

## Methow Restoration Council

July 21, 2015

### Participants:

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Amy Martin	Okanogan Conservation District
Brian Fisher	MSRF
Chris Johnson	MSRF
Chuck Peven	RTT
Derek Van Marter	UCSRB
Hans Smith	Yakama Nation
Jarred Johnson	Yakama Nation
Jennifer Molesworth	Reclamation
Jeri Timm	WWP-TU
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
Jude Trapani	Reclamation
George Schneider	George Schneider & Assoc.
Jarred Johnson	Yakama Nation
Natalie Kuehler	National Forest Foundation
Paul Wagner	Colville Tribes
Rosy Mazaika	BPA
Ryan Bellmore	USGS

### Meeting Notes:

**Derek Van Marter – UCSRB Update:** we did a flight with LightHawk, an organization that does flights to highlight conservation issues. We did a flight about a month ago; we flew over the Frazer creek area, the burn, down valley, Whitefish, 1890s Side Channel, and we flew over the Forest Service Mission project area. We did two flights; the first we had Wenatchee World taking photos and the second one we had North 40 taking videos. We have a post on our Web site. If you have an interest in photos/videos from that flight, let me know. We will probably be doing another flight over the Wenatchee soon to illustrate low water there.

Chris Johnson – Joy had contacted us about a possible second flight?

Derek – it would be good to group sites with other project sponsors

Chris – would be good for people to know that it is coming up or is a possibility

Derek – we have another grant opportunity for the outreach grant, Okanogan County. The project has to add value to lead entity process and relate to salmon recovery. Joy will bring more information in August. On a related note, the timing of the outreach corresponds with the new biennium. The Legislature decided on the budget; we needed 22 million, unfortunately, we got 16 million for salmon recovery, so this year's grant round is 18 million, but next year it will be less. How much less depends on a number of factors. Project dollars are going down. This year there are only two projects on the list from the Methow, none in the Okanogan. RTT has done their process; the next step is the Citizens' Advisory Committee evaluation. 2.6 million is the total ask to SRFB, obviously not all will be funded. Citizen's Committee recruitment is coming up – we will need two new members on the Chelan committee and one on the Okanogan committee. There will be an initial call out to the WATs for nominations, then those will be presented to the county commissioners in each county, the commissioners will weigh in and make a recommendation, and then the UCSRB board will make a selection.

Derek – the Implementation Team meeting will be on September 8<sup>th</sup>; we will bring in some speakers, “where do we go from here’ will be the theme. Also the AFS annual meeting is August 16-20 in Portland. Finally, our adaptive management/science conference that we do every five years will be January 27-28<sup>th</sup> in Wenatchee at the PAC.

Chuck – I had a question from Kate Puckett at the Bureau about whether we had plans for a synopsis like we did last time.

Derek – last time there was a substantial adaptive management process, the RTT did an analysis workshop, had a report on the findings. This time will be different. There will be abstracts and proposals, the synthesis part we haven’t talked about in detail, but we are planning on doing something to document it. It will not as substantial as last time.

Chris – should we be looking for ways to fill the upcoming holes in the SRFB allocation?

Derek – it is important for our legislature to hear from you; state match for the federal funds that come in are critical

Chris – would be good to have a dollar figure that we can work towards

Derek – I can do that and bring it to the August MRC

**Chuck Peven – RTT Scoring:** RTT met on July 8<sup>th</sup> to score the SRFB proposals; there were ten of us. We started with 13 or 14 projects, it was whittled down to 10 by the time of scoring. The average benefit score is done with criteria from Appendix C in Biological Strategy. Each RTT member provides a score and then they are averaged for each project. We have a process to give cost benefit, which is only 5% of the total score. We only do the cost benefit on the SRFB request, but the CAC requested a cost benefit on the total project cost. When we looked at total cost, only two projects in the Wenatchee switched positions.

Julie Grialou – in the past it seemed like we got a biological score and a breakdown of the risk, and then the total score.

Derek – we used to have certainty of success as a separate part, and in the revised scoring they are combined.

Chuck – threat is one of the criteria for protection projects now. Have a regression showing the cost request vs. benefit score. The closer to the line the closer to average cost benefit.

We also provided comments; some projects will have additional comments, but the format generally standardizes comments to the sponsors.

Chris – it is helpful to have this prior to the CAC; the comments help us to prepare for that.

Chuck – often not a lot of comments is a good sign.

#### **Jude Trapani and Rosy Mazaika – Expert Panel Update:**

Jude – we are here to give a brief update on the Expert Panel process. We would like to focus on the things that will be a little bit different this time around. The process will probably be in the spring for the Upper Columbia. One thing that helps is that to realize that the expert panel is the tool to evaluate everything that we do together that falls under the FCRPS BiOp. How do we show that we are putting that money to benefit? The next cycle is coming up in 2016. We will convene the expert panel in the Upper Columbia, which will include the RTT and people in the watershed. We will evaluate the projects that we’ve done – that is where we get the pie maps. We will have some tools to look at the science that has come out in the last few years so that we can utilize it.

Derek – people in the MRC have been involved in developing the look back and look forward lists.

Jude – the problem in the past was how to evaluate the benefit of the money spent on the habitat work; this is how they came up with the expert panel process. The idea was to get the people on the ground to help evaluate the benefits. We would then compile the information into reports for NOAA. The

expert panel developed the watershed breaks, and then the idea is to identify the ecological concerns and develop activities that target those ECs.

The expert panel process happened in 2009 and 2012, next is 2016. We will have two sessions – one is a look back and one is a look forward.

Rosy – the current BiOp is through 2018, so we wanted to capture as much of the construction work as we can for the reporting for 2016, 2017, & 2018. The long window in 2012-2018 was hard, this shorter window of three years should be easier.

Jude – this time we are going to document the discussion better with notes

Rosy – what the 2014 BiOp did was a better connection between the habitat work and the RME, one of NOAA's recommendations was to do a better job of incorporating the science

Jude – the idea of science is that it guides what we are doing; process of adaptive management is supposed to be rolled up in how we do things, so Expert Panel is hoping to capture that benefit and the science.

Expert Panel happens in seven areas in the Columbia Basin. Schedule: We are planning from now through October 2015. October through December: Look back workshops. January through May 2016 Look forward workshops.

Chris – how does the look back work?

Jude – we are taking construction year 2012 through 2015, project name and metric that will tie into one of the limiting factors in one of the assessment units.

Chuck – and the Expert Panel determines the percentage of improvement

Jude – we are compiling the project lists now; Jennifer Molesworth, Steve Kolk, Joy Juelson, James White, and others are helping to assemble the project lists; we will also use HWS.

Ryan Bellmore – often, even when we have a robust monitoring programs, we find that it is more complex and difficult to identify the fish response magnitude. So how do you do this across many projects?

Jude – you bring up the debate that happened at the 2007 conference. One of the things that came out was that since fish response/survival benefit is so hard, we use habitat as a surrogate. Then they decided to use the local expert process, each assessment unit has a weight of limiting factors, and then as actions happens, the local experts give their opinion on how that improved the survival. This is what we have until the science catches up. The hope is that in the next consultation the science will be more useful to help evaluate, but the expert panel process is the fall back.

Rosy – one of the things that we would like to have is a discussion on what a new process would look like.

Chuck – weren't CHaMP and ISEMP, developed to try to answer those questions, and EDT and Ryan's program can work together to try to answer those questions?

Rosy – that will probably start with the look forward on the assessment units and the limiting factors.

Jude – we are looking to find efficiencies in how we assess the process

Derek – there is a lot to be said for the inefficiencies and deficiencies in the Expert Panel process, but the challenge will always be how to translate fish habitat improvement into fish survival; we will always be facing that problem

Jude – this is the best that we have now, and we may continue with it through the next BiOp

Jennifer Molesworth – is this process going to feed into the next BiOp? Is that coming soon?

Rosy – all of this will roll up in to the implementation plan and the next BiOp, but one of the unanswered questions is whether we would start over with a new BiOp to get a fresh baseline, or whether we would roll forward.

Derek – we also need to see what the new judge's philosophy is on habitat in the upper tributaries.

Rosy – project summary sheets will help us with the people who haven't been to the project sites

Jennifer – when are the summary sheets due?

Jude – if it is in HWS, it is already there. We hope to have the project lists soon; working with Sitka to get those put in to the database.

Rosy – we are working on developing the schedule now; watersheds will be able to review the lists when they come out

Jude – in the next generation we are hopeful to have better tools for people to utilize

Discussion – HWS, use it as a reference

Jude – the idea is that we have the information so that everyone can look at the project and evaluate it; if we need to go further than HWS, we can help with that

Derek – HWS captures pretty much everything; the projects through 2013 have been QAQC'd

Jude – pie maps, the thermometer bar on the left of the pie map the width of the bar and the size of the pie is reflective of the weight of importance for the fish

Rosy – we are trying to focus on the assessment units where the work was done and the limiting factors that were addressed to make it less messy

Derek – this is a dramatic improvement from the tables.

Rosy – framework document for incorporating science is put together in “Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation (RM&E) Habitat Information Resources for [Upper Columbia Spring Chinook]” and we will have a separate chapter for each species. Everything we are developing is for the remand process in the court.

Jude – we have the percent Habitat Quality Improvements (HQIs) for projects completed through 2011 and projected through 2018.

Discussion – target percentage improvements in this BiOp, varying targets by sub-basin, how the targets were determined, may be revisited in the next BiOp, jeopardy vs. recovery and reconciliation

Jude – the Expert Panel model doesn't evaluate one project at a time, you look at each project in an assessment unit that addressed a given ecological concern. You then have to estimate the benefit of those collective activities

Discussion – FCRPS Biop is not the same as the Recovery Plan, the expert panel process look back is focused on the projects that were funded/supported by the action agencies. Recovery vs. Jeopardy, mitigation goals vs. recovery goals, identifying recovery goals really is NOAA's responsibility

Jennifer – it would be good if protection could count for credit in the next BiOp

Chuck – monitoring and evaluation should also be something that you get credit for

Jude – there has been recent litigation on the FCRPS consultation

Rosy – we were in court in June, and Judge Simon heard the plaintiffs' arguments for the first time, he had some outstanding questions on the survival tables, so the action agencies prepared a brief, also the State of Oregon filed a brief of the court. Last week the judge toured the lower Granite Dam. Tributary habitat didn't get a lot of attention paid during the hearing, focus more on the estuary and calculations of survival. We expect a decision in the fall. What Jude and I are doing is getting information to help build the administrative record for the process. Also the adequacy of the NEPA is questioned.

Discussion – the decision could affect how we move forward with projects

## **Roundtable**

Jennifer Molesworth – Bureau of Reclamation: we've got RPA 56, this week and last week we've had our Reclamation fish crew from Denver Technical Services Center (TSC), MSRF, Reclamation Boise, and USGS was here last week to work on monitoring for our M2 projects. A huge data collection effort in the Methow River. I got to snorkel 5 miles of the river last Friday. It was very rewarding to see the number of fish that are using our projects. If you want to see juvenile fish, go to one of our structures.

Brian – compared to earlier snorkels I did with USGS, the differences with spring Chinook distribution, especially with the structures that have the finer materials.

Chuck – not as many o. Mykiss in the structures?

Brian – depends on time of year. Mykiss are really small and hard to see this time of year, and they are mostly in the channel margins

Jennifer – also hard to know if the fish are fatter and happier, if there are more of them, or if they are just attracted to the structures. Also saw a lot of bull trout, which really surprised me.

Brian – talking with John Crandall, it seemed like our Chinook count was about double our previous high

Jennifer – Beaver Creek, last year we had the fires and debris flows, and now I am seeing salmon in the creek by my house, wouldn't have expected it so soon. Hardly any water is getting out at the bottom, so habitat features upstream and the really deep pools are really important for the creek.

Everybody should go snorkeling. You learn a lot

Chuck Peven – RTT: I will be presenting to CAC for Chelan County tonight and on Thursday here in the Methow. There are going to be some interesting presentations in August and September. ISEMP and CHaMP are going to roll out some of their products and present them at one of our monthly meetings, some in August and some in September. Ryan, Joe Benjamin, and Kate Puckett will be presenting on their work in September on the 12<sup>th</sup> at the USFS Office on Melody Lane. We are also talking about a presentation on EDT, and the Upper Methow Reach Assessment coming up. Last year we organized a number of workshops, and would like to pursue one on hatchery RME work.

Jennifer – those workshops were really great

Chuck – we were really fortunate to get some of those folks; some talk of doing one on riparian too. Let me know of any other ideas.

Jarred Johnson– YN: I have update from Chris Butler for the Chewuch projects: RM 13-15 (Kysar & Koistinen is the contractor) will be completed by the end of this week. Will do replanting in the fall. They found a buried temp logger in a piece of PVC pipe, so if you are missing one call Chris Butler. On the Chewuch River Right project (BCI is the contractor), work should be done by August. They are done with all the instream log placements but need to add vertical piles for ballast. Also just finished the Eightmile barrier assessment, should be ready this fall.

Brian Fisher – MSRF: on the Twisp Floodplain project, we are planning on going to bid at the end of the month. We are also just starting working with UCSRB, USGS, BPA, and Reclamation on the Barkley Bear project. We will be working with Ryan on validating the model and using it as a trial run to help inform project development.

Hans Smith – YN: Fender Mill is starting tomorrow, project will go through October, all permits are in place. Pipkin is the contractor. The Upper Methow RA is in draft phase, will be done by the end of the year. A big document, and a big, complex chunk of river.

Signage – restoration information signs went up – two on the Chewuch, two on the Methow, will do one in Twisp and one at the KOA

Chris – and we have two that are going in in Winthrop before the fall

Hans – Jarred and I are working on a lot of projects up the Twisp River for next year in the Middle Twisp RA area, doing a lot of landowner outreach. We got funding from PRCC to do fish monitoring at 1890s. Need to talk to Ryan about getting coverage on take to do the monitoring, it is in the M2, consistent with the rest of the monitoring going on.

Ryan Bellmore – USGS: I was up last week working with Reclamation and MSRF and others to reinstate some of the fish sampling in the M2 reach trying to monitor responses to these restoration actions. Also trying to develop tools that can help with decision support to help inform what designs might give us the biggest ecological response, and then we monitor that and re-inform the model and come up with a

more predictive future model. And then we can use it to make predictions on what we think the response was from restoration that has already done. Finally, we will start using the tools to start making predictions on how different locations would respond to attempts to alleviate limiting factors to help us prioritize where on the landscape to put these restoration actions. We will be presenting in September to the RTT.

Jeri Timm – TU: MVID is on schedule and individual wells are going in, West pump in under construction and West pipe going in. Permits going in for Barkley, scheduled for fall 2016 construction.

Drought – we are focusing on Yakima basin, but let us know if landowners come in with questions.

Jennifer – is there a watershed assessment for Beaver Creek?

Jeri – we hired a consultant to look at the work that had been done in Beaver Creek – really high level, summarizes what has been done and also what other work has been out. Will send the assessment to Jessica for distribution if people are interested.

Amy Martin – OCD: I will be working on water quality and riparian improvement in Okanogan County, have been with the Conservation District for about three months.

We have been doing a lot of Carlton Complex recovery efforts, got some fencing up, will be applying for stream related recovery this fall, have been working with landowners. If there is some gap, we will be working on that. Emergency watershed protection projects have been done, flood control structures. Have also been learning about the CREP program, which provides small compensation for landowners to maintain riparian buffers for 10-15 year contracts. Have to be active ag or potential for pasture or range, also have to have degraded riparian.

Derek – historically the reimbursement rate is too low for our area

Natalie Kuehler – National Forest Foundation: I am working on community outreach and project development for NFF in the Methow. We have the Majestic Methow campaign in the Upper Methow. We have a slew of restoration projects that we are doing, landscape level restoration. We are doing some stream restoration work, including one in Goat Creek with MSRF. We have another one with YN at Early Winters. We are also working on the Beaver Project. We are looking at how our projects can tie in with what you are doing.

Chris Johnson – MSRF: we had funding from DNR to remove debris from State Owned Aquatic Lands that ended in June; we removed the debris from last year's flood events and we removed cars from the Methow River banks. We plan to work with DNR to renew the funding, so if you know of debris to be removed, let me know.

We are working on two signs to install

We put a lock on the gate at Sugar Levee, as rafters kept leaving the gate open. It is the standard MSRF code, please lock it behind you.

Aspen Meadows moving forward, got 200 gpm from the test well, better than expected.

**Next MRC Meeting: August 18<sup>th</sup>**

<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)
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
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")
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/  
NFISH      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.