

Methow Restoration Council

January 17th, 2012

Participants:

| Name | Organization/Affiliation |
|---------------------|------------------------------|
| Brian Fisher | MSRF |
| Char Schumacher | Okanogan County |
| Charlie Snow | WDFW |
| Chris Butler | Yakama Nation |
| Dori Blackburn | Yakama Nation |
| Hans Smith | Yakama Nation |
| Jason Lundgren | CCFEG |
| Jennifer Molesworth | Reclamation |
| Jeri Timm | WWP-TU |
| Jessica Goldberg | MSRF |
| Julie Grialou | Methow Conservancy |
| Ken Bevis | WDFW |
| Kent Woodruff | Forest Service |
| Lee Hatcher | Methow Watershed Council |
| Lisa Pelly | WWP-TU |
| Michael Notaro | Watershed Resource Solutions |
| Mike McAllister | InterFluve |
| Peter Jenkins | US Fish and Wildlife Service |
| Robes Parrish | US Fish and Wildlife Service |
| Torre Stockard | Van Hees |
| Wes Tibbits | USGS |

Notes:

Jeri Timm—Salmon Safe video: we worked with Howl at the Moon to create an Eastern Washington-specific video. The audience is farmers to be recruited, but also to educate the general public. [~5 minute video] The video can be seen at <http://vimeo.com/34868421>

Brian Fisher—LWD Update: (handout—matrix from UCSRB regarding coordinating message around wood in rivers) Last week at the UCSRB staff meeting there was a discussion on how to follow up on December conference in Wenatchee. All watersheds agreed that wood was an important component to improving health in rivers, and that they would work on how to improve safety, communication with the public. They have formed a small group to figure out how to get funds for monitoring and O&M once we get the wood in the rivers.

Brian Fisher—Upper M2 Reach update: moving forward with projects at Whitefish Island (WFI) and WDFW Floodplain; we are expecting 60% design in mid-February and plan on submitting permit applications at the end of the month. DNR has changed how they intend to look at projects; they will require a 5-year right of entry rather than a 30-year lease.

Lee Hatcher—what does that mean?

Brian—waters that were considered navigable at the time of statehood and depending on how they migrate are considered state aquatic lands. Working on state aquatic lands requires working with DNR as a landowner. There are a couple of ways to do that: one way is to get a right of entry with specific requirement, the other is to get a lease or easement. Up until last week, DNR has said that in order for restoration projects on state aquatic lands, they would require a 30-year lease or easement, which would be very difficult given the limitations on funding.

Jennifer Molesworth—Congress commits funding one year at a time; so it isn't possible to commit the Federal government for that period of time.

Chris Butler—is there a policy statement or email about this?

Brian—don't know yet.

Julie Grialou—so the what is required under the right of entry?

Brian—there will still be requirements for the 5-year period; DNR will likely require insurance for construction and some period afterward.

Discussion—state ownership and how it's determined, revisions to the DNR application checklist and how this affects projects; how landowners would feel about not owning the bed of the river

Brian—DNR has a new person based in Wenatchee who is working on this; they streamlined the checklist to bring it into line with the new policy.

Charlie Snow—the DNR permit is not covered by the HPA, which can make it challenging for projects.

Brian—this is different than a permitting process because the State Aquatic Lands application is a landowner process.

Brian—the M2 newsletter went out last week; went to almost 2500 landowners within 300 ft of the river from Winthrop to Pateros. If you have any questions regarding Upper M2, contact Brian

Hans Smith—Lower M2 Reach Update: the Yakama Nation has one M2 project scheduled for 2012; everything else moved to 2013 due to landowner constraints, DNR issues, etc. We are hoping to have a very productive year in 2013; the landowner issues are moving forward, but they take time. We will be doing permitting on Eagle Rocks Large Wood project in February. We will likely do an outreach community meeting by spring.

Robes Parrish—USFWS Update: this is the time of year when we are looking for Partners for Fish and Wildlife projects; we are looking for private lands restoration projects that benefit steelhead and potentially bull trout. These projects come with potentially a lot of support from Robes. USFWS will also be hiring an engineer here in the next few months, so we will be able to do more traditional engineering projects, including culverts, bridges, irrigation intakes, etc., and our ability to help will be improved. Some people got out to Hancock Springs already, may arrange for another field trip to the site this summer. There is a lot of monitoring work beginning at Hancock; John Jorgensen is doing the work to monitor fish use, macroinvertebrates, metrics, water quality, before and after nutrient addition, etc. John is setting it up now.

Talk to Robes for the Partners funds; projects are generally less than 25k; can be more; it can be used to kick start a project, help put a project over the top, or we can do small projects. Jennifer—will the engineer be doing habitat work too? Robes—hope so, it will depend on who we get. Jen—is the position advertised yet? Robes—not yet, will send it around when it comes.

Ken Bevis—Outreach Update: John Crandall is working on the BEF outreach implementation; will be continuing the various activities, and will be looking at ways to integrate the subgroup into other work like landowner outreach. John has an activities matrix, outreach elements of the BEF grant. Jennifer—we are a model watershed for BEF, joining the Entiat. They asked us what we needed help with, and we said to help us with outreach. We just went through a process with them to hire a consultant to do an assessment, will develop a plan. It is a short contract, will take a month or two. We will get an assessment of all the outreach efforts that are going on, and they will help us build a strategy. Ken—we are looking to get a cohesive outreach strategy. Jennifer—think we will have a starting point within the next month or two; everyone will have a piece in that. They will help us figure out who to talk to, what to talk to them about, and how often. The BEF partnership will be a great thing for us for the next 10 years.

Hans Smith—M2 Reach Recreational Use Assessment [PowerPoint presentation]: The assessment will be published at

http://host119.yakama.com/Habitat/UCHR/documents/WaveTrekRescue_M2_River_Use_Assessment_Dec2011.pdf

The study area was the Middle Methow; most river users were accessing the reach in Winthrop. Most data in the study is based on observations in Winthrop at the Red Barn and other put-in areas. Started late this year (2011); cold weather and high flows delayed recreation users. Had use at 2500 cfs by inner

tubes and below 80 degrees F, including by kids. Observations were on weekends in July and August. On average, there were 73 adults and 26 children per day.

Summary

- High volume of use
- Many unsophisticated users, alcohol consumption high, children use high, PFDs lacking in many groups
- Most users from out of town
- Current put-ins lack signage or information

Commercial outfits are focusing on River Run to KOA, they also have inflatable kayaks guided tours; we do not know of any tube rental that allows people to go beyond the Winthrop KOA

Peter—any indication of the types of tubes? A big concern is about the material the tubes are made out of.

Hans—that is in the report.

Ken—any reports of accidents?

Hans--Aero Methow didn't have any reports of accidents. We did show this report to Aero Methow, and they agree that there is a severe issue with the current use, but they don't have the resources to do anything yet; they are interested in partnerships.

Discussion—jurisdiction for enforcing PFD use, alcohol

Hans—Aero Methow is not the principal response agency (the sheriff's department is), but they were not interested in receiving the report or maps of habitat projects because they weren't going to create an additional layer in the case of an emergency. Aero Methow is interested, so that they know what is out there

Jason—first map showed intensity of usage at different spots, are people traveling the whole way, or playing on the beach? Discussion—people can get in or out at different places; intensity of use is at the put-ins.

Hans—we are planning to do river use assessments in other parts of the Methow

Jennifer—last year was a very unusual time of the year, a very late season with higher flow and higher user groups; in lower water years, many of the stretches wouldn't be accessible because people would be bumping bottom

Wes Tibbits—are there any suggestions to actions in the report?

Hans—some; mostly it was a documentation of current use.

Wes—does YN plan to issue any recommendations?

Hans—no plans right now; there are a lot of liability issues, we are interested in partnering.

Charlie—a sentence or two about littering would be nice too

Hans Smith and Mike McAllister—LRT (Lower M2 Reach) Wood Enhancement Projects

[PowerPoint]: most not to be installed until 2013. Project considerations:

- Wood plays critical role in providing habitat
- M2 Reach currently lacks instream LWD
- Wood recruitment process in the reach is broken
 - Will take decades to fix
 - Habitat benefits are needed in the short term
- Limited opportunities to restore wood
 - Social constraints

Enhancement Goals

- Increase amount and distribution of LWD
- Whenever possible, augment existing riprap/levees with LWD
- Improve/restore LW supply (not addressed in this presentation)

There are four sites and three basic treatment types:

- LWD installations at Riprap banks
- Riverbank logjams
- Side channel enhancement

Design measures to decrease conflicts with recreation—Chris Jonason of Wavetrek is reviewing project sites; four project sites.

- Sites located at areas outside of impounding flow
- Long sight distance
- Structures will be obvious
- Wood installations configured to deflect and shed

Actions designed for short-term benefit will not preclude other actions in the future if landowner constraints change; for example, at the Sugar Dike (site C).

Most wood is self-ballasted with large boulders and cable; not excavated in; this is easier for permitting, protects stability of the riprap

Discussion—DNR ownership, landowner and social constraints; MSRF and Reclamation talking with DNR on a project by project basis, YN is discussing with DNR at higher levels, but not project by project

Timelines: Site B 2012, others 2013, other projects in 2013

Round Table/Public Comment

Wes Tibbits—USGS: Ryan Belmore finished his dissertation on food web information; it has discussion regarding restoration efforts and how current food webs may fit into future projects

USGS has progress report up through 2011.

Chris Butler—Yakama Nation: Chewuch RM 11.75-13 project update: had conceptals, finally had last meeting with the FS; we will be giving a presentation on what they will be doing with that. Last spring, we identified some potential projects in Big Valley South; projects would be from People-mover down valley, on river left, weaving in and out of a big wetland area. We have done a SEPA, and were issued a DNS; we spoke with DNR, have done a cultural survey, have put in piezometers. The plan is to put in a backwater channel; but the project had stalled due to DNR. Michael Notaro—would you leave the People-mover? Chris—we were told that it is important.

Discussion—general thought among those present is that the people mover doesn't do anything, and it is a big problem

Chris—DNR doesn't like the People-mover either, and they would like it to go away. If anyone else has interest in Big Valley South, Jason Lundgren and Chris are meeting to discuss options for the area.

Charlie—there is a lot of use in the area by juveniles, including coho. Wes—we have monitored the side channel for the last three years, there hasn't been much change in use, but there is a lot of use. It has three or four deep pools.

Chris—we are looking at three pump tests and four groundwater wells to look at project viability. DNR put a hold on the project last fall; we hope that the new policy benefits the project. It may allow fish to access ponds above Heath.

Charlie Snow—WDFW: we have our job announcements for seasonal technicians, close on the 29th, hiring around 18 doing stream surveys, smolt traps, train a lot of the technicians every year. Have 3, 6, and 9 month positions, big mix of types of work. Listed on WDFW website at the jobs section, have a new process this year, have to fill out the state application on line and email it to the website listed, instructions are on the application.

Michael Notaro—related to M2 WDFW project, we will have first draft of construction access agreements for left bank landowners; moving forward.

Kent Woodruff—USFS: Beaver Project now has 12 successful sites established, more than twice the estimate for project. Did follow up on hair analysis for sexing beavers; we now can successfully sex all the beavers we get. Tested the crew on sexing, and they were 100 percent successful this year. With Charlie's help, we are now successful monitoring Beaver movements with PIT tags. Have applications pending for more funds, about 1/3 of the way through a 10 year program, working on BMP guidelines with state DOE, helping WDFW update the beaver restoration guidelines, official guidelines for stream restoration practice series (SHRUG) Have people from elsewhere coming to learn from us. We have established 12 sites out of 24 tried. Have 23 tagged Beavers; have hits from at least three.

Charlie—some are hitting repeatedly. More antennae are coming online, so we have good infrastructure in place for monitoring.

Kent—we can't trap beavers in the winter, because they will freeze in the trap.

Hans Smith—YN RAs: we have a draft RA from InterFluve for Libby Creek; hope to present in Feb. We are still exploring Twisp Ponds in 2012; timeline is quickly moving away; designs haven't changed much, if they do we will bring it back to MRC. Appreciate Wes and Charlie, others come to the meetings; it helps with the monitoring perspective.

Lisa Pelly—Trout Unlimited: we just got our report back from NRCS; we have about \$180,000 from our Farm Bill efficiencies, working to get the projects nailed down, hope to have everyone compiled by the end of January, if you know of anyone interested in getting water savings infrastructure on the ground, let Jeri know. Focus is on tributaries, has to be with a landowner to help them with their practices. Julie—does it have to be on Methow? Lisa—it depends on where people rank.

Jason Lundgren—CCFEG: we are hosting a speaker at the Twisp Grange on March 15 at 6:00: Dennis Dauble. He will be at Bar and Beach in Leavenworth the next day. He is a fisheries biologist and a fisherman, and he will talk about the natural history of fishes in the NW. Sponsored by Humanities Washington. Pretty cool deal.

Robes Parrish—USFWS: we are putting together a short video for Hancock Springs, talking about partnerships, restoration, unique techniques. Intended for a wide audience. Looking for suggestions for increasing hits?

Discussion: linking to Methow Conservancy Web site, Methow Grist on Methownet web site, Rural Roots film festival.

Robes—next month we are planning a presentation on results of a wood study that Pete and I did, putting out a paper within a week, would be nice if people will read the abstract ahead of time.

Jennifer Molesworth—Reclamation: the W2 Reach Assessment is done and awaiting RTT review, will likely have in a month or two.

Last week Ron Gross and I went to Boise for our annual trip to regional office; we had two days of project management training. It was very good, done by a consultant that specializes in project management of simple or complicated construction projects. There was a lot of talk about bringing this to the Upper Columbia, so I'm looking for any interest in this area if they brought it here. It is formal project management from inception to closure of projects.

Jason—is it relevant to what we do or very broad?

Jennifer—very relevant; it can be broken down or nested, but is fairly methodical and thought out from establishing objectives and following it out through construction. There is software; it uses existing software like Microsoft Project. Contact Jennifer for more information.

Jason—a course description would be good.

Jennifer—for the 2013-18 BiOp, within the next few months we have to identify the project areas that we will be working on so that it can be submitted to the judge for our actions through 2018. For anyone that gets BPA funding or Reclamation design, this is a critical thing. We need to formalize our plan of attack through 2018 in the next few months. This is an important thing for everyone to be thinking about. It ties into the RAs. There is some flexibility, but FCRPS agencies need a list of actions that are reasonably certain to occur.

Discussion—how we will update; HWS is to be used instead of the Implementation Schedule; people need to identify where they want to work. WDFW is looking at how land acquisitions could support this, everyone's information is important. Building the out-year plan; helping to provide some certainty that the habitat actions will occur.

Next MRC is Tuesday, February 21st

| Definitions of Commonly used Acronyms | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 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 |
| 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.