

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes

Date: July 28, 2015

Place: Governor Hotel, Olympia, Washington

Summary: Agenda items with formal action

Item	Formal Action
Meeting Notes - June	Approved
Scope of work for Communication Strategy	Approved
Final Workplan	Approved with several edits

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
Updated WDFW fiscal note on 5996	Julie will provide when available
Weighting of criteria	Julie will send out to the FBRB

Board Members/Alternates Present:

<i>Julie Henning, Chair, WDFW</i>	<i>Donelle Mahan, WDNR</i>
<i>Casey Baldwin, Colville Tribe</i>	<i>Brian Abbott, GSRO</i>
<i>Paul Wagner, DOT</i>	<i>Carl Schroeder, AWC</i>
<i>Gary Rowe, WSAC</i>	<i>Jon Brand, Kitsap County/WSAC</i>

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. Julie explained some recent workload shifts at WDFW. She is becoming the chair again, Dave Price will be the co-chair. In response to a question, she said the environmental engineers are remaining with Dave and the fish passage section will report to Julie.

A motion was made by Carl Schroeder to approve the June meeting notes; Jon Brand seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

The workplan was briefly reviewed. A change in timing for Goal 4, Action 1 was made from September to October. Neil suggested adding a comment on page 1 that dates could be flexible depending on need; Board members agreed. Carl Schroeder moved to approve, Brian Abbott seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comments: No member of the public asked to offer comments.

Updates on Legislative Session

The mitigation bill (5996) passed. It's not clear how it affects this Board. Carl gave a brief summary. The bill directs Ecology, WDOT, and WDFW to show a preference for local government barrier removal projects as mitigation. A framework must be developed for deciding at the local level. There will be some work for the FBRB to tee up opportunities for this process. The first phase will be opportunistic. Ecology is in the lead. The difficult part will be how to decide which projects to select. Julie said WDFW has been requested by OFM to provide revised costs for implementation. It will take a couple of years to develop a policy framework. The COE will have to be involved regarding wetlands and the Clean Water Act. Julie said she could share revised fiscal note calculations.

Subcommittee Report on Communications Strategy

Brian Abbott and Carl provided this report. They met on July 20 with Pyramid, along with a member of AWC's communications staff. A list of people to interview is needed for the consultant. Brian reviewed the draft scope and project timelines.

Questions and comments included:

- Gary thinks the goal is strategies for a 2016 budget request
 - Julie clarified that we are looking at 2017-19 for a full grant program budget request
- Carl is not sure if this will result in a capital or operating budget request
- Casey wonders if it is too soon for messages
 - Need to have some messages/tools in place before any legislative request
- Need messages even if we don't have all the pieces
- Carl thinks we can add messages regarding successful fish barrier removal in the final communication plan on page 2 of the scope
- Casey thinks we need to specify target audiences
- Need to develop messages about what the FBRB is about
- Gary suggested we think about key metrics; Brian said this will be part of messaging
- Carl said new information won't come out of this plan; it will help us respond to our current information
- Suggested parties to interview will include WDFW, WSAC, AWC, WDNR, WDOT, Puget Sound Tribes (need to determine which people from tribes, can start by contacting NWIFC)
 - Paul said we need to consider eastern Washington tribes, not just Puget Sound
 - Brian will reach out to Jonalee Squeochs

Brian moved and Julie seconded to direct the subcommittee to finish negotiation on the scope of work based on this discussion, and begin implementing. Motion passed unanimously.

Jim Wright from NOAA Fisheries, audience member, stated they are interested in barrier removal. Their focus has been larger dams; they don't know about dams on private lands. FBRB members expressed interest in further dialogue with NOAA Fisheries.

Progress on obtaining local input

Julie explained that she sent out, a couple of weeks ago, the request for information from Puget Sound entities. FBRB members were cc'd. She gave them one month to review information and provide feedback. Cade Roler reviewed a PowerPoint presentation on the information request (refer to this for details on his presentation). As an example, he discussed the Snake River region's response.

Julie reviewed the work flow timeline. Casey asked whether they would be able to review criteria; Julie said the FRB previously discussed the criteria but we didn't talk about the weighting. She said Cade could send the weighting out to the Board. Carl said he is also sensitive to that issue; the Board should review the weighting. Julie said the FBRB will see the results of weighting and can revise it at that point. She added that the process will be for WDFW to review the projects, evaluate them, and discuss the results with the FBRB and get feedback. Gary said he thinks about this as an approved project list with different time slots for implementation. It was pointed out that the priorities and project sequencing should be separate.

Brian was asked how the SRFB does project lists. He said the SRFB gives the whole list of projects to the legislature and asks for funding. Neil pointed out the WDFW approach is an iterative process, and there are opportunities for review. He asked about the criteria, how the weighting will be done. The weighting criteria will be placed on the agenda for September.

It was suggested that different lists could be prepared based on different weighting. Julie pointed out the weighting is for Puget Sound; other lists are from the Salmon Recovery Regions and will reflect their choices.

Carl said there are different approaches. One is that the FBRB could fund the top projects in one priority area; or fund the top projects in all regions. Julie thinks it will be a combination. Brian suggested it will not be good to prioritize each Puget Sound area 1-14; instead prioritize the top packages.

Neil summarized what might be put forth at the September meeting:

- Approve lists of watersheds and HUC 10s
- Discuss criteria to be used in weighting

Julie thinks those topics will take all day and suggested the FBR consider a longer meeting. The FBRB decided to meet part day on Monday, September 27 (this day will be to meet with communications consultant), then all day on Tuesday, September 28 to do the remainder of the topics.

Casey expressed some concern about the message being sent to the regions. He mentioned we need to be aware of the difference between treaty and non-treaty tribes when referencing tribal involvement. He also mentioned there is a difference in listing status between Coho and chinook. Julie said if there's steelhead streams then that would cover chinook as well. Casey was okay with that explanation.

A break was taken from 12:00 to 12:15. The meeting then re-convened as a working lunch.

Framework for Implementer's Workshop

This is a topic that has come up several times and is listed in the work plan. Brian thinks it's a way to communicate with those who actually implement projects on the ground. It could serve as a way to get input into our strategy, especially before the bigger budget ask. Potential objectives could include:

- Addressing permit streamlining for implementers
- Encouraging people to apply with their projects

Neil explained his thinking from his work on the work plan. It would be a higher level workshop than what Brian organizes each spring; the focus of this workshop would be on the FBRB and the statewide strategy. Brian thinks it is a way to get people on board with the strategy. Julie thought springtime might be better timing to roll out the strategy to these groups. There are two different outcomes that could occur:

1. Get input from people on the work of the FBRB; and
2. Train them on the results

Julie said WDFW is doing outreach now, but she wonders if some groups are being missed.

Paul asked how we balance between laying groundwork for the larger funding program versus removing fish barriers (how do we promote that?). What can be done in the short term, and on an on-going basis? Carl thinks it is a good idea to put out useful information to help others remove barriers now. Gary suggested we need to do outreach to counties to know what they are doing; there may be information from local planning departments.

Julie summarized this conversation:

- WDFW will continue to work with salmon recovery organizations; they are engaging with local governments
- Communication plan is underway, may be a clearer sense of engaging
- FBRB will re-visit the workshop idea in the spring

FBRB members agreed with her summary.

Brian asked if FBRB is addressing just transportation-related projects or all barriers. The legislative language indicates all barriers for the FBRB work; it separately directs WDFW and WSDOT to work together on transportation-related projects.

Summary/Next Steps

The August meeting will be cancelled. September's meeting will be delayed several weeks to allow WDFW to do its work and prepare for the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm.

The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for 1:00 to 5:00 pm Monday September 28; and 9:00 to 5:00 pm Tuesday Sept 29, 2015. The location will be the Association of Washington Cities, 1076 Franklin Street SE, Olympia, WA.

Others present at meeting:

Neil Aaland, Facilitator	Zack Martin, Mackay Esposito
Cade Roler, WDFW	Samantha Tanner, Mackay Esposito
Jim Wright, NOAA Fisheries	