

Methow Restoration Council

January 15, 2013

Participants:

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Amanda Barg	WDFW
Brian Fisher	MSRF
Char Schumacher	Okanogan County
Charlie Snow	WDFW
Crystal Elliot	Herrera Environmental
Chuck Peven	RTT
Derek Van Marter	UCSRB
Grace Watson	USGS
Greer Maier	UCSRB
Hans Smith	Yakama Nation
Jarred Johnson	Yakama Nation
Jeri Timm	WWP-TU
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
John Crandall	Wild Fish Conservancy
John Jorgensen	Yakama Nation
Lee Hatcher	Methow Watershed Council
Lynda Hofmann	WDFW
Michelle Dewey	Dewey Consulting LLC
Peter Jenkins	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Rick Alford	Yakama Nation
Robes Parrish	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Terri Williams	Okanogan Conservation District
Torre Stockard	Van Hees
Wesley Tibbits	USGS

Meeting Notes:

John Crandall—Monitoring Update: trying to describe how Reclamation is evaluating their habitat actions in the Methow. The context is that the work that Reclamation does in the Methow is related to the FCRPS BiOp and listed fish populations that cause the need for actions in the tributaries to address mortality at the dams. We are also trying to evaluate the effectiveness of the habitat actions that are going on, and how we are meeting goals of improving fish populations. That Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation (RM&E) effort at Reclamation is led by Michael Newsom; who is working with USGS on the study. Right now the primary focus is in the Middle Methow (M2). Habitat and monitoring actions are not attached, but they are coordinated.

[Graphic —Methow IMW Evaluation Schema] In a true IMW (Intensively Monitored Watershed), the habitat actions and monitoring are set up at the same time and planned together, with treatment reaches and “hands off” reaches. In the Methow, restoration and monitoring has been all over the map—a diversity of projects in a diversity of areas. The RM&E effort for the Methow has developed a “Methow IMW” approach that is different, but we are definitely “intensively monitored”. They are trying to get the metrics that we need to get at fish recovery. The data set is really important and ongoing; they have a running 12-year data set. Reclamation is also looking at modeling to get at some

of the answers of how well the aquatic habitat is providing for the production of fish—this is the Aquatic Trophic Production model. Food web/food pyramid based. For example, you look at a change in the physical habitat, and a model can help you get information that is helpful in evaluating the change. It is a tool to help us evaluate the work that is going on. The answer from the model is only as good as what you put in, so you have to refine it as you go along. The model has habitat monitoring data that can track changes in attributes over time, and it also has different water quality data, multi-agency fish survival data, and there is also a life cycle model component. The task is to use the model to simulate the outcome of different restoration strategies, and the associated consequences for fish populations—in other words, how does restoration change the habitat for fish? Primary model is being run out of the USGS Cook Lab (by Ryan Bellmore). There are all these data from the 35 different monitoring programs in the Methow; how easy it is to obtain the data varies. The University of Idaho is developing a “data harvester” component to extract the relevant pieces that only collects the pieces of data that you need; this will be no small feat. This is an effort that is going on as we speak to evaluate the habitat work. It is very specific to the BiOp and the RM&E approach; there are things that are set up just to meet the perspective of the FCRPS BiOp, a little bit separate from the recovery plan efforts, but there are links. The Recovery Plan has restoration actions to address local key limiting factors; we need to know how to improve our management decisions/answer the management questions. Monitoring, status and trend, critical uncertainties, action effectiveness monitoring, implementation/compliance monitoring
Derek Van Marter—what areas are being modeled using this model?

John C—Hancock, probably Twisp River, some or all of M2.

John Jorgensen—it will be coarse data, but we hope to have some sort of recommendations of what treatments should happen, and we will have some predicted outcomes

Derek—in terms of response?

John J—yes, looking at primary, secondary, and tertiary production. Looking at beginning stages of what is driving fish production. There is a lot of data, but not really sure of how to use all of that.

John C—if you were to look at the effort now, you would wonder why they didn’t do it 5 years ago before all of this work; but that isn’t how it happened. Ideally you would use this to see what to do.

Derek—seems like the advantage is that the model is using all the data, not just the USGS data

John C—trying to see how to use all the data to drive the model; the data is driving how we approach how the model could be run; there will be places where there is a lot of data

Robes Parrish—seems like you could also use it as a validation tool

John J—yes, the model would have some sort of predicted response to a treatment

Chuck Peven—is there a hope that you could use the model to help predict survival at some point?

John C—there is a component that takes the whole Columbia River into account, but that is not the focus, which is primarily production.

Robes—to what extent is the model predicated on having fixed or known limiting factors? Is the model sensitive enough to adjust to changing conditions?

John C—only sensitive enough to look at the input data; you could adjust with the inputs, but not sure it is that sensitive

John J—there are different modules; you can only look at so many at one time, design is there

Discussion—changes in limiting factors, expert panel and BiOp, limiting factors change over time, but there is limited data

Wesley Tibbits—USGS Preliminary M2 Pre-treatment Data: USGS was asked by Reclamation to answer some of the BiOp questions, the M&E portion of the RM&E. We put together a study design that put together a pre- and post-treatment phase in the M2. We broke it down to looking at side channels within the treatment area, and at a control area between Twisp and Carlton. There are also two reference sites in Upper Methow and Chewuch. Data is compiled from 2009-2012, (table) and these are

numbers of PIT tags deployed at the various sites, broken down by species. We will tag just about anything; we are looking at what is there, finding abundance, population status. These numbers are fish in hand. In the M2 treatment section, we see coho in the deepwater/backwater types of pools in side channels; we see more Chinook and steelhead in the high gravel bars, roughened channel areas. Looking at detecting our tagged fish outside of the Methow; juvenile detection over dams is very difficult. Detection sites outside of the basin (in the Columbia) are just at the dams, Rocky Reach has the best juvenile detection but the rest have low efficiencies. Rocky Reach can detect 80-90% of the tagged fish going through the bypass.

Brian Fisher—do you have an estimate of the probability of a tagged fish being detected at some point along the way?

Wes—not now, but we have an interim report coming out in the next year that will have that sort of information. Here we are just looking at a portion of the raw data. One assumption that we made is that steelhead have a 2-3 year freshwater lifecycle, so we haven't detected some because they haven't left yet, but we are assuming that if you have the same detection rate over the age classes then they should be the same across species.

Derek—are there ways of accounting for efficiencies at the different dams?

Wes—we use a similar way as WDFW uses to account for detection rates at the different traps.

Chuck—do you look at survival across the different seasons?

Wes—we look at the spring, summer, and fall. Need cold enough water in the summer and enough oxygen, in the winter need some sort of upwelling/connectivity that keeps the water from freezing. If you have some sort of ground or surface connection that keeps it from freezing solid

Greg Knott—what do you mean by “disconnected” side channels?

Wes—it means not connected at either top or bottom

Robes—it seems like the benefit of this not being a true IMW is that the control reaches are somewhat flexible. There is a work plan for some of those areas

John C—true, we know about that. Also, the Upper Methow is a reference reach, not a control reach. Looking at an example of the data from Elbow Coulee, it is interesting to see how fast the fish can move through the system.

Derek Van Marter—UCSRB 2013 Work Plan: Greer Maier is working for UCSRB now; she has a strong science background and is providing science services to the UCSRB. She will be talking more about that later. Joy Juelson couldn't be here today, so I will be filling in for her on the Lead Entity information. Lead Entity (LE) Transition Process—the old LE program in the Upper Columbia region included multiple WRIAs and three LE programs. Over the last year, largely as a result of a request from RCO, we combined the three LEs and are now housing a single LE within the UCSRB. There are 7 tasks under the LE program within the state; the first 6 tasks are going to be within the UCSRB and task 7 (outreach) will be contracted to Okanogan and Chelan Counties.

1. Maintain LE organization;
2. Maintain LE committees;
3. Develop annual work plan;
4. Maintain process guide;
5. Develop project list;
6. Maintain habitat work schedule,
Implementation Schedule;
7. Provide training and community outreach,
Subcontract with counties for a majority of subtask 7.

Joy Juelson is the Interim LE Coordinator. We went through a hiring process, which is now in an evaluation stage, and Julie Morgan has decided to hold off on hiring for at least 6 months due to uncertainties and moving parts in the budget. As a result, Joy will remain the interim LE Coordinator through the next round. Theo (Burgoon) and Greer are also contacts for LE within UCSRB; Chelan and Okanogan County are contacts for Outreach.

[graphic-Outreach by subbasin; plan, administrators, contacts]

Joy has been working on the Lead Entity Transition Report; we completed project sponsor interviews between last July and September; we tried to generate input and suggestions. In December the sponsors were given opportunity for review of the feedback generated. This Jan-Feb we are proposing recommendations, and we will have the SRFB debrief in February, likely at the end of the month.

LE Report recommendations on several topics [see handout]

- Application process
- Funding coordination
- Access to technical information and understandable science
- Upper Columbia Regional Technical Team
- Chelan and Okanogan Citizens Advisory Committees
- Outreach
- Project Costs Reports

There is a blank spot for the RTT recommendations; Joy presented the LE Report with project sponsor comments to the RTT last week; they will review and determine their own set of recommendations based on the comments

Chuck—likely in first week of February

Derek—UCSRB Services to Support LE Process

- Project Process and Proposal Development
 - Schedule, coordinate, and communicate process
 - Coord and assist various entities
 - Provide guidance and feedback
 - Technical assistance
- Science and Reporting Support (Greer will present)

Derek—next SRFB/Trib round is just around the corner; we are also working with BPA to determine how much, if any BPA money will also be available

Greer Maier—UCSRB Science and Reporting Support: science and integrated reporting program manager for UCSRB

Recovery Plan Background—Appendix Q of the Recovery Plan

RTT Role:

- Recommend region-wide approaches and priorities to protect and restore habitat
- Develop and evaluate recovery projects within the Upper Columbia region
- Develop and guide recovery monitoring plans as appropriate

UCSRB Role:

- Data stewardship
- Communication of RTT products
- Technical Assistance
 - Project sponsor workshop
 - Science conference
 - Project technical support
 - Data compilation

- Reporting support
- Responsive to needs

Greer—I will be working on the project sponsor workshop to give project sponsors access to usable information, then plan to have a science conference in the fall. Technical support, can provide assistance in various ways with data, reporting, and want to be responsive to project sponsor needs. We want to enhance the flow of information between the RTT/UCSRB/Co-managers and the WATs.

Project Sponsor Workshop 2013

Based on initial direction from WATs:

- Life histories/habitat use
- Connect monitoring people with sponsors for informal discussions
- Compilation of monitoring data for comprehensive look at life histories and limited life stages and habitats

We would like to keep it regional for the first workshop, and I need to hear from people what would be most useful.

Next steps:

- WAT discussions
- Outreach to monitoring teams and sponsors
- Work group formed
- Topic and agenda formed
- Data compilation and review
- Outreach for participation

Greer—We hope to provide project sponsors with context that helps piece the data together. Let me know if you are interested in being involved in the science conference or the workshop. If you have a specific need that isn't on the list, we can still put it on the back burner to work on.

We also will be working on revamping the UCSRB website; we will be working on “report” stewardship so that people can find the information.

Discussion—YN has a status and trend reporting effort funded by the fish accords that is focused on YN projects only. USGS reports are available online, send additional reports to Greer as they are generated.

Greer—reports can be of limited use for people, but we can provide service related reports. If you want to be involved, send email (include address) to Greer.Maier@ucsr.com.

Roundtable/Public Comment

Derek Van Marter—as most of you know, there are a few new county commissioners. Ray Campbell will be the Okanogan representative to the UCSRB, and we will have the first board meeting of the year on January 24th. The other two commissioners on the board have taken it on to bring Ray up to speed, and we have welcomed their input. On landowner liability, we have been working on the legislation that we dropped last session; we are working to revise it, right now it is an amendment to the existing salmon recovery act that limits landowner liability for personal property damage downstream. It does not address personal injury. The RCO has to submit a “state of the salmon in Watersheds” report every other year. The 2012 report is online only and is available at <http://stateofsalmon.wa.gov>.

Chuck Peven—The RTT will be deliberating on comments received on the scoring criteria on the 22nd; we hope to have responses out by the end of the month or so. We are also working on comments in the LE transition report. One comment was on RTT representation from this area, and we will likely recommend that the MRC nominate someone from the Methow to be on the RTT.

Torre Stockard—MVID update: for quite a few years there have been efforts to improve irrigation efficiencies in MVID, particularly on the Twisp River. TU is working with Reclamation and MVID and we have contracts with DOE, we have four alternatives, and they will move the MVID West point of diversion to the Methow River, which will return 11 cfs to the Twisp River. Derek—this is largely funded through the Department of Ecology Office of Columbia River.

Char Schumacher—both new county commissioners appear to be very interested in what is going on in Salmon Recovery.

John Crandall—I am still working on the 2013 Outreach and Communications Plan update, and I need your outreach events with dates and enough information as possible ASAP so I can provide it to Ecology. I hope to have it done by the end of the month. We had a very successful outreach year last year, with over 20 outdoor education days. I am still waiting to hear back on status of the grant for the Upper Columbia Lamprey restoration guide. Lamprey returns this year over Wells dam doubled from last year; we got 2.

Hans Smith—YN is working on signage for our program, and we are also working with others in Wenatchee and Entiat subbasins, hope to bring a prototype to share soon.

Wesley Tibbits—those interested can go to western fisheries research center Columbia research lab to find publications on the Methow; it is mostly tributary work between 2004-2008, and annual reporting for mainstem Methow. <http://wfrc.usgs.gov/fieldstations/columbia/>

Lee Hatcher—for the Watershed Council, TU is going to be sponsor for the Davis Lake project; we have an MOA, and the project will put more water into Bear Creek. We are also working on instream flow rule, which has been reenergized and will become the baseline for watershed council planning. The Watershed Council is also working on institutional development, Phase 4 funding ends in June.

Derek—what is status of the Twin Lakes Aquifer Coalition project?

Lee—not sure; it not a Watershed Council project.

Derek—it is also an Ecology office of the Columbia River project

Char—SEPA closed, haven't heard the comments from Ecology

Next MRC meeting February 19th

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
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act
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.