

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes**Date: November 15, 2016****Place: Association of Washington Cities, Olympia, Washington****Summary: Agenda items with formal action**

Item	Formal Action
Meeting Notes - September	Approved

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
Training on culvert inventories	Document the training that Justin Zweifel has been providing
Questions from Sen. King on the size of barrier replacement structures	Tom will confer with WDFW Leg Liaison and provide additional information
Before/after pictures of structures	Everyone send good before/after pictures, if they have any, to Alison

Board Members/Alternates Present:

Tom Jameson, Chair, WDFW	Steve Martin, Council of Regions
Paul Wagner, DOT	Brian Abbott, GSRO
Joe Shramek, WDNR	Jon Brand, WSAC/Kitsap Co
Carl Schroeder, AWC	

Others present at meeting:

Dave Collins, WDFW	Neil Aaland, Facilitator
Cade Roler, WDFW	Alison Hart, WDFW
Gina Piazza, WDFW	

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. Neil reviewed the agenda. He noted that the decision to hold a meeting in December will be based on the need to discuss the status of the budget request for a grant program (OFM's decisions).

Public Comments: No member of the public provided comment.**Follow-up Items:** The Board approved the September meeting notes as submitted (Joe moved to accept them, Paul seconded – unanimous approval).**Lessons Learned from First Grant Round:**

Tom Jameson introduced the topic. He noted that the Board had an initial discussion at the previous meeting, and wanted to follow up with a more in-depth discussion. He opened the powerpoint from the previous meeting, and noted that Stacy captured initial comments within that file. Tom noted that we will use the powerpoint as a basis for today's conversation.

The first slide talked about the overall approach, including offering two pathways and providing outreach materials. Brian asked whether the program should continue to have two separate pathways. He asked staff if they think it makes sense to continue the watershed approach, and also noted he believes a year-round application process makes sense. Cade responded that he believes the two path approach is good. He noted that the watershed pathway should include a way to assess HUCs. His other comment was that

applications for the watershed pathway were solicited during construction season, which means some potential applicants might have been too busy. Alison added that a better application process might help.

Discussion points:

- Being able to confer with regional organizations is helpful; if we go to one pathway should include that
- We could merge the application processes and have one application for both; also could identify priority areas in advance
- We should wait and see what is included in the Governor's funding package before making any decisions on pathways
- OFM had some initial interest in conditioning FFFPP with the FBRB work; WDFW has argued against this in the past
 - A UW researcher has done some work on the relationship with water quality projects; we might want to invite them down for a presentation at a future meeting
 - Relationship of barrier corrections to watershed health is something we should consider in the future
 - Joe noted that the commitments made to FFFPP applicants need to be considered; they don't have to make improvements without funding
 - Carl asked for more discussion on this before the next grant round

Tom then moved on to the next slide in the powerpoint presentation, which addressed providing an opportunity for Lead Entities (LE's) to better participate with the FBRB. Steve Martin commented on the relationship between LE's and Regional Organizations. There are 25 LE's and 6 regional organizations. He suggests the Board use the regions, rather than all 25 LE's. Cade noted that our recent experience was the some of the regions don't want to prioritize projects within their regions. Carl thought we might need to push Puget Sound and the Coast to prioritize for the next round.

The notion of a Technical Review Team, similar to the one for the SRFB, was discussed. WDFW currently provides some of that function; what would be the difference? Cade suggested one difference could be the presence of someone within each region; and the TRT could also have someone to look at the engineering aspects. Carl asked about the administrative funding built into the package. 4.12% is built in to cover RCO's costs of grant management; approximately 3% is included for WDFW staff (they contact sponsors, meet with them, look at design elements, and assist with inventory and assessment). Brian suggested writing up a description of the current WDFW technical support.

The next topic was the watershed approach, and the Board discussed the methods used to designate priority watersheds. A topic for a future meeting is whether those methods are adjusted. Paul asked if WDFW is providing training for culvert inventories. Justin Zweifel has done a lot of such training; this should be written up and documented.

The coordinated pathway was reviewed. Carl noted that there were only 15 coordinated pathway projects that made it on the list. He's most interested in the watershed project but he wonders if the split with the two pathways is the right one. Paul thinks the lower number is due to the newness of the program. The application period was only open for two months. Paul would like to see more interest in leveraging investments with WSDOT projects. Carl suggested that when WSDOT prepares future lists, it would be good for the FBRB to be connected somehow. Brian said it would be useful to have a GIS mapping exercise, with all the different programs correcting barriers on one map so connections can be seen.

Carl noted that political support from the program comes from several entities and people, and it would be good to show linkage and get support for funding. Continuing to the next page; Cade noted that guidance is needed to be able to say when a watershed is done.

Tom handed out a workflow timeline for 2019-21 biennium. It's an updated item from the summer of 2015.

Legislative Report

There are two different reports required by the statute. The first was due October 31, and Tom handed out what was submitted. He also emailed it to the four sponsors. The only feedback on the first one was an email from Rep. Orcutt, who wanted to know how the 160 miles of habitat is determined.

The second is due the end of June 2017, and is associated with the \$300,000 provided from the city/county transportation funding budget. It is a progress update on the Board and an attached report from the "culverts as mitigation" work.

Tom noted he was invited by WSDOT to be in the audience for briefing the Senate Transportation Committee. Sen. King had questions about why replacement structures were so big. Tom thinks providing him with some additional information and schematics might be useful; he will work on that and check with the WDFW legislative liaison.

Paul asked about the permit streamlining piece, as mentioned in the statute. Tom said Dave only had one conversation with federal agencies about this; it is on Tom's "to-do" list.

City of Lake Forest Park submission

The city submitted a project on Lyon Creek under the coordinated project approach during the application window. Staff reviewed and determined it could not be considered due to downstream barriers. The city asked for a status report three months ago. No formal response had gone out yet; since then official notifications have been sent. Carl was contacted a week ago, and the city asked the FBRB to re-look at its submittal. A letter with that request was sent to WDFW signed by all local legislators. Tom reviewed the projects and noted there are still barriers downstream, mainly private and listed as 67% passable.

Discussion points:

- If the FBRB re-considers this project, it would open up others that were screened out due to similar downstream barriers
- We might want to encourage them to bring the three private ones forward
- There is some discomfort changing the process at this point
- This seems like a good question for the Board to consider for future grant round

The Board decided not to re-visit its decision.

Legislative Session Preparation

This agenda item is for all FBRB members to discuss how they're preparing for the session (regarding the FBRB funding piece), and to share any information they want to provide.

- Brian: He is meeting with OFM next Monday, and he handed out GSRO's roll-up document. He's also working with Ecology and others on a state water quality recreation grant program; trying to get more consistent with existing programs.
- Paul: They made a presentation to the State Transportation Committee last week; \$80 million per biennium in funding is provided for implementing requirements from the injunction (which will need to be increased over the years)
- Joe: DNR is in flux right now with a new Commissioner coming on. They tend to focus on assistance to small forest landowners.
- Carl: Cities included this in their legislative request. He has talked with Sen. Kaiser and met with Rep. Tharinger a few weeks ago and will meet with Sen. Honeyford tomorrow.
- Jon: He noted that Tom Jameson will be briefing people at the WSAC annual conference tomorrow.

Tools

Alison showed people the story map, that is now available for use. People noted that the before/after pictures are persuasive. Members were asked to send any additional before/after pictures to Alison. WDFW is working on a ten minute video. Carl said Mark Doumit did a video a couple of years ago, which is on the AWC website.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 pm.

Next meeting: Tentatively Tuesday, December 20 @ Association of Washington Cities (may be cancelled depending on topics and need for meeting)