

Methow Restoration Council

April 18, 2017

Participants:

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Aaron Rosenblum	Foster Creek Conservation District
Charlie Snow	WDFW
Chris Butler	Yakama Nation
Chris Johnson	MSRF
Greer Maier	UCSRB
Hans Smith	Yakama Nation
Jaqueline Wallace	TU
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
Joe Connor	BPA
John Crandall	MSRF
Jon Merz	Foster Creek Conservation District
Joy Juelson	UCSRB
Kristen Kirkby	CCFEG
Maddie Eckmann	Yakama Nation
Olivia Schilling	Foster Creek Conservation District
Paul Wagner	Colville Tribes
Ryan Fortier	WDFW

John Crandall – Monitoring Update: introducing the 2017 Methow Subbasin monitoring programmatic Worksheet. Its' a means to take inventory of all of the different monitoring programs in the Methow. We try to get this updated every year. We have 40 separate monitoring efforts this year, a slight decrease from previous years. A lot of monitoring is going on. Many of these programs are wrapped into an overarching program, such as RME and Hatchery evaluation program of Douglas County. Interestingly, we have very little Methow Specific habitat monitoring going on this year. We have CHaMP, Watershed Health program (Ecology), site specific, sites visited on rotation. We have stream habitat inventory from the Forest Service, this year they are going to Black Canyon creek. Also FS region-wide programs AREMP, PIBO. We also have fish population stuff, PUD hatchery evaluation, coho reintroduction, other fish population work like relative reproductive success study, bull trout, adult lamprey recently released in the Methow. A lot of PIT tag work, some effectiveness monitoring efforts based on habitat restoration, by Bureau, YN, etc. Beaver monitoring that is flow and temperature related. We also have AEM from BPA; they have been monitoring Twisp River and Chewuch. Also water quality monitoring. Oldest monitoring program is up water quality, the discharge up on Andrews Creek. We are updating this sheet for each of the four subbasins. We hope to have the four worksheets completed through MaDMC and posted on the UCSRB web site. If you are talking to people about what is going on, this is a good place to send people. There is also a lot of contact information that we update annually. This is a good accounting tool, and once it is populated, the updates are relatively painless.

Through the MaDMC, we have begun and are further into the revision of the data gaps lists for the Upper Columbia. We went through the old list and removed some and next meeting we will go through the list and revise to improve descriptions. Within 3 or 4 months we will have a revised data gaps list. This is timely, because several of the SRFB project classes need to be addressing data gaps.

Ryan Fortier – is that posted on the UCSRB site?

Greer Maier – I think it is on there, but we will need to discuss how we will use it with RCO.

Greer Maier – UCSRB Updates: we chose dates for our next science conference – it will be in Wenatchee on January 23-24, 2018.

We are going to talk about the Power Council Meeting tomorrow. BPA attended the last RTT meeting and gave their support for the prioritization they are working on and would like to have a prioritized project list from the region to guide their funding for the region. We would like to see one prioritization process. We are under contract with ICF to redefine our spatial units to get smaller assessment units. The Methow is already done, so we can start prioritizing at that scale now. The RTT is working through metrics to prioritize the assessment units. This is an ongoing process, once finished they will go on to defining actions and then it will be kicked back to the WATs to identify projects. A long process, we expect it to take about two years.

Joy Juelson – SRFB Update: We are moving forward with the SRFB process; we just received just over 20 draft proposals. This is really a draft list, because these projects are just now getting pulled off of the database. There are about 4 in the Methow, 0 in the Okanogan, 13 in Wenatchee and 3 in the Entiat. We are starting to schedule the tours, which will be on the 10th and the 11th in Wenatchee/Entiat, and on the 18th in the Methow. We will be working with sponsors soon to get tour materials together. We will get information out to sponsors, reviewers, CAC, etc. These are PCSRF federal funds with a state match, and right now there is no PCSRF funding line in the president's budget. We are hoping that congress will add a line, and the board is going to WA DC in May to talk with our representatives about the importance of PCSRF. We will also be doing some flights over salmon recovery projects with representatives. Crossing our fingers on the funding, but we will move forward with the process as if we are going to get it. We will send our projects to reviewers so they can have the information before the tours.

Chris Johnson – do we have a total dollar figure ask vs. allocation yet?

Joy – not yet; Pete is working on it. In the past our allocation has been just under \$2 million, and last year it was about \$1.4 million; this year we don't know

The Salmon Conference is next week in Wenatchee, and over 700 people are expected.

Greer Maier – NWPPC RME Questions: I sent an email out to the WATs, the NWPPC requested of the region to talk about their RME programs – CHAMP, ISEMP, and AEM. They want to ask questions, and they want to know if the tools and data are being used by regional partners. This is a huge opportunity; we don't often get the chance to give feedback. It's nice to be able to have the dialog, for monitoring programs and for the region. This is an ongoing discussion and this meeting is just part of it. The WATs will each send someone to represent sponsors, Tracy Hillman will be there to discuss how the RTT uses the data, WDFW and the tribes will also be there. I am gathering information on the questions from the NWPPC from project sponsors at the WAT meetings as well to share with the Council.

To start, what kind of information do you need, and how well does the information from Champ/ISEMP and AEM meet your needs?

John C – we only had one year of ISEMP, and then they switched to CHaMP. There are 45 CHaMP sites in the Methow. They used a random site selection process, a master list was used. They are multiple basins in the Columbia River basin, and they are looking at more of a meta-analysis. The sites were picked out of the sampling frame, and then after the initial ISEMP year, the CHaMP sites were bounded by the anadromous zone. But within that, they broke it out further based on geography. The 45 sites

are spread out; there are 15 are annual sites and for the rest every year they do a rotating panel of 10, so those get hit every third year. CHaMP was one of the first habitat programs to use topo surveys to look at habitat. Within that, they have a whole suite of other things commonly collected with habitat surveys. They do flows, collect bugs, and the protocol has evolved over time, but it is pretty similar. Chris J – it seems like more of status and trend for a condition of a watershed than anything a project sponsor would use to develop a project actions.

John C – the CHaMP sites were not selected related to projects, but some are proximate to project sites. BPA's AEM program is based on project types. They have a reference site, a treatment site, collect data similar to CHaMP, plus a fish survey. In the Methow we have two at the Twisp River Floodplain project, and the other ones are in the Chewuch River at RM 10 (backwater) and Eightmile Ranch (instream complexity), and River Right (side channel). Both of the Twisp River sites share the same control or reference reach, which is downstream of the project site and immediately upstream of another restoration site. At the Chewuch ones, the control is upstream but at least two had the same control site. AEM doesn't have an interface that I'm aware of; CHaMP has a website. These efforts come into the Methow, they collect their data, and that's it.

Kristen Kirkby – there is an AEM site at Silver too

Greer – the first question is whether you used CHaMP data, and how

Kristen – I have attempted to use CHaMP data a few times. I found it very challenging to get data from CHaMP, and also challenges using the data. They lacked a visual for the data to help it make sense.

Chris J – we were not under the expectation that those data were for use in project development, so we have not attempted to use them.

Chris Butler – working with Jennifer O'Neal in the past has been good; we have received a draft report, some of the projects they were surveying weren't being surveyed for what they were designed for, and not surveyed at the target time of use, so it seemed like useless data. They have been slowly changing that. We don't use the data, but we have been trying to help them with their designs.

Chris J – we had a similar issue with our Fender Mill SRFB project, where SRFB monitored it for the wrong things.

Kristen – to my knowledge we haven't received any information from AEM on Silver

Paul Wagner – we have worked with them trying to set up an AEM site, but they wanted two years of pre-treatment data, which is difficult with our program.

John C – we discussed timing of fish surveys with them, and timing is really key. They know that, they apparently had a funding issue, travel costs because they don't use local crews. We've pulled things from the AEM site data, and it can be useful. You can look at change over time, run HSI over time, and see how it changes. Having the DEM (digital elevation model) is very useful.

Greer – does anyone use those DEMs at non-restoration sites?

John C – it is good information. Is it in the scope of work from the CHaMP people to help project sponsors? They do fish sampling in the intensively monitored watersheds like the Entiat, but they don't do them here.

Discussion – whether people use CHaMP data; study design and timing is important. They are trying to evaluate habitat at large scales

Paul – it is status and trend monitoring. In terms of identifying a project need on an annual basis, it doesn't seem like it would be that applicable.

John C – it would be helpful if they gave feedback on where to focus to affect habitat

Chris J – the time scale doesn't work for it to be a feedback loop

Charlie Snow – that would be a different design than they have now. The AEM that includes fish observation might be more useful. A good approach, but it needs a different design and to be conducted more robustly to be useful; they would need population estimates, maybe at key points of movement

Kristen – CHaMP data might be more useful to sponsors if they were producing reports on the trends that they are seeing and making them available. For us to go in and use their data is pretty challenging
John C – also, what you need to make decisions about project design often depends on the funding source. For a lot of projects there are no needs for empirical data. Is CHaMP tasked with helping project sponsors and are project sponsors tasked with going to them? Someone needs to be in charge of making that happen

Greer – these are things that these programs are claiming to do – to produce data that are being used for restoration. That is why this conversation is valuable, because no one has previously asked sponsors if this is how this is working. It sounds like there is almost nobody accessing CHaMP data, and if they are accessing the data, they aren't using it. This data is not being used on the ground in the Upper Columbia, and in some regions they are using it, so something isn't happening in our region. AEM is really constrained by project type, so they can't pick up just any projects. OBMEP is one case study where CHaMP /ISEMP was not working for them, so CTCR brought a proposal to them to modify it and that is how they developed OBMEP and EDT. And that is moving toward the Methow.

Paul – OBMEP coupled with EDT is more intensive, and we do use it for guidance for restoration activities. They are presenting that at the June IT meeting

Kristen – I have used the OBMEP/EDT information, and it is much more accessible and usable

Jacqueline – I have used it too and agree it is useful and accessible

Paul – OBMEP/EDT has been going for a long time

Jacqueline – also, John Arterburn is very transparent about the limitations of EDT and that makes the analysis even more useful

Discussion – have we interacted with CHaMP/ISEMP or AEM folks

Jessica Goldberg – we tried to get the CHaMP folks at MRC last year, but they weren't able to make any of the dates

Chris B – we have had Jen O'Neal at our Wenatchee office, and they have made some changes based on our feedback

Kristen – I have struggled to get in touch with them with specific data requests

Greer – will put together a survey that we can provide to the council

Chris J – if we had a funded program with longevity that helped answer these questions, that would be useful

John C – with monitoring you have to be very specific with your questions. If something is Columbia basin wide, how is that going to help us develop a project in a very specific site? Having something like EDT is fantastic if you have the data to populate it.

Greer – I will send out the survey. I encourage you to fill it out, and I will provide that information to the council.

Roundtable

Paul Wagner – Colville Tribes: we have our 11 projects currently underway that need to be completed by June 30, and another 9 projects starting July 1. The Master Cost Share Agreement almost finished with USFS, and the first action will be corrections to Volstead Rd. We will contract the FS to do the NEPA for that.

Charlie Snow – WDFW: we are in the middle of our spring work, steelhead surveys, juvenile hatchery fish, getting PIT arrays going. We are doing the Twisp, using PIT antennas to estimate steelhead escapement, so we only have to do surveys where we don't have PIT arrays. We have hired everyone for the spring, although we may have an opening this summer.

Jaqueline Wallace – TU: we are moving ahead on Barkley and a couple of surface to well conversions. Also exploring something on Ramsey creek, so if anyone has any info on Ramsey please let me know

Chris Butler – Yakama Nation: we had contractors out doing site visits this week. We got our FONSI on the Chewuch, working with the FS on roads identified in the transportation plan, primarily changing maintenance categories.

Kristen Kirkby – CCFEG: we are still trying to collect information on a barrier assessment in the Methow. Much of the information in the state's database is outdated. The information needs to be updated, so I'm looking for feedback on what would be useful. FS information is difficult to get, done with different methods.

We have an outreach event tonight, two authors talking about the historical free-flowing Columbia. There will be lots of historic photos.

Maddie Eckmann – Yakama Nation: we had contractor site visits up at Horseshoe; collected baseline information for Wolf Creek ponds. Jarred has been talking to landowners on Storer Creek, landowners on board, he has been talking with the county and the conservation district, moving forward. Jarred has a draft of the Beaver Creek RA that he is working through.

Chris J – had a landowner from Storer reach out to us for a section of pipe that we have leftover, let Jarred know we've got it.

Jon Merz – Foster Creek Conservation District: I'm the manager of the Conservation District; we inherited the HCP from the county. We are organizing monitoring meetings, and we're interested to see how this group is organized, how it works, etc.

Joy – I would love to connect with you and see if we can coordinate on some level.

John C – Is Foster Creek a WAT?

Joy – no; In the past Foster Creek was a separate lead entity with a separate CAC, but since they only had Foster Creek and they didn't have projects, they were kind of put to sleep. But it could be revived at any time.

Jon – we are doing some restoration work on Foster now

Joy – we should definitely connect

Chris J – Foster has a lot of similarities with Frazer Creek, would be happy to share our info

Aaron Rosenblum – we are doing some riparian projects, looking at others

Chris J – Jessica will send you the link to the Frazer Report

Kristen – CCFEG was interested in a project in Foster Creek a few years back, and we are looking at bringing that back

John Crandall – Methow Monitoring: I have been working with a student at the Independent Learning Center at Twisp Works, and he has a strong artistic interest. We had an idea to get these watershed signs at the three entrances to the valley. We now have a draft image, and we have teamed the student up with a graphic design group at TwispWorks. We will have the image done, and it has turned into a great project; we should have it in a few weeks. We are working through the constraints with DOT for putting a sign along the highway. A really super project.

On the Lamprey world front, we have genetics samples of some of the fish we caught last year. This was the first year we caught young of the year ammocoetes. The results of the genetics samples were that some of those lamprey were western brook lamprey, which is a new species for the Methow. Brook lamprey are not anadromous and not parasitic.

Chris Johnson – MSRF: we have multiple funding sources for Frazer Creek, a minor tributary to Beaver Creek that has been heavily impacted with post-fire flows. We had 8 ft. of cut where the creek moved about 45 feet after it went around a culvert. [Photos] It is a complex situation, and the creek has not found any equilibrium. Have contacted the Okanogan Conservation district, if anyone has any resources we would be happy to talk.

Joy Juelson – UCSRB: we have two positions open with the CAC; call for nominations ends this week. We have three nominations so far for the three positions. We just finished developing an outreach brochure; I will show it at the next meeting.

Next meeting May 16th

Definitions of Commonly used Acronyms	
AEM	Action Effectiveness Monitoring
ANS	Aquatic Nuisance Species
AREMP	Aquatic and Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring Program
BACI	Before, After, Control, Impact (study design type)
BDA	Beaver Dam Analogue
BEF	Bonneville Environmental Foundation
BO/BiOp	Biological Opinion
BPA	Bonneville Power Administration
CAC	Citizens Advisory Committee (for SRFB funding applications)
CAO	Critical Areas Ordinance
CBFWA	Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (pronounced "cubfwah")
CCFEG	Columbia Cascade Fisheries Enhancement Group
CCT	Colville Confederated Tribes (newer acronym is CTCR – see below)
CTCR	Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation (older acronym is CCT – see above)
CHaMP	Columbia Habitat Monitoring Program
CMZ	Channel Migration Zone
CREP	Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program
CSF	Community Salmon Fund
EDT	Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment
EQIP	Environmental Quality Incentives Program
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FCRPS	Federal Columbia River Power System
FFFP	Family Forest Fish Passage Program
FIA	Forest Inventory and Analysis program (USFS)
Four "H"s	The four factors affecting salmon recovery: Hatchery, Hydro, Habitat, Harvest
HACCP	Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point
HGMP	Hatchery Genetic Management Plan
HPA	Hydraulic Project Approval
HSRG	Hatchery Scientific Review Group
HWS	Habitat Work Schedule
IMW	Intensively Monitored Watershed
IS	Implementation Schedule
ISAB	Independent Science Advisory Board
ISEMP	Integrated Status and Effectiveness Monitoring Project
ISRP	Independent Scientific Review Panel (reviews BPA projects)
IT	Implementation Team
LW/LWD	Large Wood/Large Woody Debris
M2	Middle Methow (a project area defined as the reach between Winthrop and Twisp)
MaDMC	Monitoring and Data Management Committee (pronounced "madmac")
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MRC	Methow Restoration Council
MSRF	Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation (pronounced "em-surf")
MVRD	Methow Valley Ranger District
MWC	Methow Watershed Council
MYAP	Multi-year Action Plan (also sometimes called the 3-year workplan)

NFF	National Forest Foundation
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NPCC	Northwest Power and Conservation Council
OCD	Okanogan Conservation District
OBMEP	Okanogan Basin Monitoring and Evaluation Program
OWL	Okanogan Wilderness League
PCSRF	Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (pronounced "Pacsurf")
PHABSIM	Physical Habitat Simulation
PIBO	PACFISH/INFISH* Biological Opinion
PNAMP	Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Partnership
PUD	Public Utility District
QAQC	Quality Assurance, Quality Control
RA	Reach Assessment
RCO	(Washington State) Recreation and Conservation Office
REI	Reach-based Ecosystem Indicators (used in Reach Assessments)
RFEG	Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group
RFP	Request for Proposals
RM	River Mile
RPA	Reasonable and Prudent Alternative(s)
RTT	Regional Technical Team
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act
SMP	Shoreline Management Plan
Snerd	Fish Capture-Snorkel Herding
SOAL	State Owned Aquatic Lands
SOW	Statement of Work
SPIF	Specific Project Information Form (used with the Corps ESA programmatic)
SRFB	(Washington State) Salmon Recovery Funding Board (pronounced "surfboard")
SRP	State Review Panel (for SRFB funding applications)
STEM Database	Status, Trend and Effectiveness Monitoring database at NOAA's Northwest Fisheries Science Center
UCSRB	Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board
TRT	Technical Recovery Team (NOAA)
USFS	US Forest Service
USGS	US Geological Survey
VSP	Viable Salmonid Population
WAT	Watershed Action Team (the MRC is our WAT)
WDFW	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
WDNR	Washington Department of Natural Resources
WNFH	Winthrop National Fish Hatchery
WWP-TU	Washington Water Project of Trout Unlimited
YN	Yakama Nation

*PACFISH/INFISH The PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinion (PIBO) Effectiveness Monitoring Program was initiated in 1998 to provide a consistent framework for monitoring aquatic and riparian resources on most Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands within the Upper Columbia River Basin.