

## Methow Restoration Council

February 19, 2013

### Participants:

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Allen Lebovitz	WDNR
Amanda Barg	WDFW
Amy Windrope	WDFW
Bob Clark	Okanogan Conservation District
Carmen Andonaegui	WDFW
Charlie Snow	WDFW
Chris Butler	Yakama Nation
Chuck Peven (by phone)	RTT
Craig Nelson	Okanogan Conservation District
Crystal Elliot	Herrera Environmental
Derek Van Marter	UCSRB
Don Phillips	Local Landowner
Greer Maier	UCSRB
Hans Smith	Yakama Nation
Jarred Johnson	Yakama Nation
Jeri Timm	WWP-TU
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
John Crandall	MRC
John Jorgensen	Yakama Nation
Judy Neibauer	USFWS
Julie Grialou	Methow Conservancy
Ken Bevis	WDFW
Kent Woodruff	Forest Service
Lee Hatcher	Methow Watershed Council
Lynda Hofmann	WDFW
Michael Notaro	Watershed Resource Solutions
Michelle Dewey	Dewey Consulting LLC
Robes Parrish (by phone)	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Roy Beaty	Bonneville Power Administration
Wes Tibbits	USGS

### Meeting Notes:

**Derek Van Marter—UCSRB Update:** The UCSRB is meeting via conference call on Feb 21<sup>st</sup> (same day as SRFB debrief meeting in Chelan). Contact Derek for conference call details; they will talk about preparations for the annual trip to DC, and will have staffers for congressional representatives/senators on the phone; sequestration is looming so we may not get much info from them. We will also talk about the status of the hatchery program for Douglas county PUD; NOAA is doing a status update. The SRFB debrief is at the PUD in Chelan on the 21<sup>st</sup>; contact Joy Juelson for info.

On house bill 1194, landowner liability passed out of the judiciary committee and is now in the rules committee; if it passes there it will go to senate. We had three questions in judiciary committee: the chair asked if it needs to say anything about funding sources since it isn't specific to funding source, but haven't seen any revised bill; there was another question on who will be liable if landowners are not, but the chair said that he thought the question was sufficiently answered—we are not trying to remove liability entirely, we are trying to say that landowners are not the ones who should be held liable, court process, etc., will determine who is liable. The third question was when we would be done with all of the recovery stuff; we had a good conversation around that, Steve Parker answered the question, saying that it is a long-term effort, and we are making a lot of progress. Our efforts are paying off, but it is a long-term endeavor. No one signed in opposition, around 7-9 signed in support, including a representative from the cattleman's association. Once the bill is in the legislative process, it is anyone's guess how it goes. Michael Notaro—will it get carved up in the senate? Derek—it was introduced as part of the existing Salmon Recovery Act, and it is pretty straightforward, so not as likely as if it were separate. We hope it will get a hearing in rules committee.

**John Crandall—Monitoring Update:** we have two upcoming monitoring coordination meetings as people are starting to think about gearing up for field season. We will have both a Methow coordination meeting and also a regional meeting. We are trying to avoid duplication in our monitoring and see how we can help each other out. The Methow meeting will be in the Riverbank conference room on February 26<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 am. The regional meeting is March 1<sup>st</sup> at the City Hall in Pateros, probably at 9:00 am. It may coincide with fishing opportunity for those heading down valley.

Habitat monitoring—many are aware that we have a large number of habitat monitoring programs in the Methow, three through the USFS, one through Ecology, and CHaMP; these are five fairly organized efforts. The FS stream inventory program does big reaches rather than smaller sites, and this year they will be doing the Twisp River from confluence with Little Bridge Creek upstream to the anadromous barrier. CHaMP will be here for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year for their annual panel of 15 sites and their first go-round of the third of ten rotating panels. Ecology will not be here this year. FS PIBO will be here in Twentymile Creek, Thirtymile Creek, and Andrews creeks; these are all in the upper watershed out of anadromous zone. They are not looking at any type of aquatic restoration, more fencing and grazing effects; they will be here in the heat of summer, but we probably won't see them. CHaMP sites are more in the anadromous zones so we will see them, some will overlap with the FS stream inventory up the Twisp River.

**Presentation—WDFW Habitat Restoration Pathway: Carmen Andonaegui and Amy Windrope**

Carmen—I am here as the regional habitat program manager for WDFW; Amy works out of Olympia and she is here to present about the WDFW Habitat Restoration Pathway.

Amy—I am the Columbia Basin Mitigation Manager for WDFW. I share the position with a fish person, but I am not fish person; rather, I am more of a policy person. WDFW has been working on becoming more effective at being a partner for working on salmon restoration on WDFW lands. We are trying to get our act together internally, and we're trying to help project sponsors understand how our process works. It is part of the WDFW Conservation Initiative—improving how we work with each other and our partners to implement ecosystem based improvement. This process came from working in the Skagit, and I understand that there are similar issues here on the East Side. In the Skagit, we had some experiences with projects going very badly in terms of impacts to neighbors/infrastructure. Based on this experience, we are focused on being a good neighbor. We identified steps, and what role WDFW plays in each step, what we need internally at each step, and what we need from project proponents.

1. Engage partners early and often
2. Understanding cost of collaboration

3. WDFW staff have multiple values
4. Watch out for legal and contractual agreements
5. Address risk
6. It ain't over until the Adaptive Management Lady has sung

Big focus on adaptive management as it is core to managing risk and being a good neighbor  
Ken Bevis—this is where this group (MRC) comes in; you need to engage the wildlife area office, the engineer, the permit writer

Carmen—but we need to work with one voice, and we have one point person to coordinate

Roy Beaty—you will give us the contact info?

Carmen—yes, we have a handout for the end

Amy—we have also developed a template with cost estimates to help project proponents plan for WDFW costs

Carmen—we are working at reduced capacity, and now we are losing Ken, Lynda is only on half time for habitat for the Methow, Connie covers the Okanogan, Chelan, Entiat, others, and Gina is an engineer; we are under capacity, but we are working on it.

Amy—we are committed to speaking with one voice with our project proponents, explaining multiple values, and having consistency for partners. We understand that as you talk to different people within the agency, it is easy to be confused as to what the WDFW wants, so we are committed to speaking with one voice and giving consistent answers.

Our lands were all purchased with a specific purpose in mind, and this can affect projects in specific ways. The lands are constrained by contracts, so it is important to address this early. And—what is a conversion? We as an agency have to mitigate for the impacts to change the purpose of the lands and this can really drive project costs up. We need to talk about this early. Carmen—this is identified in the guidance, the need to talk to us early so that we can talk with our real estate people and Olympia so we can determine if there might be a conversion.

Amy—the Right of Entry permit helps address WDFW's risk through design review, insurance, indemnification, and performance bonds. Carmen—includes human safety risks and risks to infrastructure. Amy—bond is for construction only, indemnification and insurance is for 3 years.

Adaptive management is about dealing with uncertainty; it is a negotiation. We are looking at whether we are meeting our ecological objectives as well as liability. We as the property owner we have things we want to monitor, and the project proponent has things they want to monitor, and the negotiation is how we balance these needs. Q—timeframe? Amy—we are looking at 3 year timeframe for indemnification and liability, before state takes on ownership of the project

Roy—what mechanisms have you found that the sponsors are using to cover the costs? Upfront payment?

Amy—yes, this is part of what we have developed through RCO, adaptive management has to be funded as a part of the costs of the project, upfront payment is one way

Roy—will talk to you more about that.

Amy—we need to link uncertainty and risk to levels of monitoring

- Compliance—did you do what you said you would do
- Effectiveness—did action have desired effect?
- Validation—fish response

WDFW is much more interested in the first two.

[handout]

Amy—we need to be able to apply the criteria (begin on page 3) to the project at the very earliest stages of the project.

Carmen—the point of these criteria is to help our staff identify any issues that may come up with the project; our internal framework is a lot more detailed and identifies the staff/individual that is tasked to make sure that it is addressed internally with the right people

Amy—we want to help identify the project red flags within WDFW to help adjust projects as needed

John C—is this in use?

Amy/Carmen—yes, internally, it was implemented in January, we are still learning to use; we are using it now on the MSRF (M2) project, but it came in late; we haven't yet started from the early stages

Amy—it is in use in the Skagit

Ken—so far here it is more of a retrofit

Carmen—we are here to help partners understand what we need

Amy—the process is set up to have a “move forward” decision step at the 10%; after 30% design step we are committed to moving the project forward; it ends with a 3-year adaptive management agreement.

Roy—the restoration steps appear to be written for an internal process, it would be helpful for an example of what the project sponsor would be expected to submit, and what sort of turnaround time could be expected

Carmen—we have a turnaround time of 30-45 days for step one, every time we get something new in hand, there is a 30-45 day turnaround; we do have staffing constraints

Amy—we are committed to improving the response time

Hans Smith—who do we go to?

Amy—the wildlife area manager and the area habitat biologist

Carmen—Here it is Tom McCoy and Lynda Hofmann; they need to give a recommendation to the management

Amy—they will use the criteria in the handout

Hans—and they will set up the district team meeting; is that the start of scoping?

Carmen—the team term is used loosely, each subbasin will have a team that has to have input. Each subbasin will have the fish, wildlife, area habitat biologist, wildlife area manager, and the engineer of the habitat program interests represented. They will ask questions at the meeting, and then provide a written response with a recommendation to the regional managers. At that point there may still be questions that need to be answered at the 30%

Ken—the MRC provides pre-scoping to the scoping, I think it will be a tighter process than you think

Carmen—as we keep doing this it will get better

Michael—at what point in the process will the project sponsor get an estimate of what it would add to the budget to work with WDFW staff? Is it after the scoping?

Carmen—we did come up with a template estimate of the staff time of what it would take for a complicated project; we have an estimate of staff hours that can be provided as a line item budget

Amy—it would come from WDFW at the end of the step one

Hans—there is also the estimate for the funding needed for the adaptive management portion of the budget

Discussion—how to fund the monitoring for adaptive management

Hans—we wouldn't know the costs for the adaptive management portion until further down the design process

Amy—if there is a piece of the monitoring that is very important to WDFW but not critical to the project, like use, then we would pay for that, if it is to monitor effectiveness, risk, then the project sponsor would pay for that

Carmen—if changes need to be made to the project, then that would restart the 3-year timeframe

Hans—so the adaptive part would be part of the Right of Entry agreement?

Carmen—it would be an exhibit to the agreement

Amy—our goal as a property owner is to expand our view of the project to the footprint of what we might be affecting

Derek—the way this reads right now, it looks like the 8 criteria must be met in the scoping meeting so that the team can approve it?

Amy—no, the criteria are more like flags, to identify possible problems that we have to look at

Derek—a lot of the criteria are unknown at conceptual phase, seem to be setting up for a lot of denial

Amy—trying to help identify problems early so that we can address them

Carmen—and identify things early that might be constraints that we can't overcome

John C—at what step could WDFW pull the plug on the project?

Carmen—30% is the go/no-go; something else might come up that no one identified, but it wouldn't be because of lack of coordination on our part. Right of Entry agreements often start with a Temporary Use Permit agreement to allow for monitoring and data collection prior to the construction, Right of Entry is closer to the final steps

Derek—suggest that you describe the temporary use agreement in the process guide so that people understand that they can access the site to do pre-project data collection

Derek—how is the tie to the director's Conservation Initiative related to the risk management?

Amy—it ties into the adaptive management; it is how we can meet the objectives in the conservation initiative, a way to create structure with our partners so that we can learn from the process

Carmen—part of the initiative is to help coordinate between the different parts of WDFW

Amy—these steps were always here, but they were not clear before. They are the same steps, but we hope to be more transparent about how WDFW makes decisions. We hope this is not a barrier, that it opens the door to our decision making so that we can be better partners

Derek—think that will be good if it can be timely with the existing process, but if it is above and beyond, then it can be a barrier

Amy—the goal is to be transparent that we hold multiple values that we need to hold equally with the restoration values

Ken—Amy is trying to make sense of the things that are already happening

Julie Grialou—in terms of coordinating with other reviews like MRC presentations and RTT reviews, would the WDFW representative listen in to these other reviews to streamline things for the project sponsors? Also if WDFW has multiple values, what if the other value is in conflict with the RCO or RTT views/mandate of what should be done

Amy—don't think that the project sponsor would raise money to meet goals that they don't hold

Julie—but if it is in conflict?

Amy—at the 10% we can see what we can do to address the conflict

Carmen—we are primarily a landowner, and we have to be able to meet all of our values, and we can try to work through it, but sometimes we can't work through it

John C—Could we have the local folks go through the lands here where there might be conflicts so that the project sponsors could use to know where we can do projects and where we can't

Carmen—we did that on our lands but it isn't finished/still internal document, but we can use it to help work with you. We do understand that project sponsors have time constraints too, we have developed the process timeline in order to match these, but we currently have too many projects and have capacity issues that we are working on.

Hans—in practice we have been through some of this and it has worked better, transparency and speaking with one voice, knowing what hoops to jump through. With the permits themselves, TUP, ROE, we still have issues, and don't see that addressed here, hope it will be addressed in the future, especially coordination with DNR.

Allen Lebovitz—we (DNR) are a little decentralized with our decision making, and since I work throughout the state, there is more of a one voice at DNR

Amy—we are working with Allen to help see that the state speaks with one voice

Carmen—for liability, especially

Allen—DNR is also exploring the partnership approach, rather than just having proponents coming with us as landowners

Amy—for questions, I can be reached via email, and also through Carmen; it is probably best to start with Carmen

Carmen—start with me and I will help coordinate with Amy

Amy—and we will adaptively manage the process as well; it is a work in progress

[Break]

**Presentation—Bull Trout Recovery Planning Update: Judy Neibauer and Greer Maier**

Judy—I work for USFWS in Wenatchee, previously worked for USFS, just finished genetics baseline for bull trout. We are trying to coordinate bull trout recovery planning with some other efforts for salmon recovery.

Bull trout ESA history: began in 1994, and they were listed in 1998-9, draft recovery planning in early 2000s, challenged in court on Critical Habitat (CH) listing, 5-year status review in 2008-9, CH finalized in 2010, 2011-12 began work to finalize draft recovery plans using new draft Recovery Units (RUs)

Boise office is lead office for recovery planning, and they currently have vacancy in the bull trout position. They need to hire someone to finish up the process. I am working locally to finish up implementation/action plans while we wait for Boise to finish

Derek—why couldn't it move to the regional director rather than wait for the position to be hired?

Judy—think they are working on it, but don't have any dates

Judy—Local bull trout information: we have 15 local populations in Yakima, 7 in Wenatchee, 2 in Entiat, the Methow has 10; a lot of these populations use the Columbia and mix

There may also be bull trout in Chelan, anecdotal reports in Stehekin

Recovery Plan Structure—new six draft Recovery Units (RUs); now we have many core areas combined in single RUs.

Hierarchy: 1 DPS, 6 RUs, 32 CH units, 121 core areas

We will develop a DPS recovery Plan, then 6 RU plans (Coastal, Mid-Columbia/Snake, Upper Snake, Columbia Headwaters, St. Mary, and Klamath), then work on implementation plans to link up to those chapters

We have 7 Guiding principles:

1. Conserve diverse life history,
2. Conserve genetic diversity,
3. Ensure species distribution across habitats,
4. Ensure connectivity among populations,
5. Ensure sufficient habitat for viable populations,
6. Consider threats (e.g. barriers, climate change),
7. Ensure multiple, redundant populations.

Biological significance and the 3 Rs: redundancy, resiliency, representation

Structure of Recovery Criteria: All 6 RUs are essential; threats to RU persistence are removed; spatial and life history maintained across DPS

RU-level Criteria: Address primary threats; address primary connectivity issues; maintain all life history expressions; may include higher standards for strongholds; may include unoccupied core areas (core habitat)

Targets: Threats-based recovery targets; demographic based recovery targets (spatial distribution of local populations, life-history representation, etc)

Process: Staff got tech input from local biologists; developed short summary for each area; bull trout tech team working on recovery criteria. Once the outline is finished, we will come back for feedback  
Judy—I am working on the coordination across the salmon recovery realm; we will have an FCRPS BiOp for bull Trout; coordination with other large BiOps with requirements for minimizing effects to bull trout  
Greer—we (UCSRB) have been meeting with USFWS over the last 6 months on how we can coordinate. Our approach is looking at how we can improve these processes and how we can use them to develop and implement these recovery plans. We are starting with the Wenatchee. The Biological Strategy is being revised by the RTT; they are receiving comments on what can be added to address bull trout needs; there is a lot of overlap with steelhead distribution. We will need to further refine the biological strategy as we get input from the bull trout folks, and a lot more information can be brought in. in terms of capturing what’s already been done, Judy will capture that in a table and try to compare it with what is already in the biological strategy. There will be other issues like invasive species; we are still working out the details. The idea is to have our processes included in the bull trout action plan so that we all get the most from the actions taken.

Derek—from the board’s perspective, the problems associated with having a new separate bull trout plan that is separate from the existing Recovery Plan from the public perspective is what we are working on

Greer—we are starting from the perspective of having the biggest bang for our buck for all of our actions; we have HWS, which is helpful, and we want to incorporate the bull trout process with our existing salmon and steelhead processes

Judy—I have to develop a bull trout list anyway, so that if I can integrate it into the HWS, that helps me

Greer—we hope that action plan development will feed into the Recovery Plan, and hope that the action plan will set forward a path to recovery

Judy—the USFWS needs to have action plans for the target species, so if we can do this process it can meet this need and then UCSRB can be the tool for recovery planning

John C—who is taking the lead on the BIOP for FCRPS?

Judy—our regional office

John C—will it be similar to the salmon and steelhead BiOp with RPAs, terms and conditions?

Judy—yes. Many don’t know that there is an existing FCRPS BIOP, but it needs to be reworked. A draft is probably a year out.

Greer—we welcome any comments/assistance. We are starting with the Wenatchee, but will move to the other sub-basins, possibly Methow next.

Judy—once we develop a framework, we can take it to other watersheds

Allen—is anyone looking at the effects on ongoing salmon restoration on bull trout? Things that we should do, but also things we shouldn’t do?

Judy—we do consult on federally funded projects for effects to bull trout; we have worked on an effects tracking database, hope to have some reports that we can look at

John C—to the extent that bull trout reside in the areas that are being monitored for salmon and steelhead, they will be included in that data. Biggest effect on bull trout here is probably the steelhead fishery

Ken—the brook trout population may also be a big factor

Wes Tibbits—does the Recovery Plan target the anadromous bull trout?

Judy—we have ad-fluvial, fluvial, and resident, mostly we target the fluvial and ad-fluvial

### **Presentation—Beaver Project Update: Kent Woodruff**

Kent—last month I had the chance to present at a beaver conference in Oregon. Things are looking good in the Methow for our beaver population, and it ties into the other things we are doing for water storage, climate change, salmon recovery, etc. We are being acknowledged as the leading beaver

project around. We are working on restoring stream complexity one beaver at a time. Funding is always an issue. We are working on the final draft of a small documentary video that captures what we do; will present at a future MRC meeting. We are beginning the 6<sup>th</sup> year of the project. This year is the end of the pre-treatment period for monitoring our temperature and flow; will do treatment at half of the stations and monitor the change. One key we've learned about release is that if you can take the first 30 minutes to 3 hours of panic off from their release, put the beavers in dark temporary release lodges that they chew out of to calm them down, this provide predator avoidance opportunity immediately and reduces mortality perhaps as much as by half. We put the beavers together at the facility in the hatchery to learn which are compatible and separate the ones that try to fight.

Innovation:

- Sexing techniques (rapid)
- Safe handling procedures
- Beavers and livestock management on public hand
- Temporary lodge structures for security
- Release group selection at holding facility
- GIS and site evaluation techniques
- Tagging and monitoring passage movements

Kent—we have had several hundred PIT tag detections over reader arrays; we have had up to 30-40 miles of movement. We have 84 sites with temp loggers

Judy—are you also taking air temp at the same time?

Kent—yes; we have 12 air temp stations

Judy—do you look at geo changes?

Kent—we don't have resources for LiDAR up in the tributaries, unfortunately. We have evaluated 161 sites, and we have 18 active sites so far

John C—are they all sites you could drive to?

Kent—no; several are pack trips

From 2008-12:

- 181 beavers trapped
- 163 beavers relocated
- 35 release sites
- 18 active locations
- 14 sites successful (meets specific criteria over at least 1 year)

Roy—do you trap nuisance beavers only?

Kent—we do not discriminate; we try to carefully understand that aspect, if it isn't causing a problem we try to work with landowners to try to leave them and mitigate the issues on site—this works about half the time. When we move them up in the watershed, they will populate the watershed and increase water storage up high, and will provide stock to provide future beavers in the watershed

Wes—do you have a recovery goal?

Kent—we hope to have 50 new establishments in the Methow

Wes—are the other Recovery Plans considering beavers?

Kent—it is a giant ecological process, very complex, we are restoring stream complexity, temperature, refugia, temperature, difficult to quantify

Wes—what about passage issues?

Kent—we don't understand that fully; telemetry data indicate that fish move above and below beaver dams, especially during the freshet and that the dams are fairly porous; the fish usually go around or through the dams

Judy—they have examples of sockeye in Alaska digging through beaver dams

### **Roundtable and Public Comment**

Allen Lebovitz—DNR: I want to remind folks that the new public safety checklist for working on DNR lands is available, and the instructions for filling out the JARPA are also out there. I would love to hear feedback on both documents. There is officially a process for getting support to work on DNR uplands; contacts are the region person for those areas, but you will end up working with me

Chris Butler—SEPA process—will you run it through your agency?

Allen—don't know

Kent—it is unclear and needs to be answered

Roy Beaty—BPA: In regard to the Upper Columbia Targeted Solicitation, UCSRB has hosted some workshops with BPA and Reclamation; we have some preliminary decisions and hope to have results at the Implementation Team meeting on March 5<sup>th</sup>; we also will be a debrief in April or May to improve the next round

Jeri Timm—TU: TU is hiring a project manager for abandoned mines restoration for the mines division of TU, not part of the water division, position will be in Wenatchee or Twisp,

Ken Bevis—Outreach/WDFW: this Thursday CCFEG is sponsoring a Fish Flick at the Twisp Pub, and there will be a panel; movie is Alaska Gold, will be at 7:00 pm

On April 9<sup>th</sup> I will be at the First Tuesday program

I will be stepping out of the Outreach Committee and handing it off to John Crandall

We are still planning on the 3<sup>rd</sup> annual Salmon Celebration this year, need folks to step up. Amanda or Lynda will be on for the National Fishing Day

Finally, I recently accepted a position with DNR for a statewide position, will travel around meeting with small forest landowners, don't have to move

In regard to WDFW, they have no plans to replace me in the position that I have; I would suggest to my agency that we create a new and improved Watershed Steward to recreate the link to WDFW. I think there is a specific set of tasks that could be moved into a new position

In regard to outreach and the way that we do our work, I think that we all need to learn collectively to tell the big story over and over again; we need to learn to do it better and more effectively. We are engaged in a totally remarkably environmental restoration effort and we have an opportunity to wave our flag vigorously and consistently.

My last day on this job will be the end of February, and my first day at DNR is April 1<sup>st</sup>.

Jarred Johnson—Yakama Nation: the YN has a river use assessment up on three web sites: MRC site, Methow Grist is running a news article, and American Whitewater

At next MRC, Gardner Johnston from Interfluve will present a white paper that he did on LWD and historic sizes; also Hans will be presenting our signage plan with some mockups

John Crandall—we are inching closer with the Lamprey Restoration Guide, did a presentation last week, and it is looking good. The guide will be Columbia Basin in scope. Also, National Fishing Day will be the 8<sup>th</sup> of June (second Saturday in June). A partner meeting will be organized soon; contact John Crandall for more info or Chris Pasley or Dave Carie at the Winthrop National Fish Hatchery 509-996-2424 if you have questions or want to participate.

Lee Hatcher—Methow Watershed Council: the Watershed Council has a bill in the legislature, Senate bill 5677, to establish a Watershed Management Board. It is open for changes, but deadline is the 27<sup>th</sup>;

Linda Evans-Parlette and her staff have been quite helpful; this would formalize the MWC. Not statewide, for Methow only. Take a look at the bill and provide comments if you like.

Derek Van Marter—UCSRB: it sounds like the MV news will be doing a story on the liability legislation; stay tuned.

Greer Maier—UCSRB: we are tentatively looking at piggybacking the sponsor workshop (discussed at the January MRC) with the SRFB kickoff meeting in March (date TBA). It will be a one day workshop; the science conference will be in November, will move toward picking a date for that soon.

Kent Woodruff—USFS Beaver Project: contact me if you have any ideas for a short window of interim funding for the Beaver Project until our fiscal year starts April 1<sup>st</sup>; we are looking for 5 or 6 thousand.

[Adjourn]

**Next MRC Meeting: March 19<sup>th</sup>**

<b>Definitions of Commonly used Acronyms</b>	
ANS	Aquatic Nuisance Species
AREMP	Aquatic and Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring Program
BEF	Bonneville Environmental Foundation
BO/BiOp	Biological Opinion
BPA	Bonneville Power Administration
CBFWA	Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (pronounced "cubfwah")
CCFEG	Columbia Cascade Fisheries Enhancement Group (formerly Upper Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group)
CHaMP	Columbia Habitat Monitoring Program
CMZ	Channel Migration Zone
CREP	Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program
CSF	Community Salmon Fund
EDT	Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FCRPS	Federal Columbia River Power System
FFFPP	Family Forest Fish Passage Program
FIA	Forest Inventory and Analysis program (USFS)
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
ISEMP	Integrated Status and Effectiveness Monitoring Project
ISRP	Independent Scientific Review Panel
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)
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NPCC	Northwest Power and Conservation Council
OBMEP	Okanogan Basin Monitoring and Evaluation Program
OWL	Okanogan Wilderness League
PCSRF	Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (pronounced "Pacsurf")

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
RM	River Mile
RPA	Reasonable and Prudent Alternative(s)
RTT	Regional Technical Team
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act
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")
STEM Database	Status, Trend and Effectiveness Monitoring database at NOAA's Northwest Fisheries Science Center
UCSRB	Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board
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 (formerly Washington Rivers Conservancy)
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. This 7-year status report gives our funding sources, partners, and the public an overview of past activities, current business practices, products and publications, and future program directions. It is designed to increase accountability and summarize our accomplishments during the initial phase of the program.