

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes

Date: December 15, 2015

Place: Washington State Association of Counties, Olympia, Washington

Summary: Agenda items with formal action

Item	Formal Action
Meeting Notes - October	Approved
List of nominated watersheds for the Coast region	Approved list submitted by Coast region
Select one watershed as the top priority for the Coast region	Approved Newaukum watershed
Communication plan	Approved

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
Provide feedback on approach for coordinated pathway projects	Subcommittee is formed and will meet prior to next meeting; Dave will convene
Communication plan	Implementation subcommittee formed consisting of Brian, Dave, and Carl

Board Members/Alternates Present:

David Price, Chair, WDFW	Donelle Mahan, WDNR
Carl Schroeder, AWC	Brian Abbott, GSRO
Susan Cierebiej, DOT	Casey Baldwin, Colville Tribe (on phone)
Gary Rowe, WSAC	Dave Howe, WDFW

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Facilitator Neil Aaland. David Price confirmed that a quorum was present. Gary Rowe moved that the Board prepare a letter to Julie thanking her for her service; Dave seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Dave will prepare the letter. A motion was made by Dave to approve the October meeting notes; Carl seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comments: No public comments.

Watershed Pathway update

Dave introduced this topic. He introduced Stacy Polkowske, WDFW, who updated the FBRB. She showed the approved HUC 10s statewide. By the next Board meeting, should have barrier packages for all watersheds. Packages will be strings of culverts approved by locals. They want 2-3 packages per approved HUC 10. These would be submitted for funding in the next biennium. The timeframe for implementing packages is within the next ten years or so. Dave said they have to be open to a scaled approach; WDFW has more projects than we think can be done in the first round.

The watershed pathway will focus on whole watersheds; the coordinated project pathway focuses on individual projects. The three approved Puget Sound HUC 10 watersheds are Pilchuck River, Goldsborough Creek, and Pysht River-Strait of Juan de Fuca Frontal.

An update was then provided for the Coast region. There are no approved HUC 10s yet. There are four separate Lead Entities on the coast, and there is no agreement on one watershed. Julie and Stacy met with them to discuss their approach. The suggestion is to take four watersheds from their regional strategy; these four comprise the coastal nominations. Stacy reviewed a handout with an analysis, a summary of each watershed based on available information, along with some socio-political information. The tribes

are listed on the handout purely for FBRB information. She also discussed the results of the intrinsic potential density analysis (also used in the Puget Sound); the Newaukum River HUC 10 ranks highest.

FBRB members had the following questions and comments:

- Brian suggested looking at all four areas, perhaps smaller areas within each watershed [Dave said one challenge is that other regions have been asked for one focus area.]
- Gary expressed concern about the message that would be inherent in treating the coast differently
- Donelle and Carl agreed with Gary
- Gary would consider adding the Clearwater but not all four

Dave moved to approve the list of nominated watersheds from the Coast, Carl seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Next, we need to decide which of the four the FBRB will focus on. There has been discussion on different approaches. Neil thought the majority of the FBRB is leaning toward picking one, rather than two or more. Dave said the rationale for nominating 4 and narrowing down to 1 later is that we aren't getting closer by doing more staff work. The coast has done its best and nominated 4. WDFW employed the IP model and looked at the rankings. Dave suggests we pick one watershed (the Newaukum River) with the option of later opening the door for others. Brian introduced Miles Batchelder from the Coast region. Miles explained the difficulties the coast had in picking only one watershed. He suggested if it had to be only one, it's better to have the FBRB pick it.

Casey thought choosing one and adding later could confuse others. He thought if one area didn't work could always choose another. Carl said he is comfortable going with one. If we expand beyond one, we can add opportunity to the whole state. Brian noted that all four have activities happening. Miles explained the process by which the coast lead entities ended up nominating four watersheds. Susan Cierebiej said Miles presented some good background information on Newaukum River Watershed, and is now leaning toward picking only one watershed.

Gary moved to nominate the Newaukum watershed as the coast priority watershed, Dave seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Coordinated Pathway Nominations

Dave confirmed that the nomination time for this pathway is closed; now we are reviewing submittals. Gary had thought more outreach was being done to local governments to see what coordination could occur. Dave confirmed that the deadline was closed, and over 200 projects were nominated. For future biennia, he is interested in figuring out a way for outreach related to new grant opportunities, perhaps have a rolling deadline.

Dave said the goal for this topic is receiving feedback on methodology. Cade Roler (WDFW) presented this topic. He discussed how the call for projects went out. The initial solicitation was sent out in July, along with watershed nominations. The "ask" was nominations for 1 or more projects upstream or downstream of recently completed (within the last 5 years) or funded fish passage projects. Once nominations were received DFW used filters based on board and legislative principles:

1. Were nominated projects on anadromous streams?
2. Are the nominated projects directly upstream or downstream of a recently corrected or funded barrier replacement project? (because the legislature told the FBRB to build on previous investments)
3. Are there downstream barriers?

109 projects out of 244 submitted met all three filters.

Cade reviewed project readiness scoring. Questions and comments from FBRB members:

- Gary noted that counties don't want to spend money on design unless they know projects are funded
 - Dave noted that the more design work that is done, the more “shovel-ready” it is
- Carl wondered if we should consider SRFB non-funded projects
- Casey suggested that when the list is narrowed down to 10-20 projects, we should connect with the salmon recovery regions to ensure we're not missing anything (e.g. conforms to regional plans)
- Dave noted that some projects have been flagged for potential additional review
 - Cade flagged 10-15 projects that he thought might be worth looking at
- Gary thinks we need to define “coordination” and decide how we value that; we need more information on coordination and it should be a more nuanced filter, not just yes/no
 - Justin thinks we could quantify coordination by the number of types of owners
 - Dave wonders if we ask the Puget Sound Lead Entities and Recovery Regions with approved watersheds how they will coordinate with others
 - Dave also thinks for the coordinated pathway, for this biennium apply the simple yes/no filter and discuss later how we do this in future biennia

FBRB members noted that if a project was nominated as both a coordination project and is also located within a focus watershed, it should NOT be filtered out from consideration from the coordination list. This will ensure that messaging will be consistent.

Cade then reviewed the list of 109 qualified sites that met all three filters. Nominated projects were then put into Arc GIS for further analysis. WDFW used the DNR stream type layer for measuring the nominated projects' net gain. Cade wonders what they should look at now. Comments and questions from FBRB members:

- Gary thinks it's useful to see 109 projects – present what HUC 10s are involved, show on a map what projects have been done in that HUC 10; he wants to see what's been going on in a HUC 10
- Susan suggested using the HPA database to see what's been done in the past years
- Brian noted that in the statute, section 2(d) and (e) lists five things; look at those five. Scoring would be developed and applied.
- Cade wants feedback on what screens to apply
- Casey suggested considering stream width, and noted there are a couple of ways to do that
- Brian thinks distance opened may not be helpful; it could be a smaller but critical reach
- Susan suggested putting some of these questions back to the sponsors
- Consider full versus partial barriers (that would probably cut the list in half)
- In answering a question, Cade thinks we could further reduce the list based on stream order; number of species present
- Susan mentioned that WSDOT previously used a “surrogate priority index tool”, which gets at estimated habitat quantity and quality.
- Carl suggested using net miles as first cut, then data on stream quality

Dave wants, for the next meeting, support for the process and for a list coming out of this process. A potential list size of 20-50 would be good. For the next meeting, Cade could keep the 109 projects and apply the factors in the RCW – 2 (d) and (e), and consider readiness.

Gary wants to know what WSDOT is doing. Susan noted that WSDOT is only using linear gain for injunction culverts.

Carl noted that we could score and see about natural break points; easier to apply scoring out to all and we see the cut at next meeting.

Neil noted that the FBRB is not coalescing around an approach. In response, the Board agreed to form a subcommittee and meet in January to further consider. Brian, Donelle, Paul, and Gary are the

subcommittee and will work with Cade. Dave will call the first meeting, but not attend to avoid a quorum being present. The Board agreed with this approach.

Communications Strategy

Brian reviewed the status of the plan. He mentioned the January 8 meeting of the subcommittee to further review; WFWA has also been invited. Target audiences should include user groups (add them to “external audiences” on page 9). Carl is satisfied with the plan. He thinks we should all work within our organizations to support. He noted that a key piece for him, the messages piece, is buried in the middle. Brian thinks this will be pulled out as a separate one pager. Susan noted that another target event is Fish Migration day in the spring; WSDOT is participating on May 21. This will be added.

Carl moved to adopt and start an implementation subcommittee with Brian, Carl, and Dave as the members; Dave seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Carl suggested Neil would be the keeper of this plan and the work plan. Dave, as project manager for Neil’s contract, agreed.

The meeting adjourned at 2:25 pm.

The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for 9:00 am to 2:30 pm Tuesday, January 19. Location to be determined.

Others present at meeting:

Justin Zweifel, WDFW	Larry Dominguez, WDFW
Cade Roler, WDFW	Neil Aaland, Facilitator
Alison Hart, WDFW	Miles Batchelder, WCSSP
Stacy Polkowske, WDFW	