

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes

Date: June 17, 2014

Place: Olympia, Washington

Summary: Agenda items and follow-up

Item	Follow-up Actions
Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review	None
Statements of Interest	None
Review of Legislation/Tasks	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Review whether/how federal and military lands may be affected, and how private and other state lands may be affected2. Provide a copy of the PowerPoint presentation to the Board.
Ground rules/bylaws	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Proposed set of ground rules will be developed and brought to July meeting2. Look into requirement for Board training on public records law
Variables to consider in barrier removal strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Prepare summary of information needed by the Board to move forward on its assignments2. Contact the California Forum and assess whether their work provides any useful perspectives for Washington
Proposed work schedule	Prepare a draft proposed work schedule, including deliverables
Schedule for future meetings	July: Meeting set for July 10 Starting August: Third Tuesday of each month

Board Members/Alternates Present:

Julie Henning, Chair (WDFW)	Casey Baldwin, Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
Megan White, DOT	Jon Brand, Kitsap County/WSAC
Paul Wagner, DOT	Chris Hanlon-Meyer, WDNR
Jonalee Squeochs, Yakama Indian Nation	David Price, WDFW
Brian Abbott, GSRO	

Others Present: See Attachment A

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Julie Henning, Board Chair. Julie welcomed members and introduced the facilitator, Neil Aaland. Neil reviewed some logistical items, asked people around the table to introduce themselves, and then reviewed the agenda.

Statements of interest

As requested, each member came prepared to talk briefly about their agency/tribe/entity's interests in the Board and its responsibilities.

Megan White, Department of Transportation: There are a lot of strict requirements in the 2013 federal injunction, the lawsuit by tribes. Western Washington is the area primarily covered by the

injunction. DOT has logistical concerns. Funding is limited, concerned about their ability to comply, concerns about statewide barriers. DOT wants partnerships.

Jonalee Squeochs, Yakama Indian Nation: She is representing the Yakama nation. They want to find and remove barriers. She offered that Yakama staff members are available to help.

Brian Abbott, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office: This is a great opportunity to get coordination. We need to be sure that resources go in the right location. The Board should take advantage of the existing network, including Fish Recovery Boards. He wants to hear from people who are out doing the work.

Casey Baldwin, Confederated Tribe of the Colville Reservation: He has worked locally on these issues. His interests and background are more technical. He's looking for anything that benefits recovery in eastern Washington. He's interested in the interface between technical and policy issues. He has some frustration with implementation of previous projects; budgets for them were set too early.

Jon Brand, Kitsap County/Washington State Association of Counties: This is a great opportunity to coordinate on projects. Kitsap County's list of projects has grown to 118, and it's a huge challenge for not just Kitsap County but all local agencies. One challenge is to identify and prioritize projects.

Chris Hanlon-Meyer, Washington DNR: DNR has a couple of programs related to this work. Road Maintenance and Abandonment Program (RMAP) – owners have a 2016 deadline (or, if they get approval, owners can delay that deadline to 2021). Those are already scheduled. The Family Forest Fish Passage Program (FFFPP) provides funding to small forestry owners to remove barriers, an annual process. Funding is scarce and a strategy developed by this Board will be helpful.

Carl Schroeder, Association of Washington Cities, could not be here today and sent Neil an e-mail summarizing their perspectives. Cities are interested in collaborative approaches and in partnering. They believe a prioritized approach will help secure funding, and think a statewide strategy needs to address all areas of the state. They have some ideas about how to prioritize and look forward to the discussions around that.

Review of Legislation and Tasks (Julie Henning)

Julie reviewed a PowerPoint presentation [presentation will be provided to the Board]. She noted that an ad hoc group is meeting separately to discuss short term funding. The Board will be looking at long term funding. She reviewed the legislation, which also includes sections on streamlined state and local permitting. These topics are not the tasks of the Board. The Legislation created the Board and specified its membership, while providing authority to expand the Board. Julie looks forward to considering other groups to add. The Board will need other agencies and entities to help implement. Its purpose is to consider removal on a statewide scale. The legislation also specifies that WDFW and WDOT are to work in partnership, WDFW will develop an inventory training program, and WDFW is to report back to the legislature on permit streamlining efforts in section 7 (1-4), as well as board recommendations on proposed funding mechanisms and methodologies to remove barriers .

Questions/Comments from the Board:

- Does the legislation address federal agencies and Military lands? [This is not addressed in the legislation; Julie is interested in that link, and is also interested about the link to other state and private lands]
- This is a long-term Board, no timeline specified in legislation
- The references to a “strategy” come from a discussion of priorities
- Need to understand existing work in this area and any legislative direction for that other work
- Need to be sure we mention when the legislation is being paraphrased rather than quoted
- This is not necessarily a strategy, more of a collaboration and cooperative approach; should stick with the legislative language
- Need to think about linking all of these pieces, and that requires a strategy
- Where is the funding report and due date mentioned in the legislation? [We will get back to you with that information.]

Ground rules/bylaws

The Board needs to adopt a set of bylaws and ground rules. The Board discussed some general ideas, including how the website should be used, ensuring the Board’s work is consistent with the legislation, the need for Board members to fully participate in discussions and prepare for each meeting. It was noted that the Board is subject to open public meetings act and public records act, and is required to receive training on public records. Suggestions for additional topics to be addressed:

- The activities of the board should be clearly related to the language of the enacting legislation. If other activities or responsibilities are added, this needs to be clearly identified as an additional effort, and subject to agreement of the board.
- How to memorialize decisions – key decisions should be voted on
 - Is voting by a simple majority? 2/3 majority? Majority of those in attendance? What constitutes a quorum? (there may be statutory requirements addressing a quorum)
- Materials should be provided 5 working days prior to a meeting
- Process for adding additional members
- The Board needs to be as open and transparent as possible
- Each alternate is in the discussion, but they do not have a separate vote – one vote per member AND alternate
- The Board should consider using WebEx (audience member)
- Consider allowing members to call for a break when they want to confer on or consider a topic
- Longer term (parking lot issue): how projects are cost estimated, useful if there’s standard methodology

Board members encouraged Julie to add items as she sees fit in a draft set of ground rules/bylaws for consideration at the next meeting.

Break: the Board took a break at 10:45 am and re-convened at 11:00 am

Variables to consider in barrier removal strategy

This agenda item is to get feedback from Board members on information they need to carry out this project. What background is needed to move forward?

- Need to hear from partners – e.g. WSAC – who’s doing related work
- What hurdles have partners run into when doing their work?

- What are the recovery criteria for salmon related to removing barriers?
- Coastal Washington does not have a recovery plan but a sustainability plan; how does that fit into the Board's work?
 - Is the focus on listed species? [It's a consideration but this doesn't exclude other species; legislation addresses statewide applicability]
- Other work to consider includes "extinction is not an option" and the 1997 Task Force Report
- Update on the status of barriers (but don't get too much in the weeds)
- Funding (this is a big topic and long term this Board will need to discuss) – need to understand the "lay of the land"
 - DOT, locals – what dollars are available?
 - DOT can help with funding sources information
- Clarify relationship between the ad hoc funding group and the Board
- Information regarding land use as it relates to the quality of habitat
 - This needs to happen later, need to consider how urbanized areas and more pristine areas fit in the strategy
- Is there any other place in the country doing a similar project?
 - CA has a fish passage forum, not sure what they've done; Washington is in the forefront. Contact the CA forum and find out what they've done

Proposed work schedule

The factors and information needed by the Board were discussed. This will result in a schedule of topic and decision points, based on the legislation and on Board ideas. The following were suggested by Board members:

- What is the Board's decision space/authority?
- What is the product?
- The Board needs to define a prioritization process for barriers
- Review the legislation for the deliverables and build a workplan off of that
 - This should be done this early in the Board's process
- Can the Board compel an agency's prioritization?
- Coordination is important in the strategy
 - Groups such as Regional Fisheries Enhancement Groups (RFEGs) need to understand this effort

Future meetings

The group decided to meet on the previously scheduled meeting date of July 10, and after that regular meetings will be the third Tuesday of the month. Next month we'll meet from 10 am to 1 pm, and re-visit the length at each meeting. **[Note: by e-mail sent following the meeting, the Chair expressed concern about the shortened length and asked the Board to hold 9:30 am to 3:00 pm for the third meeting]**

Questions from public attendees

- Will we post meeting agendas?
- Be sure to do as much work as possible prior to the next legislative session (Karen Terwilliger)

The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:00 p.m.

The next meeting of the Board will be July 10, 2014 in room 172 of the Natural Resources Building in Olympia, Washington.

Attachment A: Others in Attendance

Neil Aaland, Facilitator
Jon Ambrose, GeoEngineers
Jason Callahan, Washington House of Representatives (staff)
Mark Doumit, Washington Forest Protection Association
Chris Dwight, WDFW/Visitor
Jeremy Graham, Mason County Public Works
Dan Jones, Washington House of Representatives (staff)
Dave Knutsen, CCA/Fish Northwest
Chantell Krider, Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board
Don Luford, URS Corporation
Marc McCalmon, WDFW
Gabe Ng, GeoEngineers
Leihla Scharlau, Mid Sound Fisheries Enhancement Group
Karen Terwilliger, Washington Forest Protection Association