

Methow Restoration Council

December 18, 2012

Participants:

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Allen Lebovitz	WDNR
Amanda Barg	WDFW
Brian Fisher	MSRF
Charlie Snow	WDFW
Chris Butler	Yakama Nation
Chris Johnson	MSRF
Crystal Elliot	Herrera Environmental
Chuck Peven	RTT
Derek Van Marter	UCSRB
Hans Smith	Yakama Nation
Jarred Johnson	Yakama Nation
Jennifer Molesworth	Reclamation
Jeri Timm	WWP-TU
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
John Baas	MIG
John Crandall	MRC/Monitoring
Ken Bevis	WDFW
Kurt Oakley	Aero Methow Rescue Service
Leslie Michel	Okanogan Conservation District
Michelle Dewey	Dewey Consulting LLC
Mike Brunfelt	InterFluve
Vikki Buzzard	Aero Methow Rescue Service

Meeting Notes:

John Crandall—Monitoring Update: regarding the concept of the “Methow IMW”—Intensively Monitored Watersheds are basins where there is a tight coordination between restoration work and monitoring. There are usually a lot of different programs, which are getting at status and trend in response to the restoration work going on. It can be reach-scale or basin-wide. The closest true IMW is in the Entiat; their watershed has been broken down into reaches and there are time-frames for restoration within a reach, and a monitoring program is overlaid within that. There is a treatment reach and a hands-off reach, and it is fairly well designed to facilitate statistical analysis to see the relationship between restoration and fish production. Fish production is what is behind most of the work we are doing. Entiat has this well laid-out, and their treatment was planned out ahead of time. Other similar programs are in the John Day, and the Lemhi; these are the three IMWs where it was laid out ahead of time and well planned. In the Methow, we have been doing restoration for over a decade, and it has been all over the map. It has been targeted, but all over the map geographically. This includes any kind of restoration action targeting a limiting factor—water transactions, passage, easements, etc. The monitoring was not planned out ahead of time, but we have a lot, so what we have is sort of IMW-like. Under Reclamation with the USGS, people have come up with the concept of the “Methow IMW”, which has lots of pieces. We have restoration, primarily in M2, with YN, Bureau, MSRF work, plus the USGS work in all of the side channels, of which Whitefish Island is a good example. They have also been doing

an in-depth look at rainbow trout genetics. We also have a modeling effort to look at food production/food web. And we also have other things that have been added on over the last few years, largely the YN work with nutrient enhancement on the Twisp River and more recently in Hancock springs. That work is being brought in to the "Methow IMW" concept. We are trying to get a handle on how the restoration work affects fish productivity. There are many potential confounding attributes—like the location of the restoration and the fish you are looking at (it is hard to know which tributary work it is responding to); PIT tag arrays help, but you need a high sample size and a lot of recaptures. There are also a lot of irrigation efficiencies putting water back in the stream. It is difficult to tease out a response at the population level; modeling can help if you have a very robust model. So, although Methow is not a true IMW, it is being viewed as such, but it is being set up differently, with no hands-off reaches. We have modeling and monitoring programs that are trying to capture it all. There is also a whole data analysis piece that is also being worked on lead by a few people at the University of Idaho, but it is not up and running yet.

Chris Johnson—curious, we have 1.5-2 decades of work behind us, but no real baseline behind us; is that something we can address?

Discussion—it is such a big area, sample size, is there a baseline? Big scale changes have happened over the last 100 years, hatcheries overlaid on everything, trying to be more systematic, many confounding things have occurred, aiming for wild fish recovery but hatchery work makes it hard to monitor.

Chuck Peven—there is a difference between jeopardy and recovery; the BiOp standard is jeopardy, not recovery. I recommend that you abandon the goal to get a baseline; I think that you should look at it in terms of getting data. I'm also not sure why you need to call it an "IMW"

JohnC—it is a process; we are trying to keep clear that it is different than the true IMWs, but it is somewhat out of the barn already

Allen Lebovitz—agree with the need for a reference reach, and I'm hoping that you are looking at a broad range of data to help measure the response—invertebrates, channel response

JohnC—that is happening; we are developing a monitoring plan for the basin that plays off of the recovery plan. The monitoring plan will use the guidance in the recovery plan to set up the questions that we are trying to answer with monitoring. We currently have 5 different habitat monitoring programs in the Methow. The CHaMP is going to be here every year taking samples; they have rotating panels with 15 sites sampled every year looking at change over time, all within the anadromous zone. We also have effectiveness monitoring on several levels, some at the project scale—we put wood in the river, are fish using it? It helps us say something in the short term about the work we are doing.

Recovery goals are looking at a much larger scale, but the confounding issues and noise are greatly amplified. We are looking at both status and trend and habitat monitoring; mostly spring Chinook and steelhead, bull trout are an outlier. Stream flow is another one we are starting to look at. There is an invertebrate component on several of the programs.

Allen Lebovitz—DNR signage and ELJ design: responding to the notes from last month, two particular issues caught my eye. In terms of DNR requirements, we do not require cables; there is no guidance or stipulations on how ELJs should be designed, but they mostly need to be engineered. Nothing is set in stone, more like guidance. My preference is to not see cable, but sometimes cables are required to achieve the objectives.

ChrisJ—it has been an evolving process with DNR, in the beginning we were told we should design to the 100-year standard. We are trying to keep up with the standard as it is evolving. On the M2 we used some hemp rope and other fasteners so will have the opportunity to see that will happen. For the HPA, we were required to have 100-year flows for the standard.

Allen—my opinion is that it is not appropriate to be so prescriptive on how to do restoration statewide; there is a lot of variability, and we need to be able to be flexible within sideboards. We have been

working with WDFW on the standards, but they seem to be leaning toward the 100-year design criteria. DNR doesn't have the same requirement; no specific requirement to meet our standards, but things may vary depending on the situation. You need to be upfront in the safety analysis and deal with it appropriately.

Ken Bevis—our agency is also struggling with the same liability questions

ChrisJ—in the high risk situations, we are aware of them as well, and we need to be able to work with the agencies on the specific situations

Jennifer Molesworth—what is a high risk situation?

Allen—an ELJ just upstream of a bridge is an example

ChrisJ—or an area where the channel is very unstable

Allen—we have a new version of the safety checklist coming out, and I think it is simpler and more appropriate. It should be synchronized with what WDFW is doing, you should be able to deal with it once from both agencies. I steered them away from categorizing the risk; it has been stripped out of the DNR version, is currently being reviewed by our attorney general, so will see how it changes. We are always willing to work with you.

Allen—we also do not have a signage requirement, we have guidance that there should be signage when appropriate, but it is an outcome of the public safety review, and that will determine what kinds of signs are appropriate. It requires a high level of honesty of where the risks really are. We may weigh in on a specific project, but there is no set in stone requirement for signage in this DNR district.

Brian Fisher—are you willing to engage earlier in the design process so we can see how the designs fit within the guidance so we can see which way the variability lies?

Allen—yes. Talk to me early and often. We are not the experts on signage either; we are learning from project implementers all over the state. Also, DNR, YN, WDFW, and USFW are talking about initiating restoration work on DNR lands in the Big Valley; this will include both DNR aquatics and DNR uplands. I will be here until Thursday working on that.

Derek Van Marter—two weeks ago we had an implementer's workshop, and we had a lot of discussion on signage. We haven't had it come up yet, but we need to quickly and thoughtfully decide how we deal with signage; need to do it now so that when we get to the spring we are ready to go. Will be setting precedent, and we need to think about addressing perceived liability. We also have the opportunity to do education on the inherent risk of river use. I would like to do a mock up, and address it region-wide.

JohnC—I think there is are also places to do it that gets to the education and outreach component, something that does more detailed outreach, a kiosk with panels, at places like the red barn. On the river, a sign is not beautiful—we want to be minimally invasive with any in-river signs. There may be two different pathways.

Allen—I agree that it is good to coordinate on language; don't think there should be a single sign, may not be the best for every setting, should involve river user groups

Hans Smith—with the general DNR signage policy, is there a willingness on DNR to take ownership of the physical sign on public access points adjoining SOAL?

Allen—there is no mandate, there is guidance. We are not a regulator, we are a proprietary land manager, but is a possibility that we would be willing to help, we have a sincere willingness to work with you

Ken—many of the regular put-ins are owned by WDFW/DOT/private; there would be a lot of legwork in the coordination, and you would need to coordinate with the various players

Vikki Buzzard—Aero Methow has been working on trying to get education on river use, trying to see what would be effective; most people that we need to assist are in the small rafts and inner tubes that they can't control; they also tend to be drinking. We often see defensiveness when trying to provide awareness. We have done a kid program on life jackets, "know before you go"

Kurt Oakley—also on dynamics of the water, what things look like.

Vikki—we find visitors that don't understand that the river changes all the time; we also find that the kids can influence their parents

Jennifer—you could do something for river safety education at National Fishing Day, also thinking about the places where people buy the inner tubes

Discussion—places where people get hung up, time of year

Vikki—most of the real problems are in late June/early July; a few in August, but those usually have to do with intoxication

Allen—there are two issues; one is public safety and the other is liability

Kurt—long term awareness, focusing on children, would be good, as well as direct education that covers immediate use; the more locals we teach about the river, the more they can educate people who come to visit

Discussion—stats on emergency response calls; lots of information, but targeting the specific audience is difficult

Vikki—we don't have too many calls, we hear about close calls; professional guides often come along and find people in trouble and help them.

ChrisJ—we will be working on some signage, would like to have your input

Vikki—we will help, and we will be doing the river education again this year. We assist the sheriff's office with search and rescue, Aero-Methow is a private ambulance company; knowing the access points is important

Chris Butler—anything you can do at the Kiosks that will catch kids' attention will help catch their parent's attention

ChrisJ—using QR codes can get even more information

Jarred Johnson, Yakama Nation & John Baas, MIG: Twisp and Chewuch River Recreation assessments

Jarred—the overall goal of the study is to assess the current hazards and potential introduced hazards; we want to evaluate both human and environmental factors. MIG is contracted to do recreation assessments for the Chewuch and the Twisp.

John Baas—We specialize in public recreation—public outreach, surveys, planning, master planning, facility design. We want to get an understanding of boating use levels, large wood (LW) characteristics, navigability, boater safety practices, search and rescue capabilities. We will do boater counts and surveys, LW and navigability, and search and rescue capabilities. We will do interviews, online questionnaires, LW count observations, boater count observations. Asking general user characteristics, perceptions of river navigability, support for river management actions, detailed safety questions, use of alternate locations. We will likely have a more educated, higher skilled population on the Twisp and Chewuch rivers than on the Methow. We want to cover entire boatable season. On the Chewuch, this is mid-May through labor day; on the Twisp mid-May through July. We will likely do more work online because we think it will be more difficult to find people on the river, and we will be more rigorous of counts. Potential challenges—presumed low boating use levels, identifying boater count locations, need to address two distinctly different skill levels of boaters, timing LW data collection with high, medium, and low flows.

ChrisJ—you need to make sure that the questions address different types of potential hazards, some problems with rocks

JohnB—we did a similar report on the Upper Wenatchee, high use reach with relatively flat water, mostly class 1 and 2, mostly low-skilled boating

For more information on the assessments, contact Jarred Johnson (509) 881-1642, John Bass (510) 845-7549 johnb@migcom.com.

JohnC—you will find two user groups; the whitewater user groups and the recreational groups, safety equipment use will be quite different; there will be other significant differences in their behaviors, which could give a mixed picture if you combine the data from the groups

JohnB—we will likely combine them in the presentation, but we can break them out in the analysis

Jarred—from Twisp Confluence to RM 8 (Newby Creek), and from Chewuch confluence to Twentymile

Hans—the intent is not to compare the reaches; we already did an assessment of the M2 reach previously. We are focusing on areas where there have been Reach Assessments

Allen—what is your take on how much risk we are introducing with ELJs?

JohnB—depends on the area, skill level and use is highly variable; river recreation is an inherently unsafe activity, accidents happen.

Hans—the information will be available for others to use, if you have information on who they should interview let us know

Derek Van Marter—UCSRB Update: we have a change in commissioner in the Okanogan County district; the commissioners will determine which among them will sit on the USCRB. We have completed the LE transition to the USCRB, they are interviewing for a new LE coordinator today in Wenatchee. The new coordinator will be in Wenatchee, but will represent the whole Upper Columbia and will be available. I will still be here, but the new coordinator will move toward representing the board at the WATs.

We have been facilitating the effort for working on forest health, and we will be assembling a large and diverse stakeholder group with the help of the FS and some stakeholders

JohnC—how does that play into the Recovery Plan?

Derek—the health of the forest vis-à-vis sediment has been a focus; mostly looking at roads up to now, we also have 3 million acres of National Forest near spawning grounds, so what happens in the Forest is important to recovery. We have the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program, and Congress has historically allocated about 40 million dollars to the FS, a large part goes to restoration—up-scaling restoration actions from an ecosystem perspective. FS is asking us to be involved in facilitating the dialogue.

Chuck—even if there is not a solid nexus with the Recovery Plan, the UCSRB staff is in a great place to facilitate this, definitely a tie between forest health and salmon recovery

Derek—UCSRB is successful in facilitating collaborative dialogue, working on a collaborative convening role as a neutral facilitator; what they do will be up for them. The Okanogan-Wenatchee Ranger District has a forest restoration strategy, focused on restoration rather than focusing on board feet. The FS is looking for help in implementing, we are looking for things that have restoration opportunities, involve roads, and affect aquatics.

JohnC—how far reaching is it? The recovery plan has a very clear road map and this is not so clear?

Bugs, infestation, aerial spraying?

Derek—solely focused on restoration opportunities, does include some sort of timber extraction, but also includes the ecosystem perspective.

JohnC—who is on the collaborative?

Derek—it is being formed now; there were 8 members on the steering committee

Jennifer—the place where restoration can happen really rapidly is on a fire, so if restoration of natural river processes is included in the beginning when that is being set up, that is really crucial to the process.

Fires are good for the rivers and they are good for fish. If you can get that into the emergency management program, that would be good. It is difficult politically, and there are caveats, but you can get salmon recovery from top to bottom from the ways the events are managed. Getting salmon recovery on the map of values that they are managing during the emergency is critical to managing the landscape for the next 100 years.

Ken—see some concern for mission creep, for losing the resource of the UCSRB that has been so great for the last 10 years.

Discussion—whole watershed restoration, grazing, recreation, “forest health” encompasses a lot

Derek—there is a tremendous amount of varied interest in changing the paradigm and improving the health of the 3 million acres of National Forest in the Upper Columbia. These are all issues for the future collaborative to be dealing with. Mission creep is a valid concern and question, people who are concerned about that need to keep bringing it up, and it is a big unknown

Jarred Johnson—Yakama Nation Beaver Creek Restoration Plans: (PowerPoint) I am the project manager for the Old School House Fish Habitat Enhancement on Beaver Creek. Two land parcels were purchased by MSRF with YN Accord funds (BPA). We have two project areas—the upper project area has 1500 feet of Beaver Creek and the lower project area includes 2200 feet of Beaver Creek; there is approx 1000 feet of private land between (MSRF previously did a restoration project on that property). We want to place LW to improve and enhance cover and improve channel complexity to improve juvenile rearing opportunities, stabilize bank to decrease sedimentation, riparian planting to improve future cottonwood sources for instream habitat. Others are working on instream flow issues.

Jennifer—Dave Hopkins from the FS did a stream habitat survey through there last summer; pre-project data

JohnC—we also have a flow monitoring stations upstream and downstream

Jarred—we will construct at the end of the summer, and then the plan is to resell the property and reuse the funds to support habitat restoration in other priority areas.

Mike Brunfelt—the creek runs through glacial outwash, a lot of larger sized material that impacts channel dimensions and grade, peak flow is Q2 (178 cfs) to Q100 (953), low flow probably around 5-7, but did not measure it. Habitat is created by existing boulders and natural large woody material. There is an existing wetland complex (wall-based) in the upper project area that is currently a stock pond that we will repurpose for fish. There are predominantly large wood enhancement and off-channel/alcove project sites.

Jarred—program direction is for permanent structures, so we will cable and ballast if we think they may move. We don't want to impact adjacent landowners.

Mike—for the most part we won't need cable, but there are a few places.

Jennifer—what about the veg plan?

Jarred—Wildlands is working on a veg plan; we will do a large riparian planting project

JohnC—we also have Centennial funds

Discussion—reed canary grass in the area

John Crandall—Outreach Update: will be updating the outreach and education plan to refresh and get all 2013 events in for submission to Ecology, so I will need people's information and events ASAP

ChrisJ—we are working on ways to make the calendar more interactive, link to website, want people to adopt months for info, pictures, video

We also have been working on the outreach collaborative, defining how people communicate to the public. We hired a consultant to work on it, and will have the download at our outreach meeting tomorrow.

Roundtable/Public Comment

Jennifer Molesworth—Reclamation has been working with TU and MVID and John Sunderland on MVID West; they will be abandoning the Twisp River diversion, and they have a suite of options for the new system, MVID will make a decision in March, which will be up and running in the spring of 2015. It is an ambitious timeline, people are working really hard, and they have funding from Office of Columbia River

ChrisJ—and this also creates a really stellar opportunity for habitat restoration on the Twisp River. Jennifer—we had 9 targeted proposals from the Upper Columbia; 4 were from the Methow. The RTT will review, action agencies will look at them in March. We will likely do a similar process next year, which should fill our timeline out to 2018 and define our program of work for large non-Accord actions out through 2018.

John Crandall—I submitted a grant proposal to the Northern Wasco and Klickitat County People's Utility District for lamprey. I will try to do a lamprey restoration guide for the whole Columbia basin, working with the YN out of the Toppenish shop, will include fish guide info, BMPs, methods for turning a salmon-centric project for added benefits for Lamprey. Should hear back soon.

Chris Butler—Yakama Nation has partnered with MSRF for an application for an EcoTrust grant for monitoring on the Chewuch.

Ken Bevis—at CCFEG, Jason dropped an advertisement for a project manager; they will be doubling their staff. The duty station is negotiable, prefer Wenatchee, but could be flexible. Recommend that people help CCFEG find the gaps. I predict that there will be strong interest. WDFW is still in process of shifting, looks like Lynda Hofmann will be the link to WDFW in the Methow. I will be working in other areas, will still be able to do some outreach with John. Recommend people keep talking with the right people early and often about projects—Tom McCoy, Gina, Lynda, and Amanda.

Jeri Timm—Trout Unlimited has NRCS grant for Beaver Creek; we will be developing a stakeholder group to bring the landowners together.

Hans Smith—YN projects still going on, nothing fallen off the table.

Allen Lebovitz—DNR reminder to implementers—I would like to see the as-built data to describe what is on the ground, so that it can be documented in our records. This can help future projects to prevent something being authorized that is incompatible. I am available to talk with people early and often about projects.

ChrisJ—what do you want from as-builts? What is the context?

Allen—not a prescription, but GPS locations, as much description as you can provide, dimensions, survey if you have them, at a minimum document the footprint on a map.

Brian Fisher—MSRF is picking up the Upper Beaver Creek project; if you are involved in the project, expect an email soon to schedule a kickoff meeting. It involves the Batie diversion, moving the channel alignment.

Amanda Barg—I would like to be involved in Beaver Creek projects that have irrigation component; I'm currently working on the diversions inspections and annual maintenance. We will be rebuilding the Lampson, and I can work on anything related to irrigation screening or decommissioning. I am trying to select sound bites on habitat to be gained on the space between the intakes and the screen sites, trying to collect information on potential benefits of restoration projects in these areas.

Jennifer Molesworth—Barkley Ditch directors heard from NMFS this summer that they have to change the way they do business and not put equipment in the river, TU got a grant from Priest Rapids to put in

a temporary pumping station, will work for another year or two, and we are just starting to talk with the directors about alternatives, but something will be happening there.

Chuck Peven—yesterday was the deadline to receive comments on the revised scoring criteria. Received fewer than I had anticipated.

Jennifer—RTT will be using it for the targeted applications

Chuck—we received 9 projects from BPA and the board that we will be reviewing them, we will have strong RTT participation, and we will be using the new criteria. These are all restoration projects, and we will not be looking at cost effectiveness or landowner acceptance. We continue to work on other revisions to the Biological Strategy and are on track to finish before the next round.

Jennifer—Reclamation had thought to do the Silver Assessment, but the funding is not there, so if others are interested, you may need to apply for funding soon if the data is to be there for projects

Derek—we have talked about that, could be an application in the SRFB round

Chuck—assessments and design are going to be on equal footing with the revised scoring criteria; and there will be an appendix that will discuss them

Jennifer—we also need to define what a “rapid reach assessment” is; people are making it up as they go

Chuck—need to look into that as well, have made a note

Jennifer—guidelines will be important; recommend talking to Rob Richardson

Chuck—also planning to have a modified table on what assessments have been done and what are the priorities for the next one

Jennifer—Reclamation did the W2, which links Winthrop to Wolf Creek, not sure if RTT reviewed

Derek—the RTT is only reviewing RAs that are in high biological priorities areas, but you can ask for review in other areas

Chuck—send the W2 to me, and I will see about review

Chris Johnson—we have one steelhead “carfish” left from a 1941 Plymouth; they are \$100, which goes to good work.

Next MRC January 15th

Definitions of Commonly used Acronyms	
ANS	Aquatic Nuisance Species
AREMP	Aquatic and Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring Program
BEF	Bonneville Environmental Foundation
BO/BiOp	Biological Opinion
BPA	Bonneville Power Administration
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
FFFPP	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
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")
STEM Database	Status, Trend and Effectiveness Monitoring database at NOAA's Northwest Fisheries Science Center
UCSRB	Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board
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.