

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board – Meeting Notes

Date: April 18, 2017

Place: Association of Washington Cities, Olympia, Washington

Summary: Agenda items with formal action

Item	Formal Action
March meeting notes	Approved
Updated work plan	Approved

Summary: Follow-up actions

Item	Follow-up
Communication Plan	Review with communication subcommittee and bring back in May or June for review and approval
Grant manual	Circulate for comment; come back for approval at May meeting

Board Members/Alternates Present:

Tom Jameson, Chair, WDFW	Jon Brand, WSAC
Paul Wagner, DOT	Dave Caudill, RCO
Casey Baldwin, CCT (phone)	Carl Schroeder, AWC
Stacy Polkowske, WDFW	

Others present at meeting:

Gina Piazza, WDFW	Neil Aaland, Facilitator
Dave Collins, WDFW	Alison Hart, WDFW
Erik Schwartz, Mason County	Jan Rosholt, Parametrix
Morgan Stinson, WDFW	

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. Facilitator Neil Aaland reviewed the agenda. He noted that Tom Jameson would be coming around noon. Casey Baldwin joined by phone. Neil asked, for future meetings, that members reply to the meeting agenda and calendar announcement by noon on the Friday before each meeting; that will let WDFW plan for food and logistics.

Public Comments

Nobody present offered comments to the Board.

Follow-up Items

Approval of March meeting notes: Members reviewed Casey's addition and had no concerns. Casey moved to approve with the revision, Paul seconded. Motion approved unanimously.

Legislative and budget updates

Stacy updated the Board on the overview of funding sent by Tom on April 4. Both the House and Senate capital budgets have \$19 million for FBRB projects. In each of those, projects are listed individually rather than a lump sum being provided. It is hoped that the line-item requirement is removed. The transportation budget also includes an additional \$5 million as a lump sum, for city/county projects. FFFPP has been allocated \$5 million, and WDFW has been allocated \$250,000 for city fish passage inventories.

Lake Forest Park is specifically mentioned in the capital budget; \$1.2 million for Lions Creek. Paul noted it is listed as a highway project, and DOT has questions about that. More clarity is needed. DOT thinks it is a \$4 million project, and \$1.2 million is in the budget.

Nobody else had any legislative/budget updates.

Grant Manual

Stacy presented this topic. She is looking for a “soft approval” today, so the manual can be circulated to interested parties for comment. Formal approval would come at the May meeting. She had a powerpoint presentation to focus discussion.

There were questions and observations about the description of the two pathways. These included:

- Casey liked the added descriptions
- The intent is the Board will continue to work down the current project list for the watershed pathway until the list needs more projects
- Board could decide to change policy, e.g. on downstream barriers, and that might be another reason to re-open the list
- Stacy anticipates a project solicitation for both pathways
- The solicitation for watershed pathway projects would be for projects within the current prioritized watershed
 - Assumption is the funding will continue to be applied to the current list of projects, and applicants could also propose a new project within the same watershed

There was no change to the description of the coordinated pathway. The Board reviewed the Technical Team description on page 8, and some changes were identified. This was clarified to describe the handoff from WDFW staff to RCO staff; it's after the application submittal deadline. A calendar will be provided. Dave Caudill and Stacy will get together and provide more details on the pre-application and application process.

Dave Caudill and Casey Baldwin had several detailed comments. It was agreed that they would work with Stacy to get these into the next iteration of the manual, prior to circulating for review and comment.

Paul expressed concern about page 9, “legally required projects”. WDFW will check with RCO on this item, and we will delete it from the version being circulated for review and comment.

Under “Schedule and Important Dates”, Casey asked about site visits for small number of applications, not all applications. A step is needed where the TRT and FBRB engage. An “offramp” for watershed projects previously reviewed needs to be provided. The review for these projects should be verification that it's the same project, and a check to see if site conditions have changed. Photos of the site should be provided to assist in this. The listing of tentative dates for each step should be left in to provide some perspective, even if those dates are not yet determined.

The project agreements are proposed for three years, rather than two, as discussed at the last meeting. WDFW will check on whether the issue of re-appropriations (if/when a project is not completed by the end of the biennium) is a factor.

Other comments:

- For pre-construction, added procedural requirements from the state regulations (from DES)
- Stacy and Dave Caudill will work offline on the issue of preliminary design level review – cost estimate review

The intent is to make revisions, get this out for about two weeks of review, have about a week for WDFW staff to make changes, and have it on the agenda for the May FBRB meeting to approve the grant manual.

Extra Funding in Transportation budget

Tom and Stacy are interested in getting some preliminary thoughts about the \$5 million that is presently in the transportation budget. This is funding that is not allocated for any specific projects, and is meant to

be used for city and county owned projects. They wanted to get this on the FBRB radar screen. Questions they have include whether a whole watershed should be funded; or whether we would just continue down the list of current projects. Dave Caudill asked if this would “supplant” current funding. Stacy clarified that any funding in the transportation budget would be in addition to the capital funds (\$19.7 million).

Additional comments:

- Jon wonders why we wouldn’t just continue to go down the current list
- Some members wondered what watershed sticks out as an obvious choice to fully fund corrections
 - Would need to delve into the requests to answer this
- Dave Collins suggested that doing a whole watershed would let the FBRB demonstrate the benefit of fixing a whole watershed; Paul and several other members agreed
- Casey wonders about looking for projects with urgency or a good story to tell; perhaps based on a large amount of linear gain? A project not currently funded that provides a lot of gain?

If this funding remains in the transportation budget, we will come back to this topic at an upcoming meeting.

Communication plan update

Neil explained that following the discussion at the previous meeting, the plan was going to be revised and brought back for approval at this meeting. However, there was potentially more revising needed than just the list of tasks. Neil proposed that he and Allison work on revisions, then meet with the communications subcommittee and get their review before bringing it back to the FBRB. This would then be on the agenda for the May or June meeting. FBRB members agreed with this process.

Workplan update

Neil reviewed the proposed revisions to the workplan, based on the discussion at the previous meeting. Several changes to the workplan as drafted:

- The timing of the item on page 3 about the FBRB website was clarified.
- Item 6 in the table on page 5, about developing a plan to coordinate information sharing, will be left in (there is interest in knowing what others are doing)
- A reference to climate change will be added to item 12 in the same table on page 6
- Goal 4, Action C will be left in and changed to “document the training that WDFW has provided”, and the statutory citation will be provided
- Goal 5 will be kept as a separate goal, rather than combining it with goal 3 as proposed

Goal 6 regarding permit streamlining was not changed, but Tom Jameson mentioned that WDFW is creating a position at the COE Seattle office. It will deal with Chehalis projects 75% and FBRB projects 25%.

Jon Brand moved to approve the revised workplan, and Dave Caudill seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Brian Abbott legacy

Tom handed out a picture provided by Dave Caudill of a project that was dedicated to someone. He is proposing that the first couple of projects would be dedicated to Brian. Members liked that idea. Jon wanted the FBRB to be clear on who would be responsible for maintaining or replacing the sign if it was damaged. Dave Caudill will check on the cost of signs and the point Jon mentioned. Paul liked the idea, and he wonders if we need to think about general signage for fish passage projects, so people see the work being done in the field and have an opportunity to better understand that work. We will discuss this at a future meeting.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 1:45 pm.

Next meeting: Wednesday, May 24th @ Association of Washington Cities (note day and date change for the May meeting)