

Methow Restoration Council

March 19, 2013

Participants:

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Allen Lebovitz	WDNR
Amanda Barg	WDFW
Brandon Rogers	Yakama Nation
Brian Fisher	MSRF
Char Schumacher	Okanogan County
Charlie Snow	WDFW
Chris Butler	Yakama Nation
Chris Johnson	MSRF
Chuck Peven	RTT
Crystal Elliot	Herrera Environmental
Derek Van Marter	UCSRB
Don Phillips	Local Landowner
Gardner Johnston	InterFluve
Hans Smith	Yakama Nation
Jarred Johnson	Yakama Nation
Jeri Timm	WWP-TU
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
Joy Juelson	UCSRB
Julie Grialou	Methow Conservancy
Lee Bernheisel	Okanogan Wilderness League
Lee Hatcher	Methow Watershed Council
Lynda Hofmann	WDFW
Michael Notaro	Watershed Resource Solutions
Robes Parrish	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Terri Williams	Okanogan Conservation District

Meeting Notes:

Derek Van Marter—UCSRB Update: Regarding House bill 1194, on landowner liability legislation, it passed the house, and now it is in the senate. It's in the justice committee. The UCSRB directors are planning for their annual trips to Portland and DC to meet with elected officials and agency representatives. They will send the message on progress in habitat restoration, efforts on forest health through a collaborative process.

Hans Smith—Universal Signage Plan from Yakama Nation: We identified a need throughout the Upper Columbia (UC) for signage to notify the public that habitat restoration is under way, thoughts on river safety, thoughts on interacting with other subbasins. The goal is to fulfill outreach and hazard notification requirements and keep a unified approach throughout the UC. Our objectives are to create a common set of signs to be used between implementers and between subbasins to have consistency.

(PowerPoint: Proposed Sign example) Timeline: we hope to have a signage team in each subbasin after these WAT meetings, begin working in April, with outreach to landowners, checking sign ordinances, erect signs in May, reconvene at the end of the summer to identify potential improvements, discuss additional needs, etc.

We are considering a press release on the signage campaign. YN will produce initial signs and start putting them up in May. I think it is a doable timeline. We have almost 50 locations proposed for Methow Subbasin, have identified landowners; also for other subbasins.

DNR's attorney general has said that if there are known, latent risks from manmade structures, we need a public safety analysis to determine if site specific sign or additional info is needed. May be able to use unique QR codes that direct readers to Web-based, site-specific info that can be updated relatively easily; we may also need signs on some structures to satisfy DNR.

Next steps—look at proposed locations, identify landowners, divide responsibility, identify who will pay for which costs associated with individual signs, monitoring and maintenance.

Derek—YN will pay for the costs associated with producing the signs this year?

Hans—the signs, yes, but not necessarily the kiosks or other holders. But the aluminum signs, yes.

Derek—you should also talk about maintenance.

Chris Johnson—are there other opportunities to include costs on additional educational materials? Signs specifically about biology and intent of projects?

Discussion—may be site specific on additional information, QR codes, uniformity of the sign, sign universal, kiosk isn't, dual sided possibilities, managing color scheme

Hans Smith and Gardner Johnston: Presentation—Use of Large Wood for Habitat Restoration

Hans—YN asked InterFluve to come up with a white paper on the most current literature, information on use of large wood.

Gardner Johnston—this is an overview of main topics in the paper, won't detail the ecological function and role of wood; I assume the audience is familiar. Looking at the current status of wood, restoration approaches to compensate for the lack, short term-approaches. Design requires extensive investigative work by interdisciplinary teams, coordination with stakeholders.

Factors affecting large wood availability

- Source—what's available in riparian areas and floodplains
- Recruitment—are processes for recruiting wood intact?
- Retention—are processes for retaining wood in the channel intact?

Historical Wood Quantities

- Little direct evidence
- Historical photos and maps
- Snagging records
- Anecdotal accounts
- Existing “analog” conditions—one of the main ways; there are few true analogs left because of the way we've managed forests, land use

Martin Fox at UW did a big effort to determine analogs for different regions of the state; different criteria are used by different groups/agencies, based on diameter and length. NMFS threshold of 20 pieces per mile is likely low.

History of Wood Management

- Riparian clearing,
- Log drives, logs floated down to the mills, blast log jams out to use the river as a transport corridor, close side channels, straighten channels
- Channel alterations, for aesthetics, agricultural development, create efficient transport channel

- Direct wood removal, for safety, protect infrastructure, help “fish passage”

Existing Large Wood Conditions (based on Reach Assessments, FS stream surveys, etc)

- 8% adequate (20 pieces or more per mile)
- 51% unacceptable
- 41% at risk

Effects to Aquatic habitat:

- Channel simplification
- Lack of pools
- Lack of overhead cover
- Lack of velocity refuge
- Lack of gravel retention, bar formation
- Lack of hydraulic complexity
- Altered bank erosion processes

Existing Riparian Conditions

- 19% unacceptable
- 35% at risk
- 46% adequate
- Have areas of permanently impaired conditions
- Areas that can be restored but will take decades or centuries to recovery

Existing Recruitment

- Bank stability/channel migration (REI metric): 24% unacceptable, 35% adequate, 41% at risk for ability to recruit wood
- Armoring prevents recruitment
- Channelization prevents retention
- Need adequate sizes for retention; key pieces are needed to self-stabilize and form log jams; don't have the same size trees as in the past

Future Outlook

- Future riparian source areas, many protected and growing back, but will take time
- Future recruitment and retention—many areas will be unlikely
- Continued safety and risk concerns—wood still being removed in the NW

Restoration Needs

- Improve future wood sources
- Improve recruitment and retention
 - Remove bank armoring and levees
 - Address incision
 - Place jams to increase lateral channel dynamics, split flow and channel complexity
 - Install key pieces and jams to collect additional wood
- Increase LW quantities until long-term processes restoration can take effect—and to mitigate for permanently altered processes
 - Install LW jams

Effectiveness of LW Projects

- Reviews and meta-analysis show that LW provides habitat and/or fish benefits
 - Roni (2001) and Roni et al (2008)
 - Smokerowski and Pratt (2007)
 - Whiteway et al (2010)
- Physical response easier to measure than biological response

- Failure rates
 - Review of studies back to 1956, many based on whether structures fail, not necessarily the best way, should be whether you meet your objectives
 - About 75% success
 - Newer techniques have lower failure rates

Assessment and Design

- Interdisciplinary approach
- Multiple scales
- Trib and reach assessments: technical foundation
- Restoration strategy: limiting factors, performance targets, project identification, project prioritization
- Site analysis and design: survey, data collection, hydraulics, geomorph, design plans, tech specs, permits

Design Criteria

- Measurable objectives that guide the design process
- Developed in coordination with stakeholders
- Criteria consist of :
 - Habitat objectives
 - Permit requirements
 - Landowner/stakeholder requirements
 - Risk and safety considerations

Derek—how at odds are the four criteria?

Gardner—think in most cases they can be worked out, get stakeholders involved early, a lot of stakeholder education. In the end there are often things that prevent the ideal situation, but in other cases not.

Chris J—the more recreational use, the higher the density, the more conflicts

Derek—will there be a release of the white paper?

Hans—it is in final editing; we will release on our web site and send an announcement to MRC

Allen Lebovitz—volume of the material is also important in addition to numbers of pieces

Gardner—true, and we don't have wood of the historic size any more

Discussion—designing structure to meet volume targets, ELJs can make up for lack of volume

Chuck Peven: Presentation—Updated Biological Strategy

Chuck—the RTT has been revising the Biological Strategy; we started in 2011; recently we agreed that it is ready for distribution, will send it out later today.

Structure is similar to the past, but there are a few additions. The appendices are different than in the past. Added advice on how to use the document; I recommend reading the background information in Sections 1-3, examining Appendix E, and becoming familiar with the new scoring criteria.

In Table 3, we listed all of the assessment units, which we hope to serve as a standardized list. We also put together information on completed assessments.

Appendix D defines the necessary components of an assessment.

Changes: better define prioritization, updated technical appendices, defined process-based restoration. Changed how we categorized existing habitat; RTT has deemphasized current conditions so that projects that are proposed in habitat that is not currently functioning well do not get a reduced priority rating, used intrinsic potential instead.

Discussion—river mile systems, variance between different systems, tables in the revised strategy have river miles from different sources

Priority Areas, similar as before, but not difference in points

Priority Actions: protection: tier 1 and 2, considerations not tied to the scoring as much as initially proposed

Restoration—Tier 1 and 2; 1 restores process, 2 short term fixes that may increase habitat complexity

Tier 1 is a preference if possible, if can't then Tier 2; Table 5 captures some of that tied to ecological concerns (new term for limiting factors). Sometimes you can't do the Tier 1 action, and sometimes Tier 2 makes more sense.

Chuck—we are hoping to help project proponents understand the foundation of strategy.

For each assessment units, put in priority order, and gave priority for ecological concerns. For protection projects, broke them into tiers

Robes Parrish—is the priority order lumped for steelhead and Chinook?

Chuck—yes, in general, identified where you will get more bang for your buck

Chris J—are the objectives ordered by which are functioning the best?

Chuck—no; the first objective is the one that is functioning the worst

Julie Grialou—if you are doing a combined restoration and protection project, then it seems like you would be pairing priority 1s for restoration and tier 2 and 3s for protection.

Chuck—ecological concerns are relative to each other in a row

Julie—is there another place that prioritizes assessment unit?

Chuck—the assessment units are in priority order

Derek—which review criteria would the RTT use in a combined project?

Chuck—the restoration criteria, but the protection action would give the highest score for longevity

Discussion—how the priority areas were determined, partially based on intrinsic potential, benefit to multiple species at multiple life stages, partially, also based on knowledge of the areas, data

Derek—in the past, there was information on how this was determined

Chuck—we do talk about the definition of priority areas in there

Allen—where does this fit in terms of where to go first for restoration?

Chuck—more for where you are going to get the most improved habitat

Lee Bernheisel—it seems like it would be easier to work with public agencies first, is there anything in there that recognizes that it might be cheaper to work with public agencies?

Chuck—that is beyond the scope of this, more on the geomorphology and biology

Julie—what about the numbers on the different rows, in terms of where to do the project, where should we start? Is a number 6 in a higher level assessment unit preferable to a number 1 on a lower level assessment unit?

Chuck—no—better to do the number 1; Appendix E and the reach assessments will give more guidance

Robes—is there any attempt to track over time that would give understanding of why you can't do a higher priority ecological concern?

Chuck—guidance is that if you can't follow the advice we give you, then explain why; information is much more detailed in Appendix E

Appendix B includes all ecological concerns, even those that aren't relevant to Upper Columbia

Appendix C gives information on how scores will be evaluated for intrinsic potential for spring Chinook and for steelhead

Appendix D definitions and use of Assessments

Appendix E—Assessment Unit detailed summary, description, and priority reaches and actions

Appendix F—data gap identification and prioritization; if you are proposing an assessment may want to look here

Chris J—do you have a definition of a rapid reach assessment?

Chuck—yes; it should not be used in place of a full RA; may provide a basic geomorphic context for a project that has already received universal support and is commonly accepted as a priority within a the basin enabling the project to proceed on an expedited basis; can be used to evaluate the need and/or level of effort required for a larger RA

Discussion—when to use the rapid RA, may work when the landowner opportunity is there out of sequence, will depend on the priority, big difference is the level of modeling effort.

Discussion—ecological processes; process based restoration

Gardner—can think of it in terms of symptoms-based vs. source-based

Robes Parrish: Presentation—USFWS-NRCS Habitat Restoration Program

Over the last two years the program has undergone some changes, we now have the habitat restoration team/design team: Robes, Peter Jenkins, Joe Lange; jointly funded by USFWS, NRCS, BPA; value added, much simpler to access than traditional design only proposals, a turn-key group. We have a process by which sponsors can access the team for design for restoration projects. The RFP is only 2 pages.

Chris J—does that imply that USFWS does not want to be a partner for implementing?

Robes—no, this is more for larger, phased projects, allows us to do bigger things, this is like step 1, no intention to limit participation in implementation; however, implementation dollars are currently on the chopping/whittling block due to budget problems.

Prefer to work on:

- Migration barriers
- Screening and irrigation infrastructure
- Riparian enhancement/establishment
- Channel reconstruction
- Side channels and floodplain connectivity
- Large wood and complexity
- Sediment retention
- Water quality/quantity

Brian Fisher—prioritized list?

Robes—no, only to the extent that it is prioritized in the biological strategy

We would rather not work on

- Bank revetment
- Nutrient enhancement
- Projects with major human infrastructure constraints (like major highways; grey term)

Successful applications will

- Benefit biOp species (Chinook, steelhead)
- Be in priority reaches (per Biological Strategy)
- Provides BPA with mitigation credit (direct benefits to survival)
- Targets ecological concerns in EP gap analysis

Prefer to work in areas with a completed RA, but not required, must have considerable supporting information

RFP, Kate will send out, due April 11th; we would like to do work in the Methow in 2013. From the proposals we will develop a ranked list, then the list will be approved by BPA and UCSRB, sponsors will be notified by April 19th. This will give time to put into regular SRFB round if not selected. Successful projects will get started on right away. Will be some RTT review at initial project development phase, then 60%, final. Then project will move to SRFB/Trib/Targeted/Other for implementation funding.

Discussion—types of projects/scope

Robes—not sure what our limitations are at this point, would expect to spend more time at fewer projects, don't think a more complex project is a deterrent. Also, projects that appear small can balloon, can help to shape design as well, so you don't need to have a concrete design idea for proposal.

Brian—do you offer construction support too?

Robes—yes, hope to do this and follow through with that and monitoring

Joy Juelson—what is the funding amount/how many proposals do you think to take on?

Robes—the contract with BPA is somewhat flexible, currently is 3-5, currently being renewed right now.

Chris J—are you looking to prioritize the same areas that Reclamation and YN are in, or are you looking at other areas?

Robes—we want to be additive, not crowd, but shouldn't preclude those areas. If you think we can be additive within those areas, then we would be interested.

Terry—what is the schedule for other years as to which watersheds you are looking at?

Robes—not set, have some ideas, designs are not always done in one year, would prefer to keep working in the Methow, but not able to dictate priorities

Kate Terrell will send out the RFP form in the next day or so, hope to get them back quickly.

Joy Juelson—SRFB/Trib Funding Update: we used to have three Lead Entities, as of January 1st, it was consolidated into a single lead entity housed at UCSRB, Joy is the LE Coordinator; she has been LE Coordinator previously for Chelan County. Primary task is help project sponsors negotiate the funding process, coordinate the citizens committees, coordinate with the RTT. Counties have retained outreach tasks. Have just kicked off the 14th funding round, if you are planning to participate give Joy your email so she can send updates. On May 7th, the Draft proposal is due, final proposal due July 12th. We had our annual debrief meeting on February 21st, talked about concerns, solutions. Got comments, will incorporate as appropriate. Next week on Monday, RCO has an online webinar on filling out applications, will be fairly detailed. On the 27th is the annual kickoff meeting, highly recommend. Will be looking at updates to regional and state process, Chuck will go through new scoring criteria, Becky from the Trib Committee will be there, will also be taking a straw poll on projects. The kickoff will be at the Chelan Fire hall from 10-3. We are also looking at ways to provide sponsors with the most recent science data. Looking at a number of ways, including an annual informal science workshop for sponsors, would like it to be in February, hoping for that for next year. This year it will be in June, but we will have a webinar on April 4th for some recent data, will send out information on that. It will be in Wenatchee at the Confluence Technology Center, and available via Webinar.

Habitat Work Schedule—Theo Burgoon is data steward on point for the HWS; working to update all of the projects from last year into the system (due March 31st). Also have a report due, have to come up with metrics for past projects and is contacting sponsors on that.

Roundtable

Terri Williams—Okanogan Conservation District: we have a few programs available—still looking for CREP participants, funding is from FSA, is a reserve type program, can be for riparian projects along creeks, landowners receive a payment. Contact Bob Clark. Also have irrigation efficiencies project for converting hand and wheel lines to pivots, saved water converted back to the screen. We also have a round of implementation funding for livestock projects, riparian plantings, off-channel watering, small amounts of funding.

Have a couple of energy projects, like pipe repairs, sprinkler nozzles, anything that would reduce the amount of work, primarily for hay and pasture folks. We are also working with DNR on their firewise program, doing assessments for firewise fuel reduction. Also working on any screening projects, working with the tribes and the UCSRB, 130 fish screens scheduled for the Okanogan. Contact Terri for questions on any of these programs.

Chris J—any screens on Columbia mainstem?

Terri—we don't have the Bridgeport side, we have the Brewster side; don't think we have any in the Columbia

Hans Smith—Yakama Nation: we are looking at doing some design work on two projects on the Twisp this year, one just above the bridge at RM 0.5, and the other just above the first Poorman Creek bridge

Jeri Timm—Trout Unlimited: we are still working through the MVID alternatives, more will be coming out

Lee B—is there updated info on the web site?

Jeri—Katherine will be working on it, likely after the next public meeting

Salmon Safe funding has gone down for TU, still active with existing farms, new farms are being directed to partner in the Yakima Basin, will have a dinner this year. In NCW have around 13 farms, a new winery in Chelan will be going through evaluation.

Lynda Hofmann—WDFW: I will be doing the HPAs for WDFW in the Methow, contact me early and often

Brian Fisher—Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation: we have two construction projects at the WDFW M2 property across from the airport, will be going out to bid this week

Chris Johnson—we are getting ready on the WDFW project levee removal and large wood project; there will be a fair amount of activity, can have guided tours, but hope that people will avoid the construction site during the work. At Whitefish island we put about 27 separate wood structures in, we are anticipating high water, making sure community knows that we are watching and monitoring, will have signage at the site.

Will also be doing the Beaver Creek irrigation weirs project this fall, and the delayed Upper Beaver Creek complexity project is on for this year.

Amanda Barg—WDFW: I work for WDFW on screening in the Methow and some in the Okanogan. Working primarily on gravity diversions, doing weekly inspections, maintenance O&M, also money for capital projects, includes permitting, design, implementation.

Robes Parrish—USFWS: we have been funded through Trib Comm small projects to do preliminary data collection at Silver, also pursuing some sort of RA with the Bureau and other partners for the Twisp to Carlton reach. Rob Richardson will be doing a sort of rapid reach assessment of sorts, will see what other data collection will be needed.

Julie—when would you do the RA?

Robes—depends on who wants to fund it. If you have ideas on what you think should go into that, let Robes know.

Derek—I think that it would be good to do assessment at Silver, but agree that it would be best to do the whole reach from Twisp to Carlton.

Next MRC April 16th

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
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act
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")
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
WDNR	Washington Department of Natural Resources
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.