

## Methow Restoration Council

November 20, 2018

### Participants:

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Amy Martin	Okanogan Conservation District
Charlie Snow	WDFW
Chris Butler	Yakama Nation
Chris Johnson	MSRF
Greer Maier	UCSRB
Hans Smith	Yakama Nation
Jennifer Molesworth	Reclamation
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
John Crandall	MSRF
Ken Bevis	DNR
Kristen Kirkby	CCFEG
Lance George	USFS
Larry Hill	Methow Valley Fly Fishers
Lee Bernheisel	Okanogan Wilderness League
Luke Cerise	USFS
Maddie Eckmann	Yakama Nation
Pete Teigen	UCSRB
Ryan Fortier	WDFW
Steve Kolk	Reclamation
Susan Crampton	Local Citizen
Tara Gregg	MSRF

### Notes:

**Luke Cerise – Crescent Mountain and McCloud Fires BAER:** the Forest Service started the rapid assessment of the burned areas on September 25; we would always like to collect more data, but we do a rapid assessment. We look at culverts, roads, etc. BAER stands for Burned Area Emergency Response. We did a helicopter flight to do the broader watershed assessment, we had a mosaic burn pattern. A lot of the higher burn severity was in the upper watershed. We didn't see the soil burn severity in these fires that we saw in Carlton Complex; we got fairly lucky.

There is a lot of green in between the burn and private land. We assess values at risk, high, moderate, low. The assessment was strictly for FS land; if during the process we identify private land at risk, we send that information to the Okanogan Conservation District and NRCS, which we have done. We identified roads at risk for rain events and rapid snow melt. On the Crescent Mountain fire, there are several bridges to be monitoring and doing storm patrol on, War Creek and Mystery Camp bridges. There are 71 miles of trail in the burn perimeter up the Twisp River. We've posted signs warning the public, but next year we are only closing the War Creek Trail for next year.

Lance George - we are going to analyze it this winter, and we will open it when it is safe.

John Crandall - is it closed because of hazard trees or debris flow risks?

Lance - both, mostly hazard trees

Ryan Fortier - any plans to abandon any trails?

Lance - no

Luke - the BAER team just identifies life and safety risks, we just make recommendations; we do not decide the closures.

We will monitor for water quality, we also looked at botany along dozer lines for invasive species, we will monitor. We also identified fish and wildlife short-term risks but also long-term benefits; for soil and water there are very high risks

For the McLeod fire, there is a lot less infrastructure up there, Maintenance level 2 and 3 roads are affected. We will pull some pipes, and will do storm patrol on some bridges. There are only 7 trails, and none pose the risk that War Creek posed in the Twisp, so we didn't recommend any closures.

We will replace some stock troughs and riparian fencing. Botany and soil and water, fish values are at risk.

Jennifer Molesworth - it burned into the Lost, right?

Luke - just barely

Lance - it's not in the riparian area, I'm not sure if it came off of the ridge

Luke - we did the watershed modeling for the Lost, but we had no issues from this fire

Lance - if we do have issues up there, it would probably be from last year's Diamond fire, not McLeod

Luke - all of the reports are available

Lance - I have the soils and hydro resource reports too.

Luke - Soil burn severity; for the Crescent Fire, there is a low amount of high severity. We do a ground truth for soil hydrophobicity out there and we didn't see that really high, we should get good soil penetration. The high severity is all ridgetops in the upper watersheds, so we couldn't have asked for a better burn out there.

McCloud - is a similar mosaic compared to Crescent

Lance - Ortell was the highest burn

Luke - we do have some severe burn areas, but not to the extent we had with the Carlton Complex (2014). I don't think we will see a major watershed response. After we do our soil mapping, we send our results to the USGS and they map the debris flow potential. At Crescent we have high debris flow potential because of the slope steepness, but we also have a lot of bedrock. Scaffold Creek and War Creek have higher potential. There is less risk on McCleod, and that is because it isn't as steep; there is still potential but not like in the Twisp River drainages. We did model Buttermilk Creek, but the upper watershed in Buttermilk didn't burn like the War Creek and Scaffold Creek.

Jennifer - do we think people on the other side of the river have to worry?

Luke - I don't think so unless we get a 1000 year event

Lance - we did see some rain events right after the fire, and nothing moved, unlike what we saw in the Carlton Complex.

Luke - we have a lot more bedrock in the topography, so we don't expect to see a hillside unzip glacial till like we saw after Carlton.

John - we had a previous debris flow on War Creek on the road

Luke - that is why we recommended to close that, because there have already been past events there. We modeled the 6<sup>th</sup> field HUCs; we can't look at everything at the same time. We don't model rapid snowmelt, so all bets are off if we get 70 degree weather in March.

In McCleod, Goat Creek is the major drainage we're concerned about, but it is so high in the watershed, we are not too worried because it has a lot of room to dissipate; I'm not too worried about the fan

Chris Johnson - the fan scares me to death

Jennifer - there isn't a lot of floodplain storage in Goat

Luke - the majority of treatments recommended are on the south side of Twisp River, relief ditches, drivable dips, etc.

Jennifer - is there money to log out the trails?

Luke - we don't give money to snag trails, just around work areas

Discussion – trail maintenance, always an issue to fund

Luke – the Crescent fires ask \$211, 022 for proposed treatments, after \$30 million for the fires; if we exceed we can put in an interim request for additional funds. Less ask for McCloud: \$112,338

John – will they rest the grazing?

Lance – yes

Luke – we coordinated with partners, NRCS, OCD, WA DNR, Reclamation, the National Weather Service, and private landowners. We have a website where all of the maps are housed; we have kmz files, debris flow mapping, etc. It's a very useful website. If you need shapefiles for mapping Lance or I can get that for you. They are working on getting some weather stations out there.

John – is there a review of BAER? We've had a bunch of fires in the recent past, to identify how the treatments work, what got accomplished? Is there some kind of feedback loop?

Luke – there is implementation monitoring for the actions proposed

Lance – and Luke and I do all kinds of monitoring for everything we do

Luke – it's in a national BMP database that is publicly accessible

Discussion – Scaffold Camp Creek and Reynolds for a fish passage culvert, the Region said no for replacement, but is under programmatic NEPA so permitting would be easy

Chris J – if you send Jessica a list of fish passage culverts, we can look at potential funding

Pete Teigen – the statewide forest collaborative is having a call next month on the 19<sup>th</sup>; I can send the call in information

John – how does this fit with Mission?

Luke – it depends on what they do in consultation; they may delay logging treatments, or log in the snow. They are looking at the change of condition in the Twisp for the Twisp project

Lance – a lot of the areas that burned weren't in areas that we treat commercially: wilderness, Roadless, and Late Successional Reserve (LSR) areas mostly

**John Crandall – Monitoring Update/RTT:** lamprey update – lamprey passage over Wells, for about a decade the numbers were very low (like 1 or 0) for adult lamprey moving up to spawn in the Methow or Okanogan. Very few were observed in Okanogan, so the assumption was that they were headed to the Methow. We have had larval lamprey monitoring for many years, but we were having trouble finding them, and the ones we were finding were large, meaning they were older fish. It was getting kind of dire. So, starting in 2015, the YN started doing translocation of adult lamprey from the lower Columbia into the Methow. Things are very different now. Lamprey spawn in June/July; we've almost never found any redds, difficult to detect and the redds are very small. Now WDFW is seeing redds and fish, due to the translocation efforts. Lamprey don't have a genetic homing, they are more genetically homogeneous. Adult lamprey can pick up pheromones that are released from the ammocoetes. Douglas County PUD and the Colvilles also released in the Methow; this year 709 released in the Methow. They are also putting them into the Okanogan. We are starting to see the fruit of those efforts in the larval counts, numbers have gone up and sizes have gone down. We are finding a lot of larvae and young of the year, which we weren't seeing prior to translocation.

Chris J – so ditch screens are designed for salmon and not for lamprey, and the ditch sediments seem like perfect lamprey habitat, is anyone looking at that?

John – not here, but they are in the Yakima basin, doing trials and looking at it hoping to learn something down there that they can bring up. Definitely salmon screens are not sufficient to prevent lamprey entrainment in ditches

Susan Crampton – where do the transplants come from?

John – they come from the lower Columbia River at the dams. The numbers coming into the Columbia has gone up at the same time, but it is clear that adult lamprey don't like Wells dam

Ryan – they never seem to get past the pool; they don't even approach the dam, so it's hard to identify where the problem is

John – translocated fish are PIT tagged

Susan – is there any lamprey research going on in the Ocean?

John – very little, they are kind of a black box in the ocean

John – EDT is becoming the tool of choice in the Upper Columbia for funding decisions. As a quick refresher, I urge you to check it out. There is a ton of information in it, everything in the anadromous zone is included, information from Reach Assessments, habitat surveys, etc., it is all in there. It populates the model with habitat and then runs "fish" through it, it ties habitat to fish production. It gets to fish benefit; it is a tool/model. When we're looking at habitat, we are looking at Ecological Concerns/Limiting factors, which comes to the Biological Strategy. EDT has limiting factors that are a little different than ECs; Biological Strategy is going through an update and is using EDT. The strength of EDT is that it has a lot of information in it. You can look at limiting factors at the reach scale. There are a lot of nuances based on how the model processes the information; we need to understand what information went into it to see why we got what we did. This is important, because it will quickly lead to prioritization. We need to understand it to use it. It is a great tool, easy to use.

Chris J – why did EDT in the Wenatchee get POC'd?

Pete – We're not sure; the monitoring panel at the state had questions, and Chelan County submitted their responses. We heard two days before we had to submit the list to the state for funding that it was a POC, and our regional policy that we don't submit POC projects because of the potential to lose the funds to the state.

Discussion – issues with monitoring proposals to the state, a statewide issue

Greer Maier – the region is engaging the monitoring panel, and we may need to hold off on new monitoring proposals; the gist of their comments was that EDT is an antiquated subbasin planning tool that NOAA uses for its status updates, and that BPA should fund it. The panel missed the link to prioritization. We may do a presentation for the SRFB conference to help people understand

Chris J – it would be good to have a consistent guidance

John – keep in mind with EDT that we have yet to run it on bull trout. Until we do, it won't be comprehensive. It is just an add on. It should be dealt with, they are a listed species in the basin. We should include it. If we are doing this for fish recovery, we should include bull trout.

John – there was a habitat monitoring data gaps assessment for the Methow, this is the base information that went into the model, and they gave the sources for the information. However, the majority of the information that went into it were one-off surveys. Temperature and streamflow did go into it, but that is a very small percentage. So it is not good at looking at status and trends. We keep trying to invent holistic monitoring programs, but they fail. We are data rich but lack summaries, but we don't have good habitat monitoring programs. Colvilles may develop a monitoring program to go along with EDT. Know that it is out there, and it gives information about where things came from.

Greer – John Arterburn has been talking about updating the Recovery Plan's adaptive management; it was based on CHaMP and now that is gone. We need monitoring to get the data to feed the model.

Jennifer – we can't update EDT unless we get new information to put in it

Greer – do we need a monitoring strategy that helps identify the issue?

Discussion – need more data collection to rerun EDT, EDT is popular now, but all models have issues, all models need data, entities may still pick and choose where they will work regardless of the model results

**Pete Teigen – UCSRB Updates:** we did the Okanogan Outreach grant process. MSRF will do the next iteration of their brochure, CCFEG will continue their work in the schools, and Okanogan Land Trust and OCD also will be working in the Okanogan. The start date for the grant was November 1.

The RCO received some funding from the legislature last year to do a LEAN study that looked at the SRFB process to look for efficiencies to increase the money that gets on the ground. They did surveys, workshops, and interviews with folks to guide their understanding of the current process to develop recommendations that SRFB can implement effective 2020. SRFB will be looking at the recommendations and deciding on all or some of them to move forward with. They want to shift the application process earlier in the year so funding decisions would happen in September.

Recommendations: They would reduce the number of iterations with the State Review Panel, allow for biennial grant rounds within regions, and other policy updates.

Chris J – we can look at the other biennial grant rounds in the state to see how those work for folks

Discussion – pros and cons of biennial rounds

Jessica Goldberg – Melody said that if project sponsors have feedback on the LEAN study and don't want to go to the December meeting, then you can give her your feedback and she will share it with the board.

Pete – the information is on the web site, probably worth looking through. I will send out our updated regional list that we submitted for funding to the state.

Greer – the IT meeting is coming up on December 4<sup>th</sup>. We have an Arc GIS data portal, and we will use the IT meeting to see what else people want to see. We usually do a year in review. If you completed a project in 2018, send me the name and I will look it up in HWS.

Pete – we had the SRFB debrief yesterday, and we had several members of the CAC, and they have asked for information on projects that they've previously ranked to see the status.

Chris J – we upload project reports to PRISM when we finish RCO-funded projects

Greer – at IT I will give an overview of fish numbers so we can see how dire 2018 was. It sounds like the Forest Service will come to talk about the new ARBO for fish projects, which will allow them to cover NEPA on most fish projects on FS land. I hope to have a conversation with them about what that means and whether it will open up opportunity on the forest.

I will also provide a presentation on the barrier prioritization; the RTT has tiered the barrier process and I will go over the tiering scheme.

We will have a conversation on the IT role in prioritization. At the last RTT meeting there was good conversation about the Burns Garrity project, and the RTT gave good direction on where to go. The direction was that perennial was good, but if you can't get perennial then seasonal would be important.

Chris J – we will be flying a drone flight on the reach and meeting with one of the adjacent landowners, so we will see what that adds.

John – we heard Rob Richardson talk about what would happen, there would be straightening and incision; more habitat is available on the left side

Greer – there was a lot of talk on prioritization, a working meeting in the afternoon, Chuck Pevan is under contract with the YN, and he identified some of the issues he's coming across. Looking at human change in the watershed, roads, recent timber harvest (a deviation on how to address canopy cover – John), agriculture, mining, development, powerlines. If you think of any other issues, let me know

Discussion – riprap, differences in wetlands/storage,

Greer – other focus on habitat quality, a way to compare assessment units. If you have any data that would help identify properly functioning condition metrics, let me know. Also, is there any major mining disturbance in the Methow?

Chris J – we have an ongoing leach site on both sides of the river in the Red Shirt area.

Greer – our next board meeting on December 13th there will be a conversation about outreach grants, people used to come present to the board. Melody was thinking that someone from MRC could come present all of the projects from this year.

Jessica – John is our outreach lead

John – I will come to the meeting

Kristin – I can help with that

**Larry Hill – Methow Valley Fly Fishers:** the Methow Valley Flyfishers have been awarding scholarships, and we give about \$4000 per year to (hopefully) local students. We were looking for people going into fisheries, wildlife, or fisheries enforcement, but many of them don't end up doing that. So instead of giving scholarships, we have thought of funding interns. I had a contact with Sarah Smith, who is an instructor at Bellingham Technical college. She suggested that we bring a student from there, a second year student, for a month or so. I am looking to see if anyone has a use for an intern. They have will have experience with the WDFW hatchery program, snorkeling, electrofishing, etc., so they would have some experience. We're trying to explore how we can get experience and what the quality of the Methow is for some of these students. We are at the beginning stages how we can set something up. Chris J – I had a call two days ago from a student from WSU who was looking for some kind of experience. Knowing that there is an opportunity for us to match-make these students with people who could fund them would be helpful.

Larry – I will leave my contact information and people can contact me

Steve Kolk – how much of a barrier to having student interns in the Methow is having a place for them to live?

Jennifer – we've had students for a number of years, and they always find a place to live

## **Roundtable**

*John Crandall – MSRF/RTT:* we're still working on the Lower Methow Reach Assessment (LMRA), the lower 28 miles of river. We contracted with TetraTech to develop the restoration strategy. We are working on a State of the Salmon report with UCSRB LE funds, which will be out in the spring. It will be a public outreach tool.

Pete – I have gotten a lot of positive feedback on the pamphlets you made

Kristen – the reason we have that in the Methow is because we have the competitive outreach grant

*Kristen Kirkby – CCFEG:* we had a channel change at Burns Garrity that makes us consider where we are headed with the design; we will likely put off design for a year and then will need to go after new construction funding. We had a crew of 4 barrier technicians doing barrier surveys all summer. They did get up the Twisp before the fires, and will likely have another crew next year. We are sharing the data with the folks with EDT who want to do their own prioritization, and will compare results with UCSRB prioritization model. We have been working with students, in partnerships with Watershed Watchers. We just finished up a nutrient enhancement project in the Chiwawa. We're trying to do some basic fish monitoring down there along that effort, partnering with WDFW.

*Chris Butler – YN:* we finished phase 2 of construction of 15.5-20 on the Chewuch. The Upper Chewuch RA – we are hoping to have a final draft after New Year. The Chewuch 4.2-5, we agreed on concepts with WDFW and then will work towards 30% and will be reaching out to neighboring landowners. Have a draft of RM 8-9. NSD won a contract for concept and report of RM 6.

*Maddie Eckmann – YN:* we just did a bunch of groundwater investigation in the Twisp to Carlton reach, piezometers in the Alder Creek floodplain. We installed some hand-driven piezometers in the Beaver

Pond area. They are a little problematic to install, lots of rocks. We're working on some preliminary concepts in that beaver pond area and will review those with CCFEG and MSRF moving forward.  
Chris J – we met with Maddie and we're moving forward with TetraTech with a follow on contract after they are done with the YN contract.

*Tara Gregg – MSRF:* we are wrapping up the last bridge at the Lazy K on Frazer Creek, bridge was set yesterday, placed some wood along the banks. It is a 70 ft. bridge.

*Ken Bevis – DNR:* I wanted to float in and check in. I work for DNR, and I'm the small forest landowner steward for the state. I do outreach at different levels. We have a similar dilemma to salmon recovery. They scale of collaborative work is almost insurmountable. The goal of outreach is to communicate with those who need to know and generate support when you need it. Telling the story is always the difficult piece. I'm also on the board of CCFEG. I wanted to encourage you to stick to the high level storytelling to describe the public benefit that people get something out of. There is so much complexity to the whole thing that it is hard for the people on the street to understand it.  
Coordination on particular messaging, identify what people get out of it – do they get to go fishing, will there be river access, you have to be ready for the hardest question, how many fish.  
If you know any small forest landowners that have 5 acres or more that need a forest health consultation, let me know.

*Susan Crampton – Public:* glad to be here and that all of you are working on these projects. Even with all of the acronyms and the tangle of process, you all are still working on it.

*Hans Smith – YN:* we have an ongoing master cost share agreement with the Forest Service for doing work in the Upper Columbia region. We had a meeting to look at their new NEPA, and it does have language limiting the number of projects in the region. On the Twisp before the fire, we collected a bunch of data, have the level 2, pathways and indicators, so the outcome of the BAER assessment was of interest. We're poised to do a lot of restoration with the Forest. A lot of stuff going on up the Twisp, we've been waiting for them to come back to it.

Greer – in the Mission project, the MRC was pretty involved, is that happening with the Twisp project?

John – MRC wasn't that involved in the Mission, they gave a presentation here, but there was little input from people here in the Mission.

Greer – does this group want to have a role in putting things into this project?

Hans – it's just picking back up, it's about to start again, not sure how they are planning to roll their work into what they are doing there

John – I would encourage the FS to make it a more open process and bring more people into the process.

Greer – the Twisp is a priority watershed in the Methow, so it would be great if the MRC was part of the process

Hans – we are not a decision making body

Jennifer – outside of the accords, the funders don't want to work on the Forest that much

Pete – the Forest Health Collaborative is meeting with the new Ranger

John – there needs to be a better way to get the message out, if the Collaborative could send the information to Jessica, she could send the information to the WATs

Pete – we can pass the message on,

Greer – December 14<sup>th</sup> 10:30-12 at the Methow Ranger Station for the Project work group., planning for Twisp is a big piece of the agenda

Hans – on Beaver Creek we are planning for a project next year on state land; we have done a lot of planning and outreach. We just completed the bridge replacement project at RM 2.6 on Beaver Creek along the highway. DOT contributed to the construction cost. We removed fill so that the creek can meander and increased the span of the bridge put in log cribs. Cost went up for us and DOT that came up late in the design process to get certification for a bridge approach in the right of way, materials sourcing and compaction testing requirements also increased costs. We also finished the Chewuch project this year.

*Ryan Fortier – WDFW:* the district team has been working on the Burns Garrity project; I'm eager to see what strategy they will be using, where spoils will go. Also working on barrier removal on Eightmile Creek and how that impacts brook trout upstream. No steelhead season, probably none for a while.

Jennifer – how were the spring chinook redd counts?

Charlie Snow – actually pretty good, all things considered. We actually had pretty good escapement, we had typical for a low escapement year. The BAER report was pretty great; maybe we don't have serious landslide issues, spring Chinook are our most at risk population.

John – same for bull trout, we weren't able to get up there to survey for bull trout this year; they were in there spawning during the fire

Ryan – for the LMRA, are northern pike on any of the radar?

John – no

Ryan – we had four agencies out doing eDNA and we haven't found them yet

John – they are coming and it is only a matter of time

Ryan – they are pretty effective at removing them through gill netting; when they get here we have good habitat and it will be more difficult to get them here, they will end up in Banks Lake

*Chris Johnson – MSRF:* we are at 80% draft design for Twisp River Floodplain Phase II; at Barkley Bear Habitat we are moving along, and MVID/Barkley Irrigation project is moving forward, which allows our project to move forward

We working on the Elbow Right project

We got four 60' and two 46' I-beams, railroad, very heavy duty. If someone has a need we have more than we need.

WDFW is interpreting the HPA codes such that WDFW is exerting authority over areas outside of the stream/Ordinary High into areas that may sometime in the future may affect the bed of the river. If anyone has any experience with this, I would like to hear about it

**Next MRC December 18**

<b>Definitions of Commonly used Acronyms</b>	
AEM	Action Effectiveness Monitoring
ANS	Aquatic Nuisance Species
AREMP	Aquatic and Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring Program
AU	Assessment Unit
BACI	Before, After, Control, Impact (study design type)
BDA	Beaver Dam Analogue
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
DEM	Digital Elevation Model
EC	Ecological Concern
EDT	Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment
EQIP	Environmental Quality Incentives Program
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
ISAB	Independent Science Advisory Board
ISEMP	Integrated Status and Effectiveness Monitoring Project
ISRP	Independent Scientific Review Panel (reviews BPA projects)
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

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
Snerd	Fish Capture-Snorkel Herding
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