

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes**Date: October 16, 2018****Place: Association of Washington Cities, Olympia, Washington****Summary: Agenda items with formal action**

Item	Formal Action
Meeting notes from August	Approved
Meeting notes from special meeting Sept 11	Approved with corrections

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
PSP should be made aware of the FBRB barrier funding process	FBRB Chair will send a letter to PSP Executive Director Sheida Sahandy
Capital budget handout	Comments by next FBRB meeting
Talking points for legislative session	Update the talking points prepared for last session
Workplan	Neil will revise as more of a task list; will include previous communication plan in next mailout

Board Members/Alternates Present:

Tom Jameson, Chair, WDFW	Carl Schroeder, AWC
Paul Wagner, DOT	Dave Caudill, RCO - GSRO
Jon Brand, WSAC	Steve Martin, GSRO
Justin Zweifel, WDFW	Casey Baldwin, CCT
Jane Wall, WSAC (phone)	Steve Manlow (phone)

Others present at meeting:

Dave Collins, WDFW	Christy Rains, WDFW
Cade Roler, WDFW	Corey Morss, WDFW
Gina Piazza, WDFW	Neil Aaland, Facilitator
Alison Hart, WDFW	Steve Helvey, GeoEngineers
Wendy Brown, RCO	Richard Vacirca, USFS
Julie Watson, WDFW	

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review: Meeting started at 9:00. Neil reviewed the agenda.**Public Comment:** No comment was offered.**Old Business:** Approval of August meeting notes: approved unanimously. Approval of September 11 conference call meeting notes: approved with edits.**Lochsloy Dam update:** This barrier has been previously discussed by the Board and is on the funding list. The Homeowners Association (HOA) does not have concurrence of all members. Justin and staff went to the site to view it in preparation for attending an upcoming HOA meeting on November 13. Ownership of the dam by the HOA is uncertain; the Tulalip Tribe is looking into that issue. Justin showed some current pictures and noted that “stop logs” have been placed by neighbors. These are intended to force more water into fishway, but the fishway is not designed for that. He estimates a short term fix costing \$10 – 15,000 would be needed to extend the spillway and provide a potential short term fix by

reducing attraction to the spillway. A long term fix would be either full dam removal, or replace the dam with a roughened 300 foot channel. This has been submitted as a design-only project in three phases; second phase would be additional design and third would be construction.

Questions and comments include:

- At what point do they have to sign a landowner agreement? [RCO needs that before committing the funding]
- There are no downstream barriers, and it is a very productive stream
- What is the purpose of the dam? [It's older, and might have been intended to help small scale logging; now it is more recreational]
- Casey is not supportive of providing funding that would improve the structural integrity or extend the life of the structure, since it is deteriorating. He favors a full removal project, though he might be okay with the \$10-15K short term fix to solve the problem of fish jumping to their death[Paul agreed]
- Barrier is 33% passable, plus it has the problem of attracting adult salmon to jump to the side with no water and perish.
- Carl thinks it is premature to take any option off the table; need to think about long-term investment [Jon agreed]
- Steve Manlow wonders about creating a separate channel from the pond (to keep the pond)
- Species composition includes several warm water species in addition to salmonids
- Some concern has been raised over potential impacts on wells if the dam was removed and the pond was not maintained.
- Casey thought it would be a reasonable concession for the project to include digging wells deeper if it means the project can completely remove the dam. Wells are often provided to landowners for instream flow projects that remove an instream diversion.

Justin will report on the results of the 11/13 HOA meeting at the next Board meeting.

New legislative handout: Justin provided a new handout prepared by WDFW on the capital budget request. It was prepared for the Joint Transportation Committee tour, and it seemed to be a useful item. He asked if there was any feedback from the Board, both now and by the next Board meeting.

- Good to get pictures showing higher flows
- Casey wondered about providing context around the cost of \$300,000 per mile [Steve Manlow said they have some analysis that says the rule of thumb is a cost of 0.5 million/mile; Steve Martin said a Tucannon project cost 1 million/mile]
 - Tom said it is difficult to reconcile how different areas report different costs, for example how do you count the planning/design projects, do you measure to the next partial barrier, full barrier or end of potential distribution?
- Carl thinks this could be useful as a talking points list for those going to the legislature
 - It was suggested that last session's talking points could be updated for the coming session
- Carl also wonders about lumping together design and construction costs

The talking points will be updated, and this handout will also be updated.

Update on 2017-2019 Projects: Justin referred to the spreadsheet provided as a handout and reviewed specific projects. We now have \$676,000 remaining (after two newly approved cost increases). He noted that Tom Jameson is the approving authority for cost increases. He is thinking about using the remaining funding for alternates. He showed a new form created by RCO for cost increase requests. Dave Caudill noted the Board can set what is considered a change in scope. It might include something like adding a barrier removal on an adjacent stream. Casey gave an example that after a survey in Okanogan County,

need more work on the same project. Dave thinks each one is case by case. It was suggested that the \$676,000 be kept in reserve for other cost over runs and not used for an alternative project.

A break was taken at 10:35. The Board re-convened at 10:50.

Discuss ways to improve grant process: This is a “lessons learned” discussion. Justin referred to a letter sent to Alex Conley as an example of initial project solicitations. The initial solicitations were loosely structured. He recently sent an e-mail to each watershed coordinator asking them to come and brief the Board on their next priorities. Questions include where they are moving next and how they operate within their regions. Over the next six months or so coordinators will be coming to Board meetings. John Foltz from Snake River region has already spoken with the Board, so he is not scheduled again. Justin asked the Board if there is any other information they want to hear:

- Steve Manlow noted there is a mix of regional organizations and lead entities presenting; want to be sure we get the regional organization perspective. Puget Sound may delegate; Amber Moore with PSP is the contact

Justin reviewed John Foltz’s letter and his recommendations. Comments included:

- Barrier inventories are done by WDFW staff
- Some targeted inventories being done on the eastside right now
 - Wendy Brown noted DNR is asking for \$20 million for FFFPP, with 5% of that to be used for inventories

In response to one of the suggestions in John Foltz’s letter, Casey said he is not in favor of requiring FBRB projects to go through the lead entity grant process. Many of them will because that will be the funding match, but if that is not the match then why add the workload to both processes. Cade agreed with Casey. Justin said he has heard regions would like more time to work with WDFW pre-submittal. He heard other concerns in Puget Sound. The three watersheds in Puget Sound were selected by using the Intrinsic Potential (IP) model; PSP did not want to make the selection. Several watersheds did not submit in Puget Sound; Skagit watershed was rated #4 using the IP model and they were not happy with that result. Steve Manlow will discuss this process for Puget Sound with the regional organizations; he has concerns about the process used previously.

Joint Transportation Committee tour: Tom Jameson briefed on this. The tour happened on October 10-11. Tom, Justin, and Paul Wagner participated. This committee deals with transportation funding, not the capital budget. He reviewed a list of participants. It started up north in the Bellingham area and visited several sites. Justin showed the exhibits prepared for Fisher Creek. They received questions about partial barriers, and this site was a good example of that. Paul said WSDOT is looking for increases in funding leading to \$600 million per biennium for their part of the injunction.

Tom introduced Richard Vacirca from the US Forest Service. He works with the Puget Sound federal task force. One of their focuses is fish passage. He plans to track the FBRB and may show up periodically. He’s looking for good fits in overlapping areas of interest.

A lunch break was taken from 12:10 to 12:40.

General updates: Tom Jameson discussed several topics:

- Injunction: an annual meeting between state agencies and tribes is coming up. It will be held November 6 in Lynnwood
- Governor’s Natural Resources sub-cabinet asked Tom to attend on September 20. They spent 30 minutes discussing culverts. Tom explained the Board’s \$50 million request. FFFPP is requesting

\$20 million for the biennium. There is \$3.2 billion available in state bonding capacity; OFM is reserving \$1 billion for school construction. There is potentially \$300-\$400 million being reserved for mental health.

- Quarterly meetings are also held with tribes; at the last one tribes asked to meet with DFW on slip lining of culverts, incorporating climate change into HPAs, and tidally influenced culvert crossings

Puget Sound Partnership Action Agenda: Justin introduced Julie Watson, DFW policy lead for the Action Agenda. Julie gave a presentation that outlined the Action Agenda and how it was developed. Carl wonders about the alignment between the PSP review process and the Board's. He wonders why the barrier projects in their lists aren't applying for FBRB funding. He also thinks better communication is needed so funding entities know about the PSP list. Cade thinks the PSP criteria is more qualitative. Carl thinks it's not coordinated enough. FBRB has a sophisticated process for developing a project list, and it doesn't seem like the PSP list process is as rigorous. Since there is no funding, proponents are spending time and money getting on the PSP list. He thinks they would be better off getting on our list.

Members of the Board want to send the PSP a letter suggesting they refer barrier projects to the FBRB.

Workplan: Neil presented this topic. The Board provided some feedback at the August meeting about what they would like to see in an updated workplan. Neil revised the workplan based on that and has an update for review today. Discussion points included:

- Include a coordinated effort to bring more applications in the door
- Think about a different format – e.g. a task list that includes responsible party, timeline, status; and include the goals/actions in the table
- Carl likes the status report part

Neil will bring back a streamlined workplan and will include the communication plan for reference.

Other business: Carl noted that AWC has adopted culvert funding as one of their 6 top priorities. It is also on WSAC's top priority list.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm.

Next meeting: Tuesday, November 20, 2018 – Rainier Room, Association of Washington Cities