

## **Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes**

**Date: October 21, 2014**

**Place: Red Lion Hotel, Olympia, Washington**

### **Summary: Agenda items with formal action**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Formal Action</b>
Meeting Notes	Approved meeting notes from September 2014
Bylaws	Approved bylaws with one revision

### **Summary: Follow-up actions**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Follow-up</b>
Develop criteria or questions to guide input from the Regional Salmon Recovery boards on determining focus areas in each region.	FBRB Chair or designee should attend the Council of Regions meeting in December and discuss ideas with them. In preparation for this, Board will discuss criteria or questions to provide guidance to recovery boards
Method of allocating any future funding	This is a parking lot issue; FBRB will need to re-visit at an appropriate point.
Develop a demonstration project for potential funding for this session	WDFW will bring some options to the November meeting.

### **Board Members/Alternates Present:**

Julie Henning, Chair (WDFW)	Gary Rowe, WSAC
Casey Baldwin, Colville Confederated Tribes	Jon Brand, Kitsap County/WSAC
Megan White, DOT	Chris Hanlon-Meyer, WDNR
Jonalee Squeochs, Yakama Indian Nation	Brian Abbott, GSRO
David Price, WDFW	Carl Schroeder, AWC

### **Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review**

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by facilitator Neil Aaland. Neil asked people around the table to introduce themselves, and then reviewed the agenda. Julie Henning explained that she has taken a new position within WDFW, and David Price will be taking over as the Chair at the next meeting (November). He is presently the WDFW alternate on the Board. A motion was made and seconded to approve the September meeting notes; motion passed unanimously. A revised set of the bylaws was handed out for review and approval.

**Public Comments:** Nobody present wished to offer any comments.

### **Overview of the proposed general prioritization scheme**

At the request of the FBRB, Julie drafted a proposal for a statewide barrier correction strategy. She explained it was built around Evolutionally Significant Units (ESUs), which are also the boundaries of the Salmon Recovery Regions. This approach aligns with the how recovery plans are written with the idea to build on the existing recovery model.

Within each of the recovery regions, focus areas would be identified. The board will need input from the Regions that know their recovery plans to assist with identifying the watersheds that would have the

largest benefit to salmon recovery from fish barrier removal. As shown on the flowchart, there are three tracks:

- Standard: utilize focus areas, criteria in the statute
- Coordination: outside of the focus area, where opportunities may exist; and
- Portfolio: where there are multiple phases of a project.

The existing salmon recovery regional entities would be asked to identify the focus areas in their region. Each region is different, some could do this easily, other regions would have more difficulty. The FBRB needs to decide if each region is limited to one focus area. Once focus areas are known, project development can begin.

In general, FBRB members thought this regional recovery region approach was a good approach. The areas of the state that don't have a recovery board do not have anadromous fish. The legislation only addresses anadromous fish. It was pointed out that there are other existing funding processes. The FBRB will need to coordinate with other processes. A robust outreach approach will be needed. It was noted that the legislation provides direction to NOT interfere with DOT's barrier removal program.

Puget Sound is a challenge, with the complexity of watersheds and Lead Entities. Hood Canal is a region within a region, as part of the larger Puget Sound but it has its own plan for addressing summer chum salmon.

The group discussed the questions that would be posed to the regions. We should not ask them to change their usual method of prioritization, but ask how they can get the most value out of their investment. The scale issue is challenging, it may be different for each region.

The regions could be asked to use their priorities that have highest benefit to salmon recovery and the FBRB criteria to develop a proposal. They would have to review and identify an area that makes sense for them. They should also be asked to consider where opportunities exist. Barrier inventories are important and will need to be part of the preliminary work. There was discussion about the program criteria. This included variables around the level of certainty of completing a project. If they DON'T know the potential of an area and the extent of blockage, then it likely will not score well.

Additional discussion and comments<sup>1</sup> from members and alternates:

- What is the outcome of this process? Is it a list of projects we take to the legislature?
- We are asking each region to identify focus areas, and which areas should be emphasized
  - Perhaps we ask them to identify their top 5 focus areas
- FBRB representative should attend the Council of Regions meeting in December and have a discussion with them about our proposal

Parking lot issue: allocation – what are trying to accomplish?

**BREAK**

FBRB members came up with other observations about the proposed approach:

- We should ask what their plan is for engaging with private barrier owners
- How detailed a proposal do we want?
- How is funding to be distributed – design and implementation phases together?
- How detailed is the first submittal?
- Typically, the regions would know some details, but will need funding for refinement
- How do we view projects that could be funded by other programs – is that an eligibility issue?

---

<sup>1</sup> In these meeting notes, the sections for each topic on questions and comments do not necessarily reflect consensus or a decision; they only reflect individual discussion point unless otherwise noted

- How far up a stream reach do we fund? Are there diminishing returns further up streams? [Need to provide some level of flexibility; would this question be a phase 2 of prioritizing areas?]
- Portfolio approach may be based on projects already funded, and any funding FBRB could provide is needed to complete a basin
- Important to allow for opportunistic approach as well
- We need to understand the funding priorities of other funders
- One question for focus areas is what is the largest area that could be opened for the lowest cost/number of projects
  - The legislation says “whole watershed restoration”, but we should help define what that means; don’t want to penalize 1 or 2 barrier projects
- What is the time element? [it’s about a three year process to correct a barrier]
- What timeframe do we give the regions to respond?

The group began discussing a potential demonstration (pilot) project that could test the program. The timing for proposal would be by next August 2015, for inclusion in a budget proposal for the 2016 supplemental legislative session. It’s also possible a non-state agency may propose some seed funding to start the program.

Additional discussion points and comments:

- Should a demonstration project include an inventory? [Julie thinks a pilot would need to include an inventory; choose a small area and do an inventory AND the project
  - Want to show a demonstrated success
- Consider looking at adopted county/city capital improvement plans
- Having a project connected to a DOT project might help
- Don’t use the term “pilot project”, because there was already a successful 1998 effort and we don’t want to confuse the current work with that project – perhaps consider this “seed money”, or phase 1 of a program
- Need to keep Washington Forest Protection Association in mind, as they have been integral to the effort to correct barriers
- Development of a demonstration project/first phase/seed money should consider:
  - What DFW already knows about areas needing correction
  - Regional focus areas
  - What DOT knows about their areas needing corrections
- The Family Forest Fish Passage Program (FFFPP) has a huge backlog; do we assume that backlog will be funded or should they be eligible?
- We should keep RMAP and private investment in mind as we allocate any funding
- We need to have a strategy for a state budget package submittal, when the time becomes appropriate

## **LUNCH BREAK 12:00 noon to 1:00 pm**

### **Bylaws**

Chair Julie Henning reviewed the changes to the previous draft of the bylaws. She kept the sections related to open public meetings the same, which included referencing statute in the bylaws. She provided some clarifications related to notification when the board would vote on particular issues. Carl Schroeder moved to approve with one change as discussed, Chris Hanlon-Meyer seconded. The motion to approve was passed unanimously.

### **Criteria for evaluation of project proposals**

A straw-dog proposal was e-mailed along with the agenda. This proposal had criteria that could be used to evaluate projects being considered for funding. There was discussion about if the criteria would apply within a salmon recovery region, verses between regions. DFW has considered having a technical review as part of the evaluation process, similar to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) process.

Comments and questions from members and alternates:

- Need to decide if we are assuming habitat quality is the same between linear miles opened of different streams
- Don't want to require re-assessment if assessments have already been done for streams
- One issue is prioritization both within and across regions, there will need to be prioritization between regions, a subset of the technical evaluation criteria could/should be used.
- Should the criterion be percent of population rather than percent of stream?
- The Endangered Species Act implications are an important consideration
- We might consider just using the criteria from the legislation
- We should consider the "production potential" and factor that into what's funded
- We need to invest where it will improve – need to know the priorities in order to fund improvement upstream
- There is a concern about the long term success of improvements
- What is the purpose of criteria?
  - One thought: To help regions prioritize
  - Another thought: Project sponsors would submit a bundle of projects for funding; this is how the FBRB would evaluate the projects
- This could be a regional board approach; they would coordinate different proposals within their region
- The criteria (or a subset of them) would be used to guide Regions on their project development and for the Board to evaluate projects once they are submitted for funding.
- What is different about this process? [It covers a larger scale, and coordination is a key part]
- Are we using this criteria to select focus areas as well as projects? [the Board should develop criteria for selecting focus areas, doesn't have to be the same criteria for both focus areas and projects]
- Regarding the different tracks, portfolio is a subset of the standard track, should move it there
  - FBRB members discussed this and did not resolve for today
- Landowner approval needs to be a factor (it needs to be part of the 'certainty of success' criteria in the evaluation)
- Need to define the tracks more clearly for the next meeting; look at an example so we can better understand
- Do we ask the regions to divide projects into standard and portfolio, or do we do that? [Suggest giving regions some general questions out of today's meeting and get their feedback for consideration at the November meeting]
- Would also be nice to hear from on the ground implementers – project sponsors
  - Sometime in the winter?

**Next steps**

1. Determine the focus areas within each region.
2. Discuss the options for a demonstration project.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:40 p.m.

**The next meeting of the Board will be Tuesday, November 18, 2014 - location to be determined.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Others present at meeting:**

Neil Aaland, Facilitator	Marc McCalmon, WDFW
Alison Hart, WDFW	Bonnie Kim, Washington State Senate staff