

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes

Date: May 19, 2016

Place: Association of Washington Cities, Olympia, Washington

Summary: Agenda items with formal action

Item	Formal Action
Meeting Notes - April	Approved
Coordinated Pathway Tier 2 Ranking	Top 5 criteria approved

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
Match criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Board will review and approve at June meeting• Subcommittee will review forms and report back with recommendations

Board Members/Alternates Present:

David Price, Chair, WDFW	Steve Martin, Council of Regions (phone)
Paul Wagner, DOT	Carl Schroeder, AWC
Brian Abbott, GSRO	Jon Brand, WSAC/Kitsap County
Tom Jameson, WDFW	Dave Caudill, RCO
Joe Shramek, DNR	Casey Baldwin, CCT
Neil Aaland, Facilitator	

Others present at meeting:

Dave Collins, WDFW	Stacy Polkowske
Cade Roler, WDFW	Alison Hart, WDFW
Gina Piazza, WDFW	

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. A motion was made by Paul Wagner to approve the March meeting notes as drafted; Carl Schroeder seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comments: No public comment was made.

Subcommittee Update - Communication Plan: An updated tour description was handed out. David Price asked members to let them know if they want to participate, and he will keep them posted on dates and logistics. Paul asked WDFW to think about connecting to DOT sites, they have a number of projects happening this summer. Paul also said to think about showing sites in urban areas, so legislators understand differences in cost and what drives the differences.

Project Match

David summarized this item. People are seeing this new program, and since it's new they haven't been able to plan for it. He heard at the last meeting that members were okay with 15% match requirement for this first round, which may change in future biennia. Members present agreed. The Board then discussed matching resources. The Salmon Recovery Funding Board allows state dollars to match federal dollars, but still requires some local match. It was suggested to allow a "match waiver" policy. Another idea was to look at a 15% match requirement from within a watershed perspective, not a specific project perspective. Everyone agreed that if a project is within the same HUC 10, it could serve as match. Casey

suggested that the 15% match requirement should be for the phase they're applying for; e.g. if not applying for construction money, don't include that in the match requirement. Members agreed with that. Other comments on specific points in the draft match guidance document:

5th bullet (geographic and time scope):

- Either you have a 15% match or you apply for a waiver; still have to work out waiver criteria
- Criteria are key to avoid "gaming" the waiver process
- Discussed timeframe for ability to use projects as match; liked the notion of limiting projects used as match to within two biennia
- Call it something other than "waiver" – e.g. coordinated match, coordination credit
- In a package, not looking at individual projects but looking at 15% of the package
- Allow individual projects to be used as match in increments of 15% for multiple projects
- Use signed contacts to determine project eligibility for use as match, and the amount in the contact is the amount eligible
- Refer to this policy as "initial match requirement" and re-visit in two years

3rd bullet (matching resources):

- Model on existing program such as FFFPP or SRFB
- Subcommittee will look at the forms and come back to FBRB (but this doesn't need to hold back decision on overall match program)
 - Brian, Dave Caudill, Jon, DFW)

Additional comments on match proposal:

- Move the 5th bullet to be the 3rd bullet
- For last bullet, DFW will provide that support in coordination with RCO

The revised match document will be on the June agenda for approval.

Watershed Pathway

David Price noted that this is setting the stage for Board approval. He'd like to use the FFFPP model of submitting lists with costs. For the next meeting, FBRB members will get a notebook. The details are in the handouts, today's presentation will be more of an overview.

Cade Roler, WDFW, reviewed specific projects and packages. David Price said they will start using miles, not feet, for distance discussions.

- Coast (Newaukum River) – Priority 1 (Middle Fork Newaukum)
 - This package doesn't fix all the barriers in the stream segment. Cade noted the Lewis CD did an inventory ten years ago; other surveys done by DFW since. Still waiting on cost estimates, will have for June FBRB meeting. Suggestion was made to organize this to see costs per lineal gain; others agreed.
- Coast (Newaukum River) – Priority 2 (South Fork Newaukum Tributaries)
 - 8 barriers
 - Need to consider what to do when barriers are not that severe a blockage
 - Helpful to know how these fit in the overall landscape
 - Rest of projects in this package aren't ready to go, but wanted to show the FBRB
- Lower Columbia - Priority 1 (Delemeter/Arkansas watershed) and Priority 2 (Leckler)
 - 7 culverts priority 1 and 2 culverts priority 2
 - Site 2 has some issues with ownership and permission
 - Should consider having this one on the tour
 - Need to discuss the value of having this on the list, when other barriers are more supported locally

- The package opens a lot of stream miles but is one of the more expensive packages being considered
- Upper Columbia – Priority 1 (Okanogan River package)
 - Projects are all close together
 - DOT culvert on highway 97 within the package not yet scheduled for removal
 - Packages will be ready by June; they're using this as a way to get to delisting
- Snake River – Priorities are Snake and Grande Ronde tributaries
 - Buford Creek top priority for regional group
 - Be consistent in reflecting passability (between slide and spreadsheet)
 - A summary table for the packages was suggested; Steve Martin noted one concern with packaging together is they are all independent tributaries
 - More work will be done to clarify this package
- Puget Sound packages under development
 - Goldsborough (looking at combining both packages into one; perhaps by June)
 - Locals may want to move projects up and down in priority depending on funding received
 - It was noted that the legislature has been more likely to fund lists rather than funding buckets
 - Brian suggested we could give the legislature a list for each recovery region
 - Pilchuck: Reviewed package 1 (Little Pilchuck)
 - Pilchuck: Reviewed package 2 (Catherine Creek)
 - Site 2 opens up a 2.5 acre wetland
 - Upper Hoko: Reviewed priorities 1 and 2

In June, the FBRB will ideally be approving a list; perhaps in July if not fully ready. The next iteration will have costs determined.

Coordinated Pathway

Cade Roler noted they are almost done with habitat surveys. He reviewed a handout – tier 2 ranking criteria. Comments included:

- General concern about the lack of central Puget Sound projects in the list
- If projects have made it this far, they're all relatively equal – perhaps consider a random draw for funding
- Scoring is useful, whether or not we use it
- Need flexibility to address regional imbalances
- #6 is intended to address the intangibles
- Nominations of watersheds reflects the regional priorities

Carl Schroeder moved to approve the top 5 items on the ranking; Joe Shramek seconded. Motion approved.

Summary/Next Steps

- Next meeting is June 16th at the Natural Resources Building, Room 175

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm.