

Methow Restoration Council

May 19, 2015

Participants:

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Charlie Snow	WDFW
Chris Butler	Yakama Nation
Chris Johnson	MSRF
Eric Doyle	ICF International
Gene Shull	Forest Service
Hans Smith	Yakama Nation
Jarred Johnson	Yakama Nation
Jennifer Molesworth	Reclamation
Jeri Timm	WWP-TU
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
John Crandall	MRC
Joy Juelson	UCSRB
Kristen Kirkby	Yakama Nation
Lance George	Forest Service
Lynda Hofmann	WDFW
Madeleine Eckmann	Forest Service
Paul Wagner	Colville Confederated Tribes
Rick Alford	Yakama Nation
Steve Ralph	Cardno, Inc.

Meeting Notes:

John Crandall – Goat Creek Project Update: Gene, Madeleine, and Lance are here from the Forest Service; they are working on this with MSRF, National Forest Foundation, and USFWS. The Goat Creek project is the first Bull Trout project that has been funded by the SRFB. Bull trout are charr, not salmon. Sometimes called Dolly Varden. Bull trout were listed as threatened under ESA in 1999. The Bull Trout Recovery Plan has been in draft form since 1999, and we hope there will be a final recovery plan within a year. There are major populations in the Columbia, Snake, Willamette, and Fraser Rivers.

Gene Shull– I saw a bull trout in upper Eightmile creek.

John – Bull trout like cold water; they spawn in the upper portions of the watershed. The project area is in Upper Goat Creek near the Vanderpool Crossing.

Gene – their spawning and rearing habitat is in the upper reaches of the watershed, generally in the National Forest. Most of that habitat is in good shape, but the Goat Creek area is multi-use.

John – in Goat Creek, they are spawning in late September. Bull trout have a variety of life histories, resident, fluvial, adfluvial. Most of the fish in project area are the fluvial. The project is to put in some wood structures in the creek. Previous logging in the area eliminated large trees from the project area; there no spawning currently in the project area. The culvert at Vanderpool crossing was a barrier, but it was replaced in the 90s and after that we started to see spawning above the crossing. Currently, there isn't much suitable spawning in the project area, very little gravel, etc. There is minimal pool habitat or cover, and so the goal of the project is to put in wood to encourage pool formation and gravel deposition

Lynda Hofmann – what is the population up there?

John – redd counts started later than the other areas, but is about 6-12 redds per year. It is not a huge group of fish, but they are genetically distinct.

Rick Alford – is there an isolated population?

John – no, they all have access to each other.

Jennifer Molesworth – until the culvert was fixed, it was a barrier.

John – the majority of spawning is within a mile of Vanderpool Crossing. We are using an upstream area as a reference reach. The project reach has large cobble, very little gravel, and very little wood in the channel; above there are big logjams, pools, and gravels. We are trying to replicate the conditions in the upstream reference reach area. We have two work areas; we will be installing three logjams in each of the project areas, in the area between we will be felling standing dead and live trees to place them in the creek channel. The lower area is called the campground reach – there is dispersed camping in the area, and the upper area is the Vanderpool reach. There is a short grazing allotment; all cows should be out by the end of August.

Lance George – we aren't impacting wetlands; we are putting up buck and rail fence to protect wet areas at the upper and lower site.

Chris Johnson – good to document that for consistency with other projects.

John – we are not eliminating camping, but we are blocking access to creek by vehicles. It will be a combination of buck and rail fence, boulders to block access, and riparian plantings.

Chris J – we have experience with them using winches to move the rocks.

John – we plan to use really big rocks and partially bury them. Plan to place wood to cause aggradation, pool formation, create spawning habitat. There is a cattle grazing allotment there, with a very responsive permittee, and the cattle generally gone by spawning time. Charlie is also trying to find out if there are steelhead in the project area.

Gene – this project is part of the larger Treasured Landscape effort, Majestic Methow, where we are working with the National Forest Foundation.

John – the land ownership is entirely National Forest. We are looking at fall implementation. Forest Service doing NEPA, which will lead to SEPA, and then we will apply for the HPA.

Chris J – Monitoring?

John – will try to keep tabs on the reach as a whole, photo points, stream surveys, redd surveys

Gene – post project habitat survey, then wait several years to do a full survey. We think there is enough spawnable gravel there, if we put the wood in we will catch it.

Lance – it is a transport reach now

Jarred Johnson – what creek mile?

Madeleine Eckmann – creek mile 6.7-7.6

Hans Smith – Yakama Nation: Fender Mill Side Channel Project Presentation: we are going to construct the project this year. Fender Mill is between Mazama and Winthrop near the Weeman Bridge. Partly on USFS property, partly on WDFW property. It is a large floodplain area. The purpose is to recreate and enhance side channel habitat using groundwater. We looked at historic side channel complexity and migration; there was a lot more movement before the bridge and the highway and also the levee protecting Wolf Creek Road on the other side. It is an upwelling and gaining reach after the upper Methow losing reach, so there is a lot of groundwater available.

It is a groundwater infiltration gallery project, similar to the 1890s side channel completed just north of Twisp. We saw immediate fish use in the 1890s side channel, where we created a spring creek that had been cut off by the levee and highway. We are very excited about the results from the 1890s project; fish use and thermal refugia.

Rick – I think we picked up about a dozen coho redds in the channel.

Hans – we are also picking up chinook and steelhead in the PIT tag interrogator, and also saw a steelhead redd in the upper channel.

At Fender Mill, it will be analogous to the 1890s side channel. The outlet is at the Stansberry side channel. The bulk of the project is on state land; the side channel is on state land. We are attempting to avoid impacts to the existing riparian/wetland areas, and we will be creating a new channel.

We will not be doing anything to affect the old ditch intake, and we don't think we will be affecting the surface water that comes through there.

Discussion – surface flows, stranding issues

Hans – we will look at that with the state as a phase II effort.

At the lower end of the channel, we want to continue to move sediment, so we are redoing the channel outlet to come down-valley to increase the slope and allow for scour to maintain and keep it from filling in. Fish will have better access to return to the river from the areas left undisturbed. We will add wood elements in the outsides of the bends of the spring creek, pools, with riffles in between. About 2-4 ft. of excavation at the lower end, 8-10 ft. at the upper end.

Discussion – when the Methow River accesses the site, levees on site will stay, mill pond, fish stranding

Hans – all excess material (32,000 cy) is going to be hauled offsite. 2:1 and 6:1 slopes for the channel depending on area, plan to create wetland habitat adjacent to the spring fed channel. At low flow we are hoping for 7 cfs in the channel at low flow; 20 cfs is the high. We will ballast structures with wood pilings; no boulders to be brought in. Close to 300 logs for the wood structures. Gallery will follow the old Rockview ditch alignment, then the conveyance will head out of the alignment. We sited the conveyance to avoid trees; will work to keep trench widths as narrow as possible. Topography will be restored to existing.

Discussion – stockpiling/leaving material on site for later use if phase II is to fill some areas; timing is an issue; will still be quite a bit of material on site.

Kristen Kirkby – what is the expected lifespan of the infiltration galleries?

Hans – we will put finer drain rock around it; depends on how much turbid water goes through the well screens; they can fill up with sediment eventually. We expect it to last 50-100 years, maybe longer; we will watch it.

Eric Doyle – ICF International: EDT Model Introduction and Implications: I am working with the Colville Tribes on the Okanogan on the EDT effort there.

EDT is used for monitoring, reporting, and decision support. It was first applied on a broad scale in subbasin planning. The Covilles recognized that it could be useful for dealing with data and then using the data for reporting and making decisions

EDT is a lifecycle based habitat model; a deterministic model. Based on the Beverton – Holt function. EDT has three primary components – habitat data, trajectory generator, Species/habitat rules. Back in subbasin planning, there was one rule set per species; in the new version of EDT, you can view all the rules, save your own set, and also create your own rules. Based on historical literature at the time that the rules were developed. They haven't been changed for the Okanogan program since the initial version, but there are arguments for going and making some changes. We have modified the rule set for use in other watersheds.

EDT works by comparing scenarios. Template is the restoration ideal, Patient is where we are or expect to be.

For the Okanogan, we established the historic Template (max potential) and are building a Patient scenario for each four year monitoring cycle.

We developed a set of customized reporting tools that are scalable. Results are population report cards by subbasin, diagnostic unit, reach. Also rates the level of proof for the data attributes. You can use the report cards to drill down; it can provide a decision pathway for restoration planning.

Discussion – revisiting the rules, updating the information, how this affects the results

Eric – the problem is fundamental to all the modeling efforts; these rules are based on the literature of their time, the model has been applied pretty widely, and it does do a pretty good job. It is never going to be perfect, but the question is whether it is useful. Found that despite variation in judgment, the model still did a pretty good job of identifying priority areas and priority actions. The caution is how to use the information and to understand what it means when it is used. It is useful in integrating a large amount of data into a tool that can be used. The new version of the model was entirely redesigned on a new platform so that it is modifiable as new information becomes available.

Chris J – can you use the tool backwards and look at a specific area and see whether you are observing in the field is what was predicted?

Eric – if you wanted to look at habitat actions and evaluate a response. It is pretty good down to a reach scale depending on how you define your reaches. So you would be able to see a large side channel project; change in habitat productivity is a useful habitat metric. The model can provide information that challenges your assumptions or provides you with information that you didn't think of. Below the reach scale at the site level, using the model to evaluate success wouldn't be appropriate. EDT is a model, so it is never going to be right, but it can be useful.

Building a Methow EDT Model – one was created during subbasin planning, but we would need update/expand template, to incorporate new species and habitat data, build reporting tools

Discussion – how to use EDT in the Methow, a long time since subbasin planning, utility

Eric – it is not prescriptive

Action – Jessica will send a request for people to attend a follow up EDT meeting after the June MRC meeting to follow up. **Update:** EDT presentation/discussion scheduled for June 24 from 9:30-12:00 in the RiverBank conference room.

Joy Juelson – UCSRB Updates: we had SRFB tours over the last few weeks; two tours, one in the Methow and one in the Wenatchee. They were very well attended. There were three site visits in the Methow and nine in the Wenatchee. Comments will be coming, final proposals are due June 19th. Amount available is still in flux. The SRFB conference is next week. There will be about 700 people, the largest ever, 27-29th in Vancouver WA, many concurrent sessions. There will be an Upper Columbia conference on January 27th and 28th, likely in Wenatchee. The June 2nd implementation team meeting was cancelled due to conflicts. Hope to have speakers from NOAA science center, WDFW, has been moved to September 8th and will be about project prioritization.

We did a Lighthawk flight on May 8th. They are a great organization, free to us. Our intention was to get imagery of the post-fire landscape, restoration work. Flew over Beaver and Frazer, got imagery of upland sediment input into the Methow. Wenatchee World was there taking stills. We went over the FS Mission project, M2, and 1890s side channel. North 40 working on a video too. We will share when we get it.

Mission Project – we are connected through the Forest Health Collaborative – partners are working to gather information and field crews will be out in May and June to survey roads and streams.

Gene – we started field work; fish presence and absence, and we will start doing some tributary habitat work, looking at streams that could be impacted by roads. And then will do road inventory. Roads are our primary focus, to identify those that are impacting streams, riparian. Our supervisor's office has developed a habitat inventory model; so we will go out and identify problem road areas, and then develop proposed actions to change/reduce impacts from roads that we will bring into the Mission Project. We were going to do the full planning this summer, but now has shifted to a 2016 project but we got funds to get the aquatics data collection done this summer. The project will be Libby Creek and Buttermilk.

Joy – if anyone is interested in a Lighthawk flight, we are building a partnership with them, so if we can connect you let me know.

Joy – we will have another Outreach Grant process coming up for Okanogan County; 10,000 max per sponsor, around 27,000.

Outreach Updates:

John – national Fishing Day on June 13th. 10-2 at the WNFH.

Gene – Blackpine Lake/Foggy Dew environmental education going on this year. With decrease in funding, we are looking at phasing that out for Methow kids; if anyone has a nagging interest to do it this year, we could use some help. May 26th at Blackpine Lake for Methow 1st Graders, June 1-5th at Foggy Dew for Pateros and Brewster.

Chris J– we are putting a lot of materials out on public lands, theft is up. We've been hit twice at Whitefish, they are stealing batteries, battery chargers, and they stole the camera we had up. Anyone else experiencing this?

Discussion – appears to be localized, law enforcement has been contacted

Roundtable

John Crandall– the lamprey guide went to the printer yesterday.

Hans Smith– Yakama Nation: the Middle Twisp RA is online. We are working on the Upper Methow RA, going well, will likely have a presentation in the fall. Fender, Big Valley, and the Chewuch projects for implementation this year. We are working on developing projects in the Twisp.

Kristen Kirkby – Yakama Nation: we have been working in the field; around a dozen steelhead redds, a large bull trout found in the reach.

Chris Butler – Yakama Nation: starting next week we will be moving large wood to project sites. I was out yesterday at the Chewuch River Right project with DNR and we will be applying for Forest Practices Application, and we awarded that project to BCI contingent on permits. And we awarded RM 15-15.5 to Kysar & Koinsteinin also contingent on permits.

Gene Shull– USFS: we are looking to have a decision on the Chewuch Transportation Plan – how we will manage roads in the Chewuch for the next 50 years. Decommissioning around 90-100 miles of roads in the Chewuch, 125 miles of roads will be closed in hydrologic storage – pull pipes, put in water bars, etc, but not permanent closure. Forest is working on a travel management plan that will set up how people can use ATVs on our lands; currently they can use them on any road unless they are designated closed to ATVs, in the new plan they will only be able to use them if they are designated open. We are soon to have a decision on the South Summit 2 timber sale on the Loup – substantially reduced after the fire. We aren't doing any fire salvage, will decommission about 80 miles of road, about 114 miles of road closed in hydrologic storage. Focused on areas that didn't burn with some thinning; hope to expedite the recovery process of the fire area. The first thing is to decommission about 5 high risk roads. Will be winter logging for about 80%.

We are continually updating the Grazing allotments. Next up is the Hunter-McFarland.

This is one of the biggest years of commercial mushroom pickers that we have seen. Unconfirmed reports of guns, but be aware if you are out there. Some may be protective of the area that they are picking. Some areas are closed for commercial picking – Black Canyon, little bridge creek, and upper falls. We have designated camp sites.

John – what is happening with the dispersed camping sites on the Chewuch?

Gene – we are keeping the Respect the River sites, decommissioning the other sites. When we went through the minimum roads analysis, generally recreation didn't consider dispersed recreation sites as a priority to maintain.

Jennifer – what about Volstead Road?

Gene- it is on the radar; Volstead creek drains into Beaver Creek on the FS boundary. It has 11 stream crossings in 1 mile. Looking at a full road relocation or drivable dips. Moving slowly, looking at options. Steep terrain, we definitely want to do a project there.

Jennifer – it is pretty damaging to a lot of anadromous habitat.

Gene – we should arrange a field trip – maybe mid-late June

Paul Wagner– we are supportive of some sort of corrective action

Jeri Timm – Trout Unlimited: MVID is still going strong. Awarded contract for MVID West, that will start soon.

Paul Wagner– Colville Tribes: we are providing some assistance to the Forest service for the Mission Timber Sale, just finished the Stokes Bridge project with MSRF; next couple of weeks will do the Aspen Meadows test well. Also working with a few owners on Frazer Creek to provide another bridge. Also working with TU on fencing and livestock watering for Lawson property.

Chris Johnson – Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation: Stokes Bridge was identified after the fire – was our largest bridge, a 70 footer. We took out the bridge before we took out the culverts. Quick and easy project.

Twisp River Floodplain – we did our wetlands delineation with the Corps and Ecology last week, no mitigation will be required.

We put together an application to SRFB for Frazer – we will likely pull lit back and work directly with USFWS and the Colvilles on a working group for short term solutions while the creek stabilizes.

Chris – is the MRC valuable, to meet monthly?

John – is the coordination working for people?

Jennifer – think that we should table it to the next meeting

Chris J – would ask people to think about whether the format is working for people, if we are using the time well, etc.

Next meeting June 16th

UPDATE: June meeting cancelled; next meeting July 21st

**EDT Detailed Presentation/Discussion of possible Methow applications: June 24, 9:30 – Noon
RiverBank conference Room**

Definitions of Commonly used Acronyms	
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
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/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.