

Methow Restoration Council

July 17, 2012
Meeting Notes

Participants:

Brian Fisher	MSRF
Chris Johnson	MSRF
Derek Van Marter	UCSRB
Don McIvor	Local Landowner
Greg Knott	Van Hees Environmental
Hans Smith	YN
Jason Paulsen	Methow Conservancy
Jennifer Molesworth	Bureau of Reclamation
Jeri Timm	Trout Unlimited
Jessica Goldberg	MRC/MSRF
John Crandall	MRC/Wild Fish Conservancy
John Sunderland	Methow Conservancy
Jon Merz	Ecology/CRO
Ken Bevis	WDFW
Kirsten Cook	Okanogan Conservation District
Lee Hatcher	Methow Watershed Council
Michael Notaro	Watershed Resource Solutions
Robert Warren	Bonneville Environmental Foundation
Ryan Houston	Upper Deschutes Watershed Council
Torre Stockard	Van Hees Environmental

Notes:

Derek Van Marter—bulk of today's agenda is to hear from Ryan Houston from the Deschutes; they are also funded by the BEF, and have many similar partnerships. As a follow up to the presentation from Pyramid last month, this is an opportunity to hear some lessons learned from another area.

John Crandall—Monitoring Update: there is a lot of work beginning to be coordinated in the Twisp Watershed. It is primarily an effort with YN and John Jorgenson's work on nutrients and trophic productivity—looking at energy pathways in the Twisp River, productivity is down due to lack of marine derived nutrients, extends into stream banks and riparian areas, keystone species. They are looking at nutrients in 6 sites on the Twisp river; the study is well thought out, and the treatment potential is still being figured out. Jennifer Molesworth—I think that whatever they do, it shouldn't be impacting an ecosystem somewhere else.

John—Reclamation and Michael Newsom have an interest in partnering with John J. on this effort, and they are putting resources in the Twisp River to partner with a big effort through modeling. They will also be studying productivity; data being collected fits very well into the models; it is complicated to a degree, with a lot of information—there is a lot going on with that, and over the next few years, will use modeling to help with restoration decision making. There is a lot of restoration going on concurrently, which confounds things somewhat. Hancock Springs (upper Methow) is a small confined area, and monitoring is also really ramping up there, folding in to the CHaMP effort. For these monitoring efforts, YN, USGS, CHaMP, NOAA, BPA have a grand partnership, plus work on temperature and sediment, so about 5 different study efforts will have inputs into the model.

Derek—at Hancock, we have all the pre-treatment data that John has collected for years, what about the Twisp?

John—John J also has been collecting data on the Twisp for years; Hancock is actually a bit late because he wasn't set up for that, but it is really ramping up; the Twisp has a good baseline. Treatment part still to be determined. Ongoing, crews are getting ready to mobilize, USGS ramping up, a lot of coordination going on.

In terms of landowner issues, whenever we are going on private land we need to think of whose land it is and whether we have permission to be there. We need to know where we are at all times and where the property lines are, and whether we have permission to be there, and if we're putting up flagging, we need to figure out how to get it down.

Michael Notaro—different teams have different protocols, so if control points, rebar, etc., need to be left on site, then that needs to be clear so that we can communicate that with the landowners.

Chris Johnson—we've had a number of different expectations from landowners, advance calls, understanding what the flagging is about, etc., when we're out, it's a good opportunity to connect with people. Also, if you have your dog with you, be sure that it is okay to bring a dog to someone else's property

John—CHaMP habitat work is also going on in the Entiat and the Wenatchee; they are developing little cards to hand out when people meet folks out in the field, and it may be a good idea to implement here—a short info card with a contact person for people to call.

Jennifer—we could have a monitoring map on an MRC web site that could help people understand

John—it is true that there is really a lot going on; it's very extensive and there are a lot of folks involved

Brian Fisher—Upper M2 Update: we awarded the Whitefish Island contract to KRCI out of Wenatchee, and we are planning on constructing in early August. We have the HPA, the rest of the permits waiting on cultural, which will clear on August 1, and the rest will domino after that.

We took the Methow Conservancy stewardship committee out to the site, mostly positive feedback

John—installed a time-lapse camera on the island looking upstream on the side channel, which will show change over time. It will take three photos a day throughout the summer.

Chris—we are working this summer to get a prototype of an MRC website up so that we can have a place to send people to where they can get information this summer during construction

John—time lapse could be an incredible tool to show results over time

Chris—we are also looking at adding the wildlife activated cameras

John—I have a line on those; we are trying to respond to comments on documenting the added benefits to the sites to other types of wildlife

Brian—at the WDFW site, most of the project will go to construction next year. This year, we will be doing work on river left just downstream of the airport, and a contract has been let to Palm Construction. We lost the ability to build a structure on one private property where one of the property owners put the property up for sale. It is expected to close at the end of the month, but we can't know anything of that site until it closes. We are also removing remnants of the old MVID dam. We are also down to only three wood structures on the project, because DOT Aviation decided not to let us build the one their property. The airport is concerned that we will be too successful at producing fish and therefore attract birds; so they've said that they don't want any habitat projects within the wildlife corridor. This means that they won't allow any part of the project on their land so we can't do the structure on the bank just downstream of the fish return.

Chris—we asked NOAA fisheries to look into airport's mitigation requirements for cutting down riparian for the airport.

Brian—So we are looking at three ELJ's on the left bank, beginning in mid-August, early September. All three structures are on the left bank on private property. One of the structures on a property that changed hands this spring, but the new landowner has been supportive and signed an agreement to do the property.

John—what went into placement decision for those structures?

Brian—the literature indicated that we should have wood structures spaced more frequently. Not many opportunities for the structures to move up or downstream due to ownerships.

Brian—we've been working effectively with WDFW recently. Carmen Andonaegui has taken many steps to clarify the process for working with them; comments are now consolidated comments from WDFW, rather than from individuals.

Chris—she understands that project sponsors need to be able to take the comments and act on them. WDFW is now an active and predictable partner, and we are moving forward with the project.

Brian—in-water work in the beginning of August

Chris—will also be working with YN, WDFW, and DNR to create signage for the public, also working on water rights for the sites to water the plants as they go in

Ken Bevis—Outreach and Salmon Celebration Update: planned for September 30th at 1:00pm, MAA , MV Interpretive Center, Twisp Works, Watershed Watchers, MSRF are all partners, and the Colvilles are going to give us sockeye salmon. We may have some good local bluegrass music; the Twisp Works element will have opportunities for displays.

Chris—it is a good time to identify preliminary budget and partners, need to make sure that we have sufficient funding to do it properly; MSRF has given some budget, need to leverage the funds to get other sources

Robert Warren—what is status of art pieces MSRF commissioned?

Chris—we just installed the Rasta Tree, have the Osprey piece delivered and ready to put up, the Heron from Byers studio ready to be picked up, will have a dedication. Also, we are out of fish, so need to find more cars.

Jeri Timm—Salmon Safe Dinner September 2nd. Jenny—I went last year and it was great.

John—the fish guide is almost ready for printing; we got really good feedback from outside reviewers. Also, thanks to the OCD for their lending of the stream table at the 4th of July Arts Fest; we spent several hours working with kids on water quality.

Kirsten Cook—newsletter for summer edition is full, thanks for contributions. We are looking for articles in the fall one, will go to print in October

Chris—we are looking to put together the MRC web site, will have a template in early August. We want folks to self-nominate that there are the implementer and we can get content.

Ken—who will put it together?

Chris—still working on that

Derek—can link to HWS

Chris—we want to figure that out; we want to work on branding and building the coalition

Derek UCSRB Update: We have a final version of the Implementation Schedule, will send out, unless we hear otherwise in the next week or so, that will be the final version. It will be approved by board and transmitted to NOAA and put up on the web site.

Chris—we are still planning on updating annually?

Derek—yes; we try to make it open, transparent and accessible to the public.

Other updates—we've had two people leave the UCSRB, at the beginning of the year Kathleen Deason left to spend more time with her baby, and Don McIvor also left to spend more time on his own projects. Joy Juelson has been hired; she will work on Forest Health Initiative, and we also have hired Greer Myer—she was a FS biologist out of the Leavenworth office, she will be taken up some of the all-H initiatives

Derek—consolidation of the Lead Entity, Julie and I testified before SRFB at their June meeting, they approved the consolidation effective Jan 1, will continue the outreach and need to hire a coordinator. Next step is to reach out to both the CACs in Okanogan and Chelan counties when they meet in August, and will put it all into a final report to the SRFB

RTT rankings are done but not out, the average score of all the projects is the same as last year, some in the 100s, some in the 70s. Think they will be out this week.

I was interviewed by KPQ last week; they are doing a series on salmon recovery, an am radio station, didn't hear it, but heard from people who did. It was a good lesson on remembering how to communicate the message and being ready when the opportunity comes up.

Chris—Joy is coming to the Riverbank on the 26th at 3pm to get information from project sponsors, Theo Burgoon also coming at 2 pm to talk about monitoring, if you want to get them information will be a good time.

Derek—next step for outreach across the region, is to meet with project sponsors and get information.

Chris—if other project sponsors are available, Thursday the 26th at 3 pm is the time to get feedback on how the Lead Entity can be more effective in the consolidated role.

Derek—updates on liability legislation—the state family has been working internally (WDFW, DNR, RCO, Association of Conservation Districts) have been looking at the proposed legislation and seeing how they

would like to see it refined. We are looking at working with them and our other coalition; the outcome is unknown, but we have been working concurrently with YN doing outreach to all of the legislators. We are hoping to introduce it in the natural resources committee, and we have invited the chair of the committee in August to look at the issues. We have been waiting for the state family to see where they are, and then have a broader conversation about it, preparing en masse for upcoming legislation in August.

John Sudnerland—where is the chairs' district?

Derek—west side, I think Kelso area

Roundtable

Kirsten Cook, Okanogan Conservation District—we trying to rank project proposals for cost share, may have cost share opportunities for water quality and livestock; need soon. Taking over the plant sale, if you know anyone who needs plants, send them to Kirsten ASAP. Our new conservation planner, Leslie Michael, started and is getting up to speed.

Chris—cost share private lands only?

Kirsten—I don't think so.

John Crandall—Jon Merz from Ecology, we have been working with him on our Centennial 319 grants working on addressing 303(d) listing, have been working for last three years. Jon was here to see what we've been doing, look at some sites and techniques for riparian plantings, adapting projects to site conditions. Monitoring for water quality parameters and sediment, outreach and education is a strong piece of the grants. Had a great tour yesterday, visited a number of sites on Twisp, Chewuch, Methow, and also Beaver Creek. We will be renewing the grants.

Chris—one of the things that this program brings is a longer timeline that allows us to get better success on these projects. I encourage folks if you want to build on a restoration project or easement, there is an opportunity to connect with some longer-term funding for riparian restoration. We are happy to partner with Centennial/319 funds on other projects.

Presentation—Ryan Houston, Executive Director Deschutes Watershed Council: The Deschutes Partnership

Derek—the Deschutes went through years of trying to figure out how to organize, and they found a way that worked for them. They are also a model watershed with BEF.

Robert—there are a great example of how to do this kind of work; it has been a great learning experience

Ryan—we have been working with BEF since 2007; I think that fundamentally, we are dealing with the same kinds of challenges, although we are at different phases, and we have the opportunity to learn from each other. I will be focusing on the way that our partnership developed, and also how it is structured. Have a few publications that I really find useful; have pdf and hard copies will leave with you. It is important to remember that we are here because it serves our interest.

We had a catalytic event about 10 years ago, relicensing of three dams required fish reintroduction Whychus Creek, about 40 miles, mouth in Deschutes River, has federal land in upstream area; about 45% of the steelhead run in the Upper Deschutes historically came into this basin. Bull trout in the basin

Using reintroduction as a catalyst to get people on board to move forward: 10-J species under ESA means about 10 years of breathing room before ESA enforcement. We were facing many of the same types of challenges that you have seen, including passage barriers, unscreened diversions, dewatered streams, channelization, habitat degradation, floodplain development

Our Goal: to restore the conditions necessary to support successful reintroduction—and we spent about 2 years coming up with this phrase. We are not judging success based on whether the fish come back; we are focused on the conditions, but we can't control all the things affecting fish; successful reintroduction can interface well with other values in the region, economy, agriculture, jobs, etc. Gives clarity on goal and helps to stay focused

We Needed: \$30,000,000

- Agree on narrowly defined goal
- Establish a small group of implementing organizations

- Develop an integrated strategy—mutual trust and follow through
- Increase capacity and funding
 - Leads to Achieve Outcomes:
 - Stream flow
 - Habitat
 - Passage
 - Screening, Plus...
 - Monitoring
 - Communication

Has been very successful, funders have indicated that they like it when we come together, and they give more money to the whole than to individual organizations

Implementing organizations—concentric circles approach. Outer circle: Community at large, Middle circle: “water world” stakeholders; inner circle: implementing organizations: Deschutes River Conservancy, Deschutes Land Trust, Upper Deschutes Watershed Council. Whoever is engaged in very specific work on the ground addressing the limiting factors leading to success and they are willing to work together, these are the implementing organizations.

Conflicts arise when a group has asked “why aren’t we in the implementing organization circle?”, but we have worked to make sure that all interests are represented

It’s okay if people aren’t in the room if what is happening doesn’t meet that organization’s purpose; concept that we need to be very specific about our niches and what we’re talking about.

Implementing Organization

- Commitment to identified goal
 - Has to be a primary purpose of the organization
 - Okay to not do everything all the time in all places in order to be committed to the goal
- Relationship with Key stakeholders
 - Need to maintain relationships with the key stakeholders who are not in the room
- Leader in a specific technical niche(s)
 - Can only have one leader per niche, and you have to stay there, removing mission creep—biggest maintenance piece over time, need to avoid competitive world where we are competing for the same resources, have to build trust, very critical piece
- Plays well in the sandbox

Delegation model to allow things to work efficiently

Integration: operate like a large business that has different departments, stay separate and have partners, maintain cultures and organizational styles of the different organizations; have one lead in each area, except community engagement, where we all share the message across a broader audience.

Having defined niches allows speaking more freely because everyone knows the boundaries of where they are working.

Hurdles

- Historic mission creep
- Institutional pride
- Personalities
- Staff turnover
- Short-term investment vs. long-term return
- Unequal perception of opportunity
- Perceived loss of control

Lessons

- Clear incentives
 - Better outcomes, better bragging rights, increased funding

- Carefully defined near-term purpose
 - “conditions necessary to support successful reintroduction”
- Small geographic scale—focus on specific area(s)
- Focus on outcomes and strategy...not projects
 - Measurable indicators of success
- Niche clarity
 - Focus on the core competencies of the key implementing organizations

Jason Lundgren—is there a tribal component to the coordination/funding?

Ryan—in the watershed they aren’t doing the work, they are on the boards of the different organizations, are involved at the board level and at an advisory level

Chris—niche clarity is difficult here; landowner clarity isn’t there either

Discussion—how to find niches when multiple organizations are doing the same types of work, how to move forward, liability, how the liability legislation in Oregon works

Ryan—prefer to be blunt with people and let them know that rivers are dynamic and that what we do will occur within that reality

Derek—really appreciate what BEF has set up to allow this kind of collaboration and sharing across watersheds.

Next MRC: August 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.