

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes

Date: March 20, 2015

Place: Governor Hotel, Olympia, Washington

Summary: Agenda items with formal action

Item	Formal Action
Meeting Notes	Approved meeting notes from February 20

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
Fact sheet	WDFW will send the final version to FBRB members and post on the FBRB website.
Year 2000 agreement regarding mitigation: WDOT, Ecology, WDFW	Paul will send to Julie for circulation to FBRB
“FBRB Program Process” diagram	FBRB members generally comfortable with boxes 1-5 as discussed; WDFW will continue to refine
Work plan	Neil will work with Brian and prepare another draft for review and discussion

Board Members/Alternates Present/on the phone:

Julie Henning, WDFW	Chris Hanlon-Meyer, WDNR
Casey Baldwin, Colville Confederated Tribes	Brian Abbott, GSRO
Paul Wagner, DOT	Carl Schroeder, AWC
Jon Brand, Kitsap County/WSAC	Gary Rowe, WSAC
David Price, WDFW	Jonalee Squeochs, Yakama Tribe

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by facilitator Neil Aaland. Neil asked Board members and attendees to introduce themselves, and then reviewed the agenda. A motion was made by Chris Hanlon-Meyer to approve the September meeting notes; Gary Rowe seconded. The motion passed unanimously. The Board set the next meeting for Friday April 24.

Public Comments: No one present offered comments.

Follow-up on Fact Sheet

After the last meeting, Julie sent the fact sheet out to FBRB members asking for additional comments. There was not enough consensus to send it out with logos of all participating agencies so it is remaining a WDFW handout. She'll send the final out to FBRB members, and post on the FBRB website.

Update on work with Lead Entities

Julie attended a watershed council meeting with Puget Sound Lead Entities (LEs). They suggested that any grant program be run through them; Julie did not commit to that. The LEs believe they can nominate watersheds, and think the FBRB should provide more direction and a process for them to use in Puget Sound. The FBRB needs to consider how to address a situation where the LEs propose multiple watersheds.

Updates on Legislative Session

Carl Schroeder mentioned that he is looking for opportunities during the legislative session for funding. They've been considering asking to prioritize mitigation funding in the transportation package. Ecology, WDFW and WDOT have an agreement from 2000 that seems to lay out a pathway. One idea is rather than funding mitigation sites right next to freeways, the funding could be directed to barriers within the

same watershed. They have been discussing with NWIFC, state regulatory agencies, others. This might also include directing agencies to consider a fee-in-lieu program.

Feedback from FBRB members includes:

- In lieu fee fits within the intent of the FBRB (Dave)
- Likes it but don't want it to result in a county paying more - mitigation fee plus an in-lieu fee (Jon)
- Seem pro-active, would like Carl to come discuss with DNR (Chris)
- FBRB role is to provide opportunities and funding, and then stand back (Brian)
- Hesitate to have FBRB decide the right way to mitigate (Paul)

Dave asked if people around the table generally support this concept; in general, FBRB members agreed it was worth pursuing.

Developments on the Statewide Strategy

Julie opened the discussion on the statewide strategy. At the last meeting, she presented several different grant options. As follow-up, WDFW wanted to show the overall program and how it would work. She referred to the chart titled "FBRB Program Process". Justin Zweifel, WDFW, presented this information. The chart is looking at the HUC 10 level; for comparison, WRIAs are several HUC 10s. There are a couple of hundred HUC 10s statewide. Boundaries of HUC 10s are sub-watersheds.

There was discussion about how the HUC 10s line up with WRIAs. It might be that this is more appropriate for Puget Sound. Even a HUC 10 is a pretty large geography. We'll need to think about how to get to a smaller area. Paul mentioned you could have a barrier downstream of a HUC 10 boundary; Dave stressed you have to consider the mainstem.

Paul suggested we consider asking regions for watersheds as a high, medium, low priority. Dave thought that had value. Brian thought we ask for the priorities of regions, not just high but all of their priorities and why. Dave thinks we ask for the high/medium/low priorities of HUC 10s. At a minimum we need their top priorities.

Justin discussed Box 4, the explanation of WDFW's GIS assessment of HUC 10s (the office assessment). The product for box 4 is the best project areas within HUC 10s. WDFW would use maps, do the scoring and ranking. Brian thought another approach was to go back to the regions and use a team approach with WDFW.

Additional comments:

- Project areas could include multiple projects; a subset of a HUC 10
- Wanted to include a reference to "opportunistic projects", have it adjacent to box 8
 - These are separate from the strategy but part of the grant program
 - FBRB will need to figure out how to combine opportunistic projects with a project list
- What is box 9 (approved projects go to Legislature)? Is this agency request legislation?
 - Looking at a July 2016 timeframe for a legislative request
 - Reference to TIB: TIB is a relic, still in statute but not really in place
 - Some are not sure about the process providing the legislature with a list of projects; concerned about selective picking of projects rather than the whole list
- This is a good general layout for now; step 6 should start sooner, perhaps after step 3
- Perhaps use the HUC 10 level for Puget Sound, and the rest of the state could use whatever locally makes sense
- Casey suggested that box 3 should be "FBRB approves focused watersheds", not specifying HUC 10s; there was general agreement
- Conclusion for today: members generally comfortable with boxes 1 through 5, as amended; WDFW will continue to work with regions and internally to refine

Next steps with regions

Dave explained he is going to meet again with the Recovery Council on April 2 to continue the dialogue. We need to discuss their role in this process. One question is whether the FBRB hands off any decision-making authority to them. The Recovery Council has an FYI role; not asking for them to approve lists. What if they want to have a role in narrowing down the 15 priority areas? The question is who do we want to apply the criteria developed by the FBRB? Comments:

- Why not encourage all 15 LEs to provide their priorities?
- We want the PS Recovery Council to support our decisions
- The FBRB should lay out preliminary thoughts and get their reaction, but reserve authority to determine the funding
- General agreement on this notion

LUNCH BREAK 12 NOON TO 1:00 PM

Eligibility criteria

Julie discussed the handout that was included in the meeting packet. She wanted to try to put together a draft of potential eligibility criteria. This is intended to be an introduction to this topic; discussion will continue at a future meeting. Chris asked if the private landowner referenced in the document was non-forest; the answer is yes. Brian mentioned that one of the issues is private project applicants on state-owned or government lands; that's something addressed in SRFB procedures. He thinks that needs to be provided for.

Additional comments/discussion points include:

- Look at the significance of barriers rather than who owns them, although some fund sources have restrictions on who is eligible
- All private landowners should be eligible
- Board should be as inclusive as possible, unless funding requires otherwise
- Need to define large bridges and eligibility
- Focus of the legislation is on roads
- Fishways should be considered as eligible, but need some boundaries around it; need further discussion

Workplan

Neil explained that he was asked to put together a draft for discussion purposes. It is a work in progress. He worked with Brian on this draft, based on previous discussions by the Board. Paul suggested that the mission statement should be more closely aligned with the legislation, and said footnote 2 should be used instead as the mission. He thought the draft workplan is a good start, overall. Other commenters generally like its structure and organization. Brian added that a lot of discussion is needed to refine the actions, and other members may think of other action items that need to be added.

Casey discussed the "values" section. He pointed out there are additional owners other than state, local government, and private parties. Julie pointed out we have to be careful about not confusing coordination with funding.

Board members discussed goal 3 (coordinate information). Some thought this seemed like part of goal 2, action c (develop a statewide strategy for barrier removal). The questions around this goal are what are we doing and how are we sharing information? Carl suggested having this be action h under 2, and revising: "develop a plan to coordinate information sharing between the FBRB and other entities involved in fish passage barrier removal projects". Several liked this idea. After discussion, the decision was to temporarily leave it separate and Neil and Brian will consider how to revise the draft. Carl suggested consideration of making a new action under goal 3 which would read: identify information and

coordination needed to support goal 2, and then a separate action to identify information and coordination needs for other parties. Neil and Brian will consider that in the revisions.

Additional comments and observations:

- General agreement on goal 1(a)
- Concept behind goal 1(b) regarding need for more resources might fit better elsewhere
 - Recognize the resources that are already in place
 - Consider adding “resources needed” to the timeline/responsibility section
- Communication strategy: add to this goal the slot at the salmon recovery conference in May; other outreach opportunities such as salmon recovery council
 - Julie noted this is around internal communications; we should revisit this roughly once/year
- Revisit membership annually is separate action for goal 1
- Action 2 (d) is a good idea, sooner rather than later – should include RFEGs, CDs, AGC
- Goal 8 should reflect permitting and streamlining, and should include local government planners due to the local shoreline and critical area permits typically needed for barrier removal projects

Paul handed out a list and map of potential DOT barrier removal projects for the next six years. This is what could be done with \$80 million per biennium over the next six years.

Summary/Next Steps

- **Workplan:** Neil will prepare another iteration of the work plan for the next meeting.
- **WDFW will refine** the “FBRB Program Process” diagram.
- **WDFW will continue to engage** with the Puget Sound Partnership/Recovery Council.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:10 p.m.

The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for Friday, April 24 at the Governor Hotel.

Others present at meeting:

Neil Aaland, Facilitator	Justin Zweifel, WDFW
Cade Roler, WDFW	Larry Dominguez, WDFW
Colleen Thompson, RFEG Coalition	