

## Methow Restoration Council

April 21, 2015

### Participants:

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Chris Butler	Yakama Nation
Derek Booth	Cardno, Inc.
Derek Van Marter	UCSRB
George Schneider	George Schneider & Assoc.
Heide Andersen	Methow Conservancy
Jenni Novak	WDFW
Jennifer Molesworth	Reclamation
Jeri Timm	WWP-TU
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
John Crandall	MRC
Joy Juelson	UCSRB
Julie Grialou	Methow Conservancy
Keith Watson	Multi
Ken Muir	USFWS
Kristen Kirkby	Yakama Nation
Matt Shales	CCFEG
Rick Alford	Yakama Nation
Robes Parrish	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Stephen Ralph	Cardno, Inc.
Teresa Fish	Yakama Nation

### Meeting Notes:

**John Crandall – Monitoring Update:** We will soon have two real time discharge monitoring stations on Beaver Creek. We spent a lot on fish passage there, and a lot of the watershed has burned recently, so this is a great monitoring component. It was a joint effort led by TU & Ecology, and MSRF. One is up on state land up by Bally Hill downstream of Lester Bridge and the downstream station is at Highway 153. A lot of effort and coordination, permits. It is pretty exciting to see those stations going in. We are lucky to have good monitoring here.

Robes Parrish – will those be real time on Ecology site?

John – either on Ecology or the USGS site; I haven't checked to see if they have gone in yet.

John – CHaMP update; we have 45 sites in the Methow, 15 rotating sites, plus 10 annual panels. We are trying to figure out who is using the information. When CHaMP first came, they were all over the basin, and then later they bounded it within the anadromous zone. They have done an amazing job of getting their data available through a database. A lot of information to sift through, but it is there and available. Looking to see which data is valuable, they are looking at doing replicates and dropping a few of the annual sites this year, so it would be good to know which sites people wouldn't want to lose a year of data for. If they drop one of the annual panels, they will come back to it next year.

Discussion – repeat samples, could be same crew or different

Steve Ralph – they wouldn't use the same crew for the replicates if they are trying to detect observer bias

John – that is possible; I don't know if they are trying to detect that – they have done a lot of work in that realm.

Rick Alford – what is the consensus on the Frazer Creek sampling?

Kristen – we are going out Thursday to sample Frazer

Teresa – two 200 m stretches

Discussion – no tagging going on, no array yet, goal to put in antennas in the long term, but too much sediment now

John – there was a report this week that Jennifer Molesworth saw a big steelhead hanging out on some nice gravel by her house

**John – Outreach Update:** tomorrow night there will be a movie on lamprey at the Twisp River Pub, Freshwaters Illustrated did the video; they are doing some of the best video work out there. The movie will be at 7:00, about a 35 or 40 minute film that was done in conjunction with USFWS office out of Leavenworth.

Derek Van Marter – how did last month's movie and panel go?

John – good; it was a steelhead movie, was a good panel, a wide ranging discussion, a lot of details about hatchery, got somewhat complicated, in the weeds. The movie was pretty well attended.

John – National Fishing Day – there is a meeting today at the Duck Brand at noon. Fishing day will be June 6<sup>th</sup> I think. **Correction: Kids' Fishing Day will be June 13<sup>th</sup> from 10 am to 2 pm.**

Watershed Watchers – there will be 5 or 6 different programs, different sites including WDFW Floodplain, maybe Big Valley to incorporate geology. Talk to me or Rob Crandall of Methow Natives if you want to help.

Rick – at Twisp Ponds, we have the shade covers for the coho if the kids want to help put them out again; also have aqua cribs that we made that kids can help with

John – do you have any idea what the predation is like out there?

Rick – we estimate a 5-7% loss at that site

**Jeri Timm – Twisp River Play Dams:** there was a lady that come into our office a week or two ago, and she was pretty concerned about the kids that go out in the summer and build dams at the Twisp River, would like to have a conversation about what we can do.

John – there has been a sign there just about every year, but people just walk by them; it also happens in other locations

Jennifer Molesworth – Twisp is the worst

John – in some cases there are full-on barriers

Derek – a good opportunity for an ad in the paper

Jessica Goldberg – a My Turn, or a letter to the editor might be better, or a good addition to an ad

Derek – radio spot would also be good

Chris Butler – we see those on the Chewuch at the dispersed camping sites

John – we used to have folks that would go out and talk to people

Jennifer – when I was at the Forest Service, we used to hire someone to go out and talk to people, and it really helped. We also used to get the engine crew to out and take them down. The Respect the River crew used to really help with that. Don't think it is happening now; it would be a good thing to fund – it cost \$50k per year when we used to do it, to fund a crew to do maintenance and outreach.

George Schneider – how serious a problem is it?

Jennifer – it is serious. The dams block adult passage and can strand juveniles when the flows drop

**Action:** MSRF will take the lead on signs, and talk to the town; John will talk to Don Ashford about a radio spot. John will look into a kiosk for the park. Jeri will talk to Crystal about next steps.

**Chris Butler – Yakama Nation Chewuch Projects RM 11.75 – 15.5:** We are working with USFS and WDFW; these were developed as three separate projects, and it has been a long journey. The three projects are 1) Chewuch River Right – at Eightmile Creek Campground (WDFW Property), 2) Chewuch Camp Ground – at Falls Creek Campground (WDFW Property), and 3) Chewuch RM 13-15.5 (USFS property). Proposed treatments (all three sites) include 11 engineered log structures, 5 engineered large wood cover structures, 1 engineered apex structure, 1 backwater channel, 1 2,500 ft. side channel, 3 pool enhancements, 1.55 acres wetland creation, pit reclamation, and road abandonment.

At the Chewuch River Right site, there is an existing campground. To mitigate for the loss of the campsites near the river, we are creating new campsites in the upland areas.

Derek – are you excavating the entire side channel?

Chris B – yes. In order to get the right gradient for the channel. At the Chewuch campground site we had to eliminate some elements because we couldn't meet Department of Ecology requirements.

Side Channel and Wetland Creation at Chewuch River Right – when we first proposed the side channel project, we were just under ½ acre of disturbance, and Ecology said we would have to mitigate with credit debit ratios; we were going to use the historic side channel, but it is now a category one wetland, so now we are going to dig a new channel. We have piezometers in monitoring the groundwater. We have to create 1.3 acres of wetland to mitigate because we were disturbing .29 acres of wetlands. We are still waiting for Ecology to weigh in.

Jennifer – if we reestablish a historic side channel we will have to mitigate?

Chris B – only if it is a category 1, then they say we have to mitigate with the credit/debit tool

Jennifer – what happens to the spoils from the digging?

Chris B – that goes to reclaiming the pit, depending on the types of the spoils, some will be captured and reused to establish the wetlands?

John – how much clearing will you have to do?

Chris B – it will be about 30 ft wide; everything that we disturb will be put back, we will be using whole trees that will look like windfall

John – like at River Mile 10?

Chris B – yes, but we will have more trees. They also have more marked that we can use if we need them

Jennifer – you will be excavating into old alluvium, will you haul that to the pit?

Chris B – yes

Jennifer – the best habitat is when the river carves a new channel – river –excavated alluvium forms some of the best habitat, by digging it manually, the river won't be able to do it, and you won't get the same products

Chris B – we have been working on this for many years; we wanted to initiate natural processes, but both the WDFW and USFS thought that it wasn't a good place for it because there are too many houses downstream.

Derek – has it lost sinuosity here?

Chris B – yes, it is pretty much locked into place

Kristen Kirkby – what are the constraints?

Chris B – roads and campgrounds on both sides. We estimated low flow for September at 45 cfs using Stream Stats. NOAA required that low flow is our flow for when the side channel starts disconnecting from the Chewuch River. The cofferdam at the inlet will stay until spring 2016 to make sure we don't dewater any redds. We will use pile-driven supports for wood structures. We believe the channel will stay wet year round from the groundwater.

Chewuch Campground project: there are three sites, we have an ELJ, a cover structure, and an apex structure. It was a larger project but was made smaller due to campground constraints, wetland impacts, etc.

Chewuch RM 13-15.5 project: located on FS property; six sites directly on the opposite side of the river from the Chewuch Camp Ground site. There will be a backwater channel that will stay wet year-round. Four sites upstream, will have pools, ELJs.

Derek – when will you bid?

Chris – we have contractor site visits today, bids due on the 30<sup>th</sup>; we are still permitting.

### **CCFEG Presentation: Twisp to Carlton Reach Assessment**

Matt Shales – this is a follow up to our preliminary results presentation from November. We took comments from the preliminary findings and produced the draft Twisp to Carlton Reach Assessment. We had funding assistance from Tributary Committee and SRFB, and the Bureau of Reclamation assisted with modeling. Our goal is to determine how best to protect and improve habitat for salmonids.

Steve Ralph– the assessment reach is from Twisp to Carlton.

Matt – Goals and Objectives overview. We hope to have comments from people by April 28<sup>th</sup>.

Steve – the DRAFT is available on an ftp site that Matt sent to Jessica earlier for distribution.

Matt – we have divided the reach into sub-reaches that have been identified by M1, M2, M3, but we may need to change those that to avoid confusion with the Middle Methow

Steve – we can use TC1, TC2, TC3 instead. I will do a brief overview, and then go to the table and the maps. The greatest limiting factor in the reach is lack of juvenile rearing habitat. Our approach is to protect and restore natural river processes. We examined river processes in the larger geomorphic and hydrologic context and analyzed constraints to see how they might be reconciled.

The products are the Report, GIS data layers, Map Book, Prioritized Project Selection

Joy Juelson– there are a lot of methodologies for reach assessments; what did you base your assessment on?

Steve – we used the Bureau of Reclamation’s recommendations, which was specifically called out in the RFP.

Prioritization of Actions – we focused on ESA species, but not exclusively, identified locations where natural processes have been truncated, prime targets off-channel and slow water habitats. Key processes: recover river processes, reestablish in-channel flow complexity, and reestablish riparian forest. A lot of wood by count, but not a lot of flow interaction.

Jennifer – I was talking to someone who had been told by an old timer (Vern Lamotte) that the upper part of the reach was almost impassible before the 48 flood due to wood and the beaver work crisscrossing the reach, braided channels.

Discussion – not much in the river now that makes wood stick to it, and not much source material.

Steve – the wood should be there, but not much historic records showing what might have been there.

We only found one photograph showing an apex jam on the Methow below the Twisp River confluence.

River loading is somewhat controversial, because there are not a lot of good references. Right now there is almost no functional wood except in the Silver reach. It will be up to the community to determine how much wood is enough.

Keith Watson – there are many Shafer photos of wood being transported down the river

Discussion – logging drives, most historic photos are in the upper Methow

Steve – suite of actions:

- Riparian planting and protection
- Levee and riprap removal
- Floodplain re-grading
- ELJ Installations

- Beaver Reintroduction
- Riparian Planting
- Single-Log and Small ELJ Installations
- Bedrock Clusters and Barbs

Jennifer – did anything on stream flow come up?

Steve – we didn't look at the cumulative effects of diversions, flow not as much of a concern as temperature, although we were somewhat surprised that temperature did not look to be much of a problem. We didn't look much at flow per se.

Jennifer – at some point we need to look closer at flow, especially with climate change.

Steve – this year might be a good year, especially with as much sediment as we have; I don't think it will approach a two-year flood event.

Matt – is that something that you think should be incorporated?

Jennifer – I think it would be good; it would help TU get money if it is needed, we need to know if we are done or if there is more work to do.

Derek – it is only a political issue right now, rather than a biological one.

Steve – it is not in our current scope, and if you are going to do it, you should do it well.

Jeri – we are struggling to get funding for any work on the mainstem because of lack of information.

Discussion – flow information

Steve – it is very difficult to show change from small changes in flow, and definitely hard to show a cause effect relationship

George – is there a state minimum instream flow, and is it met?

Jennifer – yes, but it is very low. It is not a biological flow; we might see it this year.

Steve – subreach action summaries. The middle reach shows the most opportunities for restoration.

Table 5-1, 5-2

- **Subreach M1 (RM 28.2–33.7)**- some moderate but lower priority opportunities to restore riparian and in-channel habitat complexity; Constraints include lack of floodplain surfaces and deep entrenchment of river corridor.
- **Subreach M2 (RM 33.7–40.3)** – offers the most promising opportunities for protection and restoration; constraints include built environment.
- **Subreach M3 (RM 40.3–41.3)** – limited opportunities for in-channel habitat complexity via LWD and boulder clusters installation, and recovery of riparian communities; constrained by channel margins and infrastructure.

Derek Booth– Map showing RM 37-38.5; Restoration project actions – we don't recommend removing levee or riprap that is protecting developed property; there are recommended places for potential ELJs and other wood placements. We looked for opportunities where at least one side of the river is unconstrained by development.

Jennifer – if you recommend breaching the levee, wouldn't you also recommend showing protection opportunities to allow these actions?

Steve – we looked at conceptual level, but we did not look at feasibility

Discussion – how to show needs, sometimes it is better to be subtle to preserve options for negotiation with the landowners

Chris Johnson – there is sensitivity among landowners for placing wood near areas of bank erosion

Derek – we haven't drawn in specific locations of specific logs and structures in high detail; our judgment was that no one would go out and build a structure based on a reach assessment. There will always be additional engineering that would be done before anything is built, so we decided that there was no value but significant additional cost in trying to pre-design the structures. So we used fairly

broad-brushed criteria for identifying zones where some kind of wood would likely be beneficial and that would not be likely to be detrimental to adjacent landowners. These are the generalities in this RA compared to others, because we know that projects are not installed based on a Reach Assessment and we saw no value in doing that twice.

Steve – there are a lot of glides in the reach. Levee, beaver ponds, which are blocked at the lower end, and it would be nice to put some water level recorders in the ponds. Lower 6 miles has a lot of bedrock pools, somewhat entrenched.

Steve – people are more than welcome to comment, call with questions

Jennifer – I think it is great that this is getting done; it is an important reach, because all the fish have to go through there. What is the plan after the RA is done?

Discussion – a future meeting to determine priorities, opportunities for people to work in the area

Chris J – I would be interested in how changes in the Shoreline Management Act might change things

Jennifer – that might be another next step

John – we are working on a layer of that

Chris J – that would be another way of showing the risk without making it personal

Steve – we didn't go into the feasibility analysis; we didn't look at putting anything like that in there, but if you write something, we can put it in there.

Matt – I made a note.

**Joy Juelson – UCSRB Update:** SRFB process – draft proposals are in; we received 14. We started with 16 and two are already funded (protection projects). In the Wenatchee there are 9 proposals with big asks. In the Methow, we had 5 projects: 1 design, 3 protection, 1 assessment.

Jennifer – is there a list yet?

Joy – we are developing it now. We have tours in the Methow on May 7<sup>th</sup>. We will be meeting in the RiverBank at 10:30; we will have a couple of presentations in the conference room – 1 protection and 1 assessment. Then will go to three stops. The Wenatchee project tour will be the next week on the 13<sup>th</sup>; no projects in the Entiat or Okanogan this year.

Derek - if we don't get the full federal match, we will not have an 18 million round this year, which means we won't have \$2M this year. It is a good idea to reach out to representatives on how important this is.

We just went to DC, executive committee, Me, Paul Ward from YN, Steve Jenkins, had 22 meetings in three days, we met with 5 senators, representatives, importance of continued funding of PCSRF, also talked about forest health. We also met with executives of all of the agencies that we touch on, USFS, Reclamation, NOAA, USFWS. Message of local solutions for local issues.

Joy – Derek and I also visited the state capitol to talk to our local lawmakers.

Joy – the Salmon Recovery Conference is in May, registration is ongoing. Had a request from the organizers, they are doing a film festival and would like short film clips. Let me know and I can hook you up with those folks.

Finally, the Implementation Team meeting is coming up June 2<sup>nd</sup>, focusing on project prioritization in the Upper Columbia.

## **Roundtable**

**Chris Butler – Yakama Nation Habitat Update:** today and tomorrow we are doing contractor site visits for all of our projects that are being implemented this summer. From Hans and Jarred:

Final plans for Fender mill will be presented in May 2015, preliminary draft of upper Methow RA is in and will reviewed internally in late April

Final Middle Twisp RA is published on the YN Website

YN UCHRP is working on 5 projects up the Twisp River for potential 2016 implementation

- Twisp Ponds Left Bank V2
- Lower Twisp River Large Wood (RM3)
- Newby Narrows – just upstream of Little Bridge Creek – acquisitions pending (1 offer accepted, 1 offer pending)
- Horseshoe side channel (RM 11.5)
- Scaffold Camp (TwispAvia)

Hans is working with USFS on Early Winters Creek campground.

1890s monitoring proposal will be released soon. Proposal is to determine species diversity, growth rates, survival, benthic macro-inverts, and hydrologic conditions during different seasons and typical times of stress – seeking letters of support for monitoring funds

Upper Methow recreation safety and large wood assessment has started; four motion cameras have been installed.

**John Crandall:** – the Lamprey Guide is going to the printer on Friday, may have it next meeting

**Chris Johnson – MSRF Update:** for those who haven't seen the flyer, there is an Ecology Wetland training on May 6<sup>th</sup>. The direction that Ecology is going is that on reconnection projects or wetland impact projects, if the impact is resulting in a conversion of wetland type, and the mechanism that isolated the side channel is natural, then they are viewing it as a conversion. If we are taking out railroads, levees, etc., then they are looking at it differently. Groundwater-fed alcoves are harder to find natural analogs. For those that want to hear the policy explained by Ecology, the May 6th meeting is a good opportunity to hear about the changes.

**Rick Alford – Yakama Nation Coho Program Update:** for the coho program, we are continuing our efforts to establish an acclimation pond in the upper basin. Plans to initiate the next phase of the program, take juvenile to upper tribs in 2017 and 2018. Got our BiOp from NOAA. For the Upper Columbia Spring Chinook and Steelhead acclimation program, there will be a public scoping (BPA) this Thursday at the Barn at 6. There is one in Wenatchee tomorrow.

**Jeri Timm– TU Update:** we are waiting to see if the Methow will be added to the drought declaration at some point, at which point there would be funding available for leases. We would be focusing on Beaver Creek if that is available.

Chris J – I will be talking with a landowner next week, so let me know.

**Matt Shales– CCFEG Update:** the Geestman revetment is in, Methow Natives did a really good job. We will do a little more planting in the fall, then weed maintenance through next summer.

At Silver, we were originally on a 2015 track for implementation. Now it is 2016 with a question mark. Still working with WDFW.

**Jenni Novak – WDFW Update:** we just finished tidying up the Goat Creek project, I am working on putting together a sign. We replaced a fish screen and put it closer to the diversion. I like the Fulton Signs as a model.

Jennifer – I can see if Bobby at Reclamation can help with tweaking the graphic for your screen – he did the one at Fulton.

Jenni – at the Upper Wolf Creek – have some conceptual ideas, have surveyed it, will come up with a new screen design, would like to put in a vertical plate screen. Would probably move the fish bypass; pushing to get the design so we can talk about funding it. I have a meeting to talk about Frazer Creek diversions, then will get out a list about things that we would like to do there.

I have a questions about the Batie and the new side channel; does stranding occur in the side channel, has anyone looked at that?

John – Brian has looked at it and hasn't seen any.

Jennifer – I don't think it will maintain itself

Chris J – the intent was as a flood release; I don't think it will stay as the channel.

Jenni – will be doing presence absence in the Early Winters ditch to see if there are fish, and if so where they are coming from.

Looked at the Bear Creek diversion on the WDFW land to see if anything can be done, but there is nothing to be done at this time.

**Kristen Kirkby – YN Hancock Project Update:** we lost another Hancock team member, Lucius is down in Portland.

Jennifer – will you be advertising a position?

Kristen – I will likely be moving to that position

Chris J – any interest in any interns?

Kristen – maybe

**Jennifer Molesworth– Reclamation:** this weekend we were hanging out at our house by Beaver Creek above Frazer Creek, and there was a big steelhead hanging out. The water is clearing, gravels are sorting. Much better than last fall where we did a survey and found 4 fish where we should have seen 500. It also says that the passage project we did at Fort Thurlow last year is working.

Chris J – if anyone has any ideas of where we can find some monitoring support for Beaver Creek, that would be great.

John – and getting the permits is a big deal

Jennifer – the USGS program is being resurrected, and will get going; getting the sampling permit is a challenge.

John – modifying an existing permit is easier than getting a new permit.

**Next MRC meeting: May 19, 2015**

<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
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.