

Methow Restoration Council

December 18, 2018

Participants:

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Chris Johnson	MSRF
Hans Smith	Yakama Nation
Heide Andersen	Methow Conservancy
Jaqueline Wallace	TU
Jarred Johnson	Yakama Nation
Jennifer Molesworth	Reclamation
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
John Crandall	MSRF
Katy Pfannenstein	USFWS
Ken Muir	Cascadia Conservation District
Kristen Kirkby	CCFEG
Lynda Hofmann	WDFW
Maddie Eckmann	Yakama Nation
Michele Bianchi	Methow Arts
Mike Kaputa	Chelan County Natural Resources
Paul Wagner	Colville Tribes
Sarah Walker	UCSRB
Steve Kolk	Reclamation
Tara Gregg	MSRF

Meeting Notes:

Michele Bianchi – Methow River Collaborative: this project has been ongoing for a while between MSRF and Methow Arts. We have produced plaques by local artists. This is an ongoing project to raise public awareness about water quality and salmon recovery.

Chris Johnson – the plaques are about 2 ft. diameter; there is one on the front of the RiverBank building
Michele – we have 10 signs, produced by local artist Hannah Viano. Methow Arts has been in the valley for 35 years doing art in the community. Goal of the project is to expand public acceptance/awareness of water quality and salmon recovery through a Wayfinding system designed to be directed at audiences at ten sites currently, promotion, event, ongoing communication/education, PR, web, social media
The project is part of a global movement for creative place-making; we're doing it because art educates, and people are responsive to creative undertakings that bring people in visually, to understand creative ideas. Also, art inspires action, and is a way to illustrate issues in the natural environment; people are more inclined to take action if they view something visual.

Phase 1 of the project – place ten signs in a variety of locations, ranging from public buildings/businesses to natural settings. The idea is to raise awareness of river restoration,/salmon recovery sites, and point them to other restoration projects and/or other points of interest. There will be brochure stands with tri-fold brochures next to each sign with an explanation of the collaborative, and a map with sign locations

Phase 2 – create quarterly leaflets that will slip into brochures, speaking specifically to seasonal audiences; we would work with agencies to come up with the content, which would vary at different sites. The plan would be to change the leaflets 4 times per year.

Chris – we talked about what to call the things that go in the box, the inserts will be quick, colorful, and designed to have people take them away. It is a commitment to keep putting things into the box, to have something different in the box quarterly. This is a pilot, we did ten signs, and we are looking for other collaborators, partners, and other businesses that want to participate. If other people want to get involved we would love that, to have more partners and funding; this is not a closed group. I think it was about \$1000 per site for the signs/box

Discussion – people can adopt signs, specific leaflets, help find funding for more sites, MSRF and MAA will monitor sites/boxes at least initially

Lynda Hofmann – have you thought of little buttons that people could have/use?

Discussion – larger plaque version of the brochures, badges that people could collect, pamphlet, there are cheaper sign options for additional signs/plaques

John Crandall – how do we work on the messaging, to make sure it reflects the intention of the process?

Chris – I don't think we need to vet and approve each leaflet, as long as each of the inserts has something to do with water quality and salmon recovery

Michele – we can do a brainstorming session to identify word length, audiences, messages, and then give the content over to the owners to get consistency

Heide Andersen – have you thought of having different messaging at each sign instead of changing them all quarterly?

Chris – we may not need a unique insert at every site, but if people want to get creative and make it their own, that would be great

John – this does lead to the conversation about how the Collaborative is different than this MRC; people can enter into the collaborative and agree on the messaging

This effort is to identify that people are interested in the place that is the Methow Valley, a mechanism to more formalize what we were already doing with Methow Arts, to better explain why these groups work together

Kristen Kirkby – is there something written up about the collaborative? I am confused about the goals and objectives. There are already so many acronyms out there, having a clear message is a good thing, and I think it would be good to wrap it up with *this* MRC

Jennifer – this is a marketing campaign more than anything

Kristen – then it isn't really a collaborative

Chris – if the MRC wants to get involved, that would be great

John – the MRC doesn't have a good track record of organizing; we are a loose aggregation of interested folks that get together and talk about things

Chris – that is why we took this on independently. The power is that people get to learn about restoration while they are doing other things like mountain biking.

Jennifer – I think it's great and we need it; we need to be aware of the confusions about different organizations, but there will need to be review of content [because the signs have agency logos]

John – Ecology will need to review as well

Discussion – need to set up process for review, would be best to do all four of the year's leaflets at once so they just have to be put in

Lynda – how did you decide where to put the signs?

Chris – it has been based on interest and where we think people will run into them

Discussion – leaflet will be the thing that directs people to restoration or protection sites

Michele – I'm envisioning a brainstorming session to map out the content of each site and the audiences we anticipate. Will be a website presence

Discussion – timelines, Sun Mountain could be a good site, if people are interested get in touch with Methow Arts or MSRF, and will be an announcement

John Crandall – Monitoring Updates: changes to the 2017 Biological Strategy: the Assessment Units changed, they are a lot smaller, mostly HUC 12s. You get more detail, but when you get into the smaller AUs you also lose some data. More and more prioritization and working within that framework will be advantageous to project sponsors. Nothing much more is happening with EDT here, it is run and it is done, and there is some talk about rolling that into the Biological Strategy. If you familiarize yourself with the EDT, and you see issues, please bring them up.

Jennifer – is there any ground-truthing, testing, or questioning of the results, like how/why Beaver Creek and Wolf creek ranked really high?

John – the method for ranking was developed by the Colvilles for the Okanogan and that was brought over here, and that is how the scores came up. Diversity in EDT means diversity of life stages, they have different pathways, and the more pathways that are successful that increases the diversity in EDT. How funders use the information is up to them

Jennifer – we also need to have an understanding of what it is telling us.

John – yes, like in wolf creek understanding why it came up with the result, it came from the data that went into the model. Look into it and if you have questions, you can contact Eric Doyle. You can get a link from Eric to get into the system to download the modules. That is the way to understand how they got to the results, and there is a paper on the development of the combined rank/score.

Discussion – data, sources, Biological Strategy AUs are different than the EDT AUs, they aren't 1:1, EDT also breaks things into smaller reaches, has increased the need for data at smaller scales

John – *Paper of the month:* I was down at a lamprey conference in Portland, and learned about Stage Zero restoration

Jennifer – this year's RRNW is going to do a short course on Stage Zero restoration before the regular conference begins

John – the paper is *A Stream Evolution Model Integrating Habitat and Ecosystem Benefits* (Cluer and Thorne, 2013). It has to do with serial stages of streams, how the process of evolution of a stream channel occurs; it's an interesting concept paper, and they threw in a precursor stage to channel evolution that is the Stage 0. Rather than one defined threads of channels there are all of these channels, precursor stage, in the model they found that these Stage 0 channels had highest benefit.

Kristen – what does Stage 0 look like?

John – it's really messy. In Stage 0 you don't define the channel, no pilot channel, you let things develop randomly

Jennifer – upper watershed areas are good examples of this, very complex and connected areas, depends on disturbance cycles like fires, avalanches

John – the other things that they put forward in the paper is that channel evolution isn't necessarily linear; it's cyclical, with short circuits that can occur. It needs to occur in places where you don't have human constraints affecting restoration. The Forest Service did 20 of these projects down in Oregon.

Hans Smith – does it tie productivity to that kind of treatment, or just habitat conditions?

Discussion – Stage 0 is very diverse and messy. It allows the river and the process to take over. There are limited opportunities to do it in the Methow.

Jennifer – it would be good if this kind of idea got into emergency management planning/treatments

John – *Lamprey results:* from 2006 the lamprey numbers were low for a long time, and then starting in 2016 the numbers spiked. Adult lamprey have been translocated into the Methow starting in 2015, so we have a lot of more adults now than in the last decade. We are seeing a decrease in the mean length of the ammocoetes captured, which means that there are more young ones. 2016 was the first time we saw young of the year. Translocation seems to have had a massive effect on the population. The young stay for 4-8 years. Last year was the first year we saw larvae in the Twisp River. The bump in 2017 was

likely due to ocean conditions; numbers at Bonneville closely match the Hake catch. At this time we don't know that there is any fidelity to home streams. This makes lamprey hard to list under ESA because there is no specific ESU. They are finding that there does seem to be a spring run/fall run. More to learn. The ones that come back in the fall hold over in winter and then spawn the next June. The ones that come in later arrive ready to spawn.

Paul Wagner – the analogy was winter run/summer run steelhead

John – Douglas County is now doing translocation, also in other areas besides Methow

Chris – do the numbers have any relation to fire disturbance?

Jenny – the really big sediment events were around 2004 in the Chewuch

John – in 2014 we didn't find any, but the next year we found a lot of larvae in the lower Methow, that fine sediment is the first to be mobilized and leaves pretty quickly

Tara – we didn't really see a change in the fines in our sediment monitoring in 2014-15

John – site based long term monitoring of lamprey is difficult because the sand moves around

Chris Johnson – MRC/WAT Participation in IT/RTT Prioritization: this topic came up at the last IT meeting and other meetings. BPA has moved about \$2 million out of the Upper Columbia, and they may not restore it because they feel that we are behind in prioritization. At the IT meeting this month we had a discussion about what the IT does, what the WAT does. The WAT is the more local group. What emerged is whether the WAT should be more involved in prioritization. Now it looks like the WAT would be involved in the 3rd phase of prioritization, and the question is whether we wanted to be involved earlier. I wanted to bring it forward. There is concern that BPA funding may continue to drop, and the message is that is primarily due to the lack of prioritization. I wanted to find out what people think at the WAT level. Do we want to be more engaged, and have more control over the process, and provide more information to the RTT?

Jennifer – we talked about ground-truthing the EDT, which RTT is not doing.

John – they (RTT) are talking to Eric Doyle. They know that there are errors in there, they are small, but they realize that. It's a learning curve. I was thinking that we get Eric here for a day and go through the EDT results; a clinic on how it works. They are looking to run it for the Wenatchee and the Entiat. Bull trout weren't included in the Methow EDT, but I've been pushing to get bull trout included in the Wenatchee.

Chris – it's not just EDT, we also have Reach Assessments, etc. We have a wealth of information, we could do that prioritization here, and there is interest from the agencies in having that prioritization done earlier. We would provide something to the RTT for them to review.

Jacqueline Wallace – what is BPA looking for? A prioritized list of projects, or prioritized reaches?

Chris – the word that I heard was projects

Sarah Walker – Chris is fairly correct, BPA is looking for the revised Biological Strategy and prioritization. They have a new strategic plan, and they are looking to get the most mitigation bang for the buck. They have indicated support for moving prioritization along, which would not be a set of projects but a set of action types that identify high priority actions that address in ecological concerns in high priority areas.

John – in the last round they also looked at which life stages the projects need to address. The prioritization will get us a lot more specific information.

Chris – the question is does the WAT want the regional prioritization to be something that is brought to us, or something that we participate in

Sarah – each WAT is different, but this is a good time for the dialogue. There is active dialogue at the level of the WAT and the IT in what is the best way to engage groups in the Methow, Entiat, and the Wenatchee. If it is a regional prioritization framework, each WAT needs to buy in. All of this is in play now. I see a role for both the IT and the WATs. As this moves forward, I encourage people to look at this. I think the track is to have the revision done by the end of 2019.

Jenny – isn't the RTT relying on the WATs to review the product, look at feasibilities, landowners, etc.? The WAT will be asked to do that before the end of 2019? Or do we do the filter at the end of 2019.

Chris – the question that is worthy of WAT discussion is whether we want to be involved earlier?

Jenny – going forward, what are the data gaps so we can repopulate the strategy for the next round? It might be a good exercise to identify what information we need to know to make decisions going forward. Also what monitoring tools we need. Reclamation is going to be funding sponsors for some kind of data collection but we need to know how to set that up

Chris – and there may be support from BPA to facilitate the discussion of what prioritization would look like. It could be in the WATs interest to engage with BPA. I'm not looking to make work, but I'm trying to engage. There is also a concern that it will lock up when it gets to the WATs.

Sarah – the YN is also supporting the RTT work, there are going to be these additional steps that will involve feasibility but also to make sure that we have a basic level of standardization between the subbasins.

John – RTT likes numbers, a lot of things get ranked, but then there is a weight to scores. There is no way that they can do this without WAT input; I think it will be done as early as possible. Also, all RTT meetings are open. If you consider the RAs, they pull out project sites, we aren't that far from having that.

Discussion – capacity issues, funding, what could be done to get it done earlier, what prioritization will look like, read the RTT agendas and notes, need some out-reporting from the RTT, facilitating remote access to the RTT meetings

Steve Kolk – the purpose of RTT meetings is for the RTT members to discuss things together and for scheduled presentations, rather than for an open forum for discussion.

Jenny – true, but for prioritization they want more participation, and for the meetings it needs to be easier for people to listen in remotely

Steve – if you want to bring things to the table, you need to talk with Tracy ahead of time

Hans – is the IT appointed membership?

Sarah – good question. ITs and WATs were originally set up as part of the Recovery Plan. But the operating principles never listed members or alternates, only entities. They were a workgroup body; my understanding is that the group used to do that work during the recovery planning and implementation schedule. Over the years, the specific work sort of went away, it devolved into an information sharing group. I took this on, did a survey, and the response was that there was still a need, but for it to be an ad hoc group with recommendation making and some framework. I think there is still a role for basin specific groups like the WATs but it would be good to have the working group at the regional level

Chris – it turned more into a commenting board rather than a working group

Steve – it used to be that there were designates and alternates to the IT from the watershed groups.

There used to be more geographic separation, now everything is in Wenatchee, everyone makes the rounds to all the same meetings, and there is not a lot of differentiation between the meetings. When we were writing watershed plans there was a different need, and the meeting structure has devolved.

Discussion – we used to have an annual Multi-Year Action Plan (MYAP) planning at the WAT level,

Roundtable

Chris Johnson – Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation: our big issue now is developing our next agreement with Reclamation for identified projects and the way we move forward with continuing projects. We also understand that there will be a competitive announcement coming out; there may be a coordinated role/opportunity

Chris – prior to the recent court case, there was question as to whether WDFW's jurisdiction extended beyond Ordinary High Water to anything that may affect the bed or waters of the state. The court

decided that it is under their jurisdiction if it may affect what is *or may become* the bed of the river, and WDFW's permit requirements must cover fish

John – is it legal to clear in the riparian? If so, who do you call?

Discussion – that would be more of a Shoreline issue, call the county, Ecology, then WDFW, Shoreline code is brand new, persistent calls from the public may affect official response, Angie Hubbard is the contact at the county, or Char Schumacher.

Paul Wagner – Colville Tribes: through subcontract with TU and Methow Natives we did 10 BDAs in Ben Canyon Creek. We may add some more in the spring. Last week I attended the Pacific Lamprey workshop that John mentioned to support the translocation effort into the Okanogan. The workshop was really good, and John gave a good presentation. We have OBMEP, which doesn't monitor anything for lamprey specifically, but we do electrofishing and have PIT Tag arrays

John – screw traps are good ways to see lamprey; they are beginning to put PIT tags and radio transmitters on larger juveniles. They are getting better and better at dealing with lamprey, getting information and learning a lot in the lab.

Paul – we have a pretty good monitoring program in place that should help us evaluate our program. We figured they were pretty much extirpated.

Tara Gregg – MSRF: the final bridge on Frazer Creek will be finished by the end of the month. The block print calendars will be here by Thursday

Jarred Johnson – Yakama Nation: we just finished the bridge on Beaver Creek, I also have projects up on Beaver Creek and the Upper Twisp that I'm working on.

The River Safety Recreation Assessment for M3 (Twisp to Carlton) should be out this winter

John – it would be great to have that for Carlton to the mouth

Jarred – we got a lot of data from motion cameras, and had a good surveyor who talked to boaters, so we have a lot of good information

Jaqueline Wallace – Trout Unlimited: Barkley piping, preliminary construction is starting now, then more in the spring.

I'm working on a permanent water acquisition on McFarland Creek, about 1 cfs back in. We're also working on an update to our landowner's guide to water rights.

Chris – I would like to set up a meeting with Mark Schuppe to get him up here and talk to folks, he's the new water master for the Methow for Ecology.

Lynda – I would like to be involved in that

Hans – we would like to be involved too

Jaqueline – I will give him a call

Kristen Kirkby – Cascade Columbia Fisheries Enhancement group: we just went to bid on a FFFPP culvert on Benson Creek; that will be this summer. I'm working on reviewing data on the barrier assessment, will be bringing that to MRC, and we will hire another crew for Methow and Entiat this coming summer. We will be starting up Salmon in the Classroom in Pateros and Bridgeport. We just finished up a video that MSRF and CCFEG partnered on using Okanogan outreach funds; it's a companion to the restoration guide. We will show it at the next MRC, and it will be available to anyone who wants to post it.

Sarah – liked it a lot, I think that the statistics were really impressive, a great job

Kristen – we gave a summary to the board of how everyone in the Okanogan is using the outreach funds for a combination of youth/education and project development outreach funding

Maddie Eckmann – YN: we just got a set of concepts from TetraTech for the Beaver Pond reach, which we will be reviewing with Kristen and Chris next year.

Sarah Walker – Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board: for the recent Targeted Solicitation, they received a total of 6 proposals from Chelan County, TU, and MSRF. The RTT scored them last week, and Tracy Hillman is working on the write up for that. Next step is that BPA and UCSRB staff will get together and do a separate analysis, and the results will be out in February or early March. Between \$750-900k is available; the total ask from the proposals was about 1.1 million. The RTT has never taken a stand about not scoring proposals, so they were all scored by the RTT, but the Targeted has specific sideboards on what they were looking for, so BPA and UCSRB will use the sideboards in the proposal forms.

Steve Kolk – Bureau of Reclamation: in the event of Government shutdown, Reclamation will not be affected, and anyone who has a contract will get paid.

Jennifer Molesworth – Reclamation: the funding opportunity announcement will be out at some point, and we have a lot more review than previously. Reclamation has been funding a lot of evaluation work on our projects for many years. This year we ended the study and InterFluve, with Tracy Hillman, are doing the write-up, which will be released sometime this spring. Our Denver office has completed a smaller evaluation of the data for the BACI study for our M2 project that had controls in the Upper Methow. It was challenging, because the ground was shifting, but that will be coming soon and it's interesting because it evaluates some of our side channel projects. In side channels that disconnect with coho and spring chinook together, the coho get fat and the spring chinook get really shriveled up and die. Not predation. It is an interesting thing that if you have intermittent side channels where coho are present, that might be bad for spring chinook.

Kristen – is temperature a factor?

Jennifer – no, it was spring-fed

John – the other thing that might be going on is that is classic coho rearing habitat, and not classic spring chinook rearing habitat.

Jennifer – if you're looking at habitat for spring chinook you need to look at perennial rather than non-perennial

Kristen – have you seen any literature on that?

Jennifer – I haven't looked into it, it seems like they mostly looked at predation

John – competition, diet, overlap is what they need to look at

Jennifer – they went in three times per year, the fish were tagged, and they had PIT tag detectors on both sides, the final report will be coming out soon. We will use the information to review our Whitefish project. We have a huge data set, physical data, PIT tag readings of the fish, fish condition data, tried to figure out if it's working for the fish. We have 5 years of data. A really unique situation/opportunity to evaluate performance and identify any adaptive needs

John – what about 1890s? It seems like recently the wild production of coho went down.

Hans – for condition, we're not seeing an effect on condition to chinook vs coho, but species composition has changed dramatically year to year. The first year, 2015, that was the first year of spawning that had young of the year coho, so they were off the charts and then it began to level out and last year we had more spring chinook/steelhead than coho, but the overall numbers went down. This year the number of coho spiked again, we get a ton of coho spawning, steelhead too.

Kristen – we saw a lot of coho in Silver too

Hans – we are doing a study, we are also funded by PCSRF to do monitoring at Fender Mill as well. We are doing effectiveness of habitat treatments on habitat actions.

Jennifer – we are funding WDFW to do radio telemetry on spring Chinook juveniles, they will put in screw traps, they are trying to get a lot of PIT tags and radio tags out, and will track the fish through the winter; the study is paired with one in the Salmon River.

Hans Smith – YN: we put in an application to the Trib Comm; there was dramatic erosion to the trail in the Twisp Park, and the bigger concern is that it will migrate and run into a major sewage line, erosion got past the riparian buffer, not a lot of root structure there. Mike Brunfelt looked at it, and it's hard to know if we will see rapid erosion again soon. The Corps offered to do emergency action this year during the high water, and the Town declined, and we brought the Trib Comm the application, and they just decided not to fund it. I think the Town's next move will be during high water they will probably take the Corps up on their offer. I know that is in the Bureau/MSRF analysis area.

Jenny – we haven't talked about where the terminus is

Chris – we might be 5 ft apart, but may be able to coordinate on data sharing

Hans – we're trying to avoid going through the Corps process, but don't see a mechanism for a wood structure

John Crandall – MSRF: we are working on the LMRA, doing a State of the Salmon report for the Methow that will come out by the end of June.

Next MRC January 15

Definitions of Commonly used Acronyms	
AEM	Action Effectiveness Monitoring
ANS	Aquatic Nuisance Species
AREMP	Aquatic and Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring Program
AU	Assessment Unit
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
DEM	Digital Elevation Model
EC	Ecological Concern
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
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