

Methow Restoration Council

February 21, 2017

Participants:

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Chris Johnson	MSRF
Jaqueline Wallace	TU
Jarred Johnson	Yakama Nation
Jennifer Molesworth	Reclamation
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
John Crandall	MSRF
Joy Juelson	UCSRB
Kristen Kirkby	CCFEG
Maddie Eckmann	Yakama Nation
Mariah Mayfield	USFS
Paul Wagner	Colville Tribes
Robes Parrish	USFWS

Notes:

John Crandall – Monitoring Update: every year we try to update the monitoring; some of you may also have received the monitoring programmatic worksheet (Excel). We are looking to keep tabs on each monitoring program that is going on every year. Some things change, some stay the same. We update the worksheet every year. This already went out to everyone that was on the list in 2016. If anyone is beginning to do monitoring that they haven't done before or wasn't on the list before, please contact John ASAP. Not just the Methow; this is for the whole Upper Columbia. Get information to John as soon as possible.

Robes Parrish – is the NorWeST stream temperature database included?

John – they did a big request a while back, and we did a data dump, but not every year

Mariah Mayfield – I'm working on getting all of our temperature data into our sites that feed into NorWeST

Discussion – timing, data, climate modeling

John – I'm working with Adrian at Chelan County on temperature modeling for the upper Columbia

MaDMC will be meeting directly after March 8th RTT meeting. We will be revising the Upper Columbia data gaps list. One of the key needs for eligibility for SRFB monitoring funding is that it needs to address an identified data gap. The current list is old and needs to be updated. It may take a month or two, may be a re-tweaking of what we already have or it may be creation of a new list; TBD.

Kristen Kirkby – did the data gaps cover the mainstem Columbia?

John – I think it did, but it is subbasin centric

Paper – Richardson et al trace the fate of marine-derived nutrients using salmon carcass analogs – a lot of work done on the fate of marine derived nutrients in salmon streams. Plant growth, juvenile fish production, and macroinvertebrates. Since we don't have as many salmon coming back, a lot of interest in salmon carcass analogs. These people added in the analogs, and sampled periphyton, macroinvertebrates, riparian, etc. They saw a lot of movement of the nutrients in the system. Available at

<http://www.nrcresearchpress.com/doi/abs/10.1139/cjfas-2015-0500#.WKzN3UNtnDe>

Chris Johnson – what was the timeframe?

John – over a season

Kristen – one of the problems with these analogs, they see the benefits right away, but they are short-term.

Discussion – duration, need long-term monitoring and projects to see longer-term benefits, things take time to play out

Kristen – Jason has been trying to get a nutrient enhancement project in the Chiwawa, and we're working on a monitoring plan for that, but there has not been a lot of support from USFS or USFWS

John Crandall – Outreach Update: we are working on an outreach display over at the Interpretive Center. They have a section of wall reserved for rivers. They had something there they call “the ribbon of life” a journey down through the river, from headwaters to confluence. We are updating the original one-dimensional piece; it is text-heavy. Eliot Johnson is working on a metal river to replace it. Some thought of a rotating theme. They are getting a lot more visitors. The plan is that there will be a display with boxes and questions. If you are interested in participating, contact John.

Chris – we are trying to make it more than a text heavy stuck to the wall thing. We moved from a wood river to a metal river; the advantage is that you can stick magnets on it. Look for a little bit of Twisp whimsy, but they will do everything with pieces that can be added as needed, so it won’t be a static display.

John – we are working with a student at the ILC on Methow River Watershed signs. We will help the student work with an artist from Methow Arts. Signs will go at the three highway entries to the Methow, one at Pateros, one at the Loup, and one at WA pass. We will bring a design to the group to look at.

Chris – at the M2 WDFW project, we were working with the new wildlife area manager, but she resigned, so we are working on determining what the next steps are.

John – we will be having an outreach subcommittee meeting soon, let me know if you would like to participate. We plan to meet about 3 times per year.

John – have been thinking of another river cleanup this year, we did one a few years back after the fires, but there is still a lot out there, so we will try to be sponsoring something for that

Chris – we have a little money from DNR for the garbage fees; and we will need a permit from WDFW

John – it will be a good opportunity to pull people together around the river

John – we work with Bonneville Environmental Foundation under a grant; one thing we identified a number of years ago is the lack of understanding of the public perception around what we are doing. You recall the water quality survey that I did previously; I will be repeating that to see if there is any change. The Mission project has a different type of planning for forest health and watershed health. I’m curious about how people perceive this stuff. A restoration group did a similar planning process down in Ashland, OR and then they did a full survey of what people thought. They did the survey working with BEF and academics at Southern Oregon University. I’m thinking about doing a survey around salmon recovery and the work we are doing. Thought it would be good for it to be an MRC survey. We could potentially pull in some help from BEF and the people at SOU that did the survey there to help us make sure that we achieve our objectives.

Chris – we need to make sure that no one has any objections. It seems well-tied to the objectives of the MRC to gain information, but we don’t want to make that decision unilaterally.

Jacqueline Wallace – how would the information be used?

John – it would be used for our internal information, but there may also could be other uses.

Chris – it would let us know where we are going to run into which bias/issues in the watershed

Jennifer – I see that it would also work as a report card on how we are communicating and how we could improve. We could repeat it over time.

John – haven’t fleshed out exactly what it would involve, hope the folks in Ashland can give us some guidance.

The group in Ashland also worked with BEF, and so we hope to collaborate with them.

Discussion – MRC, function, good to find out what the community is thinking and needs to be Methow specific, but it could be repeated / modified for other areas

Joy – it would be good to discuss this at the IT meeting

Joy Juelson – UCSRB Updates: There are some big questions around funding right now. We have a changing environment. We are fighting for funding right now, which is why you haven’t seen much of me. The board facilitates two funding types, one is the targeted BPA solicitation, and the other is the SRFB process. This is the bread and butter for regional funding, outside of the tribal fish accords.

Targeted – in 2010, the board wrote a proposal to BPA ISRP review, and they agreed to give us 3.5 million per year. We’ve had about nine projects, many of which are reach scale projects. In 2018, this will expire. We are hoping to re-up it, and that we will be able to do that with the BiOp. We recently wrote a report to the ISRP, and

last week we presented it to them in Portland. We were the second of these projects to be funded, and now there are seven. We think it went really well.

In the past, ISRP concerns include the following:

- Program leading to effective habitat restoration actions?
- Project review and prioritization?
- Improvements to vsp?
- Incorporating monitoring results?
- Are we making progress?

We worked to address these concerns, and talked about the RTT working on the update to the biological strategy, prioritization, etc. They should give a response on March 9th.

Joy – we are also fighting for the SRFB funding. RCO and GSRO are doing a reallocation process. We get 10.85% of the PCSRF funds that are allocated to WA. Four states (WA, OR, ID, Alaska) all compete for these funds. Our funding has gone down a bit, last year we got 1.4 million, or 10.85 % of our state amount. That percentage is being looked at, and right now there is a committee looking at metrics for the allocation. Right now it is not looking good for us, and the committee will be making a recommendation to the SRFB. Unfortunately, areas on the East side that have fewer streams and are drier are taking a hit in the metrics. If our allocation is cut, we will work with folks to try to defend it. The federal side is also uncertain. We are going to WA DC with our county commissioners to try to talk to folks there. We also go to Olympia and talk to our representatives there. So far, we are looking to the state for more salmon recovery funds; they asked for 55 million to the state, and so far the budget has 32. Likely, the best we can hope for with the federal funds is a continuing resolution, but it is uncertain. There is a lot of uncertainty.

Chris – we have found that a thumb drive with a one or two minute video is very effective for presenting to people who have less time to read than to watch. We are happy to share the ones we have.

Joy – yes, we are redoing our materials, focusing on fisheries, jobs, economy, and we are happy to share those. If anyone wants to talk to lawmakers, I have material and numbers.

Robes – has anyone talked to Trib and PRCC about making up shortfalls with their funds?

Joy – there hasn't been a lot of talk about them increasing their funding, but potentially if there are good projects that come up that need funding then they may fund them, but haven't heard that they plan to fund more projects.

Joy – we just had a targeted solicitation close in January. We received 20 proposals; five were from the Methow. The ask was for 11 million, and we have between \$4 - 5 million available. RTT scored the proposals, now they go through another filter. BPA will look at risk, cost, and metric credit for the BiOp. They plan to have a decision early to mid-March. We hope that will give project sponsors enough time to switch to the SRFB process if their projects are not funded. If anyone is interested in being part of the SRFB process, please go to the kickoff meeting in Chelan on March 14th. We don't know if we are getting money/how much will be available, but we will carry on like everything is going to be great. There is a lot of uncertainty around funding.

Robes – you mentioned that the RTT is going through a prioritization process with the biological strategy update. Is there any thought to having a different prioritization based on different funding environments?

Joy – I think things are going to change with the SRFB process, that eligibility requirements will change with the new prioritization. With less money, it will likely be more targeted. We are not exactly sure what it will look like. That process is starting now. The RTT has met; the first step is they are changing the size of the units they are looking at. We are looking at more of a HUC 6; that is being contracted out to redraw our assessment units. From there they are deciding which metrics they want to look at. They are trying to pull in the data that we have across the Upper Columbia.

John – the whole region went through Ecoregional planning through the Nature Conservancy about 12 years ago – all that work is done, and it is sitting somewhere. It was ranked, and there is a lot of information that could be useful. It could be value added with plant species, bird species. This was a focus area for them. It's worth checking in with someone from the Nature Conservancy on that. I did the fish bit; it was basically looking at

species occurrence for native species. Sensitive species were highlighted. There were lot of unknowns. I will check in with that

Joy – we have an IT meeting in Wenatchee March 7th at PUD. We will be talking about integration of Forest Health efforts and salmon recovery. We facilitate the Forest Health Collaborative and there are a few projects. We are looking for opportunities to do more upland work and hoping to connect with FS and salmon recovery.

Kristen – can you set up a webinar for the IT meeting?

Joy – yes, please remind me

Jennifer – I think that webinar and good sound quality should be a priority for the region, considering that people are so far apart. You may even consider not having a meeting in a venue that doesn't have good enough sound.

Joy – good point

We also have a board retreat tomorrow. This is an annual event where we meet with our board and connect with them. We have two new board members this year, Andy Hover from Okanogan County and Doug England replaced Ron Walter. Board meeting will be Thursday. If you are interested, you can WebEx into the meeting. We are going to see if they will approve a monitoring project type this year. MaDMC is looking at data gaps, and that is an important element because we could potentially get some high priority monitoring done. We will give them some options within the SRFB criteria. The options will be no monitoring project funding, or an open monitoring solicitation, or to have a targeted/rfp type proposal

John – I recommend that you get MaDMC input on how monitoring funds would be determined

Joy – it is a priority that it comes out of what MaDMC decides. The biggest question will likely be whether to have monitoring in the SRFB process this year

Discussion – monitoring funding, outside funding is needed, difficult to get at the big questions

Joy – ISAB: Independent Science Advisory Board, they are going to review our spring Chinook and how they are doing, looking at sea lions, our projects, how we are doing at recovering spring Chinook. Ours are not doing as well as other areas and they want to know why. Our steelhead are doing much better.

Kristen – was that a request from you to them?

Joy – no, they decided that this was something they wanted to do. Greer has the timeline information.

Chris – it will be the important that they look at the whole system, not just our region.

Jennifer – right now Reclamation is contracting with Inter-Fluve and Tracy Hillman is working with them to look our IMW project and our fish data, and it will include Charlie Snow's work. It should be interesting and might be helpful for these folks. Tracy has a good perspective on these things. We will need people to look at things when the draft is out.

Joy – Ecology is starting their environmental assessment program, will do random assessments.

John – This is their EAP monitoring program; they are on 5-year cycles, and they are on their second cycle. It's a rotating panel. Their contact person will be sending us information on sites soon. Similar to PIBO, AREMP, CHaMP.

Discussion – monitoring overlap, redundancies, we don't get the specific information that we need from these larger efforts

Joy – registration is now open for the SRFB conference, which will be in Wenatchee, April 25-27th; they will let speakers know soon

SRFB tours will likely be May 10 and 11; will know more after abstracts are submitted.

Joy – it looks like we are losing two Citizen Advisory Committee members, Jerry Barnes and Dale Swedberg. We are looking to replace Jerry with another ag person, hopefully from the Okanogan. We will do a call for nominations, hopefully in the next couple of weeks. One should be from Okanogan; the other could be from either subbasin.

Chris Johnson – Frazer Creek Updates: we've been working on Frazer Creek; with Ecology funds, we hired Rob Richardson and Jeff Fealko with Rio ASE to do a geomorphic assessment of the creek. We just got the report back, and it has really good information that I wish we had when we were talking with DOT about bridges/culverts. One of the biggest problems post-fire is that you lose your wood and hard points and get incision. A lot of

conversation about places where it would be worth doing BDAs. One of the surprising things to me was that by meeting WDFW passage and flow requirements on the bridges, we created a situation downstream that almost assured incision. We need to work with the landowners to define a floodplain to address the incision, and we will be working with WDFW on how their standards are causing problems. The assessment draft is brand new; Brian and John, and Jennifer, and I have reviewed it.

Jennifer – one thing I saw was that it didn't address the culverts on the forest, which are most likely part of the problem. That's an important thing for Rob to look at, need to make sure that those things are taken care of because they will come back.

Chris – we don't have budget for that, this is a small study, which always shows you what else you need to study. But they did a good job.

Jennifer – agree, really glad you did this

John – [overview of report], similar to a Reach Assessment, done on a fairly small budget. Divided the creek into three reaches. Lower reach, partially controlled by Beaver Creek, middle reach where we did the bridges, and upper reach getting into the forest. Did an overlay with burn severity.

In conjunction with the LiDAR flight that YN did on Beaver Creek, we did LiDAR flight in Frazer. It ended up being green LiDAR.

The report includes potential treatments in a Consumer Reports style layout to identify whether an action addresses specific issues/targets. We did stream surveys using the FS stream inventory protocols. The report is a draft; we will have a final in a month or so.

Chris – it is a large document, anyone who would like to review please let me know, too large to email.

Joy – can you update on barriers?

Chris – the report identifies several head cut barriers; still have two crossings to address

If you are going to review, get comments to John this week.

Jennifer – a good read, but an executive summary for Chris and the landowners would be a good thing; should tie in nicely with the Yakama's Beaver Creek RA

Jarred Johnson – we just got the data summary from TetraTech, and we should have the Beaver Creek RA draft next month. The RA goes up to Lightning Creek confluence. It will come with a geodatabase for ArcGIS, which will be very useful.

Roundtable

Paul Wagner – Colville Tribes: we are contracting 10 projects for this BPA project cycle. We are in downtime for winter, working on the M2 trail loop. We are in the final drafting with the USFS with a master agreement to do projects on FS land. Under that there will be supplemental project agreements, the first of which will be Volstead Road. I need statements of work and LIBs by middle of next week. First thing will be to get the NEPA taken care of. Nothing will be allocated until July 1 except in-kind work.

EDT – haven't been working too much with them, but have been facilitating getting FS AREMP and PIBO data for them.

For the Mission project, NEPA was delayed, but we still have time to comment, and may be helping with some of the actions there.

Jacqueline Wallace – Trout Unlimited: I have been working on a couple of surface to well conversions and trusting that water. The TU office is moving ahead with the Barkley, and Crystal is working on Mission and on Suction Dredging legislation

Kristen Kirkby – CCFEG: the final Twisp to Carlton RA is out; it will be on the UCSRB web site and also people can get it from me. We will be sending out postcards to landowners in the reach to let them know about it.

Jennifer – are there any thoughts on having the MRC go through the assessment to identify priorities?

Kristen – I think that would be helpful

Jennifer – could be an MRC work session

Chris – could do an hour workshop, and then go through projects

Kristen – we are thinking of extending our Wenatchee basin barrier assessment up to the Methow, if anyone has any thoughts let me know

Also, Rob Crandall and I have been getting out of the basin meeting with teachers to expand the work that he is doing with Watershed Watchers to other areas, Okanogan, Pateros, Pascal Sherman Indian School. Have a little FS funding to do snorkeling programs with students, and would love to do it with adults too. Need to figure out liability.

Chris – we can talk – there is a non-profit insurance pool that we use.

Maddie Eckmann – Yakama Nation: this summer we are moving forward with the Horseshoe Project on the Twisp River, side channel and large wood. The Early Winters project will likely be pushed back until 2018. We will be snerding in the 1890s side channel with Matt Abrams next week.

Jarred – this is the second year doing the snerding, third year fish monitoring at 1890s. We have many different species in there; we will share results.

Jarred Johnson – Yakama Nation: previously mentioned the Beaver Creek RA; we are also doing the Upper Twisp habitat assessment with the FS from the end of the middle Twisp RA to the end of anadromy. We are also looking at a lot of the alluvial fan for major tributaries, as well as Little Bridge Creek. It is on generally the same timeframe as the Beaver Creek RA – mid-march. We will also revisit Newby Narrows this year. We are going ahead trying to do Big Valley this year, removing the people-mover and flying logs in. At this point, we don't have an agreement with DNR but it looks like we are moving on the right track. We have many projects in various phases of development. We are looking at restoration work in the lower sections of Hancock Springs from the confluence of the Methow to the road crossing and the unrestored reach. We haven't talked with landowners, have a meeting set up with the Conservancy. Also working on Fawn Creek area; will need to coordinate.

Mariah Mayfield – USFS: we are getting all of our plans and permitting in order for the next few years. Big efforts will be Chewuch and the road decommissioning, eight mile, pre-NEPA work to get ready for the Twisp River project. We have had some initial meetings to identify project boundaries and partner coordination. Trying to think about everyone more than in the Mission project rollout.

Jennifer Molesworth – Reclamation: John and I are going to the school to do science and block prints, helping sixth graders learn about what we do. We have not yet had a planning meeting for National Fishing Day, we need to remember to ping Julie

John Crandall – Methow Monitoring: starting to get planning bull trout surveys and planning a comprehensive redds survey database on bull trout

Mariah – it's almost done

John – we don't have much from USFWS, so we are just moving ahead and looking for funding for redd surveys. We had WDFW's help last year and it was amazing, a game changer. As far as I know there hasn't been a running database of redd locations like for other species. We are getting the older stuff and going from there. Last year we dropped a bunch of sites; my sense is that we will likely go to some annual sites and move smaller streams to some sort of rotating panel

Robes – all of our reports are on our web site; there are a lot, and I will send a link

John – I only got things from Mark previously

Chris Johnson – MSRF: I think it would be good to have the MRC as a place to have a conversation about SRFB projects prior to abstracts due at the end of the month. We can look for possible collaborations, and make sure we aren't dancing on each other's toes, etc.

Joy Juelson – UCSRB: March 8th is the day that the RTT will be available for feedback on project proposals, to have a conversation with them

~Adjourn

Next MRC March 21

Definitions of Commonly used Acronyms	
AEM	Action Effectiveness Monitoring
ANS	Aquatic Nuisance Species
AREMP	Aquatic and Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring Program
BACI	Before, After, Control, Impact (study design type)
BDA	Beaver Dam Analogue
BEF	Bonneville Environmental Foundation
BO/BiOp	Biological Opinion
BPA	Bonneville Power Administration
CAC	Citizens Advisory Committee (for SRFB funding applications)
CAO	Critical Areas Ordinance
CBFWA	Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority (pronounced “cubfwah”)
CCFEG	Columbia Cascade Fisheries Enhancement Group
CCT	Colville Confederated Tribes (newer acronym is CTCR – see below)
CTCR	Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation (older acronym is CCT – see above)
CHaMP	Columbia Habitat Monitoring Program
CMZ	Channel Migration Zone
CREP	Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program
CSF	Community Salmon Fund
EDT	Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment
EQIP	Environmental Quality Incentives Program
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FCRPS	Federal Columbia River Power System
FFFPP	Family Forest Fish Passage Program
FIA	Forest Inventory and Analysis program (USFS)
Four “H”s	The four factors affecting salmon recovery: Hatchery, Hydro, Habitat, Harvest
HACCP	Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point
HGMP	Hatchery Genetic Management Plan
HPA	Hydraulic Project Approval
HSRG	Hatchery Scientific Review Group
HWS	Habitat Work Schedule
IMW	Intensively Monitored Watershed
IS	Implementation Schedule
ISAB	Independent Science Advisory Board
ISEMP	Integrated Status and Effectiveness Monitoring Project
ISRP	Independent Scientific Review Panel
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
OCD	Okanogan Conservation District
OBMEP	Okanogan Basin Monitoring and Evaluation Program
OWL	Okanogan Wilderness League
PCSRF	Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (pronounced "Pacsurf")
PHABSIM	Physical Habitat Simulation
PIBO	PACFISH/INFISH* Biological Opinion
PNAMP	Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Partnership
PUD	Public Utility District
QAQC	Quality Assurance, Quality Control
RA	Reach Assessment
RCO	(Washington State) Recreation and Conservation Office
REI	Reach-based Ecosystem Indicators (used in Reach Assessments)
RFEG	Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group
RFP	Request for Proposals
RM	River Mile
RPA	Reasonable and Prudent Alternative(s)
RTT	Regional Technical Team
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act
SMP	Shoreline Management Plan
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.