

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes

Date: August 19, 2014

Place: Red Lion Hotel, Olympia, Washington

Summary: Agenda items with formal action

Item	Formal Action
Meeting Notes	Approved meeting notes from July 2014

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review	None
Ground rules/bylaws	Chair will revise the item related to voting and schedule the bylaws for approval in September
Board purpose/tasks	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Chair will confer with prime legislative sponsor (Rep. Wilcox) regarding report to the Legislature2. Revise task #15 to clarify the reference to grant programs3. Prioritization/coordination strategy will be clarified as discussed4. Revise values/principles as discussed
Legislative report this fall	

Board Members/Alternates Present:

Julie Henning, Chair (WDFW)	Gary Rowe, WSAC
Carl Schroeder, AWC	Jon Brand, Kitsap County/WSAC
Paul Wagner, DOT	Chris Hanlon-Meyer, WDNR
Jonalee Squeochs, Yakama Indian Nation	David Price, WDFW
Brian Abbott, GSRO	

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 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 July meeting notes; motion passed unanimously.

Public Comments: Nobody present wished to offer any comments.

Follow-up items from first meeting

1. Bylaws:

Neil explained that the Chair made changes in response to the discussion at the July meeting. Key changes are the quorum; terms of appointment (which has been deleted); and votes required for approving items (which was revised to be 5 members). Neil opened the entire topic for discussion.

- Voting members versus inactive members: this is difficult to understand. Julie thought it would be important later, when we get new members.
- Bylaws can be revisited later if a section is unworkable
- If members don't show up do they have a vote?
- Julie will revise the section on voting, and bring the full set of bylaws back to the next meeting for approval
- No other changes were proposed.

Board Purpose/Tasks

The Board reviewed items 1-6 at the last meeting. Today we will look again at item 6, then look at 7 and 8; the remaining items are mainly from the legislation and don't require additional discussion. Neil noted there were few responses to the homework assignment from the last meeting.

Item 6:

- There are significant efforts through local watershed councils; are those included in this task? [We need to be looking at what state agencies are doing; what tribes are doing; what all the local organizations are doing.]
- We need to include private entities
- Do the recommendations go to the Legislature or to DFW?
- This should be a joint recommendation from DFW and the Board
 - Joint recommendations could be awkward
 - All opinions should be delivered
 - DFW feels responsible to the legislation and to report back
 - There would be efforts to reconcile differences between the Board and DFW
- Down the road, the structure of recommendations may be a topic
- Julie will confer with Rep. Wilcox regarding recommendations

Item 7:

- The WDFW protocols are considered to be the state standards
- The statement in column 2 indicates that the Board will use WDFW databases as well as other databases

Item 8:

- Will the Board do an outreach strategy? [Yes]
 - Should make that more explicit
 - The third column is clear on that point

Items 9-16:

- Items 10 and 11 – how the Board interacts with WSDOT – WSDOT is under an injunction and Board does not want to interfere with that, but wonders how to reflect the next set of projects in this work
- Paul said DOT is considering how to move forward in the most efficient way; they had to start addressing projects before the start of this Board; a section of the authorizing legislation is aimed at NOT affecting other requirements already out there
- Same points related to other programs including Family Forest Fish Passage Program
- Re: #15, what are “all projects” – how broad?
 - This refers to a future grant program coming out of this effort
 - Does this include RCO grants? [No; relates to a stand-alone fish passage barrier removal program]
 - Julie will revise this section to clarify

Prioritization/Coordination Strategy:

This was discussed at the last meeting, and we wanted to see if there was any discussion about this item (bottom of page 3 in “tasks” document). Discussion:

- Not seeing anything on timing; this should be part of the methodology [Yes]
- Language is a little different than the bill
- Should reference depressed stocks as well; high quality spawning and rearing
- Julie was trying to shorten this up, but she will go back and revise the language to conform with legislation (except section 2 she will paraphrase, otherwise too lengthy)
- Need to address stocks important to treaty fisheries
- The Board may need additional factors to consider, can add those later

Values/Principles (pages 4-5)

This will be helpful to start developing the presentations needed by the Board to get into the substance. It will inform development of future agendas. Also, it’s intended to get Board members thinking about the kind of presentations they may want to make on behalf of their organizations. Also, is there any other information in general needed by the Board?

- Be sure to address healthy stocks as well as depressed stocks
- It would be looking at DOT’s prioritization process under the court order; their target is the largest amount of habitat gain, NOT driven by stock status
- Will estuarine projects be considered?
 - Clearly a problem but DFW does not have methodologies to know how to fix them
 - Important but available tools don’t fit
- Need to figure out how to make the projects attractive for funding
- Should consider steelhead and steelhead stocks
- Find areas where we can show some progress
- Regarding tribes, Eastside and Westside tribes are addressing different issues

BREAK

Meeting rules/laws

Julie gave an overview of this topic. Boards are required by state law to have training on public records and open public meetings. Today we will view a video produced by the Attorney General’s Office on open public meetings. There is also a video for public records, but we won’t view it as a group. A link will be sent out so you can view that in your office.

The Board then viewed the video. Julie provided some comments afterward. Regarding the Public Records Act, she noted that e-mails are subject to public disclosure. Several Board members said their agencies have procedures in place. One member asked if each agency sets its own retention schedule; the answer is yes. If a member receives a public disclosure request related to their Board activities, they do not defer to WDFW’s procedures, but it would be appreciated if they would notify WDFW.

Review background information

Report to the Legislature from the 1997 Fish Passage Task Force (Paul Wagner, WSDOT). Paul referred to the document provided in the binder. Fish stocks started being listed under the ESA in the 1990s. Many issues identified in the 1997 report still exist. The report proposed a grant program of \$4 million per year to remove barriers. A grant program was created in 1998 for \$3.5 million. 53 projects were funded. The funding was issued within 3 months of bill passage. This was the precursor to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB).

There were several lessons learned:

- Don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good
- These are long term problems and it will take patience to correct
- The costs are higher than thought; fixing the problems requires replacement not just retrofits

Questions and discussion from Board members:

- What was the source of the funding for this first round? [state capital fund]
- Was a certain amount allocated for inventories? [the program took in proposals for both projects and inventories]
- The SRFB did not initially fund fish passage because they believed it was already covered; took a few years to change this
- How were proposals evaluated? [a group of people from different agencies reviewed them based on something similar to WDFW's Priority Index, included amount of habitat gain and number of species at risk]
- Is there another report on the program? [Yes, a summary was prepared]
 - Julie will obtain and scan the report, and post it

Extinction is not an option/Salmon recovery network in Washington State (Brian Abbott, GSRO). Brian combined his two presentations into one [note: his presentation is posted on the WDFW Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board website]. He reviewed the regional salmon recovery structure and the funding process. The state is divided into 8 recovery regions, with six adopted recovery plans. A study completed in March 2011 estimated the cost of implementing the habitat-related portions of the plans would be \$5.5 billion (spent between 2010 and 2019).

The regional organizations work with local entities to implement each recovery plan. Key players at the local level include 25 Lead Entities (authorized by statute). Brian's presentation also addressed SRFB funding, their review process, and noted that between 2000 and 2014 326 passage projects were funded. He also discussed the Family Forest Fish Passage Program (FFFPP), administered by three state agencies and aimed at passage improvements for smaller forest operations.

Comments/discussion:

- Julie mentioned that the upcoming salmon recovery conference in May 2015 would be a good place to highlight the status of this Board's work
- Need to consider linking salmon recovery strategies to the work of this Board

LUNCH BREAK: 12 noon to 1:15 p.m.

Available Data Resources

WDFW Fish Passage data (Melissa Erkel, WDFW). Melissa presented a PowerPoint summary [posted on website]. In 1991, a barrier culvert inventory was initiated by WSDOT. A relational database was created, and training programs were developed. During the 1990s, additional state and local inventories were conducted. In 2013, the water crossing design guidelines were issued as part of the Aquatic Habitat Guidelines (an effort by multiple state agencies).

There are two parts to their data: the inventory data and the prioritization. They look at available information and do a habitat survey (actually walking the stream). Using this information, they then calculate a Prioritization Index (PI) number. In response to a question, Melissa explained

they don't look at actual production (how many fish are coming out of that stream) but the possibility of improvement. They take the habitat upstream into account. They don't look at other barriers present on the stream because they want to determine what would happen if a particular barrier was corrected, and man-made features are considered temporary.

The information is kept in a database (the Fish Passage and Diversion Screening Inventory Database, or FPDSI). There are 42,300 sites in the database; 20,960 are considered barriers. The information is available to the public. WDFW is working to update the accessibility and how they share and update the information. This can be a useful tool for coordinating barrier removal programs from other entities. Melissa showed some sample maps showing barriers in a couple of basins.

Discussion/comments from Board members:

- WDFW has been focusing on Puget Sound cities and on counties near DOT sites).
- Assessment of habitat is based on the swimming ability of a 6-inch trout

WDNR Data from Road Management and Abandonment Program (Brandon Austin, WDNR). The RMAP plans come from the Forest Practices Rules [note: the PowerPoint presentation is on the website]. Brandon reviewed the history of the inclusion of RMAP in the Forest Practices Rules. In 2011, with the economic downturn, the requirements to complete work included in plans were extended (from 2016 to up to 2021). In 2013, additional rule changes were made resulting from the culverts case. He reviewed the purpose of the RMAP requirements from the rule and the requirements of landowners, and the 6 basic requirements of an RMAP. There are templates for both large and small landowners. The requirements are different for small landowners, with funding available and no reporting requirements.

Discussion/comments from Board members:

- What is the cost share for small landowners? [100%]
- What is a small landowner? [Under 2 million board feet per year]
- How many small landowners are there? [They don't have a good number; it's hard to determine, sometimes you don't know until they apply for an FPA.]
- This program continues to evolve
- DNR has its own database; barriers included in an RMAP are not necessarily included in the WDFW database
- It's good to look at successes in headwaters, and leverage those successes

Additional background information to consider: Julie asked the Board about future presentations that would be helpful.

- Consider having someone from the regional salmon organization to talk about their recover plans; perhaps include a sponsor from a Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group (RFEG)
- Gary would like to have some recommendations for the upcoming legislative session; useful to have a half dozen candidate sites; consider looking at one basin as an example
 - Carl agreed, want to see how DOT projects line up with salmon recovery plans; better to get quickly into some examples
 - Julie thought that is a good idea; she provided some examples of maps
- We've now heard several different types of prioritization, need to think about that
- One of our goals is to figure out how to prioritize; variety of ways, need to keep it simple, don't spend years doing one
- Could choose certain areas around the state, or look at the PI

- How do we look at a couple of different ways we could prioritize?
 - Work backwards from the round, could help us come up with a system
- Brian is an advocate of PI, walking up and down the stream
 - Need to walk it so you don't miss private barriers
- Would be good to show some examples of prioritization

Julie mentioned the “proof of concept” maps she sent out in advance. She said these are examples of what is out there in the landscape, opportunities for coordination. She would like to be prepared if asked during the legislation session how far along the Board is. A general update can be provided, but might be useful to be able to show examples of a coordinated approach. These geographic areas are just an example, there are multiple jurisdictions and a coordinated effort will be needed. She explained the detail on the maps.

Comments/discussion:

- It would be useful to run out a couple of different scenarios to prioritize and see what the results are – e.g. would one scenario leave out eastern Washington, another leave out the coast?
- Need to find a way to incorporate RMAP information
- Part of this may be an analysis of coordination and prioritization issues in one area
- Need to think about what outcome we are trying to achieve
- Yes, need to look at geographic equity
 - It can be very difficult to prioritize different geography

The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:00 p.m.

The next meeting of the Board will be Tuesday, September 16, 2014 at the Red Lion Hotel, 2300 Evergreen Park Drive SW, Olympia, WA 98502.

Others present at meeting:

Neil Aaland, Facilitator
 Alison Hart, WDFW
 Marc McCalmon, WDFW
 Donelle Mahan, WDNR
 Colleen Thompson, RFEG
 Brandon Austin, WDNR