

## Methow Restoration Council

September 17, 2013

### Participants:

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Allen Lebovitz	WDNR
Charlie Snow	WDFW
Chris Butler	Yakama Nation
Don Phillips	Local Citizen
Hans Smith	Yakama Nation
Jarred Johnson	Yakama Nation
Jennifer Molesworth	Reclamation
Jeri Timm	WWP-TU
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
John Crandall	MRC
Joy Juelson	UCSRB
Julie Grialou	Methow Conservancy
Susan Crampton	Local Citizen
Terri Williams	Okanogan Conservation District

### Meeting notes:

**Jeri Timm—Trout Unlimited Update:** the Chewuch Canal project is moving along; TU awarded the construction to a contractor out of Wenatchee. The TU Twisp office is having an open house on Sept 28<sup>th</sup> from 4-7 in conjunction with the Twisp Art Walk (next Saturday) with appetizers and a raffle. John Crandall—the Chewuch ditch will be piped from Pearygin to the end, fixing the infrastructure at Pearygin. When Chewuch hits 100 cfs, they will have the water right change from 34 to 24 cfs. I have a monitoring effort trying to ascertain the habitat effects of that saved water.

**John Crandall—Monitoring Update:** the Upper Columbia Science Conference is coming up November 13-14<sup>th</sup> on a Wed-Thurs. The theme is “Salmon Recovery Science in Practice”. Upper Columbia specific conference, but there will be speakers from outside as well. There will be breakout sessions. Charlie Snow is presenting on spring Chinook and steelhead, we will have lamprey sessions, monitoring effects of habitat restoration, modeling, restoration strategies and practices, hatcheries and Harvest, also emerging issues. You have missed deadline for abstract submissions, talk to John if you still want to submit.

Joy Juelson—if you want to have a booth, contact Greer; will be a small fee. To register, go to [www.ucsrb.com](http://www.ucsrb.com) and click on the conference more information link.

Charlie Snow—I created a profile to upload my abstract; do I still need to register that I am going?

John—yes. Please register so that Greer knows how much food to buy, etc. There will be free drinks after.

John—Methow Monitoring Plan is the Appendix C to the monitoring strategy, which is an Appendix to the Recovery Plan. The Entiat and Wenatchee are done, but Wenatchee is mainly about ISEMP; the Entiat document isn't currently doing much—it is a description of the IMW. These are specific but don't get at everything that is going on. For the Methow, we are hitching it to the questions that the Recovery Plan seeks to answer. We are trying to be very specific, for example, what are the fish doing, how are we monitoring fish populations in the Methow—how are we measuring those here? We are trying to backfill behind all of these plans, put all this stuff out there, we are getting all this different information

from various sources, not all of which are intended for salmon recovery, but we can use the information. We have all of these different types of monitoring under the Recovery Plan, all these different levels, and we are trying to describe this in our plan. We have close to 40 different monitoring programs in the Methow. We are trying to describe how they fit, and how do we manage the data. We have bucketloads of data, but a lot hasn't seen the light of day. A lot of information is collected, but it is unwieldy and difficult for project sponsors to use to inform projects and understand how our projects are affecting fish. The monitoring plan is coming, likely have a draft this winter.

The Monitoring Data Management Committee, a subcommittee of RTT, has been tasked with trying to make sense out of the relationship between the biological world and fish needs and project implementation. What information would you (project sponsors) really want to have in terms of understanding the biological context of the places where you are working that you don't have, and what do you have that is working? We are trying to figure out how the data can be made more accessible and helpful to people as they design projects. There is a regional desire to have a stronger tie between implementation and fish. Then we can try to figure out if by doing that can we identify if we are increasing survival.

Allen Lebovitz—sounds like you are trying to reverse engineer the questions from the data you have  
John—not quite. Appendix G of the Recovery Plan helps identify assessment unit with primary limiting factor, and how to focus attention on habitat action classes on effects to fish. Unfortunately the Appendix G needs to be updated, but it could be very useful.

The monitoring data that is being collected is all over the place, but most of it is not about the Recovery Plan. It has a specific purpose, like monitoring hatchery programs, streamflow, etc. But, this is all important information that we can use to answer our questions. So we are trying to harness all that energy that is out there to use it. I think we can do a better job of developing habitat matrices for the basin, then use the existing data for project planning. For fish, we have abundance and productivity. We have criteria for fish recovery, but not for habitat recovery.

Discussion—FS data on wood, is guidance information, but it is not site specific, not always applicable on non-forest land. No target in the recovery plan for habitat, but it is in there; need more guidance.

John—the recovery plan asks whether conditions are improving, but doesn't identify what "improvement" looks like

Hans Smith—we are using the RAs, other guidance documents

John—there is a lot more information about species and life stage; trying to identify that we are getting this type of information and if that information is valuable

Allen—so how can we use this to help try to inform projects?

John—that is the difficult part.

Discussion—site specific recommendations from the data, but can we use the information that we are generating

Charlie—are you assigning habitat areas on a species basis? Different species use different types of habitat, so you may want to target specific species in certain areas; otherwise it all looks the same. We have all these different types of data, but not habitat data

John—we are trying to tie it together, trying to rectify it spatially. We have data, but trying to put it together so that we can use it, analyze it, and have the discussions about how to use it. RAs are great, but they are very physical, but not very biological, so we are trying to get that information in there as well. Don't want to mess up the things that are working.

Allen—these habitat conditions may also change over time, needs to be factored in. We also care a lot about the other species using the area.

Charlie—our program is not just a hatchery program, we are not a recovery plan, but a lot of the work we are doing is to assess recovery, but it is framed within the hatchery program, and you can't understand the hatchery program without understanding the wild.

**Hans Smith—Yakama Nation Completed & Upcoming Methow Subbasin Habitat Restoration Projects:**

We have six project areas in the Methow Subbasin: Chewuch rm 0-20, Big Valley in assessed area, M2, Lower Twisp, Upper Beaver, Lower Libby Creek. We still need an RA on Upper Beaver

We have completed a number of projects in those priority reaches; we look at this as the beginning.

This year we have one project on the Chewuch, one on Upper Beaver, one on M2.

Chris Butler—on the Chewuch, we have three engineered log jams and two engineered log cover habitats.

Jarred—on Beaver Creek, we had 13 log structures, activated a relic channel, and created a backwater habitat feature. Over almost a mile of stream was enhanced; structures vary quite a bit, use boulders in some places, some features are cables, some gravity ballasted with rock.

Hans—sugar dike wood project, implementing this portion, placing some wood in the backwater, and some wood on the riprap face on the bend

Jarred—our contractor just finished the draft of the Lower Twisp River Recreation Report, should have Chewuch and Big Valley soon. They used cameras on Big Valley, and captured a lot of images of boaters, more than we thought—150 or so boaters. Saw quite a few kayakers on the Twisp.

John—is this going to change anything?

Hans—it is part of the due diligence, knowing who is using the river where you are going to do projects

Allen—helps with liability, understand risks, influencing design, making projects safer, design how to sign or educate for a project area.

Hans—it is up to the project sponsor to determine how to use the information

Allen—the idea is to be informed about what is going on and be able to respond in each case

Jennifer Molesworth—but we can never say that the project is “safe”; but only that we have considered the risks

John—rivers are inherently dangerous

Jarred—the more dangerous uses, less skilled users, fewer life jackets, all happen at lower flows

Hans—Looking forward, we have the Middle Twisp Reach Assessment this fall, similar scope to the Lower Twisp RA, the data set should tie in really well. We have several project areas that we are looking at. Poorman Creek road just upstream of the lower bridge, MSRF owns both sides, partnering.

Charlie—the bed is really plain there, have you considered adding rock riffles? They make really great steelhead habitat

Hans—Rivermile 0.5, in the town of Twisp, backwater feature, wood structures

The rest of the project areas are in pre-concept phase, setting up contracts to look at concepts: RM 3 large wood enhancement, cover habitat; potential side channel project on Bond Lane Side Channel, will be talking with the Conservancy, landowners, have talked with some of the landowners; RM 6+ large wood enhancements, not specific spots located yet, but trying to get more wood in the Twisp, also working with MSRF on Poorman irrigation diversions to assist with restoration in the floodplain.

Hans—on M2, we have four project sites. 1890’s side channel project for implementation in 2014, one pending acquisition, also a water rights application for a groundwater infiltration gallery; we will need letters of support. Looking at enhancing the old 1890s side channel, 0.8 miles of side channel habitat, about a 4 cfs groundwater flow at the top, habitat enhancements, some similar efforts to what John Jorgenson did at Hancock springs, working with landowners.

John— you need to look at the flow patterns, if you can get perennial flowing water, fish will love it, the concern is that it will turn into frog water

Hans—the goal is to keep it flowing, and we have the gallery to flush it out

John—you need to look at the velocities too

Hans—beavers will also come into play, and it will be ultimately up to the landowner, we will put something in place that will have the best shot at maintaining flow.

M2 Two Channels—upstream of 1890s, just downstream of the MSRF WDFW project. We were going to implement this year, but had a change of landowner and the new landowner may not be receptive to restoration, so the project is in flux.

M2 Ag Island—in the sugar dike area, may be looking at backwater alcove, landowner outreach continues in this section of the river and will affect whether implementation is possible.

M2 Eagle Rocks Cottonwood Establishment across from the Riverbend trailer park; we will use the stinger to get cottonwoods down to depth, will exclusion fencing for deer with access between.

The MOU between YN and WDFW has been signed, so that we can now work on WDFW land, and this gives an alternative to the temp use permit. We are trying to plan a bunch of projects on WDFW properties for implementation in 2015. In the Chewuch and Big Valley Project Areas—we are looking at Fender Mill, Big Valley, Chewuch state land work under the MOU, other projects on the Chewuch on FS property. Fender, we will pick back up where we left off previously, working with landowners, Conservancy, FS.

Chris—Jarred is going to be the project manager for the Big Valley DNR project, he will be working with DNR and WDFW in the area of the people mover. We will be surveying this fall.

John—I have surveyed that area a lot, and I'm always surprised at how devoid of fish that is, it is a Chinook spawning reach, and also a lot of whitefish. It is interesting that you don't see a lot of resident rainbow or cutthroat.

Charlie—it is great Chinook habitat, but not steelhead habitat. Should also be good for coho. Side channel from people mover down is a fish sink—a lot of stranding when it dewater.

Allen—there are a lot of very interesting channels, relic levying in the area, there is a lot of potential to reestablish process in the area

Hans—we are also working on the habitat restoration awareness signage—there will be aggressive signing along the Methow, big kiosks for certain locations, otherwise on posts; the signs are 4x8 and 4x4. Have a kiosk up at Twisp Ponds. Waiting on cultural resources for the installation sites, should have signs delivered next week. The other subbasins are also working on it, but we are ahead.

**Joy Juelson—UCSRB Update:** I'm with UCSRB and facilitate the Lead Entity process and also work with the targeted process. I would like to give you some updates that have regional significance. Last September 10, we had an Implementation Team meeting and it was well attended. We had a panel and discussion on the new Landowner Liability Legislation that took effect July 28<sup>th</sup>, 2013. We wanted to have a panel discussion with project sponsors, engineers, and landowners. Some of the participants included: Chris Johnson, Allen Lebovitz, Greg Koonce from Interfluve, others. We had a lot of questions and confusion around what the liability legislation means for folks and this provided an opportunity to discuss a variety of interpretations. Will send out notes within the next couple of weeks. One take home that I had was the smaller the organization, the more exposure that is felt from the legislation. We are also working with the state to send out a survey to all project sponsors and that we will present to the SRFB, GSRO, and RCO at the October 16<sup>th</sup> meeting. We hope to track this legislation to see how it is affecting recovery. Also on the agenda was working on WDFW lands and discussed an analysis completed on WDFW lands by James White to assess where WDFW lands align with high priority areas for recovery; almost all areas were in the Methow. WDFW is looking to hire a part time person to work on restoration, looking at ways to get more funding to get a full FTE.

Joy—UCSRB LE Project List (SRFB/Trib)—we had 21 projects, only seven above the funding line.

Probably won't be much movement, but it isn't final yet. The RTT is going back to look at the scoring criteria and refine. Had more projects move around from the joint CAC committee. We will be looking

at ways to improve the process during this year's debrief; there will probably be lot of emphasis on streamlining, also the RTT will be revising the scoring criteria.

Discussion—CAC involvement, understanding the process, scoring, opportunities to improve the process, how to fund the very best and high priority projects, are we meeting our strategy.

Julie Grialou—who makes the final decision in terms of the criteria?

Joy—depends on what it is. If it has to do with the committee process, the individual committees have to come to consensus, so ranking they all have to come to consensus, for the RTT, they are independent science body. The Boards relationship with the RTT is that they subcontract with the Chair. We do provide them with recommendations but they make their own decisions. In terms of the regional process, we have our debrief process and process changes can be implemented by the Lead Entity but fundamental process changes need to be made by the board. If you are changing the whole way that things work, that would be a board decision, it depends on the scope of the change.

Don—I would like more interface with the RTT, can see a lot from the draft presentations, learn, but it is different every year.

Joy—there is a board meeting next week at the Okanogan County Courthouse, Sept 27<sup>th</sup>, from 10-3, these are open meetings. They will talk about the CAC recruitment process, but no decisions will be made and they will approve the implementation schedule. Thank you for your updates to the HWS. The Board will approve and then your information is submitted to NOAA.

**John Crandall—Outreach Update:** the Twisp Ponds Discovery trail is up and running; it is a 10-station ecological journey through the Twisp Ponds; Barry Stromberger made the metal signs. I would like feedback on the text and the numbered markers—can you find them, is it understandable, etc. It is another outreach piece that we hope will engage the community in what we are doing and in the watershed. Willowbrook Design from Carlton did the guides (and the fish guide too). The Lamprey Restoration Guide is gathering steam. Freshwaters Illustrated has a lamprey movie, they are coming to the Upper Columbia to take pictures of ammocoetes, and we can use their pictures in the guide. The calendar is on track to be printed, hopefully before October 1<sup>st</sup>, will be really neat. The information has been passed on to the layout folks.

Jessica Goldberg—I recently updated the calendar on the MRC web site; if you have events for the MRC events calendar the site, send them to me and I will post them

John—we had an event in conjunction with the Methow Conservancy, a field day at the Whitefish Island looking at the structures, fish, fish recovery was a fun day

Susan Crampton—people had a good time.

## **Roundtable**

Joy Juelson—UCSRB: there have been some folks that thought it would be good to have more internal communication among partners in the Upper Columbia, communication about permitting, science, outreach, etc., we are coming up with a format for an internal bulletin.

Susan Crampton—it is very nice to come here to the meeting and hear about what you are doing.

Allen Lebovitz—DNR: the public safety checklist and instructions for completing the JARPA for work on DNR managed aquatic lands is on our website now.

I had the opportunity to bring the aquatics program division manager out, and the commissioner's deputy supervisor, and showed them a bunch of the work that you've been doing, particularly Whitefish Island, and they were very impressed. There were big schools of juvenile fish in that side channel that had more water in it, and I think they are more inclined to be supportive. I have been campaigning to

get DNR more involved and supportive. Hope to be able to provide more resources and funding as well. We have funds available for habitat restoration, so if you have needs please let me know, it will be an easy application, there is also a lot of funding available for invasive species, funds should be spent on DNR managed state lands. I'm getting clarification on brook trout as invasives. The last large pot of money is for removal of large debris, like something that is too big to remove easily, car bodies, people mover, etc. Think about projects.

Jennifer—you would have to do cultural for the large debris?

Allen—yes, I am a qualified technician to do the assessment, we also have an archaeologist on staff; if we find something then it gets a little more complicated.

Allen—you will start noticing that DNR is going to start asserting ownership in more areas, likely the Twisp and the Chewuch, there still is no map. This is because we have improved our ability to use the information that we already have and using it to make our determinations on a more broad scale approach. What that means is that we have a model that works really well in determining what was navigable or susceptible to navigability for the purpose of commerce prior to statehood. The upper extent is likely to be where the Forest Service boundary is. The limit is the OHWM. DNR can only interpret the law, but only a court gets to make the final call if it is challenged.

Jennifer Molesworth—Reclamation: we have lots of projects going on in the Methow; Reclamation is involved in many with MSRF and TU. The Chewuch pipe moved through the Ecology process with no appeals. Is now fully funded, they have construction starting this fall, and they have awarded a contract to Selland out of Wenatchee. MVID is rolling along, approaching a 30% design, close to knowing what permits we need. Construction will be fall of 2014 and spring of 2015.

M2 WDFW is under construction; the side channel is done, unusual weather with the high water delaying the main channel work; we will finish cofferdam in the main stem Methow to finish the three big structures in the main channel of the river. We will be deconstructing a levee, and we are looking at finishing it in mid-October.

We are getting ready to build Beaver Creek Weirs, these are structures that Reclamation and OCD constructed in 2005, it has come apart, we are working on finalizing the design at Fort Thurlow, which is currently a passage barrier, also Marracci diversion will be rebuilt this fall.

We are also working on a design for M2 3R to implement next fall, hoping for efficiencies gained from the previously done work at M2.

We are also working on the Twisp River floodplain reach-based, levee modification/removal, at MVID West diversion, working with MSRF/BPA.

Also Right and Left Elbow coulee; we have been watching the original project levee breach on the left bank, John Crandall has been documenting fish use, and we have determined that we need a little more water in there. It will be a small effort to break a few rocks. Across the river and a little downstream we are piercing a push-up levee to reconnect a side channel, and through TU's work there will be one less diversion on the Twisp.

We are also working on the Barkley diversion, working with the directors to figure out an alternative irrigation strategy.

Reclamation is also working on the modeling for the Silver Reach Assessment.

*-Adjourn-*

**Next MRC October 15, 2013**

<b>Definitions of Commonly used Acronyms</b>	
ANS	Aquatic Nuisance Species
AREMP	Aquatic and Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring Program
BEF	Bonneville Environmental Foundation
BO/BiOp	Biological Opinion
BPA	Bonneville Power Administration
CAC	Citizens Advisory Committee
CAO	Critical Areas Ordinance
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
FFFP	Family Forest Fish Passage Program
FIA	Forest Inventory and Analysis program (USFS)
HACCP	Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point
HGMP	Hatchery Genetic Management Plan
HPA	Hydraulic Project Approval
HSRG	Hatchery Scientific Review Group
HWS	Habitat Work Schedule
IMW	Intensively Monitored Watershed
IS	Implementation Schedule
ISEMP	Integrated Status and Effectiveness Monitoring Project
ISRP	Independent Scientific Review Panel
IT	Implementation Team
LW/LWD	Large Wood/Large Woody Debris
M2	Middle Methow (a project area defined as the reach between Winthrop and Twisp)
MaDMC	Monitoring and Data Management Committee (pronounced "madmac")
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MRC	Methow Restoration Council
MSRF	Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation (pronounced "em-surf")
MVRD	Methow Valley Ranger District
MWC	Methow Watershed Council
MYAP	Multi-year Action Plan (also sometimes called the 3-year workplan)
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NPCC	Northwest Power and Conservation Council
OBMEP	Okanogan Basin Monitoring and Evaluation Program

OWL	Okanogan Wilderness League
PCSRF	Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (pronounced "Pacsurf")
PIBO	PACFISH/INFISH* Biological Opinion
PNAMP	Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Partnership
PUD	Public Utility District
QAQC	Quality Assurance, Quality Control
RA	Reach Assessment
RCO	(Washington State) Recreation and Conservation Office
REI	Reach-based Ecosystem Indicators (used in Reach Assessments)
RFEG	Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group
RM	River Mile
RPA	Reasonable and Prudent Alternative(s)
RTT	Regional Technical Team
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act
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 project 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 (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.