Methow Restoration Council

December 17, 2013

Participants:

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Brian Fisher	MSRF
Charlie Snow	WDFW
Chris Johnson	MSRF
Crystal Elliot	Trout Unlimited
Derek Van Marter	UCSRB
Don Phillips	Local Landowner
Greer Maier	UCSRB
Hans Smith	Yakama Nation
Heide Andersen	Methow Conservancy
Jenni Novak	WDFW
Jennifer Molesworth	Reclamation
Jeri Timm	WWP-TU
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
John Crandall	MRC
Ken Muir	USFWS
Lynda Hofmann	WDFW
Mark Peterschmidt	WA Department of Ecology
Michelle Dewey	Dewey Consulting LLC
Robes Parrish	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Terri Williams	Okanogan Conservation District

Meeting Notes:

John Crandall—Monitoring Update: big news in the monitoring world is that the Monitoring Strategy Appenidx C, the monitoring strategy for the Methow, is just about done as a first draft. UCSRB has been very supportive. The draft will go out to MaDMC for review next week; most comments will likely come from there. Appendix C takes a somewhat different approach to the Monitoring Plan than the other basins; it takes an approach of trying to define how the collective body of monitoring in the Methow tries to address the key management questions within a context of trying to define what are the issues (i.e. ecological concerns) identified in the Biological Strategy that are being monitored as they affect both habitat and fish. We are going to try to gather a group in the Methow to look at the ecological concerns given in the Biological Strategy and where they are assigned to make sure we have the right things identified for the right locations.

We have several large projects—M2 Whitefish, M2 WDFW, Upper Beaver Creek, and the upcoming project in the Twisp River by Poorman Creek. With that is the desire to ramp up the level of post-project monitoring; MSRF has been working on developing a schema to address these projects and organize the collective body of work when people visit the site for data collection, also the usual snorkel, etc. Will really ramp up the level of understanding of how the projects develop over time.
Brian Fisher—for each of those sites, we have a form that is attached to a map. For those who are interested, any time you go out there you fill out the form; if anyone wants to go out to those sites and fill them out that will be great. MSRF is really interested in using it to inform future project designs; we

want to keep track of what is working, what is not working, where we see fish, tracking when we see changes; it will give us something to look back on.
John—also fits within the adaptive management of the project itself; help inform when and where we may need to make changes/tweaks. Elbow Coulee adaptive work a good example.
Lynda Hofmann—I would like to be involved with that. It would be good to learn from your experience.
John –and we will try to do this to some level for all of the projects. Yakamas have a level of that as well on some of their projects—an observational thing that has triggers for some action.

John Crandall—Outreach Update: No calendars this month; maybe next month. We are always looking for volunteers with the Watershed Watchers program; it has really ramped up with a lot of dates. We have also increased the numbers of days that we get into the classrooms ahead of the field work. It seems to be working really well; the schools are very receptive and appreciating the extra attention. If anyone is interested in helping with that let me know.
When the calendar does come out, then each month will have a link to the MRC web site that relates to the monthly calendar theme.

Greer Maier—UCSRB Updates: We had over 250 people come to the science conference, and had a follow-up Implementation Team meeting where we talked about additional workshops, reports, presentations that we may want to see. There was also a lot of talk of a need for a life history workshop; it will probably be more informal and talk about how we think fish are using each of the different tributaries; we will write that up so that project sponsors can use it for project proposals. We will also talk more about the data/information gaps.
Habitat Work Schedule—there are some changes in how the LE is using it; it went through a QAQC process last February, we have been using the data, and we want to be sure that the data is good quality and usable. The system was consolidated within the database, updated the validation profile; we will be contacting sponsors and arranging training as needed. Melody, Joy, and I will be working with this. We would like to have people to input their 2013 project information in the spring. The site is now consolidated for the Upper Columbia region. We will make sure each project has the same basic project information: description, location (lat/long), budget, habitat type, contacts, sponsor, funding source.
We have refined the metrics and adopted the PCSRF metrics. Assessment units, primary and secondary ecological concerns, and Upper Columbia primary species benefitting will also be included.
HWS allows us to track our progress, numbers of projects by type, funding of projects by type, and what we have done—it allows us to talk about what we have done and what that means. Effectiveness monitoring is also there—TetraTech has their own tab, and they automatically update their data for the projects that they monitor. Some project sponsors also have uploaded their individual monitoring data.
HWS is also a good public portal for outreach.

Greer—MaDMC Survey Results: MaDMC is looking to establish a pathway for information flow from monitoring programs to project sponsors. They recognize that there is a disconnect, and they are trying to find ways to address that. They had a survey last month to determine what information is needed, the next steps to determine what the scale is, and develop a memo that documents an agreed upon process that will enable project sponsors and others to share information that will assist project sponsors for habitat restoration actions and allow funding agencies to make informed decisions regarding monitoring programs.
Derek Van Marter—this has been in the works for a long time; the catalyst was the ISRP process last year.
Chris Johnson—as a project sponsor, we have been trying to get this for many years.

Greer—BPA is also developing an effectiveness monitoring program that is well-timed for this; one of their goals is how to inform projects
Chris—we will be pushing hard for that.
Greer—survey results—we had 27 respondents (21 prject sponsors, 11 RTT MaDMC, 1 engineer/contractor). Results indicated a general consensus between surveyed groups that fish monitoring data is very to extremely important, data currently used. Top need identified was fish response to restoration, juvenile distribution and habitat response to restoration, distribution life history. Results indicate that reach-scale data is needed and important, most monitoring is reach scale; most agreed that availability and accessibility of data is generally thought of as lacking, especially for understanding the effects of actions. Reports, GIS files, and technical assistance ranked highest for best methods to distribute data. If people have reports of any size, they can send them to me and I will put them on our website. Life stage specific survival and associated limiting factors information is needed and lacking, and the biggest information gap is understanding the effectiveness of projects, and project sponsors need data every three years, not every 10 years.
Chris—we need to access funding to get that data
Greer—that is part of the new program, but there is a funding efficiency of having a programmatic approach
Jennifer Molesworth—but that doesn't help project sponsors get the information that they need; I have found that you need both; the people who are building things need to be involved in the data gathering
Discussion—monitoring by sponsors, new BPA program, still in development
Greer—key questions from the survey for fish, habitat, and effectiveness summary. These are draft, will keep working on them, and Chuck has taken it and is developing metrics for each, then I will go and find what is available.
Chris—might also find out if what we are seeing is fish moving from one place to the restored area or if we are creating a benefit
Greer—might be a research question, but can add it to the list. I will be working on it this winter and spring.

Greer—EDT Updates: when I started to write the habitat report, I identified several problems: 1. Availability of data, 2. Interpretability of data, and 3. Tracking of progress. CHaMP reports do not address the information that is important to project sponsors—it is not an appropriate scale of analysis. Need to know what factors are limiting fish populations, prioritizing restoration actions, build on past investments to make more effective and timely decisions. Okanogan EDT process; John Arterburn is going to be presenting on it; past EDT challenges, have fixed a lot of the challenges and done a lot of the groundwork to create something that is applicable to the rest of the region. Erik Doyle presented this at the science conference, which is available on the science conference web site. There is a lot of opportunity to have something beyond the Biological Strategy to inform restoration and protection actions. EDT is the only model that can be comprehensively run in all the subbasins, and the life cycle models and the food web models could add additional information in some areas.
Jennifer—the problem in the past has been having enough data to put into it
John—but that has changed. What about cost?
Greer—the cost has been high, but a lot has been in developing the template. We are trying to gage interest first, and then we will pursue funding. CHaMP collects new data every year; if we can run it over three years, then it can be useful
Discussion—data accuracy, other pitfalls, visual display of the data can be helpful,
Greer—it tries to compile and use fish use data in a way that is useful
Jennifer—I like that it shows the graph of how good the data is
Greer—things are changing and the ability to run the model can help us see that

John—we do have the ability to go back in time on a smaller scale; if we can dial it down within assessment units, it could be all data
Greer—that is what John A did; he has been doing this now for several years and can help with that process
Heide Andersen—I like the protection element as well.
Jennifer—it would be interesting to see how it could help with the next expert panel process
Greer—I think it would be helpful, we are talking with BPA; will add in the life history component
Discussion—applicability of other models, what types of information the different models will give
Chris—how do you tease out the noise of the natural cycles?
John—you need to collect more data on a longer time frame. Would like to see hatchery fish as an ecological concern, need to see what the fish are doing. You need to be careful on how you interpret the data and how you present it to the public.
Chris—I think that the caveats need to be really clear on the report card to prevent the information from being used against our efforts
John—this does not get you to recovery
Discussion—use of the data and graphics
Greer—that is why I also like the lifecycle model, because it also has the other modules; the important thing is to make sure the message is that this is a restoration tool; we are working on the messaging part
Charlie Snow—this is planning tool, the real information comes from the 5-year PUD reports.
Chris—we need to make sure that we are careful in the communication
Charlie—5 years is the shortest time frame you can look at; it is not even one generation of spring Chinook.
Discussion—need to make sure that the information is available and put on the record.
Greer—EDT seems to be a good solution to how to use habitat data to inform restoration. ICF and John Soden did a great job of honing in on what people really care about.

Chris Johnson—County Commissioner Concerns w/Conservation Actions: most of you have probably gotten the invitation from Char; the commissioners have requested the presence of a lot of restoration practitioners at a meeting on January 7th. There is no agenda, but indications are that the county feels nervous about what we are doing; they seem to not understand and are threatened by what we are doing. The four questions they asked of me is 1) when is enough, enough, 2) how do you measure success, 3) what data is being used for restoration, and 4) what baseline is being used to get the river back to what state. Challenges going forward, and there is no agenda to respond to. I wanted to raise this, as it is becoming an issue. If we get an agenda ahead I will send it out, we are working on who will attend.
Discussion—key messages, voluntary actions, how to engage in the process
Chris—if you want to be more involved in planning for that meeting, we can set up a meeting. It is an opportunity.

Roundtable & Public Comment

Derek Van Marter, UCSRB: some of you may have been associated with the situation assessment of status of Columbia Basin Recovery that NOAA initiated. The report came out yesterday; it is available through Ruckleshaus Center http://ruckelshauscenter.wsu.edu/ or Oregon Consensus http://oregonconsensus.org/projects/project-1/. We are continuing down the road of the grass-roots, collaborative, place-based approach; no one can do this alone naturally, takes this all-hands on deck approach. Good read; NOAA is reorganizing on West Coast, more for your information as a participant in the Columbia Basin process.

The other thing is we had a board meeting last week, which went reasonably well. We are in our 15th year as an organization working on the collaborative consensus based approach, not going outside of the process, was really positive. It is where we are and we need to embrace that and not be fearful. It is an opportunity.

Jennifer Molesworth, Reclamation: yesterday I noticed that the beaver ponds on Fraser creek have been bulldozed, pushed a berm along the creek.
Discussion—opportunities and challenges.

Jeri Timm, TU: our project manager position still open, probably through the end of the month. Chewuch project still going on; we are close to end of the season. MVID is at 30%, plans have been reviewed. There will be a value study to evaluate plans and costs in January. Consultant supposed to have draft SEPA in January.

John Crandall, Monitoring Coordinator: we have initiated work on the Columbia Basin Lamprey Restoration Guide, and we hope to have a draft in the spring. It will be somewhat like the fish guide but only on Lamprey. A major component will be what type of salmon restoration will benefit lamprey. Submitted a grant through MSRF for Centennial 319 for riparian restoration

Crystal Elliot, TU: submitted a grant through Ecology to start cleaning up the Red Shirt Mill site.

Heide Andersen, Methow Conservancy: We are closing on the McIvor CE, looking at next year, we have several restoration projects proposed for conservation easements—one on Konrad, one on Lehman, Hancock Springs area upland restoration, and 3R with MSRF.

Michelle Dewey, Dewey Consulting: MVID directors will also be contacting the county commissioners to talk about the commissioners' concerns about irrigation piping projects.

Greer Maier, UCSRB: reminder that Joy is out of town until the second week of January; she has set up a contact list for any LE issues. The Habitat Report should be done at the end of January.

Terri Williams, OCD: we have been working on making our 5-year plan more realistic than it has been in the past. We have some landowners that we are in contact with for livestock exclusion near Pete Creek on the Chewuch area. We are interested in helping out in any way we can, so if you have projects that have a conservation district role, we are looking to improve our ability to prioritize projects and would like input on particular places that could use more assistance, we would be interested to know how we can help you do good work or fit in some way.

Hans Smith, YN: signage update: the signs have been produced, but don't have cultural clearance to install them yet, hope to do it this summer.
Chris—we have clearance at WFI, WDFW, and Twisp Ponds; will be hanging them soon. Town of Winthrop also interested, looking at permitting through westernization.
Hans—there was some outreach done with Aero Methow with river safety and signage; it may be good to take them on a tour on the projects and show them what has been installed.
Chris—we've talked about a float with them this spring, and they thought that was a good idea. Also could go out with the Go Pro and making a short video to show what these things look like.
Hans—we are going into permitting on two Twisp River projects at RM 3 and where Poorman Creek road connects with Twisp River rd on the lower end, both large wood enhancement. Jarred is leading those

two projects. Moving forward with 1890's side channel for 2014 implementation, look positive. At the Two Channels site, we are moving forward with WDFW on an instream complexity project with wood enhancement and a wood structure upstream of the side channel; cover habitat projects. We are moving forward with WDFW under MOU looking at Fender Mill, Big Valley, and sites on the Chewuch. Have a process with an interagency team; plan to do that implementation in 2015.
Recreation user assessments—Twisp completed (Newby to mouth), will be getting it out through our website; Big Valley still being edited, Chewuch probably done. Middle Twisp RA War Creek to Newby Creek; will be writing it this winter, hope to have it for review by the end of May.

Jenni Novak, WDFW: have some fish screen projects in the area. We will be doing some work on the Black Canyon Creek bypass pipe. We are working on the Goat Creek project—fish bypass and slightly larger drum screen. Also Upper Wolf Creek project, working on design; difficult site. I am also interested in coordinating with MSRF on the work at the Fort Thurlow project.
Chris—we will add you to the contact list for the project.
Jenni—I am trying to pursue the Thurlow Stokes screen site on Frasier Creek, the barrier also, will be working on it this year.
Chris—the Lampson has the same problem; we can keep coordinating on that
John—when you put the information about the screens together, do you put that in one place? Is there any way we are tracking it?
Jenni—I go out to the screens, and I have a list and have prioritized them for myself, but there isn't any program
Lynda—I think the monitoring would be important, the fish screens are an ongoing issue.
Discussion—monitoring, adaptive management, tracking issues, mechanical injury is an ecological concern, process, screen shop not involved in enforcement
Chris—working with the FS on the Skyline; fish return is off the Forest, would like your input on the fish return
Jenni—not an easy fix, will look at it next year.

Mark Peterschmidt, Ecology: I am not doing the grant scoring this year, have grant staff. We are largely report driven, so if you have a water quality issue, give us a call.

Brian Fisher, MSRF: Upper Beaver Creek has wrapped up, we have planting next spring; we are watching the ice acting at the site.
Upcoming projects we have M2 3R, and Twisp Floodplain (same areas as MVID W intake) is in the planning stages; we are trying to paint a better picture of how the fish are using the site as we go into the site, working with John and Charlie.
We are planning to get to both Marracci and Fort Thurlow diversion fixes (Beaver Creek) next year.
Elbow Coulee also completed and Right Elbow inlet channel, groundwater input, recorded habitat and what fish are using it now, will be exciting to see how that changes. Adaptive work on Elbow Coulee side; we went in and blew up a few rocks. Went to lower the flow that the side channel activates—should be 140 cfs.

Chris Johnson, MSRF: put together the WNTI application for the Beaver Project; MSRF taking the lead on the Beaver Project transitioning from Methow Conservancy. Looking at ways of working both on and off the Forest. We are in the adaptive management phase of M2 WFI and WDFW; did a kickoff meeting in Ephrata for how to put together a working group on how to work with the state landowner and manage these projects. One positive thing is that MSRF is exploring ways to assist at Silver.

We have renewed our agricultural leases on Beaver Creek to keep them in production. We are working to wrap up an interesting land acquisition to help the 1890's project move forward. We are working with Wolf Ridge HOA to follow up previous projects, have negotiated a purchase of part of the open space and will close by January.

John Crandall: one more thing on the Twin Lakes storage project. As far as I can tell, County has changed the determination to DNS, very unclear what is happening, that process is up and going, there is an appeal period for those with standing that ends Dec. 26th.

-Adjourn-

Next MRC January 21

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
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
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
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.