

Methow Restoration Council

January 21, 2014

Participants:

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Aaron Penvose	WWP-TU
Blake Stokes	Local Citizen
Chris Butler	Yakama Nation
Chris Johnson	MSRF
Chuck Peven	RTT
Don Phillips	Local Citizen
Grace Watson	USGS
Greer Maier	UCSRB
Heide Andersen	Methow Conservancy
Jarred Johnson	Yakama Nation
Jason Paulsen	Methow Conservancy
Jenni Novak	WDFW
Jennifer Molesworth	Reclamation
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
John Crandall	MRC
Joy Juelson	UCSRB
Ken Muir	USFWS
Kent Stokes	Local Citizen
Kent Woodruff	Forest Service
Lynda Hofmann	WDFW
Matt Shales	CCFEG
Robes Parrish	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Ryan Fortier	WDFW
Sean Koester	CCFEG
Steve Ralph	Local Citizen
Terri Williams	Okanogan Conservation District
Vic Stokes	Local Citizen

Meeting Notes:

John Crandall—Monitoring Update: The long awaited Appendix C Monitoring plan for the Methow has reached the draft phase. It describes the body of monitoring that is occurring in the Methow as a whole, specifically as it addresses the Recovery Plan. In the Methow, we have close to 40 different programs that are collecting data across the watershed. All are occurring for a purpose, and not all the same purpose. Many different plans guide the overall monitoring work; Appendix C is an attempt to put that all under one umbrella. I am looking for people to review this document. Very invigorating and exciting read. It is an appendix to the Upper Columbia Monitoring Strategy, which is itself an appendix to the Recovery Plan. Appendix C includes all the work that is going on for bull trout. If you want to review it, let John know. It will go to MaDMC of the RTT, then comments will go back to John to incorporate comments, then back to RTT, then to board for approval. It will happen as fast as we can; I hope to have MaDMC review in mid-February.

Discussion—timeline, reviewers

John—we've been working on looking at fish use on the new wood structures that have gone in. Our ultimate goal is to improve habitat and see if it improves survival. We have been putting our faces in the water to see what fish are there, and then comparing them to other areas with no treatments. We are looking at the structures and trying to figure out if big vs. small structures are better, if it is better to have more smaller ones or a few big ones, etc. We have a lot of these structures, and we are starting to develop a data set for the Methow. We hope to use it to inform work that is coming up over the next few years.

The Methow IMW is moving along with their production and aquatic productivity model; year-round data collection is taking place—they are looking at temperature and dissolved oxygen at 12 sites year round. We are trying to figure out what affects growth and survival, especially for young fish. The model is very technical, but the results are easily digested.

Chuck Peven—are the models going to identify potential bottlenecks?

John—not as well as the lifecycle models that the state is working on.

John—Outreach Update: we have the 2014 MRC calendars.

Chris Johnson—I have 8 boxes, if we have groups that want to distribute them, let me know. I also left 4 boxes with Methow Arts.

John—thanks to everyone who helped contribute to the calendar. This is the first one that has photos as well as the kids' art. We have an active link to the web site where people can learn a lot more. It is flexible what the link could be. It is open, MSRF will help coordinate with the next month sponsor.

Chris—we plan to keep the months up longer than just the first month; people will be able to go back to previous month sponsors. We will continue to fine tune that.

John—every year we develop an outreach and education framework for MRC, usually in January. We meet and discuss previous year's goals and see how we did; we usually meet or exceed, and then we forecast what we plan to do for outreach and education in the coming year, then put together into a plan. It is that time again, so if you have outreach and education events planned, get them to John soon.

Terri Williams—Kirsten Cook (OCD) has developed a class on the Ecology of the Okanogan with a biology teacher at the school, and it is partnered with the Colville tribes. The program is very focused on taking data and has a lot of cool components. I know that Kirsten is planning on expanding that eventually, and she will need help. They have the curriculum worked out; this has been their pilot year. If you want to bring it here, then coordinate with Kirsten. They are also training for the Envirothon through the class; a lot of local scientists and experts are teaching the actual units. It has a lot of potential.

John—we have the Watershed Watchers program for this year has already started with the schools, second and third graders and the Independent Learning Center. Third grade is doing a unit on floods, using the Methow and the Twisp ponds to learn about floods. Looking at how it affects habitat.

Kent Woodruff—I will connect with you to see how the beaver project can tie in

Chris J—last year, we didn't do a salmon celebration, but we are looking at an event this year. Kraig Mott suggested that this year we time the event to one species or another, and I will work with him on what those opportunities might be. We also have two pieces of art that will be dedicated this year.

John—the Okanogan Board of County Commissioners invited a lot of the salmon practitioners to a meeting in early January—they wanted to know when is enough enough, and how do we know when were done. Right from the outset, those questions go to the larger regional setting; we have the four sectors, or H's, that have an influence on Recovery—Habitat, Hatchery, Hydro, and Harvest. It is a very involved response to those kind of questions, and difficult for individual project sponsors to address. Derek from UCSRB gave a thorough and detailed explanation on that overarching view. He really broke

down the core of the work we are doing and how we are involved. There are several court cases out there that are pushing things, and we aren't necessarily in charge of where things go. The project sponsors were able to testify on what kinds of projects are going on, where, and the economics that brings to the valley, and some of the results we're seeing. There were many different presentations from groups like OCD, TU, Colvilles, YN, CCFEG, MSRF. Was an interesting discussion, it is complex and there are many different things involved.

Chris J—in talking afterwards with the County, the commissioners asked three very simple questions mostly aimed at the implementation of the Recovery Plan; we were able to expand that conversation to be quite a bit larger than what they were looking for. The discussion ranged to the effects on power, economics, who is responsible for monitoring, whether irrigation projects are necessary or beneficial. The feedback that I got is that the commissioners recognize that it isn't as simple as what they initially asked. Hope that we see more involvement from the commissioners, and I plan to keep the conversation open. My next presentation will be on the implications to the tax base to address some of their concerns on our effects. Stay tuned.

Chuck—do you think there may be some topics related to the science behind the Recovery Plan that would be helpful?

Chris J—they are skeptical, but framing the information might be helpful to them

Chuck—would it be helpful to explain how we can have a lot of steelhead but still have threats?

Chris J—think providing that type of information is necessary

Jennifer—we also need to talk about predation, and what is going on to address it

Chris J—hoping that if I can start a dialogue, we can bring them the information that they are interested in.

Robes Parrish—do you feel that the economic information that you provided was well received?

Chris—there were two approaches; Derek presented a statistical analysis, but they didn't accept that.

We contacted one of our contractors (BCI) and got actual numbers of what they spent locally and where.

Chuck—think it is also helpful to acknowledge where we don't know something; we need to be careful.

Joy—Derek has some graduate students working on an economic analysis.

Chris J—we are going to use our actual expenditures and recipients.

Jennifer Molesworth—Beaver Creek Accomplishments: we have been doing a lot in Beaver Creek. Right around the tripod fire, the USFS did an assessment, then Reclamation did a lot of analysis work related to the Upper Beaver Channel relocation, which sat around in files. This summer, Reclamation did an EA related to irrigation diversion replacements, and they used this old material, and Vic Stokes noticed that the existing condition data in the document was old. We have been doing a lot of work there, and I think we need to look again at where we are, and where we want to take that, documenting a baseline.

Vic Stokes—some of the studies go back to the late '90s—it started around 1998 when WDFW looked at screening, and then Carmen Andonaegui did the limiting factors report. These seem to be quite cursory; as landowners, we think that since we've been there for awhile, we have a good view of the historical situation. A lot of money has been spent, and the landowners are appreciative. When I look at the current reports, I still see a lot of references to these old reports. We are always looking for the opportunity to be educated, but we are also here to educate. Like the commissioners, we are interested in knowing what is the effectiveness of these things, and also when we will be done.

Chris J—Vic is managing some of the land that we acquired on Beaver Creek through the YN fish accords; we wanted to increase floodplain connectivity on a working ranch. Our approach has been to show that conservation can work with Ag. We have to be very careful not to do a drive by, and be specific about the areas where we identify what is working and the areas where it is not. We jumped into Beaver

Creek without a reach assessment; we had info from Reclamation and OCD, and we were confident with the things that were obviously wrong, but when we are finished with Marracci and Fort Thurlow we will be about done with those. I agree that we should go back and revisit the existing conditions, and we plan to monitor the results of our efforts. I would like to see us to make a more routine effort to come back and update the science.

Jennifer—Beaver Creek has had a lot of improvements; barrier removals, flow improvements, and land protection; there a lot of different aspects of Beaver Creek that we could talk about. It would need to be coordinated between the different groups that are working in Beaver Creek.

Chris J—most of our grants don't allow us to do any kind of effectiveness monitoring; I am working with BPA to try to get them to fund us to go in and do some monitoring; I may be making some progress. We may be able to develop a simple protocol that we can repeat at all of our sites. I expect that will be happening over the next several years, and hope to have some data that we can use to identify what is helping.

John—Beaver Creek is a really amazing watershed; it is very large, diverse, and a little drier than others because it is further east. There are a lot of influences that affect how water moves in the watershed. Part of the work with monitoring is to inform and refine our understanding of what is going on there, and to identify where the limiting factors are changing.

Chris J—from the Hwy 20 culvert up to the Marracci diversion is a reasonable stretch to look at how those projects have addressed the limiting factors.

John—we need to remember that things that we see at the bottom are related to things that happen at the top.

Chris J—if we narrow this to look at project effectiveness, we can take a snapshot and see if you've moved the needle.

Vic—the USGS has gathered a lot of data for around 10 years; I would hope that there is some value there for understanding fish recovery in Beaver Creek. The large woody debris, is a question for me; when I see the parameters that it falls into, down in the lower reaches, we rarely see any influence from the conifer forest in large woody debris, and it is mostly from the native trees in the area.

Discussion—wood surveys, size guidelines

Vic—in 2011, when we had some of the highest water I've seen in Beaver Creek, we had wood in the creek that provided good habitat, but it was too small to meet the standards

John—a lot of people acknowledge that we don't have enough diversity in the standards; I would agree that the standards that exist are not best suited to application in Beaver Creek based on its size (i.e. standards for the larger streams like the mainstem Methow are identical to smaller streams like Beaver Creek).

Jennifer—that is where we come together and look at what the data and apply our judgment; we count the same, but then we use our experience to determine how it applies

Discussion—how the information is used, how the information is used to develop projects, problem with old references being used over and over again, how to reestablish a baseline.

Chuck—we try to update the limiting factors/ecological concerns whenever we update the Biological Strategy; we revised it last year, and incorporated local feedback. The issue is how do we capture new information and ensure that it is the correct information. We struggle with that all of the time, and we

acknowledge that it is largely based on opinion. We rely on geomorphic assessments, and we need to come back to the source documents, and we need to remember that it is a guideline.

Jennifer—in all of our other projects, we are doing them after we've done a reach assessment that looks at the underlying geology, but we have not been able to do that for Beaver Creek. The habitat survey was a way to get a little data

Discussion—ways to get funding to do effectiveness monitoring

Jason Paulsen—in anything that you do, you need to go back to 1998, to look at everything that has been done, and remember the cultural piece and the success that we have. You need to be able to show that the Beaver Creek neighbors haven't been wasting their time by being nice to you for the last 15 years.

Vic—it started off in 1998 as a risk management assessment from the landowners when we learned that we needed to protect ourselves and help with some fish issues. We are constantly doing some risk assessment as far as what we have to do next; we divert water to irrigate with and we are an adjudicated basin, but we still have to meet the requirements for temperature and flow. Everything has land management and enforcement implications, and we are trying to figure out how we can move away from that. There is a history of risk management; as landowners we are really only worried about Fraser Creek and Beaver Creek.

Chris J—I will sit down with Chuck and John and Greer, and follow up with you on next steps on how we can help you with your risk assessment; this is really high on my list, moving to the next phase on my list as a Beaver Creek landowner.

Greer—this is also an issue in other areas, so we can bring some of those experiences to help you.

Jennifer—it would be nice to have a tour of the work done. I would like to hear from the different groups about any additional plans for Beaver Creek.

Aaron Penvose—if you are going to look at the watershed, you also need to look at the National Forest upstream. TU's work started out as opportunistic with Marracci and Campbell; we've put up 12 different pivots, with a lot of match from local landowners, and I'm not sure there are others to be done. I don't know when enough is enough as far as the water is concerned; if we could get a handle on the instream flow piece, that would be helpful.

Chris J—MSRF is planning to do the Fort Thurlow and Marracci diversion this year, and this will be our second year of monitoring at OSH and Campbell, and we will be monitoring the Upper Beaver Channel complexity project for at least 3 years. I am also hearing that we need to do a better job of communicating.

Jenni—I will work with MSRF on the Fort Thurlow and Marracci through the WDFW screening project; I will look at other opportunities but no specific plans yet for the area.

Robes—USFWS will continue to work with MSRF on the monitoring and adaptive at the channel complexity projects. We have the Partners for Fish and Wildlife program that is specifically aimed at working with private landowners. Also, I think that for any product you put out, you need to emphasize the trajectory of improvement in Beaver Creek to show how far we have come. I will be glad to participate

Kent W—the Stokes have been very generous with everyone in this room, and I think we would help them in any discussions of adverse regulation. People are asking us questions that we are obligated to

answer clearly, without mumbo jumbo, on what we have accomplished and what else we need to accomplish. I think our ability to communicate that to the community is one of our strongest obligations.

Chris J—we will be doing a walk in the spring to look at how the projects works on the easement property

Heide—the Upper Beaver channel project is test case for us, how it works on the property, especially because it was designed before the property was under easement

Vic—the main body of our ranch also has an easement with the Conservancy

Kent W—there is a reason that Beaver Creek is called “Beaver” Creek, and the Stokes have been a good partner on the Beaver Project; some of the very best restoration actions for beaver restoration have happened up on the watershed on Beaver Creek.

Robes Parrish—Current Hydrologic Outlook: SNOTEL data, current trends and our seasonal outlook. A quick snapshot. [PowerPoint]

Most of our snowpack is derived from the higher elevation sites.

We need to remember this question: what is the difference between climate and weather? Answer—climate is what you expect (long term) and weather is what you get (short term). Observed climatology is an assimilation of statistical trends. Lower elevation and mid-elevations sites are experiencing lower snow-water equivalent and earlier melting trend over thirty year average. Declines are stronger below 6000 ft. Some interesting things, the thirty year outlook data correlates with what we are seeing. Many sites to look at if you are interested in more data and comparative trends. I can give you links if you are interested.

Joy Juelson and Greer Maier—UCSRB and Lead Entity Update:

Greer—we got some funding to look at how we can try to retain more snowpack through forest practices; we have an RFP out, and on our web site (www.ucsrb.com) we have a link.

Joy—SRFB process: it just ended, but we are starting the process for the next round. The US Senate approved PCSRF funds, and we match those with WA state funds through the Salmon Recovery Funding Board Process. We have a debrief every year to talk about our locally run process; this is the only time of the year that we can make changes to our process. This year, the debrief date will be February 13th. We try to make the process fair and equitable; I’m talking to sponsors, and everyone is welcome to the debrief. The SRFB kickoff will be mid-late March. Also, the board just approved a process to recruit new CAC members in December; nominations will be run through the WATs and through the planning units, and then the county commissioners will select a nominee, and the board will approve. There will be one new member per committee; each currently has 6 members, so each will have 7 total. I will send the announcement through the planning unit.

Jennifer—it should be through the WAT; our planning unit opted out of habitat.

Joy—there is a plan for who should be on the citizens committee, we will be looking for specific representation; I will send it out, and it should be really clear.

Joy—Habitat Work Schedule: it is that time of year again to update projects; HWS is the primary database for tracking habitat projects; it is a public portal and it is the primary reporting mechanism for the board to NOAA. I will send out more information and we’ve been contacting folks about who is responsible for entering the data and making it up to date.

Greer—we all have a vested interest in making sure the information is accurate—all of our reporting comes from there.

Jason—when will the new scoring criteria come from RTT? Will it be before the debrief or the before the next round?

Chuck—it will be in March, before the process is moving along

Joy—we can also get an update at the debrief

Chris J—I recently got a call from a reporter who had a hard time finding information on economic input from the HWS; the issue is that from there you can only find out what was awarded, not what was actually spent.

Greer—in HWS if you put in what is completed and update the budget, you can get that out there.

Roundtable

Jennifer Molesworth—last week I was in Boise, drove back through Idaho and Montana, and what I saw matches what was in Robes' presentation.

I am helping to curate a show for the Confluence Gallery that opens June 7th; the call for artists is open now. The show is about the natural and native history of the Methow River, so if you know any artists that would be interested have them contact me. We are working with the interpretive center at TwispWorks also. We would like to tie in a fish event. Maybe fishing day.

Chuck Peven—the RTT is in the process of revising the scoring criteria; comments are due from RTT members by the Feb meeting, and any revisions will take place between the Feb and March meetings. We have addressed some inconsistencies with the Biological Strategy, will send out with the revised scoring criteria.

Grace Watson—we are continuing the stream metabolism project throughout the winter. We have officially installed two new antenna systems at Whitefish Island side channel; MWF is the three letter code in PTAGIS. The top set is e 1-6 and the bottom is f 1-6. They are up and running. www.ptagis.org

Jason Paulsen—we've got a series of focus groups that are part of our needs assessments; we've got two next week—one for folks involved in environmental education, and the other is for people who are providing natural history and environmental education. We are looking for input and partnership opportunities for people involved in environmental education.

Kent Woodruff—Beaver Project update: project continues to go well. Winter is fundraising and reporting time. We are working on a transition to close out our time with the Conservancy and move to hosting by MSRF; targeting project fiscal year for transition, will prepare for hiring for next season. We are looking at year 7 of a ten year project, feel good about our progress.

Greer Maier—the next board meeting is Feb 20th at the Chelan PUD auditorium

Ryan Fortier—I am a new employee with WDFW, in the new position of Restoration Coordinator. WDFW is a large landowner, and I am here to expedite the process to try to get more projects done quicker, specifically on WDFW lands. I have worked all over the west, primarily in fish research.

Jarred Johnson—I would like to coordinate for a field trip on Beaver Creek this spring

Robes Parrish—USFWS has been working with WDFW and CCFEG on getting some momentum for Silver Side Channel; we put out an RFP for the design work, also for the Twisp to Carlton RA. Much of the work will depend on land transaction in the area. Project still on track for the next two years there.

John—will the design be after the RA?

Robes—we already know that is an area where we want to work, will pursue the design work during the RA process; it will be vetted against the objectives for the reach.

John—what kind of biological criteria get put into that design?

Robes—still to be determined; will come out as we gather more information, driven partly by landowner needs or desires. WDFW is principally in charge at this point; they are still negotiating with the landowner, and it is still in flux, but they look to be still the main proponent/manager.

Robes—I also just finished writing a ditty on Hancock and the restoration success story that we have there; is going into a FWS publication called Eddies, primarily fisheries issues, when it comes out I would like to cross-post it, so if you have ideas about where to do that it would be great.

Matt Shales—CCFEG will select consultant for the Silver design in the next week through a competitive process. The RFP for the Twisp to Carlton Reach Assessment will go out next week. Also, we are looking for any stage data that may have been collected in the Twisp to Carlton reach in the past. Especially if connected to a datum. Data will be used to better inform 2-D model for the reach assessment.

Jennifer Molesworth—Reclamation will probably be hiring students this year; we will likely have a USAJobs posting in February. The positions are for kids in college that are enrolled in the following fall, we will have two in the Methow. If you know of college kids looking for work, send them my way.

Next meeting February 18th

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
FFFP	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.