items in the federal budget
- John noted that local capacity is an issue

A motion was made and seconded to replace the priority HUC 10 watershed tributaries above Little Goose Dam with Mill Creek, leaving the Grand Ronde tributary in place through completion of the Cottonwood Creek project. Motion approved unanimously.

**Other business:**

Steven Manlow noted that his alternate, Stacy Vynne McKinstry, has left her position with the Puget Sound Partnership so he needs to find a new alternate. Carl and Jon noted they also need to find new alternates.

**The meeting adjourned at 1:30 pm.**

**Next meeting: Tuesday, August 21, 2018 – Rainier Room, Association of Washington Cities**

-----  
*Note to all: A FBRB member suggested it would be useful to include in these notes the results of combining the two lists. Following the July 17 meeting, WDFW staff had one of their budget staff do a random draw to determine the watershed order. The order is:*

1. *Hoko*
2. *Coast*
3. *Lower Columbia*
4. *Upper Columbia*
5. *Middle Columbia*
6. *Snake*
7. *Goldsborough*
8. *Pilchuck*

*Thus, the North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity provides their #1 project in the Hoko and that will rank #1 overall. Then the Chehalis Basin Lead Entity will provide their #1 project in the Newaukum (Coast) and that will rank #2 overall...and so on. The #9 project overall will be the top ranked Coordinated Pathway project, which is Chumstick Creek. Then the order will go:*

10. *Pilchuck*
11. *Goldsborough*
12. *Snake*
13. *Mid Col*
14. *Upp Col*
15. *Low Col*
16. *Coast*
17. *Hoko*
18. *2nd ranked Coordinated Pathway project*

*In summary, the approved watersheds were ordered randomly, then within each watershed the individual projects are ordered by the Lead Entity or Regional Organization representing that watershed.*