

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes

Date: November 20, 2018

Place: Association of Washington Cities, Olympia, Washington

Summary: Agenda items with formal action

Item	Formal Action
Meeting notes from October	Approved
Request RCO to submit revised language to OFM authorizing use of additional funds for an additional grant round	Approved
Funding for alternate projects on approved list of projects	Motion approved to fund the \$97,000 for middle fork Newaukum and hold the remainder of funding
Updated and reorganized work plan	Approved

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
Use of New Zealand-based culvert correction technology	Follow-up on the test sites in Oregon when information is available
Eligibility requirements for projects (see PSP NTA discussion below)	Consider placing an “eligibility” document on the website, pulled from manual and from application materials

Board Members/Alternates Present:

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

Others present at meeting:

Allison Cook, WDFW	Christy Rains, WDFW
Cade Roler, WDFW	Neil Aaland, Facilitator
Dave Collins, WDFW	Ash Pandya, Chinook Habitat R-Group
Alison Hart, WDFW	David Blue, Chinook Habitat R-Group
Wendy Brown, RCO	Chad Dornsife, Fish Passage Fdn
Wendy Clark-Getzin, Jefferson County	Kirsten Harma, Chehalis Basin LE
Erik Schwartz, Mason County	Adam Wright, GeoEngineers

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review: Meeting started at 9:00. Neil reviewed the agenda.

Public Comment: Chad Dornsife is working with a group in New Zealand to fix blockages. He briefly discussed their approach. Carl Schroeder is curious to know whether the techniques would be used in the state. There are a couple of test installations in Oregon. Carl suggested scheduling an update on those Oregon test sites when available.

David Blue said he owns an Indian-owned company that corrects barriers. He is working with a number of northwest tribes.

Wendy Clark-Getzin, Jefferson County spoke to emphasize the cooperation on projects in Jefferson County.

Old Business: The October meeting notes were approved unanimously. Justin noted that the December meeting of the FBRB has been cancelled. The next meeting will be the regular one in January.

Budget/Decision Package Issue: This is a follow-up on a previous discussion. Tom explained that Carl contacted him expressing concern with the language in the decision support package. There was \$32 million of projects on the project list. The Board wanted to request more overall to open another application window. RCO is not comfortable asking for funding that is not tied to specific projects on a list. On September 11 the Board had a conference call where the Board decided they wanted to ask for more funding. Tom read aloud the request submitted by RCO on the Board's behalf to OFM. The additional funding is tied in this language to additional costs for projects on the list and funded and does not include language allowing another grant round to be opened. It is unclear what the Governor's office is planning to propose.

Carl said he left the September 11 call with the understanding RCO would forward the request from the Board for the additional funding. Jane had the same understanding. The issue is the allowable use of the \$18 million in additional funding.

Wendy Brown from RCO explained her understanding. She thought it was clear that RCO only requests funding for projects. She came out of the September 11 call agreeing to propose additional funding for construction and design costs for projects on the current list. Tom noted that the Board took no additional actions on September 11, which means the earlier request for the additional funding stayed in place.

Discussion points:

- Steve Manlow expressed some concern with pursuing an unallocated \$18 million
- Jane said it is not unusual to ask for a lump sum of funding
- Carl said the Board voted in August to ask for \$50 million, including a second round; he thought the Board's lack of a second decision in September meant the August decision stood
- Paul thought the idea was to entertain potential new projects, and wants to get clarification added to the decision support package
- Casey and Steve Martin support the August decision
- Joe Shramek said we need to be true to the August decision, and wants to have the option for a second grant round; Steve Manlow agreed with Joe's position
- Dave Caudill noted there will be some administrative difficulties with a second grant round
- Tom has some wariness around a second grant round, but supports the Board's direction; it would be good to have more flexibility on the additional \$18 million
- Wendy wanted the Board to realize that the additional funding and round could result in a big re-appropriation request for the following biennium, which is not a great message to send
- She can modify the request if the Board so chooses

Carl made a motion that the Board request RCO clarify the decision package to more closely track the August decision. Jon seconded. The motion passed, with all except Steve Martin voting in approval.

A break was taken.

Regional perspectives – Progress in the Newaukum watershed: Kirsten Harma is the lead and gave a powerpoint presentation. See FBRB website for this presentation:

https://wdfw.wa.gov/about/advisory/fbrb/handouts_112018a_FBRB.pdf

She had several recommendations:

- FBRB coordinate with SRFB and other funding programs
- Most coordinators are happy with the watershed pathway; for coordinated pathway consider using the lead entity
- Align timing for coordinated pathway with the SRFB process

Questions and comments from members included:

- Justin wondered if monitoring for the Newaukum River sites would help with the review of FBRB projects
- Steve Manlow thinks integrating FBRB grant rounds with SRFB grant rounds seems supported by Lead Entities; he likes that concept
- Paul wonders if all different funding sources are being used? [Yes, all are being used; the SRFB and FFFPP are consistently used]
- Carl hears about the coordinated pathway from cities and wonders how we can integrate LEs into that process [Kirsten thinks other LEs would agree with that and wants to continue this conversation]
- Justin thinks the coordinated pathway is working well
- Dave wonders if the lack of participation here is because the FBRB is new [Yes]
- Wendy Clark-Getzin noted that, related to her area, there is a mis-conception that the FBRB is not about summer chum salmon; Jon Brand agreed, and Carl thinks this is a topic for further Board discussion

Funding for alternate projects on current list: Justin led this topic and noted we discussed this last time. He reviewed a spreadsheet of the 12 funded projects, plus the 6 approved alternates. All 12 funded projects are under agreement; the cost increase request for Cottonwood's project is still under review. The Legislative LEAP list shows the first alternate project is middle fork Newaukum; Alex Conley, Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board Executive Director, notified Justin that Coleman Creek (the 3rd alternate) is also ready to implement if funded this biennium. There is \$650,000 unobligated.

Dave had a couple of comments. First, when the Board finally has its 2019-21 budget should we consider cost increases for projects from the previous round before moving on to the next round of projects? Alternatively, should we consider not funding as far down the list until those needing increases are considered for cost increases? Second, he noted that we are allowing pre-agreement costs to be reimbursed.

Justin explained the Legislature authorized using funding for alternates, and we are moving down the list. Casey thinks we should just decide the amount we want to retain and then move down the list; he wonders how much we should reserve for over-runs.

Tom made a motion to fund the \$97,000 for middle fork Newaukum designs and holding the remainder of funding; Joe seconded. Steve Manlow thinks this gives us flexibility. The motion was unanimously approved.

A lunch break was taken.

Results of the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) Near Term Action (NTA) Review: Justin explained that the list of NTA's included some barrier removal, with no funding attached. WDFW staff did some work to understand why applications for these projects were made to the PSP. Cade's review showed the following:

- 19 of the 26 projects were not eligible for FBRB funding
- 4 were eligible and are in the 2019-21 funding proposal for the FBRB
- 3 would have been eligible but did not apply for FBRB funding

At the October meeting the Board considered sending a letter to the PSP about our process, but now Tom is thinking of not sending this letter since it's a small number. He thought a call should be made to the PSP, so they know about our program. Dave thinks it might be good to revisit project eligibility next time we re-open a grant round. Carl agrees, stating he just looked at the grant manual and doesn't see some eligibility requirements. Those should be added into the manual from the applications; perhaps place an "eligibility" document on the website.

Updates from WDFW: Tom, Justin and Danny Didrickson (WDFW Screening Section Manager) presented at the Nov. 1 CRAB design workshop in Chelan. They had 45 minutes, presented basic information on fish passage and the FBRB. It was primarily educational.

Justin reviewed a powerpoint given at the Injunction meeting held earlier in November. Treaty tribes have requested a one on one meeting with WDFW, to be held on January 8th, 2019, specifically related to slip lining of culverts, climate change and HPAs, and status of research on tidally influenced culverts.

A presentation was given to the Senate Transportation Committee on fish passage basics. Both WDFW and WSDOT were invited. Justin said he explained the FBRB and the two pathways. Questions included who manages certain projects, how we evaluated projects for funding, type of nutrient enrichment needed to encourage returns (none provided by FBRB but WDFW does generally address). It was generally a friendly audience.

Legislative Session Planning:

Justin reviewed the new information packet. A new estimate of 18-20,000 barriers was included (estimate of this number has been discussed at previous FBRB meetings). Carl thinks this packet has what needs, it helps him to respond to ad hoc questions. He wants to update the "regional stories" and add some narrative around projects on our list. We should add an explanation of partial barriers, and add the criteria used for the coordinated pathway. Casey agreed, and wonders when it will be revised and available; Justin said by early next week.

Cade asked about WSDOT's handout. It was noted that the two handouts talk differently about reporting habitat gains. Carl said that difference has been a subject of discussion over the years. Justin said he talks about 82 barrier corrections opening up 162 miles of habitat; Paul thinks in some cases the same habitat is being counted by both agencies. Perhaps a definition of actual vs. potential habitat should be addressed.

Casey has a couple of comments about the watershed pathway map. An overlay of coordinated pathway projects on this map would be useful, and he noted in the upper Columbia it's Johnson Creek, not Omak Creek.

Workplan: Neil presented this topic. He revised the workplan based on previous discussions. The Board had no additional questions or comments. Jon moved to approve, Carl seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.

Next meeting: Tuesday, January 15, 2019 – Rainier Room, Association of Washington Cities