

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes**Date: September 20, 2016****Place: Association of Washington Cities, Olympia, Washington****Summary: Agenda items with formal action**

Item	Formal Action
Meeting Notes - July	Approved
Revision to list of approved projects on priority 1 list	Approved

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
Final copies of flyer	Revise and print 700 copies
Final “talking points” document	Revise as discussed
Prepare generic powerpoint presentation	Refer to communications subcommittee

Board Members/Alternates Present:

David Price, Chair, WDFW	Steve Martin, Council of Regions
Susan Cierebiej, DOT	Brian Abbott, GSRO
Joe Shramek, WDNR	Gary Rowe, WSAC
Stacy Polkowske, WDFW	

Others present at meeting:

Dave Collins, WDFW	Tom Jameson, WDFW
Cade Roler, WDFW	Alison Hart, WDFW
Gina Piazza, WDFW	Neil Aaland, Facilitator
Loretta Swanson, Mason County	Michelle Wilcox, Ecology
Brandon Carman, GH CD	Jan Rosholt, Parametrix
Jim Shannon, Hart Crowser	

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review

The meeting was called to order at 9:25 a.m. Neil reviewed the agenda for today. There was not yet a quorum present, so agenda items requiring a formal approval were moved until later. Dave Price noted that this was his last meeting. Tom Jameson will be assuming the role of Chair, effective October 1.

Public Comments: No comment from the public.**Lessons Learned from First Grand Round:**

Tom Jameson introduced the topic, and noted WDFW staff have not completed a full process review yet. It seems like good timing to begin that discussion. Stacy Polkowske took over the discussion and presented a powerpoint slide presentation (available on the WDFW website at www.wdfw.wa.gov/about/advisory/fbrb). WDFW staff had internal discussions about lessons learned; they divided the topics into five themes. Their general conclusions for the overall process:

- Offering two pathways is a good approach
- Outreach and presentations to legislative staff and other groups is important
- Development of good outreach information is important
- Great work by FBRB Board Members and WDFW staff

For details on the presentation, see that powerpoint presentation on the FBRB website. Discussion points included:

- Consider streamlining the grant program, similar to FFFPP as a model

Watershed pathway:

- Consider an online application submittal process, similar to RCO's PRISM
- FBRB will eventually need to develop criteria to help determine when a watershed is "done" (no further investment needed in fish passage barrier removal)

Coordinated pathway:

- Be more organized for the solicitation process, and consider leaving it open for six months
- Begin planning for what will happen if lots of applications are received
- Consider opening this pathway to all entities (we only explicitly solicited submittals from cities and counties)
- Since the Puget Sound Partnership declined to submit priorities, decide how to address Puget Sound next time
- Consider a longer application process (leaving it open longer)

Other discussion points:

- If a Technical Review Team is established, consider statewide members; that makes it easier to visit geographically separate sites
- Consider having 6-10 year program lists, where projects don't go off the lists
- A lot of information was lacking in the applications
- Revisit the ranking criteria
- When federal de-listing criteria comes into play, it becomes trickier and needs NOAA fisheries involvement
- Try to determine why so few applications from eastern Washington
 - Steve said for his region, they intentionally chose the watershed approach, which might not have been the best strategy
- Need to schedule a FBRB discussion on this, including whether the solicitation got to the right people
- Susan said input from WSDOT staff should also be sought
- Funding for inventories should be considered; Brian noted this is an eligible activity for SRFB, and some existing inventories are old

At this point a quorum was present. Steve Martin made a motion to approve the meeting notes for July; Joe Shramek seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Project List Updates

A spreadsheet was handed out and Tom Jameson explained it. The spreadsheet actually includes three lists: first are the watershed pathway priority 1 projects. Second is the coordinated pathway priority 1 projects. Finally, there is the watershed pathway priority 2 projects. Some projects are divided into two phases. Phase 1 is design, and phase 2 is construction.

He noted there is one change to the list, which will require a vote by the Board to approve. This is under the coordinated pathway priority 1, project #4 – Valley Creek. They want to switch this out for another project.

Cade provided a powerpoint presentation that explained the proposed switch. Valley Creek was a priority due to large upstream habitat gain, but later identified an upstream barrier that limits habitat gain. Also, due to tidal influence, passage would only be provided two times per day. WDFW is proposing switching Ennis Creek for this project. Ennis Creek is also within the city of Port Angeles, and was initially filtered out due to a downstream barrier. They've now determined the downstream barrier can be abandoned and removed. This is a high priority for the city. Steve Martin moved to make this switch as suggested by staff; Gary Rowe seconded. There was discussion about the process we are following; Joe had some concerns but supports this switch. Dave said he was comfortable because it is in the same geographic area. The motion was approved unanimously.

Gary asked about the match, and whether the dollars listed in the spreadsheet include match. The answer was no, match is additional. Neil suggested that WDFW staff add a discussion to the spreadsheet explaining how match is not included in the estimates. Brian asked staff to also include a description of pathways on the spreadsheet.

A short break was taken at 11:45 to get lunches; meeting reconvened at 12:00 pm.

Report to Legislature: communication materials

Tom Jameson summarized the two documents handed out today. They were initiated by the communications subcommittee. The first was a four-page legislative handout. He mentioned the logo from the Yakama Tribe will be removed, as they have not heard from them about their willingness to be included on this. The summary of the proposals at the bottom will shift slightly, but the dollar amount will not. Comments included:

- Add a “fly-out” for the northeast region that explains there are no proposals from this region because there are no anadromous fish (a requirement of the legislation)
- Steve asked to change the reference to “Snake River” to “Recovery Regions”
- Find a quote from a tribal representative to include

700 copies will be made for distribution.

Tom then reviewed the “talking points” document. This was requested by Carl Schroeder, who wants something he can use as his own reference when he is meeting with legislators and staff. Comments included:

- Joe will update the RMAP numbers
- Add the description of match and the RCO funding included
- Information should be broken out by region
- Approach is focus on basins where multiple barriers can be removed
- Add something about northeast WA having no anadromous fish
- Gary asked if a powerpoint presentation could be developed for all to use; Neil suggested having the communications subcommittee address this

Report to Legislature: report content

Tom explained the statute requires WDFW to report in October of 2016. The statute says this will address permit streamlining, especially regarding federal permitting. Tom and Dave Price will meet again with the Corps of Engineers; they met once and need to follow-up with new COE staff. The report may also include a list of projects. WDFW was encouraged to do actual testimony, once they identify the appropriate committee, and not just a written report.

Review and update work plan

Neil handed out the table from the adopted work plan, and reviewed the items that have yet to be completed. Tom Jameson noted that there was no statutory requirement for a workplan; this was initially prepared to serve as a guideline to help the FBRB decide the timing to take on its various tasks.

The Board briefly discussed the item to “link with Ecology”. Michelle Wilcox has been attending the last several FBRB meetings; she is staffing Ecology’s committee exploring commonalities between water quality grants and salmon grants. Brian noted the FBRB needs to be at the table.

Additional comments:

- Steve mentioned there is also a link to the “Floodplains by Design” program
- Regarding the item to get feedback from the public, Brian mentioned the need to prepare a manual for the new grant program and get feedback on it
- Steve noted it is important for the FBRB to connect with the regions

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 pm.

Next meeting: Tuesday, October 18 – @ Association of Washington Cities