

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes

Date: October 20, 2015

Place: Washington State Association of Counties, Olympia, Washington

Summary: Agenda items with formal action

Item	Formal Action
Meeting Notes - September	Approved with one correction
Approve prioritized list of Puget Sound HUC 10s	Top three watersheds were approved

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
Coast region submittal	Julie will meet with Coast Lead Entities in two weeks and give them a deadline (by the December FBRB meeting)
Communications strategy	Next steps: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Revise the outcomes and strategies2. Prepare a first draft of the communication plan and draft messaging3. Will meet with the core group in November4. Come back to the December meeting5. Dec. 21 due date for deliverables6. In early January training for FBRB will occur

Board Members/Alternates Present:

Julie Henning, Chair, WDFW	Donelle Mahan, WDNR
David Price, WDFW	Brian Abbott, GSRO
Paul Wagner, DOT	Jon Brand, Kitsap County/WSAC
Gary Rowe, WSAC	

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Facilitator Neil Aaland. Julie wanted to narrow down the list of Puget Sound HUCs; and she wants to share what WDFW is receiving regarding the coordinated pathway. For the communication plan, she wants the group to be clear what the outcome is. Paul and Gary noted that they needed to leave early. There were no other comments, questions or additions to the agenda.

Neil announced that the November 20 meeting is cancelled, and the next meeting will be the regular meeting date of Tuesday, December 15. WDFW needs the additional time to continue its work evaluating the nominations.

A motion was made by Paul Wagner to approve the September meeting notes with a correction of Marc Engel's name; Julie Henning seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comments: No public comments.

WDFW Budget Request

Julie discussed the proposal. She heard some questions at the last meeting, and sent out a copy of the proposal with the agenda for this meeting. It's an agency request to the Governor's office. The WDFW Executive Management Team thought it was a priority. Questions and comments from Board members included:

- Brian asked if these would be new positions [Yes, they would be new and ongoing positions]
- Paul asked if training was included [Yes, described on page 2]
- Would this provide training for locals? [This request provides the infrastructure to do so]
- Jon wonders about the streamlined permitting process [WDFW is still working on that; need to tackle next year]

Update on Strategy with Salmon Recovery Regions

Julie explained there has not been much progress as WDFW has been focused on Puget Sound. Each region nominated a watershed (except Puget Sound and the Coast). They were approved except for Puget Sound and the Coast. The approved ones are shown in a map on the FBRB website. WDFW is assigning staff to look at the information in greater detail. The Coast region nominated a large area, and say they can't narrow it down. Julie has asked those Lead Entities to nominate HUC 10s (similar to request to Puget Sound). She is going to a meeting of the Coast LEs in two weeks to discuss this process. Dave noted there is a lot of funding going into the Chehalis basin. Those groups have told him they are at capacity. Julie and Gary thought they might require a longer term view.

Julie proposed that the FBRB ask the Coast to nominate areas as a starting point, and then the Board will evaluate. Gary mentioned the Chehalis is going through a process, and that should run its course.

The FBRB agreed that Julie should attend the meeting with the Coast region in two weeks and ask for their priorities, and see what happens. Julie will mention a deadline at that meeting, and if they are non-responsive by our December meeting the FBRB will move forward without the Coast region.

Discuss Watershed Pathway

Julie handed out some information from the last meeting, where we left off. WDFW scored on the IP model, for steelhead and coho. WDFW had said they'd look at the top 3 nominations of HUC 10s and do a further analysis, but they had enough time to look at the top six nominations. She also handed out impervious surface maps for the top six areas, which provide some interesting information. They somewhat confirm the ranking. Dave asked that, in the future, the anadromous layer above the HUC 10 boundary be shown. Julie noted that these maps show the differences between areas. She then reviewed the HUC 10 analysis report. This information is only based on in-office information; ground-truthing will occur later. Brian thought it was good to see the stock status. It would also be helpful to see production possibilities. There might be some scale comparability issues but WDFW will explore.

Cade Roler reviewed a PowerPoint presentation (see FBRB website for the detailed presentation). He reviewed the top three ranked watersheds, and then hones in on sub-watersheds (HUC 12s within each area). Julie noted this was an effort to take the top HUC 10s and dive deeper into barriers and ownership. Her preference is to narrow the list of six HUC 10s down to 2. Gary expressed concerns about not including Goldsborough watershed. Brian also likes Finney and wonders about including inventory and scoping. Additional comments and questions included:

- Brian thinks not including a Skagit area watershed seems problematic
- Cade noted that a detailed proposal under the coordinated project pathway is being done for the Skagit watershed
- Dave advocated staying with the top three
- Jon thinks the FBRB should stay with the original list
- Paul is okay with the proposed top 3, and noted DOT has projects in those areas that work together
- Gary noted that this process outcome is a plan, ultimately a package of potential projects will result

- Julie views the approval of these three areas as a way to narrow scope, and a starting point

Brian moved to start with the top 3 identified/prioritized watersheds listed in the report, Jon seconded. Brian made the motion with the understanding that this is the place to start, and Skagit is going the route of the coordinated pathway approach. We are not rejecting the others. The motion was approved unanimously.

Coordinated Pathway Nominations

Julie wanted to update the FBRB on this work. There is a lot of interest and participation in this approach, Cade has received many calls. It appears that submittals are primarily from local governments. Some submittals address a number of barriers. Submitters are 13 cities, 13 counties, and several Lead Entities. A September 30 deadline was established, but they've continued to accept submittals. WDFW plans to cut them off by the end of October, although some LEs said they can't complete until mid-November. WDFW will have to evaluate. Brian asked how broadly the announcement was circulated; it was targeted to lead entities and local government. Some concerns were expressed that the "ask" should be broader. Julie thinks we need to move forward with this process and we can always expand later. Members agreed.

Communications Strategy

Barbara Cairns, Pyramid Communications, introduced the topic. She reviewed the purpose of conducting a communications strategy and outlined what a strategy might include. Several items were e-mailed out in advance to the FBRB:

- Agenda for her presentation
- Guiding outcomes
- Audiences
- Timeline and Board Commitments
- Situational Analysis Method

Barbara reviewed the handouts and discussed what adopting and implementing a strategy for the FBRB might look like.

Questions and comments included:

- Dave noted that the audience is the legislature, salmon recovery world, tribes, others...everybody needs to know about the work
- Gary noted that it is important to be sure that the messaging for his members helps them support a funding request, especially since there are tough funding choices that have to be made
- Barbara tested an assumption that putting in a legislative ask is fiscally responsible, and it's important for the members of this board whose agencies have some responsibility for fish passage barrier removal; and by spring 2016 the program will be better laid out
- Julie thinks this is close; a primary focus is not so much on this legislative session but reminding the legislature of the 2014 legislation, here's the progress we've made; selling the program and seeking support for implementation and initial funding in 2016
- Dave added that the messaging for a budget request needs to be consistent among FBRB members for 2016
- Dave also noted that the 2016 session is important for capacity funding, which can then position the program for a 2017 program that is funded
- Brian noted that support from others, including cities and counties, is important to be successful

Barbara then reviewed the "audiences" handout. She noted that different kinds of messages are needed for different audiences. Several members noted that they have regional staff that will benefit from the messaging. Barbara asked whether the tribal fish commissions should be viewed as primary targets; Dave thought that makes sense. Julie thought they are primarily external audiences, since they haven't participated on the board even though invited. Barbara noted that she asked a couple of times to meet with

WFPA and hasn't been able to make that happen yet. They will be important, they were key in getting the initial legislation passed. With some edits, FBRB members thought this handout identified the appropriate internal and external audiences.

Additional comments and questions:

- Barbara suggested the Board might consider bringing on additional members; Neil noted that the workplan identified that once per year the FBRB would consider adding members
 - Brian noted that Associated General Contractors might be useful to contact, along with RFEGs and Conservation Districts
- Brian noted a key message would be the need for new funding, not just using other funding and moving it around
- Julie suggested that FBRB members should have their legislative staffs coordinate, and the communication materials will help them; others agreed
- Barbara noted that counties have agreed to help with printing costs

Barbara identified these next steps for the communication strategies:

1. Revise the outcomes and strategies
2. Prepare a first draft of the communication plan and draft messaging
3. Will meet with the core group in November
4. Come back to the December meeting
5. Dec. 21 due date for deliverables
6. In early January training for FBRB will occur

Summary/Next Steps

Neil summarized the next steps from this meeting:

- Julie will meet with the Washington Coast SRR, give them an update, and give them a deadline (prior to the FBRB December meeting) to provide nominations
- WDFW will continue working to further evaluate the prioritized list of Puget Sound HUC 10s
- Next steps for communication have been identified above

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm.

The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for 9:00 am to 2:30 pm Tuesday, December 15. Location to be determined.

Others present at meeting:

Justin Zweifel, WDFW	Larry Dominguez, WDFW
Cade Roler, WDFW	Cheryl Baumann, Clallam County
Alison Hart, WDFW	Barbara Cairns
Lilah Behrend	Neil Aaland