

## Methow Restoration Council

February 18, 2014

### Participants:

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Crystal Elliot	Trout Unlimited
Derek Van Marter	UCSRB
Don Phillips	Local Citizen
Heather Simmons	WA Department of Ecology
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
John Crandall	MRC
Ken Muir (phone)	USFWS
Lynda Hofmann	WDFW
Robes Parrish (phone)	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Ryan Fortier	WDFW
Steve Ralph	Local Citizen

### Meeting Notes:

**Derek Van Marter—UCSRB Update:** Our board of directors is meeting this Thursday the 20<sup>th</sup> in Wenatchee; we have a number of guest presentations on congressional and WA agency staffers. Invasive species legislation looks like it is moving forward—the WA invasive species council has been working to draft legislation to move responsibility for invasive species to WDFW and give them enforcement abilities. Trying to put all invasive species management under one roof; moved through both chambers and rules committee, and will probably will get a vote soon. Verbiage focused on aquatics and prevention; invasive species legislation part of a broader national effort going on. Not clear how it will be funded.

The board will also hear about how the US Army Corps of Engineers has just finished an inland avian predation management plan; tribes commented that it doesn't sufficiently address the problem; but it appears to have been approved. Our board will get up to speed on what is going on with respect to predation.

The comprehensive habitat report that Greer is working on is just about done; the board will hear a presentation on that as well; we are in a two-year process on reporting on our progress on our efforts across the four "H"s.

Implementation Team—there is a meeting scheduled for the fourth of March, probably in Chelan, if you want to be on the distribution list, let Derek know.

The UCSRB board of directors is not going to DC this year as a group; Ron Walter is going as part of the national association of Counties and I am going in May. PCSRF is the most significant source of funding from NOAA, \$65 million was approved in the budget this year; it is still a competitive grant program—WA competes with 5 states for the \$65 million. Challenge will continue to be in congress.

We are in the time frame for updating HWS for completed projects and proposed projects; very important for us in terms of being able to report. We generate our reporting and implementation schedule from the HWS.

Steve—does the HWS include all projects, including the Yakama Nation, others?

Derek—a good question; we do track all of the projects to support our reporting. The dollar figures reflect requested amounts from grant sources, not final amounts.

**John Crandall—Monitoring Update:** Appendix C Methow Monitoring Plan draft has been submitted to MaDMC for review, which they completed. Had a MaDMC meeting last week where we discussed the

plan; one thing that came up is that for better or for worse, we are a little late in developing the plan, and we have numerous drivers of the monitoring. What we have with the Monitoring Plan, it is more a description of how the body of work going on in the monitoring world addresses the Recovery Plan. It does that pretty well, but a large percentage is related to hatchery fish evaluation. A lot is trying to meet hatchery goals, which are not necessarily the same as recovery goals. We have a plan that we are developing that will go into the Recovery Plan, but it doesn't necessarily give a road map to success for monitoring programs; it is more a description of what is going on and what is being addressed. We will be working to update the draft, looking for more MRC partners to review—review copies available by request. **Action**—John will send the draft plan to Lynda, Robes, Steve, and Hans. Comments are needed ASAP.

Derek—the Upper Columbia Monitoring Strategy is our monitoring strategy for the Upper Columbia, that is what we are trying to get out of the monitoring and includes the key management questions; each of the subbasin Appendices is addressing what is going on and how we are addressing the key management questions—these questions are not going to change, so keep that in mind during any review of John's draft.

John—the Appendix P to the Recovery Plan is also part of it. The three subbasins have approached their appendices very differently. Because Wenatchee and Entiat were part of ISEMP, they started early and they took different approaches. Wenatchee went first, Entiat is mostly about the intensively monitoring watershed, ours is trying to encompass all the monitoring that is going on everything that we could come up with, including bull trout, beaver reintroduction, etc. We have many monitoring programs, other subbasins may also revise to look at the other work that is going on. Need comments by the end of February. (Note: the Recovery Plan and Appendices are available at <http://www.ucsr.com/theplan.asp>.)

John—one of the things that the MaDMC survey (last fall) identified was a need by project sponsors to have more information about the results of monitoring to include in project development, project planning, design, permitting, etc. We are looking at ways to get the results of monitoring out to the people who could use it. This effort through MaDMC is trying to get at this—they sent a questionnaire out to project sponsors asking which kinds of information would be helpful in project development. The results from that questionnaire are in, and now MaDMC is going out to monitoring agencies to try to get the information to project sponsors. We are now working with the monitoring folks to try to get a better handle on how to get the information to project sponsors. If monitoring folks could go through the spreadsheet and fill it out and get the information back to Greer that would be very helpful. The monitoring questions are what were identified by the project sponsors as information that would help them develop projects. The goal is to have projects with more clearly defined biological objectives and this information will help project sponsors develop the objectives.

Derek—we are seven years into implementing the Recovery Plan; we now have enough information to go back and test the original hypothesis. A short time, but we are looking at whether we can be more precise in developing projects to benefit the target species; trying to get information to help project sponsors be more precise.

**John Crandall—Outreach Update:** MRC calendar is here. Each month there is a theme/topic, with a link on the MRC website, with more information on the monthly theme. This month is Beaver Project next month is redds, FS is hard at work on this. When your month is coming up, if you can get your information to me or Jessica a week before the month starts that would be great.

We are just about ready to submit our 2014 Outreach plan; last month I asked people to send me activities they have planned for the coming year; have incorporated that in the coming plan; also a good time to look back on last year; last year we had the most ever Watershed Watchers programs and FS

outdoor education days at Blackpine lake; with these programs we get all of the schools, very exciting to see that outdoor education program expand and be integrated into the science standards for the school. The standards are quite good, and should be effective as the kids move through the different grade levels. We are concentrating on second and third graders and sixth and seventh graders. Third graders doing a unit of floods this year. We are also kicking around the idea of reinvigorating the Respect the River program through the Forest Service and MSRF. If you have any additional outreach items that you are thinking of doing this year, get them to me soon—the plan helps us with the tracking.

Discussion—National Fishing Day, Confluence Gallery river show in June, Interpretive Center watershed story wall

John—if you haven't been in the Interpretive Center, you should go; it is a really neat space.

**Jessica Goldberg—CAC Recruitment Process:** the Okanogan Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) has an opening for an additional member; they are looking for specific representation, in this case, they are looking for someone who represents a local government, tribal, volunteer group, or other habitat interests. The CAC is an important reviewer in the SRFB funding process; they are the ones that rank the projects after the RTT scoring. If you know someone who represents one of those interests and might be interested in this volunteer position, they need to submit a letter of interest and a short bio/resume to support the nomination to me; I need to turn in nominations to the Lead Entity Coordinator (Joy Juelson) by the end of the day on February 24<sup>th</sup>.

Discussion—recruitment process, background

Robes—how is the CAC additive to the RTT review?

Derek—the state statute lays out the requirements for including citizens review; their review criteria is significantly different than the technical review—the local effects community support for projects; it is very additive.

### **Roundtable/Public Comment**

Jessica Goldberg—the Beaver Project is moving forward starting its 7<sup>th</sup> year; MSRF is taking over Admin role for the project from the Methow Conservancy. We have been working on numerous funding proposals for this project. Looking at a variety of sources to fund this project.

John Crandall—we are well into the draft text for the Columbia River Lamprey Restoration Guide; trying to get salmon projects to consider lamprey in project development; also educating people on the lamprey. A lot rests on work that has already been done. We are looking to educate in a similar way to the Fish Guide, but it will be in pdf format rather than printed. We also have best management practices for restoration actions; funded through the McNary Mitigation Fund. It is challenging because there are so many unknowns about lamprey and what they need; they are very difficult to sample, handle, age. In the Methow, there have only been a few adult lamprey sightings in the last few years.

Thursday and Friday this week, NFWF is having a flow accounting for their water transactions program; Chewuch was selected as a model for this accounting effort; challenging. This fall, Chewuch Canal Company signed an agreement with Ecology to return 10 cfs of water to the Chewuch at specific flow triggers; this accounting is to see what the value is of that 10 cfs to the river. We will be talking about that at the meeting.

Hans Smith—Yakama Nation is exploring doing another reach assessment in the Upper Methow from around Lost River to the Weeman Bridge, may be doing that this year. We are continuing the Middle Twisp RA and will have something out for review by mid-April or so; the field work was done last fall. The projects we are working on for implementation this year are the 1890s side channel project and the Two Channels large wood enhancement project, no side channel restoration at Two Channels this

year—still working with the landowner on the larger project. On the Twisp we are doing two large wood enhancements—one at RM 3, the other at lower Poorman Creek road above the bridge where it connects to the Twisp. We are still working with landowners on larger project there. We are exploring project opportunities on lower Early Winters Creek with the National Forest Foundation through their Treasured Landscapes program. No projects on the Chewuch this year. We are gearing up to work on our MOU projects with the State on their land in 2015. We've had a technical team meeting in the field at all the sites with WDFW, we've come up with an agreed upon list of objectives for the site. The projects will go through normal permitting. We are working through the MOU framework for project development. We are redoing on contract with BPA, and we are doing a competitive bid for our revegetation contract as part of that project. We will have additional RFP's going out as well. RFPs go through the tribal process.

Don Phillips—curious if people noticed the recent letter to the editor on salmon recovery, if that person is known. Might be good to follow up with something positive.

John—a good point about the outreach; a lot is going on with salmon recovery with the restoration, water transactions, hatchery programs, etc., and in that letter they are all confused; it is nuanced and a difficult conversation to have

Don—think it is better not to respond directly, but to have an ongoing outreach/education might be good

John—Solveig's piece in the Grist is a good overview

([http://www.methownet.com/grist/features/salmon\\_money.html](http://www.methownet.com/grist/features/salmon_money.html))

Derek—that was one of the better comprehensive pieces that have been written about salmon recovery efforts

Heather Simmons—I work for Department of Ecology; working on management of the Centennial, 319, and Husseman funds; Husseman are purely state funds, there is only \$90,000 available, but you can ask for up to \$50,000; you need to show environmental/public/water benefit. We are asking for Husseman proposals to come in by the 24<sup>th</sup>. Good shot if you have projects that are difficult to fund.

John—can it be put toward state land?

Heather—not sure, will check

Hans—water quality focus?

Heather—can be a broader variety, buffer requirements do not apply—apply local buffer requirements; please contact me if you have questions, we can review proposals ahead of time. \$10-20k projects will be more competitive. The Draft 2015 funding list for Centennial and 319 projects will come out tomorrow; then will go out for review. I would like to see more projects come out for 2016, and I would like to help with that. 319 funds come from EPA, Centennial funds are both state and federal, and EPA is requiring Ecology to abide by new buffer requirements. There are already some informal conversations about talking to EPA about how we can meet the spirit and be more flexible. If you have examples of where that would help, please let me know so we can develop case studies. Technically, we can make an exception if there is a structure or road, but may make the project less competitive. If you have thoughts or project ideas that would be good for case studies, let me know.

Robes Parrish—with regard to Silver Side channel project, we put out an RFP for design services; we've tentatively selected a design contractor, Intermountain Aquatics; we will start working on alternatives and options for design this spring. WDFW is still trying to move forward to have the easement in place this spring. Still pursuing that; we will be ramping up pretty soon, and we will be incorporating a lot of data from the Bureau's RA as it becomes available.

Robes—we are also still pursuing funding and working with Heide at Methow Conservancy to get some additional upland restoration done at Hancock to increase the restoration that we are doing there; if you have ideas for upland restoration funding let me know

Crystal Elliot—we've been working with a number of groups to get some suction dredging legislation action to make changes in the current code. I would like to work with folks on education and getting some traction for the legislation next year.

**Next MRC Meeting March 18<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
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
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
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
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)
NFF	National Forest Foundation
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
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
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. 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.