

**Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes**  
**Date: July 19, 2016**  
**Place: Natural Resources Building, Olympia, Washington**

**Summary: Agenda items with formal action**

Item	Formal Action
Meeting Notes - June	Approved
List of projects making up watershed pathway	Approved
Process and list of projects making up coordinated pathway	Approved
Advise WDFW to prepare a priority 1 list with projects from both pathways as the preferred approach	Approved

**Summary: Follow-up actions**

Item	Follow-up

**Board Members/Alternates Present:**

David Price, Chair, WDFW	Steve Martin, Council of Regions
Susan Cierebij, DOT	Carl Schroeder, AWC
Joe Shramek, WDNR	Gary Rowe, WSAC
Stacey Polkowske, WDFW	Dave Caudill, RCO
Casey Baldwin, CCT	Jon Brand, WA Counties

**Others present at meeting:**

Dave Collins, WDFW	Tom Jameson, WDFW
Cade Roler, WDFW	Alison Hart, WDFW
Gina Piazza, WDFW	Neil Aaland, Facilitator
Alex Conley, YBFWRB	Jan Rosholt, Parametrix
Rebecca Benjamin, NOSC	Michelle Wilcox, Ecology
Mike Kaputa, Chelan County	

**Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review**

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. Neil reviewed the agenda for today.

**Public Comments:** Mike Kaputa, Chelan County, noted that they started addressing barriers pre-SRFB and a lot of high priority barriers have been fixed through existing funding sources. He noted that there were not any FBRB coordinated pathway projects in Eastern Washington and wondered if there would be an opportunity to provide information after the list is combined. Dave Price said the Board recognizes the lack of coordination projects on the eastside, but addressing a lack of coordinated approach projects on the eastside will be addressed during the next round of project solicitation.

**Follow-up Items**

Approval of meeting notes: Carl moved to approve, Steve Martin seconded. Meeting notes were approved unanimously.

Match guidance: Dave explained that the guidance approved at the last meeting was revised for clarification purposes; that's why it was circulated to the Board prior to today's meeting. He did not believe the changes were substantive, just clarification. No Board member asked for further discussion.

Rebecca Benjamin, in the audience, asked about the guidance and whether local groups are held to the requirements for match if they are sponsoring a county's project? Board discussion expressed that those types of issues are expected to be worked out between project owners or sponsors. Dave Caudill noted that RCO uses a simple landowner acknowledgement form.

### **Final Barrier List**

While awaiting a presenter, the Board began discussing what a final list could look like. Dave Price said this is the idea of having a comprehensive and integrated list of projects. WDFW is proposing that the recommended list is all priority one projects in both the watershed pathway and coordinated pathway. Gary suggested that it was important to check again with project proponents about readiness to proceed. Carl asked about priority two projects, how they were noted as such; some of them are so labeled due to being funded already. Dave Caudill said some are funded in the next biennium, not necessarily implemented.

The presenter for the other item was ready to proceed; the Board will return to this topic later today.

### **Watershed Pathway**

This item started off with a presentation by Alex Conley with the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board. He was asked at the last meeting to explain how they established their list. Alex explained they have been working on barriers since at least 1980, and the easy ones are completed. He displayed a set of maps that showed barriers corrected over time. He also noted that DNR/RMAP has cleared up lots of barriers. Given their importance to meeting the spatial structure criteria for the steelhead recovery plan, their primary focus areas are now Caribou/Naneum MSA's. He concluded by noting he likes the investment WDFW has made in the fish passage database, and suggests working to minimize overhead costs in any new grant program.

Questions and comments from FBRB members included:

- As the Yakima group works on de-listing, we hope they stay competitive in applying for future funding
- What would de-listing look like? [less regulatory burden, and re-establishment of a steelhead sports fishery]
- If you receive funding, could you complete these projects by 2018? [Alex believes so for priority 1 projects]
- Please discuss the condition of habitat being opened with these projects [upstream is a lot of habitat, but their first projects are in the valley; they may not LOOK productive but they have lots of salmonids]
- Steve Martin reinforced Alex's point about minimizing overhead
  - Dave Price wants to discuss what the grant program looks like, at an upcoming meeting

The Board then began discussing WDFW's recommendation on the suite of projects in this pathway. Dave Price wonders about dividing it into priority 1 and priority 2 packages. This would be good, fundable approach, and he recommends we not cull any projects from the list. Gary asked that each package have a narrative explaining why the particular packages were suggested by the regional organizations; Carl liked that idea. Dave Price noted we've already asked the regions to explain why they chose these areas.

A question was raised about removing high-cost projects if funding was not provided for the whole - package. Joe supports the process we've used, and only wants to re-visit high-cost projects if packages are not fully funded. Gary suggested that we trust the process and not keep going back, and only address if funding isn't high enough. He suggested two points for considering this: first is when we get an initial response from OFM; and second when we see what the legislature is proposing to fund. Casey suggested that we should be prepared to answer questions and justify the expensive projects and creating a narrative description would help.

Carl summarized what he's been hearing from the Board. There is comfort with the watershed pathway as it stands; engaging with the regions is good. This takes us as far as possible. Dave Price added that he likes the idea of supplemental information to explain the packages; we have till January to compile and he'll commit to WDFW working on that.

Steve Martin moved to approve the list of projects in the watershed pathway as divided into priorities 1 and 2; Casey seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

### **Coordinated Pathway**

Cade presented this item. He handed out the list of criteria for ranking and the results of the ranking in spreadsheet/table form, and reminded the Board that out of the 30 final projects 6 received other funding; there are 24 projects left. He said the results of the ranking had some surprises for him. Several projects appear on both the coordinated pathway and watershed pathway lists. The ranking results include all projects; the spreadsheet divided into priority 1 and 2. Priority 2 projects reflect being on both lists. He thinks the priority 1 projects are all solid projects.

Cade proposed that the Board approve the priority 1 and 2 lists for the coordinated pathway.

A motion was developed: Move to approve the process that led to applying ranking criteria and come up with ranking results, which then led to listing of barriers for the coordinated pathway into a list of priority 1 and 2 barriers; amended to add Starbird Creek to the list of priority 2 barriers. Carl made this motion; Dave Caudill seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

### **Final Barrier List**

The Board already began some discussion about this early in the meeting. They talked about the two separate lists. Dave Price asked if combining these two lists makes sense:

- Gary thinks it's harder for the legislature to consider funding for separate lists
- Dave Price thinks there is value to keeping separate lists at the Board level, but perhaps we should combine them for OFM and legislative purposes
- Gary wonders about combining the list within each recovery region, since those regions are the geographic basis for projects
- Joe wonders about combining project lists that were prepared using very different methods; that speaks to having two separate lists
- Other concerns were raised about whether having one list could lead to "cherry picking" individual projects

After further discussion, Dave Price suggested preparing a priority 1 list with projects from both pathways as the preferred approach. There was general agreement around the table.

A motion was developed: Move to advise WDFW to develop a list that includes watershed pathway priority 1 projects, coordinated pathway priority 1 projects, a preference for watershed followed by coordinated pathway, and ask for authority to move projects from priority 2 lists up to the funding list if needed. Carl made this motion, Joe seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

The Board thanked WDFW staff for all their hard work in preparing the lists and the supporting information.

### **Summary/Next Steps**

- We do not need to hold the special meeting on August 2
- The communications subcommittee will meet and discuss what is needed for future materials
- A report to the legislature will need to be prepared, and we'll discuss that in an upcoming meeting

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 pm.

**Next meeting: Tuesday, August 30 – NRB Room 172**