

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes

Date: June 16, 2016

Place: Natural Resources Building, Olympia, Washington

Summary: Agenda items with formal action

Item	Formal Action
Meeting Notes - May	Approved
Coordinated Pathway Tier 2 Ranking	Approved (by consensus agreement)
Project match	Approved (as revised)

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
Yakima package (watershed pathway)	Table till July meeting (need more information)

Board Members/Alternates Present:

Dave Price, Chair, WDFW	Steve Martin, Council of Regions
Paul Wagner, DOT	Carl Schroeder, AWC
Brian Abbott, GSRO	Gary Rowe, WSAC
Stacy Polkowske, WDFW	Dave Caudill, RCO
Casey Baldwin, CCT	
Neil Aaland, Facilitator	

Others present at meeting:

Dave Collins, WDFW	Tom Jameson, WDFW
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 Carl Schroeder to approve the March meeting notes as drafted; Casey Baldwin seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comments: No public comment was made.

Watershed Pathway

Dave Price reviewed this topic. The FBRB previously received materials; there is some additional information in the binder for today. In addition, a presentation on the Yakima watershed will be made, since many details were not available at the last meeting. The goal for today is to fill gaps, get approval on projects. The Board will later approve a package to submit for funding. New information for today includes the proposed fix to problems identified, and cost/benefit per mile.

Dave Collins, WDFW, presented the **Yakima information**. Priority 1 is Coleman and Caribou Creeks, in the Ellensburg area. Three sites were reviewed: diversion at Olmstead State Park; road barrier on Coleman Creek; and a diversion on Caribou Creek. Refer to that presentation for details.

Priority 2 includes four sites: two sites on Cooke Creek, and two sites on Parke Creek. More clarification of the gains for site 3 was requested. Members also wondered about a need for more inventory work with priority 2. Regarding the memo from Alex Conley, Executive Director of the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board, Casey had some concerns about opening up irrigation ditches. Dave Price thinks we have more work to do on this package; additional upstream information is needed.

Carl wondered whether we should be discussing more expensive projects with a higher level of uncertainty. Dave Price said we'd be discussing costs later; the total package so far is \$120 million, which is a high number to request. Gary noted that over a long period of time it could be reasonable, and didn't think we should be afraid of the costs. Brian wonders if we should have a completed barrier inventory before deciding on the Yakima proposal; Dave Price thinks that will be part of packages actually advanced.

It was decided to table decisions on the Yakima package until the next meeting, to allow additional information to be developed.

Next, Dave Price reviewed changes in the rest of the material. Regarding cost estimates, they're on the high side. They generally accepted cost estimates submitted by proponents.

Gina Piazza, WDFW, reviewed Puget Sound. The cost estimates are mainly from WDFW engineers. For Priority 1, the Pilchuck project (site 5), the homeowners are not yet on board. Members think they need more information on the landowner commitment. Gary suggested a focus be on "low hanging fruit" – where can we get more done now to demonstrate progress? Board members generally agreed.

Cade Roler, WDFW, reviewed Priority 2 - the Little Pilchuck watershed. He thinks we get more bang for the buck with this – lots of habitat gain for the investment. Carl said we need information on this similar to Yakima, and similar to the descriptions Alex Conley provided. This project is the story we're trying to tell, and having additional justification is important.

The Board discussed how to get to a recommendation, with the help of staff. Dave Price thinks we continue reviewing today's packages then staff goes back and builds a recommended package. They will check in with salmon recovery regions on the recommendations. In July, a ranked list would be presented for each watershed. Paul wants readiness to proceed to weigh heavily in the recommendations; also the cost/benefit per lineal gain. If the costs for the package end up at a need of \$120 million, that's the starting place. He thinks we don't need to hide a high number.

Dave Price thinks we have to narrow it down. We should focus on a number – here's what could be done with that amount. Gary said if we have an estimate of \$120 million, then say it's over three biennia. Casey agreed; if we have a list that is \$120 million, then that's the list. Dave Price said they will come back with a list, comments about priority, and costs. This list will be simplified.

Additional comments:

- Steve wonders whether completion of an inventory is a criterion
- Carl wonders whether opening irrigation ditches, as in the Kittitas area, should be considered
 - Dave Price thinks that information should be captured in the table
- Paul thinks we need to consider if we asked all the right questions of proponent – e.g. the issue of opening irrigation districts (but he noted they can also provide good habitat)

Coordinated Pathway

Cade presented this item. He would like approval of criteria to rank these. Today we are looking at the proposed points to assign for ranked criteria. The costs identified are based on overall cost, not cost per lineal foot. Some projects have fallen off this list because they've been funded elsewhere. Casey asked for a write-up of the method to assign the numbers. For item 6, restoration, includes other in-stream projects (in the same stream).

The Board is satisfied with the criteria as presented. Brian noted he can live with it, but would prefer including some information regarding healthy stocks. He would also like to know what life cycles of fish are addressed, for future work.

Cade presented the projects included in this pathway, presented in order of the tier 1 ranking. 244 nominations were received initially, and he noted only a couple in this pathway were in eastern Washington. [Refer to printed packets for detailed information on projects.] Projects and some notes are:

- Valley Creek: has been planned since 1999
- Chico Creek: still waiting on some information; DOT barrier is downstream with cost of \$40 million to correct
- Big Soos Creek: cost estimated at \$15 million. Casey asked if fish had to be able to pass during high flow (which is the identified problem). Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad has not yet been approached; the Board has some discomfort with the project due to that lack of information
- Turner Creek (lower Columbia): owned by Cowlitz County
- Johns Creek: 2 culverts; Dave Collins said the Board should have a description of how to deal with partial barriers downstream. There are beaver issues with this culvert
 - Dave Caudill suggested that one criterion should be confirmation that something actually is a barrier
- Fisher Creek (Skagit) has several issues:
 - Landowner issues – unwilling, haven't been able to contact to discuss
 - No cost estimate
 - DOT is doing a large restoration project downstream (not an issue, but a note)
- Kenny Creek (Whatcom)
- Thorndyke Creek (owned by Jefferson County); opens almost 10 miles of habitat, fix is a box culvert
- Allen Creek (Chehalis) has major low flow concerns
 - Doesn't meet this pathway as well as others
 - Good project but downstream landowner has no interest
 - **Board thinks this project should come off this list**
- Cedar Creek: velocity and depth issue, scour pool
 - Upstream landowners in support
 - Cost estimate from WDFW is \$1,029,000 (county estimate is half that, but WDFW thinks that's too low)
- Little Salmon Creek: no cost estimate, will be very expensive; not the highest priority for the county, but the FBRB said it should remain on the list
- Mason Creek (Clark County): Board asked Cade to try and get the log weir included
- Un-named tributary to Mason Creek: would be a good FFFPP project
- Tributary to Arkansas Creek: already listed on the watershed pathway; property owner issues
- Red Cabin Creek: Only a barrier during high velocities; there would be a lot of gain
- Erick Creek (lower Columbia): tributary of Abernathy Creek, which is a focus of attention
 - Not too expensive for a lot of gain
 - Some problems but keep on the list; add downstream fishway to package
- Panther Creek: 100% impassable; city project within Renton
- Leckler Creek (already discussed)
- Walker Creek (Skagit): ownership issues (foreclosed/owned by bank); should contact BPA
- E. Fork Walker: Not sure of what remedy is proposed; some sensitivity
- Enright Creek: city culvert, gain of a mile
- Lost Creek #1: (Lewis County) – small forest landowner; big scour pool. Is this an RMAP obligation?
- Lost Creek #2: gravel county road
- Gheer Creek: cut off by mill pond

Cade noted that three sites were pulled off the list; two were determined passable. Steve asked when the next solicitation for projects under this pathway would be; Dave Price thinks we need to finish this round and assess the lessons learned; perhaps late summer/early fall.

Legislative Tours

WDFW has not been able to schedule many. They are still looking at the Lower Cowlitz with Rep. Orcutt, probably July 7. They had to cancel the meeting with Senator Honeyford. Dave Price is thinking they might ask for a meeting, not a tour, in late summer with key people. Dave will follow up.

Project Match

Dave reviewed the changes based on the last meeting. These were sent out in advance (refer to May 31 draft). Discussion points:

- The department will track match except under option 2, where, sponsors would have to track their own match because WDFW won't know those details
- Under Match Certification Credit second bullet, add "and same watershed and same owner"
- Combined the first and second bullet; include 4 years in that bullet
- First Match Certification Credit bullet should say "...other than FBRB funds"
 - Project sponsor may partner with another entity

Carl Schroeder moved to approve as amended; Steve Martin seconded. The Board unanimously approved the project match document as amended.

Summary/Next Steps

- Next meeting is Tuesday, July 19th
- Gary asked about the need for getting information to the Governor's Office for budget – do we need to approve on July 19th for that reason?
 - Dave Price said we can't wait until the August regular meeting; we should schedule a special meeting for late July/early August as a placeholder in case we do not complete approving the project list(s) and determining a budget "ask" amount in July. He also noted the Governor's office has asked for a recommendation on a funding source.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.