

Methow Restoration Council

May 15, 2012

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Aaron Penvose	WWP-TU
Bob Clark	Okanogan Conservation District
Bob Rose	Yakama Nation
Brian Fisher	MSRF
Char Schumacher	Okanogan County
Charlie Snow	WDFW
Chris Johnson	MSRF
Davey Lumley	Yakama Nation
Derek Van Marter	UCSRB
Don McIvor	UCSRB
Don Phillips	Local Landowner
Frank Spillar	Yakama Nation
Hans Smith	Yakama Nation
Heide Andersen	Methow Conservancy
James White	UCSRB
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
John Crandall	Wild Fish Conservancy
John Jorgensen	Yakama Nation
Julie Grialou	Methow Conservancy
Ken Bevis	WDFW
Kent Woodruff	Forest Service
Lee Bernheisel	Okanogan Wilderness League
Lee Hatcher	Methow Watershed Council
Markeyta Piukham	Yakama Nation
Michael Humling	Forest Service
Michael Notaro	Watershed Resource Solutions
Mike Brunfelt	InterFluve
Rick Alford	Yakama Nation
Tammy Swan	Yakama Nation
Tara Gregg	Wild Fish Conservancy
Theo Burgoon	UCSRB
Torre Stockard	Van Hees

Notes:

James White—UCSRB Presentation: Expert panel process overview.

There is no easy tool to measure progress in improving fish habitat. Agencies created the expert panel process to make the attempt. They started with the Delphi method, where action agencies go region by region and assemble people who are knowledgeable about the fish, and asked them of their opinion of how actions would improve conditions. Went watershed by watershed and identified limiting factors, and looked at them in terms of PFCs (properly functioning conditions). In 2006, the first group got together, but they only looked at the FCRPS projects, not the entire realm of salmon recovery. In 2009, the expert panel reconvened, and they were asked to look at their progress on their projections for improvement.

Julie Grialou—what about looking at what would happen if you do nothing?

James—natural fluctuations are normalized in the process; action agencies are only responsible for movements that they do against the background conditions. It is not a true model of the way the world

works; it's an abstraction to create an administrative way to model the effects of the actions taken by the Action Agencies.

Handout: agenda for the expert panel workshop

This time, the expert panel will be asked to look back at their 2009 forecast and assess progress. Every time they do this forecast, it is an opportunity to review the assumptions. NOAA put together a crosswalk between the limiting factors in the different recovery plans and broke them into constituent elements so that we can have a common language and be more specific. RTT is also revising the Biological Strategy, so the expert panel process and the RTT revision can use same limiting factors.

They worked at identifying all of the different assessment units in the Upper Columbia—they found that the boundaries were different in many different documents, so they worked to standardize the assessment units

Lee Bernheisel—does it include the state assessment units that define the legal units/parameters?

John Crandall—"assessment unit" is a generic term; there are a lot of different units and it is difficult to manage them

Discussion—how the different assessment units were developed, hydrologic boundaries, salmonid spawning areas, geologic boundaries, legal boundaries

James—the assessment units we have are physical process basis, ridge top to ridge top, with breaks where the conditions change. There is an attempt to have homogeneous sections

Jenny—did they split out Beaver and Bear creeks?

James—yes

James—a small workgroup convened about a year and a half ago, to get the information together for the expert panel to review. They spent about 9 months putting together monitoring data. Low bookends can be informed by monitoring data; higher bookends are a little squishy

Jenny—in addition to how far you can get, there is also the potential for backsliding, degradation, could get at that

James—protection is one of the things in the system that is normalized; BiOp rules do not allow for protection to get credit. Expert Panel process is for the FCRPS BiOp process only.

Action agencies had a spreadsheet tool that lined up the actions taken—the look back tied to the look forward from the last process to look at progress. They compared projects we actually did compared to what we thought we were going to do. This time when we do the look forward, we have to look to 2018.

The list doesn't have any funding guarantee. In 2009, BPA was still doing direct solicitation. With the current targeted solicitation process, there is a good idea of where work is going to be done and about how much; there is also the fish accords, Columbia basin water transactions, etc, so we have a better idea now of where and how much work is going to be done.

Expert Panel Workshop:

May 29th will be a half day at the Cascade Technology Center, overview/orientation web conference also available

The next two days (30-31) will be walking through line by line; it will be somewhat tedious. Anyone is welcome to observe the expert panel process. Membership on the panel has remained stable over time. They will have the core regional group who will be there the entire time, and they also will have subbasin experts who will come during their subbasin discussion. If you are on the list, come to the orientation, then Methow is the first thing on the list first thing Wednesday morning, then Okanogan is going second. Kent Woodruff—what is your role in the expert panel?

James—I am on the expert panel

Derek Van Marter—this is not an upper Columbia process, UCSRB has a role within the upper Columbia to pull it together and facilitate, but it is not our product.

James—in the Upper Columbia, the mitigation is aligned with recovery

Bob Rose—the end of the story is the habitat component of this, and to be able to attribute a mitigation credit to an improvement of survival of juvenile salmon from egg to smolt. As habitat improves, there is an improvement in survival of spring Chinook and steelhead in terms of how credits are given.

Q—Is there an effort to weight the limiting factor this go around?

James—yes, the limiting factors rating was emphasized in 2009, made some effort to address that, this time a big effort to address that and improve the weights, but never really got to a really good, perfectly repeatable way to do it. Still not a clear evaluative path, still a lot of expert opinion

Q—can we get a copy of the new assessment unit boundaries?

James—there is a draft in the new biological strategy; I can finalize and put a link on our website

John Crandall—Monitoring Update: the Methow appendix to the Monitoring Strategy (which is an appendix to the Recovery Plan) draft is underway, progress is good; it will be a big document when it is finished. It is following the Recovery Plan and some of the key management decisions, ecological concerns, and limiting factors. There are more assessment units and more ecological concerns, so we are working to make it fit the new template. It takes part of what they are doing through the expert panel; it also looks at the work that has been done, and the monitoring in that assessment unit that addresses the specific concerns. It shows that the breadth of work we have going on here is pretty amazing. We will be able to use the information in a meta analysis to look at what has been done and what still needs to be done. It is trying to tie the projects to monitoring

Chris Johnson—have you looked at ways of monitoring as a way to show the danger of short funding cycles?

John C—we are trying to find ways use monitoring to show that

Kent—what is the crosswalk with the HWS?

John C—pulled what I can from there, but HWS is not complete. It will improve over time, but it is not one stop shopping yet.

Update on monitoring projects—we have the CHaMP, which will begin by the end of the week and is Columbia basin wide. It has a well-documented and accessible protocol for habitat monitoring; they have a number of sites here, and each year they sample 25 sites in rotating panels. Last year was Year 1. They do full topo elevation models, so we want to know ahead of time where the sites are so we can tie into that. They have lot of good tools, including hydro models.

We also have Ecology's habitat monitoring program. They will be using randomly based site selection within Upper Columbia, and they wanted to notify all potential landowners, which is like 700 different landowners in the upper Columbia, even though most would never be sampled. Hopefully, we've changed their approach. This is coming this year.

Also, through the Columbia Basin Water Transaction Program, we have an accounting program to try to track the flows; they are trying to track how the saved water improves habitat. RTT's MaDMC committee reviewed the program last week.

Ken Bevis—Outreach Update: The impression in the community is that there is a lot going on with salmon recovery. It is important that we think about how we explain ourselves to the community.

Last year we did the first annual salmon celebration, and we have the second celebration planned for Sept 30th. The partners are MRC, MAA, TwispWorks, and the MV Interpretive Center. We will have the dinner part of the celebration at the interpretive center. This year we want to emphasize salmon more, the event will be earlier, we will have lights, and we estimate that we need a budget of about \$5000 total. We can have displays at TwispWorks from different groups.

National Fishing Day is June 9th, if you want to participate, contact Lynette Desjardins from USFWS. Have a new pond at the fish hatchery, will be beavers there also.

Michael Humling—the Blackpine Lake (Methow Valley School District) Conservation Ed FS trips, 1st through 3rd graders, MV, Brewster, and Pateros schools, contact Michael H ASAP if you want to help—lots of fun. At Foggy Dew campground for the other schools

John C—Watershed Watchers is happening at Twisp Ponds, a suite of programs, if you want to volunteer, talk to John or Rob Crandall

Don McIvor—we are doing outreach for proposed transition in lead entities in the upper Columbia, going to town council meetings.

John C—the Methow Fish Guide is back from peer review (from outside of the basin). It will be finalized in the next few weeks, and it will be printed by fall.

Brian Fisher—Upper M2 Update (MSRF): we have two M2 projects scheduled for this year. We put out bid packages for Whitefish Island; had good walk through with contractors on May 14, and 10 different contracting organizations showed up. We are expecting staging to start mid-July, with construction starting the first of August. We are putting off the majority of the WDFW Floodplain project until 2013 due to some landowner issues, but we are doing some wood structures on river left and removing remnants to the MVID E dam.

Chris—this will allow us another year to evaluate the river's response to the head cut from dam removal and to evaluate other features of the project. We will have a better understanding of the project going forward.

We have our final comments from the county for our DEIS and will turn it around to the county for our FEIS to allow us to complete the permitting.

The standard work window is based on spring Chinook spawning, and we have requested an extension

Lee B—any progress with the Army Corps on removing what they put in last year?

Chris—not yet, but have asked them to call us before doing anything else.

Hans Smith—Lower M2 Update (YN): we are working on coordinating with DNR for large wood projects in M2 Reach 2; we have had some issues from the tribe with signing the land access forms; it is still being resolved. We did have a good public meeting on our large wood strategy for Reach 2. We are moving forward with Eagle Rocks large wood enhancement for this year, have received permits and will be stockpiling wood next week.

The rest of the wood projects are scheduled for next year, plus a side channel project in Two Channels, and the 1890s side channel is scheduled for 2014 pending some land acquisitions.

Mike Brunfelt, InterFluve—Presentation: Lower Libby Creek Reach Assessment

Hans—the Lower Libby Creek RA, it is a draft version; for digital copies of the RA Draft, Appendices, and the MRC PowerPoint Presentation, go to <http://www.interfluve.com/pageview.aspx?id=38839>. We are looking for comments on the document until the end of June.

The project was funded by YN; we contracted with InterFluve a rapid RA for the first two miles of stream to get a targeted approach in an area where we knew of some opportunities.

Mike—the RA covers about a mile and a half of stream

The Libby Creek Watershed is about 40 sq miles; we broke out 2 reaches for the assessment based on slope

The watershed was heavily influenced by glacial activity. Beavers heavily influenced the stream historically; it was a size of channel that would be heavily influenced. Steelhead, spring Chinook, bull trout, and brook trout are present.

Reach 1 is about 0.6 miles, from RM 0-0.58. The confluence is at about Methow River RM 26.5

Restoration Strategy:

- Increase pool frequency
- Increase pool quality, and complexity
- Restore long-term streambank deformation and function (e.g., migration rates)
- Increase the availability of off-channel habitats

Derek—is there a desired future condition based on intrinsic potential?

Mike—not sure

John C—can tie into the desired ecological condition

Opportunities

- Enhanced cover and complexity within existing pool habitats
- Replace riprap and treat eroding banks with natural riparian vegetation and large wood
- Accelerating lateral migration/channel evolution (where possible and appropriate)
- Riparian restoration

Discussion—wetland restoration in the area, beavers to aid in addressing incision, opportunities may be limited

Reach 2 is from RM 0.58-1.4

Findings:

- Improved riparian

- Vertical entrenchment is less due to bedrock contacts
- Increasing complexity
- Floodplain surfaces developing
- 17-19 channel widths between pools
- Shallow residual pool depths
- Deeper pools associated with bedrock or LWD

Gradient ~3%, some steep drops

Discussion—fish use, steelhead go way up, would probably have historically been a bull trout stream, good quality water, cold

Less bank armoring than reach one, good habitat now, but need to get more cottonwoods growing to replace what is decaying

Restoration Strategy:

- Increase pool frequency
- Increase pool quality and complexity
- Restore long-term streambank deformation and function (e.g., migration rates)
- Increase the availability of off-channel habitats

Restoration Opportunities:

- Riparian restoration
- Creating inset floodplains
- Accelerating lateral migration/channel evolution (where possible and appropriate)
- Beaver reintroduction
- Improve existing pool complexity

Chris—would it be a good opportunity to stock the shelf to place it in the floodplain to allow the creek to interact with it?

Mike—yes

Michael Notaro—there are opportunities for acquisition; would be happy to introduce folks to the landowners in the area

Kent—you need to address grazing in the riparian areas

Discussion—fencing does a lot to improve habitat

Please send Hans comments on the Draft RA by the end of June.

Roundtable

Char Schumacher (Okanogan County)—SRFB pre-proposal were due May 7th, next Wednesday (23rd) is the Methow and Okanogan tour, will send agenda hopefully this afternoon, Methow will be in the afternoon

Tara Gregg (Wild Fish Conservancy)—we are hoping to have temperature data available through the Ecology EIM website in the next few weeks

Kent Woodruff (USFS)—the Beaver Project has been hamstrung through some difficulties in the hiring; we have a potential spot for someone on the crew, 5 months of work, talk to Kent

Charlie Snow (WDFW)—we have a couple of positions that are coming open, 4-5 month jobs, hook and line survey, work with agency to get in the pool, contact Charlie, Charles Frady, or Alex at the WDFW office for details

Ken Bevis (WDFW)—new boss, Carmen Andonaegui, has hit the ground running; she will be useful to help with permitting, other issues. She works out of Ephrata.

Bob Clark (Okanogan Conservation District)—OCD is advertising for a conservation planner, the position does a little bit of everything, should be on the web site, first look at applicants is next Wednesday, so there will be a quick turn around

John Jorgensen (YN)—Hancock update—steelhead are spawning, found bull trout, they are foraging heavily on sculpin. We will include the site on the nutrient assessment program, will look at different strategies,

Lee Bernheisel—would like to encourage group to think more out of the box, think we can spend less money and do more for fish

Heide Andersen (Methow Conservancy)—thanks to everyone for helping out on the Beaver Project and assisting with gap year funding.

Hans Smith (YN UCRP update)—we have a project with MSRF at Twisp ponds this year, looking at wood complexity along left bank, also improvement on the ditch that feeds the habitat ponds. We also getting to the Chewuch RM 10 and Eightmile projects that were unable to do last year due to high water

Michael Humling (USFS)—we were successful in getting EcoTrust grant with The Wilderness Society help for the Chewuch road decommissioning and other elements of the Chewuch Transportation Plan. The Conservation Ed program with the kids is going on now, our Zone Hydrologist is leaving, so will potentially have an opening

Will be getting low elevation aerial photos of Twisp and Chewuch rivers, will be able to drag into GIS

Chris—would be interested in getting additional areas if they are already flying it

Michael H—will look into opportunities for that and send info to Jessica

Kent—the Forest Service is working with National Forest Foundation to secure private funding for restoration projects, focusing on upper Methow from Goat Creek to Harts pass, many restoration opportunities

JohnC—it's a good opportunity to crosswalk with the Biological Strategy

Michael Notaro (Landowner Outreach)—in terms of landowner perception, we really need to be coordinated on how we talk to people, and promoting the image that we are coordinating on some level.

Also please pass the word that if your teams are using string boxes, please pull the string.

USGS has 8 years of data on their PIT tag reader at the base of Libby

Rick Alford (YN)—coho releases are ongoing, total 480000. Separately, we were able to acclimate about 55000 spring Chinook in partnership with WDFW and the Conservancy at Heath Ponds, worked well

Chris Johnson (MSRF)—Rob Crandall is doing Watershed Watchers at Twisp Ponds, about 200 kids this year, the coho program is a good part of that, good outreach opportunity

John Crandall (Wild Fish Conservancy/Methow Monitoring)—starting to plan a look at how much of a threat brook trout are to bull trout in the basin, look at spawning areas, etc.

Derek Van Marter (UCSRB)—IT meeting June 5th; we will have a look at where USFWS is on the bull trout recovery plan

Jennifer Molesworth (Reclamation)—working on Chewuch Pipe this fall, rebuilding Beaver Creek irrigation weirs with Reclamation construction authority. We have two student interns. We will use a FS crew to do a habitat survey on the lower 8 miles of Beaver Creek, if anyone else is doing work in Beaver Creek, it would be good to coordinate, so contact Jennifer

Aaron Penvose (TU)—we have done some restructuring in the TU office, I will be spending more time up here in the Methow. Jeri will be back, will start planning the second annual Salmon Safe dinner in August

Important: If you put up flagging, have an idea of how it is coming down, and also talk with the surrounding landowners, marking what it is for on the flagging is also a good idea

**Bob Rose—Presentation:
YN Pacific Lamprey Project**

We have a good lamprey team assembled for the summer. I worked in the habitat program for 6 years, now work in the hydro department, and I have assumed responsibilities for the lamprey program, which was part of the fish accords. Lamprey are just about gone, and they are very important to the tribes. We are involved in every aspect of lamprey within the Columbia basin; it is a very aggressive program. The end of the story is that by the end of 2013, we will have a lamprey action plan for YN ceded lands that will be built subbasin by subbasin and be based on the existing plans. We are hoping to tie into the salmon recovery efforts.

Jennifer—do you think that efforts to help salmon through dams is impeding lamprey?

Bob—there are some conflicts; screens that keep salmon away from the turbines impinge juvenile lamprey; extra spill makes it harder for them to get to the passage

Bob—lamprey numbered in the millions before the dams, a few years back were only 20,000-25,000 at Bonneville

The tribes want to see lamprey recovery happen now—they are a food, a medicine, and a fundamental component of traditional lives and heritage.

Lamprey return because they are attracted to a pheromone that is secreted by the juveniles, so we believe that we need a supplementation program in the headwaters to attract the adults back up into the basin.

Have begun propagating the lamprey, the Finnish and the Japanese have done some work on propagation, so we are looking at a YN ceded lands research project for the supplementation program, and we are coordinating with the other tribes.

JohnC—how do you know how many you need? If passage is the problem, how do you get the adults back?

Bob—we don't know, but you have to start with what you have. We are just getting started.

Overview of life history, importance to tribes, spawning habitat is similar to spring Chinook, spawn April, May, early June, stay in gravels for only a few weeks, grow to around 10 mm, then burrow into fine sediments where they stay for around 3-7 years, then transform to juveniles and travel out to the ocean.

YN Pacific Lamprey Plan:

- Goal is to restore pacific lamprey to all YN Ceded lands—sustainable harvest and ecological contribution; they are the “earthworm of the stream”
- Have 8 objectives
- Doing telemetry studies, habitat surveys, working on artificial propagation, and starting work on development and implementation of Subbasin action plans
- Involved in regional planning, actions, and coordination
- Working on developing new screen criteria and new screens to produce entrainment, working with dams on passage issues

Next steps

- Continue Radio telemetry
- Conduct Rapid assessment
- Continue check in with irrigators and key stakeholders
- Continue public outreach
- Inter-governmental coordination
- Supplementation and monitoring
- Habitat surveys

Q—are you looking at genetics?

A—they are fairly homogenous throughout their range, would prefer to use fish close to the source, but it is better to put them in from where we can find them
Also trying to evaluate the fishways in the mid Columbia

Discussion—risks to the species, where to get the brood stock from, propagation

Derek—what can the restoration community do to help lamprey?

Bob—I think that we can come up with a book of things that people can do to help lamprey; we talked with WDFW to commit with coming up a booklet of restoration guidelines to help project sponsors, hope to have it become part of the review criteria for SRFB projects, whether projects take lamprey into consideration

Discussion—lamprey habitat, adult habitat, we know very little about them, very different than salmon

Bob—we are on the threshold of developing a tag for the lamprey that is the size of a grain of rice, think we can get them for about couple hundred dollars each, would have same receiver as the juvenile salmon acoustic tags, would last about 30 days, gives 3-D information

Bob—Next Steps: We hope to have a draft of the action plan template, and then come back in 6-9 months for follow up. We will be working with other YN folks already working in the Methow.

Next MRC is June 19th

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.