

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes

Date: January 15, 2019

Place: Association of Washington Cities, Olympia, Washington

Summary: Agenda items with formal action

Item	Formal Action
Meeting notes from November	Approved with attendance correction

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up

Board Members/Alternates Present:

Tom Jameson, Chair, WDFW	Joe Shramek, DNR
Paul Wagner, DOT	Dave Caudill, RCO - GSRO
Jon Brand, WSAC	Amber Moore, PSP - COR
Justin Zweifel, WDFW	Casey Baldwin, CCT
Jane Wall, WSAC (phone)	

Others present at meeting:

Doris Small, WDFW	Steve Helvey, GeoEngineers
Cade Roler, WDFW	Neil Aaland, Facilitator
Dave Collins, WDFW	Don Ponder, WDFW
Alison Hart, WDFW	Matthew Miskovic, KPFF
Pad Smith, WDFW	Chad Dornsife, Fish Passage Fdn
Wendy Clark-Getzin, Jefferson County	Barry Wenger, citizen
Shane Scott, SS & Associates	Sterling Bell, WHOOSHH
Michael Messina, WHOOSHH	David Blue, Chinook Hab Rest Group
Cassandra Weeks, WDFW	Jamie Quinn, Chinook Hab Rest Group
Rachel Bouchillon, WDFW	Steve Thompson, City of Olympia
Josh Lambert, RCO	Gary Cooper, citizen

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review: Meeting started at 9:00. Facilitator Neil Aaland reviewed the agenda. He noted that later in the meeting there will be a going-away cake for Steve Martin, who is leaving his position with GSRO and the Board.

Public Comment: Barry Wenger is a retired Ecology employee interested in habitat restoration. He is interested in the New Zealand inexpensive project that can be used by volunteers to quickly install. He suggested the Board set aside some funding for small projects like this.

Mike Messina is with the WHOOSHH Company which makes systems to move fish.

Ryan Barkhymer suggest considering flexible baffles on the side of box culverts.

Chad Dornsife, Fish Passage Foundation, is working on funding to allow installation of these types of projects.

Old Business: The meeting notes for the November meeting were approved unanimously, with one correction to show that Joe Shramek was in attendance.

2019-2021 Capital Budget List: Tom Jameson led this discussion. He reviewed a call that Wendy Brown, RCO, received from Myra Baldini at the Governor's office of financial management. Wendy reported that Myra said RCO could take their administration fee, but WDFW's administration fee should be removed. Tom is trying to get a meeting to understand their rationale. A report from Joint Legislative Audit & Review Committee (JLARC) was cited by the Director of RCO as justification for saying administrative costs should not come out of capital budget, but this was not directly relevant. Tom expressed frustration that he was not called and given a heads-up by RCO. Wendy submitted the LEAP list without WDFW funding. Once out, there is no way to change the governor's budget. Jeff Davis thinks WDFW will ultimately get the funding. The Governor's office drew their funding line under project #54 (at \$25,082,000). The final LEAP list submitted by RCO removed funding for RCO's administration fee, leaving enough funding for projects #1-50 and partial funding for project #51. Project #51 is 2 King County Park's barriers on Ravensdale Creek downstream of a WSDOT barrier correction that is scheduled for construction in the summer of 2020; this means that project can't be constructed – full funding is needed.

Comments and questions included:

- Could this be funded out of operating budget? [Yes, but it has to be available]
- Use of capital budget is the issue; DNR has not received the same message [There are no issues with DNR using capital budget for funding staff]
- It is possible to get this fixed during the legislative session
- Jane thinks letters of support from individual FBRB members is a good idea, send to chair of capital budget committees. The Governor's budget is just one step in the process. She is alarmed by this issue as many agencies use capital budget in this way
- Paul noted that the transportation budget includes \$296 million for fish passage; this is a tripling of the current biennium and is to meet injunction requirements
 - He thinks their capacity to manage these projects will be augmented by contracting out
- FFFPP has \$6 million in the Governor's budget; had asked for \$20 million
- State Parks has funding in the Governor's budget of \$1.6 million to fix two culverts
- Jon noted Kitsap County would be lucky to have \$500,000 in their budget; it's a huge challenge for counties to fund these
- The Governor's budget includes money to implement Orca Task Force recommendations, which includes a fish passage biologist to address Chinook barriers. A preliminary report/list of projects is due in March 2019; by June 2020 a final list and recommendation is required

2017-2019 Project Updates: Justin reviewed the updated spreadsheet for these projects. He noted \$687,000 is not allocated; he anticipates a \$147,000 cost increase request from Turner Creek. Cade says the required traffic bypass is complicated. One component of a Newaukum project is switching from steel to concrete culverts, as the soils are acidic, and steel will only last half as long. This could add \$300,000. Jon said they have similar problems in their area. WSDOT uses very little steel any more for this reason.

Additional updates:

- Chico Creek is going out to bid
- Justin wants to add a "status" column to the spreadsheet
- Dave Caudill had a couple of updates

Tidally influenced crossings: The board has expressed interest in this topic so WDFW brought in a couple of subject-matter experts to give a presentation (Doris Small and Pad Smith). Uncertainties

include: fish movement/biological needs in tidally influenced streams segments, how culverts in intertidal areas are/should be assessed, linear connectivity for fish as well as restrictions to inflow/outflow that can affect ecological function and juvenile rearing on either side of the crossing, and how are/should projects be designed in this different environment? The current design guidelines are primarily for riverine environments with one way flow, but most tidal influenced culverts are passable twice a day with flow moving both ways through it. Large tidal range can be problematic; in Olympia this is 22 feet. WDFW staff reviewed a PowerPoint slide show showing some of the ways they are trying to answer these questions.

Questions and comments included:

- It is challenging to prioritize these in relation to other barrier projects due to the difficulty of determining the barrier severity of tidally influenced culverts
- We have projects in the Sound; barriers at river mouths influence upstream projects
- This definitely affects WSDOT; difficult to answer this in a practical way
- Question includes deciding whether a project is just for fish passage or should include restoration
- Is it important for juvenile fish to move against the tide? [the presentation showed some examples where that has been documented, but it is not well understood, more studies are needed]
- Is the Board considering funding studies? [No, that is not in our authorizing statutory language]
- Tom noted that tribes are interested in this topic

Fish Passage Map App: Rachel Bouchillon, WDFW, reviewed this topic. Started to work on this three years ago, wanting to develop a user-friendly program. She pulled up the application and demonstrated to the Board. The information is updated weekly, based on information provided by people working in the field. Board members saw a lot of use for this application. Project sponsors need to submit a form to get corrections made.

A break to get lunch was taken at 12:00 noon

Middle Columbia Watershed Pathway Presentation - Alex Conley, Executive Director of Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board: Alex and Cassandra Weeks gave this presentation. The easy, low-hanging fruit has been done. Now the complex ones are needed. Some maps were shown indicating their current areas of priority. Due to complexity of the area, they are still working on a strategy for how to proceed through the priority watersheds for future FBRB rounds.

Questions and comments from members included:

- Justin requested clarification on Alex's suggestion to use regional organizations as a gatekeeper. Alex clarified that his region would prefer to select priority areas, then allow the Board to work directly with project sponsors during the application phase. Alex added that the recovery boards are interested in reviewing the final ranked list of applications for their region each grant round. Alex explained that the recently used Watershed Pathway project solicitation process caused the regional organization to serve as an unnecessary middle man.
- Tom noted that there are difficulties in working with USFS; culvert replacements can be part of a "good neighbor agreement" with them
- Cade wondered why there were no coordinated pathway projects [They have not had obvious projects, plus they have a major capacity crunch]
- Casey supported their use of the spatial structure criteria from steelhead recovery planning to guide implementation, rather than just linear gain.

WDFW updates

- PSP passage projects – Justin has tried to discuss, has not yet gotten a response

- WDFW has a document with project information for 2019-21; will be available on the website
- Steve Martin has resigned from the GSRO and will be leaving the FBRB effective this meeting; Dave Caudill will be the primary member for RCO, Wendy Brown the alternate

The meeting adjourned at 1:40 pm.

Next meeting: Tuesday, February 19, 2019 – Rainier Room, Association of Washington Cities