

## Methow Restoration Council

January 17, 2017

### Participants:

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Amy Martin	OCD
Camden Shaw	Plantas nativa east
Chelsea Trout	OCD
Chris Butler	Yakama Nation
Gene Shull	USFS
Greer Maier	UCSRB
Greg Knott	VHE
Hans Smith	Yakama Nation
Jarred Johnson	Yakama Nation
Jennifer Molesworth	Reclamation
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
Joy Juelson	UCSRB
Kelli Snodgrass	WDFW
Ken Muir	USFWS
Kent Woodruff	USFS
Kirsten Kirkby	CCFEG
Maddie Eckmann	Yakama Nation
Mariah Mayfield	USFS
Mike Brunfelt	InterFluve
Paul Wagner	Colville Tribes
Robes Parrish	USFWS
Ryan Fortier	WDFW
Steve Kolk	Reclamation

### Meeting Notes

**Chris Butler – Upcoming YN Chewuch River Projects:** We presented conceptual project plans to the Forest Service in 2015. We have a variety of work types planned. Gene Shull brought to our attention the idea of tree tipping, and we plan to do some of that. We have construction planned in two phases. In the first phase, 2017, we will be working on RM 15.5-17; in the second phase, 2018, we will be working on RM 17-20. We will be using a helicopter, which is new for us, to fly the wood in. Gene Shull – we’ve been working with the YN; this part of the Chewuch is lacking off channel habitat and wood, goal is to increase complexity, spawning, rearing, and adult holding habitat. We looked at opportunities to do more natural wood placement with the helicopter, still on the table for the future. Chris – Gene is talking about a future phase, we are still using a helicopter for this phase. Gene – we developed a desired condition for wood loading and pool habitat and used that to guide how much wood we put into the system. Mike Brunfelt – Interfluve has been working in the drainage for some time, will go over fisheries, big picture geomorph, general Chewuch history, restoration examples, etc. The project will remain consistent with the RTT guidelines for the Chewuch and with the Forest Service guidelines. Large wood jams for short-term habitat and to increase wood recruitment.

Chewuch is incised down through glacial outwash; the area we are working in has very hard rock, and erosion resistant. Alluvial fans really play a role in establishing relative slope and how wide the valleys become.

Watershed and river disturbances – fire, logging, roads, debris torrents, elevated sediment loads, meander cutoffs – current straighter than historical, reduction in large wood processes and habitats.

Strategy –

- increase large wood deposits and enhance process (gravel bar jams, whole tree pull over)
- Enhance existing pools with large wood cover (buried bank jams, whole tree pull over)
- Enhance or create side channel habitats where opportunity exists (side channel reconnect and apex jam)
- To reduce ground impacts some wood will be mobilized by helicopter.

#### *River Miles 15.5 – 17*

Mike – some of these projects may change; NEPA analysis is still ongoing.

Three sites for wood pull-over, near sites A, D, and I. The idea is that we have between 3 and 4 spruce trees in the bends

Site A – will enhance existing jam, and reorient an old spruce tree to catch more wood.

Site B (moving upstream) – opportunity to re-water an old side channel, excavate a new inlet, apex jam, and increase large wood loading on the right; another opportunity considered but not selected due to wetland impacts that we would not have been able to mitigate for. We did hydraulic modeling

Site C is another option in same area for surface wood on bars

Site D and E – buried jam in an existing jam at E, Site D is putting wood where it would naturally rack up  
F, G, H – putting wood where it naturally deposits; G is an alcove, cover habitat, same design piles with wood weaved in

Site I – log structure, obliterate an existing log road after using for access

Site J – right bank, buried bank jam, use some large spruce from area

#### *River Miles 17-20*

Chris – we are presenting these as two projects, but they are under one NEPA process

Mike - Site K – left bank buried jam in an existing pool, hand wood across for construction

Sites L and M – bank buried jams in existing pools, access from east and west Chewuch roads will add slash to the jam, will use whole trees with roots if we can salvage on site

Jennifer Molesworth – how will you manage recreation to prevent them from using your access roads?

Mike – we will rehab and put trees, etc.

Gene – we've been watching our old access roads, and they've done a pretty good job of disguising them with trees, boulders. So far, we haven't seen any use

Chris – we make sure we put everything back to slope on our way out

Gene – and will plant heavy vegetation at the head of the road

Mike – sites O, P, Q, R, S – all wood will be delivered by helicopters for R, Q, S, and we will pull over some spruce trees, whole site kind of connected logistically and will restore access on our way out

Site T – standalone buried bank jam in an existing pool, no piles needed

Site U, V – buried pile ballasted jam in existing pool, site V is a side channel a high flow but also hyporheic in the summer. Idea is to do a wood forest pool habitat, excavate pool bedforms and bury wood in the left bank. Opportunity to improve rearing habitat

Greg Knott – what will keep the excavated pools from filling up?

Mike – the wood provides hydraulics to maintain them over time, we will make it big to occlude the channel enough to create the velocity. Change is not a bad thing, if we can get the channel to move around, we will get habitat.

Gene – we've worked with them a lot to avoid designing the treatments to cause the river move around a lot. We are okay some movement over time, but we don't want to set things up for avulsions.

Greg – what I've seen is when you dig holes they tend to fill up

Jennifer – especially in the Chewuch

Mike – the wood is important

### **Kent Woodruff – Beaver Project Video Presentation: 10 Decades film**

Kent – one of the things we do monthly in this room is to talk about things that we are doing in this watershed. Over the next 6 months, I plan to do a similar coordination with people all over the region. Climate change is a big issue, and we've talked about it a lot. One of the things we can focus on is water change. The way the snow pack functions, associated habitats, and how it will affect our forests and restoration projects. Things are going to be very different on the landscape 100 years from now. We applied for and received funding from the Wildlife Conservation Fund to support the Beaver Project and focus on climate adaptation. Have been working on this film, which is more about “what can we do” and not just about the beaver project.

[Film]

Kent – the first conversation I had about the Methow Beaver Project was with Hans Smith, when he was working for PBI. Ryan Fortier has been instrumental over the past few years in working with WDFW. UCSRB/SRFB is providing funding, as is NFF, to share the message.

It is important to be able to recognize what is going to happen. 89% of this watershed is Forest Service/public land. How that is managed affects every other thing in the land. We will begin to experience more variability in the rivers. The state is going to spend a lot of money in the next ten years to right size culverts for projected changes.

Jennifer – we think about climate change with our projects

Kent – it is important that people stay informed on the science. Here are some publications that everyone needs to have and read:

- ***The Climate Adaptation Knowledge Exchange*** is dedicated to being the most up-to-date resource for people like us. <http://www.cakex.org/about-cake>
- ***Climate Savvy*** is a very valuable book to get you grounded for implementing adaptation actions.
- ***The North Cascades Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment*** is essential reading: [https://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/pubs/pnw\\_gtr892.pdf](https://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/pubs/pnw_gtr892.pdf)
- The most practical publication to become very familiar with is the primer from the top climate change adaptation advocates from 15 agencies and organizations:
- ***Climate Smart Conservation - Putting Adaptation Principles into Practice.***
- [https://www.nwf.org/pdf/Climate-Smart-Conservation/NWF-Climate-Smart-Conservation\\_5-08-14.pdf](https://www.nwf.org/pdf/Climate-Smart-Conservation/NWF-Climate-Smart-Conservation_5-08-14.pdf)

Kent – we all have our individual contributions, and if we all lead in our areas rather than wait for someone to give us direction, that is the most impact we can make. If we all do parts in our areas, then that incremental change will make a difference in our watershed.

Robes Parrish – last year Jenny and I went to the Climate Conference in Coeur d'Alene, and they had a presentation on the first IPCC projections from the 1990s; what was interesting was that there was not a lot of difference between what they knew before and what we know now. We have a good idea of

where we are headed, so now the next step is to determine what we do to adapt. It takes intentionality and being creative, as they said in the film

Greer – the new metrics that the RTT have come up with for prioritizing projects include vulnerability to climate change, I would really like to get a comprehensive analysis done for the region that we can use for prioritizing our habitat work. That will allow strategies that are specific to watersheds or sub-watersheds. We are working to try to get funding to get information to use in that process.

Jennifer – have been around awhile, and things are always changing; no matter the leadership, the work is always increasing

Kent – we are the leaders and implementers

Joy – I encourage you to make a very short version of the film where you talk about the water storage part of the message, which will help us. People have short attention spans.

**Joy Juelson – UCSRB Updates:** many of you know that we have the Targeted Solicitation going on now. The application deadline is January 20. This is through the Upper Columbia programmatic. February the RTT will score the projects and decisions will be made by BPA after that. Sponsors will be notified in March.

Board – we are going through ISRP review, which is part of the process for the BPA programmatic. We need to report to them now, and we will present in Portland in the middle of February. We were the second region to do this, but now there are a lot of these in WA, OR, ID. This made it possible to ensure that the projects selected were consistent with regional priorities, although BPA is the final decision makers. We may be reaching out to the project sponsors to get information; may be part of the next BiOp, etc.

SRFB process – this is our adaptive management time for the process, so any comments that you may have for suggestions, changes, and we will accept comments in January. Any changes would be in February, and we start the new process in March.

SRFB Conference is coming, registration coming soon

Greer Maier – we’re moving really quickly on prioritization; so far the RTT have decided to “Okanogonize” the region for reaches and assessment units – smaller subunits for assessments. The second decision made was to develop a list of metrics they would use to prioritize areas; previously it was based on major and minor spawning areas and level of degradation, and now the list is much longer. They have also ranked the metrics in terms of relative importance. The next step is to rank the prioritized restoration actions in specific areas. Prioritizing/ranking of the metrics is to help with the scoring. Once there is a list of priority actions for specific areas, they will hand the list over to the Implementation Team and the WATs to run it through the filter of the realities on the ground; this will come up with the list of actions for the specific watersheds. Will re-evaluate the priority and practicality of the actions every few years.

Jennifer – can you make sure that the RTT is sending the meeting invites?

Joy – let Barb Carillo or me know if you aren’t getting the invites if you want the invites

Discussion – metrics, assumptions, will need data in the future to support assumptions

Greer – I’m working with Tracy and Jen O’Neal and hopefully John Crandall to work on an effectiveness monitoring workshop. A lot of interesting information that has been developed on effectiveness results. Would like to have a conversation about what we are learning. It will probably be sometime in March.

### **Roundtable**

Gene Shull – USFS: we are meeting this week to start to talk about implementation of the Mission Project. Last week we had a discussion with the Forest Health Collaborative about our next area, on the

Twisp River, and our data needs for the models. The YN have stepped up to do some stream surveys. With regard to the discussion about climate change today, and the question about what we have done to soften the effects of climate change – our district is looking at the whole watershed. Reducing the amount of roads and storm proofing roads is one of the best things we can do. As opportunities come up, we will be looking for partnerships; we will have miles and miles of shelf stock. We will have 200-300 miles of road that we can decommission or close.

We are excited about our partnership with Conservation NW; they have helped us work in areas and get funding to close roads, this year in South Summit and Benson Creek.

Kent Woodruff – USFS/Methow Beaver Project: it is encouraging to me; for years, we have worked to move the ball forward, and we are building partnership capability and collaboration. The Beaver Project is working with the Mission project in a model partnership for restoration.

Chelsea Trout – OCD: I am the new conservation educator at OCD; mostly based on water quality. We have a High School class that works with the CTCR in the Okanogan, and would like to see this moved to other areas in the district, getting younger people engaged.

Amy Martin – OCD: we are also working on improving ESA knowledge in the Okanogan valley, developing materials with an emphasis on local heritage, through UCSRB.

Program announcements – NRCS through EQIP and future directions primarily passage projects focused on bull trout. Ranking will occur on February 17<sup>th</sup>, with another round in April for unused funds.

NRCS has limited staff capacity, so relying on partners to develop and implement projects.

Reminder – CREP is for any anadromous stream, riparian buffering, landowner incentive programs, for working lands.

District will have a greater role in voluntary stewardship program; we will have a contract with them to provide more direction. Will be giving updates as that is developed. For Methow and Okanogan.

Mariah Mayfield – USFS: the Mission EA is coming out, most likely next week. Two alternative for action alternatives, Alternative 2 and 3, 3 has more road decommissioning, rock armoring. We would appreciate comments. Mike Liu will make a recommendation but the Forest Supervisor will make the decision.

Kent – good climate change anticipation.

Paul Wagner – CTCR: Ryan Klett asked me to give an update on EDT. The link is functional, and we would appreciate any comments or corrections by the end of January. We will begin scoping dates for the life history workshop we talked about at last MRC.

Steve Kolk – Reclamation: I'm Jennifer's counterpart down in the Wenatchee, came up to offer support for Jennifer, and to learn more about the Methow.

**Next MRC February 21**

<b>Definitions of Commonly used Acronyms</b>	
AEM	Action Effectiveness Monitoring
ANS	Aquatic Nuisance Species
AREMP	Aquatic and Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring Program
BACI	Before, After, Control, Impact (study design type)
BDA	Beaver Dam Analogue
BEF	Bonneville Environmental Foundation
BO/BiOp	Biological Opinion
BPA	Bonneville Power Administration
CAC	Citizens Advisory Committee (for SRFB funding applications)
CAO	Critical Areas Ordinance
CBFWA	Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (pronounced “cubfwah”)
CCFEG	Columbia Cascade Fisheries Enhancement Group
CCT	Colville Confederated Tribes (newer acronym is CTCR – see below)
CTCR	Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation (older acronym is CCT – see above)
CHaMP	Columbia Habitat Monitoring Program
CMZ	Channel Migration Zone
CREP	Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program
CSF	Community Salmon Fund
EDT	Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment
EQIP	Environmental Quality Incentives Program
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FCRPS	Federal Columbia River Power System
FFFPP	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
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
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.