

## Methow Restoration Council

November 15, 2016

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Amy Martin	OCD
Brendan Dilloughery	NRCS
Carmen Andonaegui	WDFW
Chris Johnson	MSRF
Jennifer Molesworth	Reclamation
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
John Crandall	MRC
Kirsten Kirkby	CCFEG
Paul Wagner	Colville Tribes
Pete Teigen	UCSRB
Ryan Fortier	WDFW

### Meeting Notes:

**John Crandall – Monitoring Update:** as monitoring coordinator, I'm trying to maintain an inventory of where we are doing monitoring in the basin. We do quite a bit of temperature loggers, and I know that there are a lot out there that are "off the books." I am trying to get information on those loggers also locations on groundwater monitors/piezometers. If you have those out there, please let John know. This is a call for information, mostly to project sponsors.

Jennifer and I attended the Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Partnership's Intensively Monitored Watershed workshop. These IMWs are locations where monitoring and habitat restoration were linked. Mostly effectiveness monitoring. There are many of these IMWs, including the Middle Fork of the John Day, Bridge Creek, Lemhi, Entiat, etc. Set up was specific, but there are several confounding factors affecting them, including hatcheries. The Methow is also an IMW, even though it doesn't quite meet the definitions.

Jennifer Molesworth – there were a suite of IMWs that met the definition, and a few years later they broadened the definition; our IMW is what Reclamation calls a "demonstration". What I got out of the workshop was that all of the IMWs have big structural problems – it is difficult to hold things steady at a watershed or sub-watershed scale while you do a 10-20 year study.

John – they have problems with experimental control. We had many brainstorm sessions where we looked at ideas, but the end is how it informs policy. They will have a summary of the meeting, and I will report back when it becomes available.

Jennifer – one of the themes was that since all the IMWs have the same problems, like in the Entiat where they have landowner issues, is what should we do when we have these problems? Nobody is able to answer the question of what the restoration is doing for the fish production in a subbasin.

Chris Johnson – unless you are working on public lands, you will always have that uncertainty. It is a difficult challenge to try to incentivize landowners over a long period.

Carmen Andonaegui – the big question is 'what are the effects of our actions on overall productivity and survival?' From the beginning, the piece that the Recovery Boards were focused on was the habitat part, focused on the productivity resulting from juvenile rearing, holding, and smolting without looking at the other Hs, etc. So if we are having issues, what would we do differently and what would it look like? We have the life cycle models, but how is that working?

Jennifer – that is all part of what they are looking at now. The BiOp requires the monitoring; it is one of the RPAs.

John – they have learned a lot from the IMWs, but for recovery for VSP and meeting recovery goals, that measure is adult to adult. If they don't come back, essentially it shows no effects to the projects. We have bottlenecks, and the models can help us identify bottlenecks. However, models won't hold up in court; we have to have fish on the ground. And, most of the constraints are related to infrastructure, etc. that are not going away.

There are many eggs in the IMW basket. They are expensive and a lot of work, but they may not get what they were looking for. But they are still getting a lot of information.

Carmen – what we have control over here is habitat, that is all we can do. We need to know we are doing whatever we can to get fish out. There are always bigger things going on, but for us we need to know how we can give us more certainty in what we are doing. And they need to provide funding for adaptive management and monitoring so that we can address conditions on the ground.

Chris – looking back at when they were drafting the Recovery Plan, and there is an interesting mix of federal and local. An interesting difficulty.

Discussion – new BiOp, they are working on it now, they will have draft NEPA up by mid-2018. We will continue to work under the draft BiOp.

Chris – it would be good for the agencies to commit to funding the monitoring.

Discussion – the federal agencies are spending millions of dollars on monitoring already, but there are issues with the products, agencies are not happy with the programs, assistance and permits come with monitoring requirements, but difficult to have funding for it. There are different types of monitoring.

Discussion – managing projects that have already been constructed, permitting can be the largest part of the burden. No credit for taking care of projects, only credit for building projects. The process is still being litigated. HCPs lay out obligations and may provide an opportunity for funding monitoring and maintenance.

John – the paper of the month, *Factors influencing the relative fitness of hatchery and wild spring Chinook salmon (oncorhynchus tshawytscha) in the Wenatchee River, Washington, USA* (Williamson et al, 2010). Kevin Williamson and some folks at NOAA and Andrew Murdoch and Todd Pearsons, others, did a bunch of work on relative reproductive success of salmon. We have abundant steelhead, but they are mostly hatchery fish. There has been a lot of work done on relative reproductive success of wild vs. hatchery. Hatchery fish are much less productive and are detrimental to the success of wild fish. They used a genetic analysis and looked at contributing factors to the reduced success of hatchery vs wild. They used Tumwater Dam, caught all of the spawners and took a genetic sample. They then took the DNA samples from the juveniles and looked at the genetic differences and the different parents. Wild fish are more productive. A big difference was location – hatchery fish spawned lower in the system than the wild fish. May be a result of how they were propagated, water types, location and timing of releases.

Discussion – have large numbers of steelhead now, but only wild fish count for recovery.

**Pete Teigen – UCSRB Updates:** from Greer – at the RTT they talked about adaptive management and updating the biological strategy. Also, BPA is working with us on a potential targeted solicitation within the next six months. They may identify areas where they would like to see proposals.

A few years ago, we had a consultant help us develop a communication plan for how the board communicates with the WATs, and we are looking at revisiting that. We will start reaching out to the WATs to get feedback and see how we get information out. Joy and Barb are going to work on that and see what that would look like. Start thinking about how the communication loop works between the various groups and the board and we will engage in those discussions in the new year.

Chris – is that separate from the IT and RTT process?

Pete – it is part of that to make all of those communications more efficient. We are trying to figure out how we are doing the best we can and how can we improve.

Discussion – different groups within UCSRB working on separate things, coordination issues, how it used to work compared with what happens now. A good question would be to look at how things are changing, how it is working.

### **Roundtable**

*Carmen Andonaegui – WDFW:* we are working with the Benson Watershed group; they submitted an application for Centennial grants on water quality. It will be difficult, but any work they can do to improve the stream and help the landowners will be of benefit.

On December 15<sup>th</sup> we will have a new Methow Area Wildlife Manager. Dale Swedberg retired October 31<sup>st</sup>, and there is an announcement for his position.

*Ryan Fortier – WDFW:* I got news from Okanogan PUD that the Enloe dam will start kicking up; they are moving forward with that. They have a timeline that they need to meet their licensing, and there will be mitigation work associated with it.

The steelhead run appears too low to have a recreational fishery, so likely will not have a steelhead season. May still do some removal, but it will depend.

John – I talked to Jeremy Cram, and there is an issue with inbreeding with the wild fish in the Twisp River steelhead.

Ryan – they can control the population at the Twisp Weir

Discussion – fish run numbers, ocean conditions

Ryan – the Okanogan Sockeye, 180,000 went over Zoesel dam, only 50,000 spawned based on current analysis. Still primary information; will need more data to know what it means

*Pete Teigen – UCSRB:* the Forest Health Collaborative meeting will be December 7<sup>th</sup> at the Okanogan PUD auditorium. The Forest Service has the aquatics prioritization framework. It is good to have fish people at the table

John – is UCSRB going to lead the Twisp watershed effort the way they did with Mission?

Pete – Don't know. From our perspective, as the Forest Service moves forward it is important that they don't just look at the terrestrial landscape.

*Paul Wagner – Colville Tribes:* in the process of working on a master cost sharing agreement with the Forest Service to do work on FS lands. The main one is corrections to Volstead Road. Wayne Cornwall our engineer is going to meet with Gene Shull and others from the Forest Service this week. Will be looking at some perspective sites with MSRF as well.

My contract cycle with BPA is July through June, so have to have budgets submitted by February/March.

*Amy Martin – OCD:* Terri Williams is the planner that has been working on Benson Creek.

Tomorrow we have a farm bill workshop in the county commissioners room to go over EQIP, and they will be doing sign ups. There is a salmon recovery initiative that we haven't put projects into, so if you have landowners who might be more comfortable working with NRCS that may be an option. There is a Local Work Group meeting, where producers from Okanogan, Chelan and Douglas counties get together to direct the natural resource priorities for a small general pot of funding. If you have anyone who is interested in that, send him or her to NRCS to see how they can fit in. The Local Work Group meeting will be Dec 13<sup>th</sup> in Chelan.

Still working on fire recovery, mostly fence and some irrigation, hazard tree removal; projects have to be on the ground by June 1.

We will be hiring two paid internships for next summer, one will be working on soil, the other will be more general. The information will be posted on our web site.

*Jennifer Molesworth* – I have an update from the Yakama Nation: Hans said that they have hired Madeleine Eckmann for their Bio 2 position; she starts December 9.

*Kristen Kirkby* – CCFEG: we had a Reclamation technical team from Denver and Boise come out to do survey work at Burns Garry, bathymetry, etc. Rio ASE is working on design.

Twisp to Carlton RA is being worked on now and the RTT will review again.

Working on education; I took some chinook juveniles to the 10<sup>th</sup> grade biology class and held them at different temperatures, looked at breathing rates, etc.

Carmen – I recommend that you reach out to Kelli Snodgrass on Burns Garry. Lynda will be your coordination point on that.

*Chris Johnson* – MSRF: we have an agreement with the WDFW for the trail at the Floodplain site. We have a three-year agreement, and this is a unique opportunity for the community to partner with WDFW to work on their land. We have funding from the Colvilles and UCSRB, and many partners. We just finished the Wildlife Conservation Society grant for the Beaver Project, with a film on the ten years of the project with a climate change focus. We are meeting with WDFW to discuss how we extend the Beaver Project past Kent Woodruff's retirement next June. We will be showing the film likely at the next MRC.

*John Crandall* – Methow Monitoring: we wrapped up bull trout redd surveys. This year was different than past years, FS had very little funding until about halfway through. We were able to get more involvement from Charlie Snow, and they are helping in select watersheds where they are already walking for spring Chinook. We are working on changing the bull trout protocol to be more like what they do for spring Chinook. Doing it every week was a good eye opener to see how things progress. We completed seven passes in the entire Twisp River, and the same thing in a small area on the upper Chewuch, also did Goat Creek, Lost, Wolf, some had fewer passes than others. There are gaps, and we are trying to develop a funding partnership for the whole thing. May go to a rotating panel of areas for the smaller areas to try to manage the costs.

*Outdoor Education and Outreach*: This year we hit on the field component of the Salmon in the Classroom. The kids collected data at two different sites, and they will do an analysis to determine where to release the fish they will have on the classroom. Will have the stakeholder part, they will be doing internet research, and will have real stakeholder participation to come and talk to the kids about how the issues affect their lives, and then we will have the great debate. It will be at night, to open it up and get more participation.

The Outreach sub-group met and talked and we are looking forward to continuing the outreach; have developed a tracking sheet. We talked about developing a shared mentor program. Things are going well, and the school is very excited about what we are bringing. A lot of science education.

**Next MRC December 20**

<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 (newer acronym is CTCR – see below)
CTCR	Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation (older acronym is CCT – see above)
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")
PHABSIM	Physical Habitat Simulation
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.