

Methow Restoration Council

May 21, 201

Participants:

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Allen Lebovitz	WDNR
Brian Fisher	MSRF
Char Schumacher	Okanogan County
Chris Butler	Yakama Nation
Chris Johnson	MSRF
Chuck Peven	RTT
Don Phillips	Local Landowner
Grace Watson	USGS
Hans Smith	Yakama Nation
Jarred Johnson	Yakama Nation
Jennifer Molesworth	Reclamation
Jeri Timm	WWP-TU
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
John Crandall	MRC
Joy Juelson	UCSRB
Julie Grialou	Methow Conservancy
Matt Shales	CCFEG
Michelle Dewey	Dewey Consulting LLC
Terri Williams	Okanogan Conservation District

Meeting Notes

Brian Fisher—Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation M2 Update: more detailed update on M2. We built Whitefish Island (WFI) last year, and I'm going to share some of the initial fish results. We had 12 weeks of construction, wrapped up the first week of November; three weeks later we had coho spawning in the side channel. One of the goals was to increase the duration of connection of the side channel; it stayed connected all winter. This spring USGS caught three listed species there, juvenile spring Chinook, steelhead, and sub-adult bull trout. This spring as the river came up, we didn't do quantitative sampling, but we saw lots of juvenile salmon using the areas around the wood. As the water came up, we still saw a lot of slack water in the bar area.

John Crandall—where there was a current break, that was where the fish were.

Brian—at the alcove area, we didn't do much work there but we did clean it up, we see very high fish densities there.

At the apex jam, we got comments after construction that it was huge; it did look really big at low flows, but at 9000 cfs it is much less dramatic.

At the live crib at 10,000 cfs the water got up on the planting bench; this is about the 2 year flow and that was where the designed predicted it would be. Getting the plants to establish there will be one of our biggest challenges due to poor soils.

ChrisJ—that is the base of the DOT slope on the highway 20; we will be bringing a truck that slings landscape mulch on the planting bench to try to improve the planting survival. There was no vegetation there when we started, so any establishment is an improvement.

Brian—it will come down to water and mulch, and more water.

We put up a sign upstream of the side channel entrance (alerting people about the project and directing them to stay left) to help encourage people to stay out of the side channel. Also at about 2000 cfs, I put on a dry suit and floated down the channel. It was not a scary ride, so I think the real risk is pretty low. Things in the side channel likely changed during high water, but as it was, it wasn't that bad if someone accidentally ends up in there. There are definitely things that could pop a cheap raft, but at 2000 cfs a competent swimmer shouldn't have problems and it isn't that different from the rest of the river.

ChrisJ—the sign is temporary; we will take it down. Landowners are not in favor of seeing billboards on the river. Also, we had several different tours of the project site before and during construction, and we would like to do repeat tours after high water to see how it fared. Coordinate with Jessica, Brian, or me if you are interested and we will work on setting something up.

Brian—we also built three structures on the left bank main channel at the WDFW project site and took out the remnants of the MVID East dam; there is no longer a dam there.

ChrisJ—we took the dam out in stages over 6 years; no one knew what it was made of in the beginning, but it was a log crib with log piles that went down in some places 12 feet; we think we are done now.

Brian—Jenny and I went out and I snorkeled the structures in April, saw juvenile Chinook; hard to see inside the structures, landowner is happy and wants to extend the riparian planting. Pile supported and gravity L-type structures started racking debris, looking good, will continue to watch them.

Brian—overview plans for 2013 construction at WDFW Floodplain. Will be working with Boulder Creek Contracting for the culverts, and we have BCI Contracting out of Portland for the river work. We are acquiring all of the wood for the project, we have four contractors bringing wood to the site now.

Staging is expecting through the end of June, culvert construction mid-June-July, River Project work will start in July and expected to last through September, and planting in the fall. A major lesson was that no matter how early you start with the landowners, it still takes up to construction to work with them.

Allen Lebovitz—how much water do you expect the low flow channel (WFI) to convey?

Brian—at low flow, I expect less than 5%; as flows increase the percent increases.

ChrisJ—a fair amount of sediment was redistributed, so some is still unknowable.

Discussion—changes over time, different flows make different changes, changes can stimulate greater change, sediment movement, scour

Joy Juelson—UCSRB Update: Staffing change—Julie Morgan is no longer executive director (ED); Derek Van Marter is the interim ED; board will make decision on ED at the next meeting in June; Derek will be in the Methow one to two days per week and in Wenatchee three days per week.

SRFB process update; looks like we will get about the same amount of funding as last year; amount is around \$1 million each for Okanogan and Chelan counties. Other funding processes are interwoven.

Julie Grialou—in the past it was split by alternating projects rather than funding amounts, is that different now?

Joy—no, it will be the same as before; it works out as a general split but not exact.

USFWS had a design team funded by BPA that has been cancelled for this year; the Trib committee is still engaging in most of the process; they use the RTT process but not the CAC process. BPA sometimes engages in this process with remainder funding from the targeted process, but the Lower White Pine is taking most of the funding this year, unless something happens with Lower White Pine, and then there will be a lot of funding.

Terri Williams—how up in the air is that?

Joy—it looks good, but there are still things that need to happen

Chuck Peven—they sounded encouraging at the last meeting

Discussion—what might happen if the Lower White Pine project doesn't move forward.

Joy—the SRFB/Trib open funding is a 6 step process, and we are currently between steps 1 and 2. Draft proposals were due May 7th; RTT and State Review Panel (SRP) now have the proposals in hand. All

processes are in the LE Funding Process Guide available on the UCSRB web site. This year we have 23 projects submitted, 13 from Chelan and 10 from Okanogan counties. Last year there were 27 projects; 5 were withdrawn, and 11 funded.

Next step is the project site tours. Okanogan will be first on May 29th. We will start at the north and work our way down, and be in the Methow on the 30th. Sponsors, RTT, SRP, and others are invited on the tours. Project presentations will be on June 12th, where you can present additional details and respond to input from the project tours.

ChrisJ—how will we get the comments?

Chuck—I will take notes and provide comments and get them back to you as soon as possible.

Joy—CAC presentations will be in late August after the projects are complete.

Joy—for the RTT tour, Jennifer Molesworth has agreed to have a BBQ on the night of the 29th (after the Okanogan tour) at her house up Beaver Creek. If you want to come on the tours, you are all invited; give Jessica a head count and we will provide lunch.

Joy Juelson—Implementation Schedule/HWS/Science Conference Update: Theo Burgoon asked me to present on the annual Upper Columbia Implementation Schedule (IS) update; we need to provide an update to NOAA every year. The IS needs to be updated by project sponsors by the end of June. It is all done through the HWS now. The process is to assemble the updates, engage WATS, consolidate the information, present to our board for approval, and give to NOAA in October. If you are a project sponsor, we will send you a table to review, make changes in red pen if necessary, and then make changes in the HWS. We moved from limiting factors to Ecological Concerns, and some of the Assessment Units have changed. You also need to remove old projects that are no longer being pursued.

Discussion—change from Limiting Factors to Ecological Concerns

Joy—we have some guidance for folks who are making changes in the HWS database. We will give you the table and the guide, and then sponsors can go make changes in HWS. Theo or Joy can help if you have problems. We have also updated the metrics in the system to be the same as PCSRF, which will help with the reporting. We will also be having a brown bag webinar on some of the cool products that you can get from HWS. We need the updates done in HWS by June 30th.

Jarred Johnson—when where the metrics changed in HWS?

Joy—within the last two months; you should be able to glance at the table and tell if you need to update.

Joy—Greer Maier is going to be putting on a science conference (handout). She is looking for feedback this is your chance to give Greer some ideas. Go through Jessica to give Greer feedback.

Chuck Peven—Biological Strategy Addendum: Brian started it, but three people contacted me in one day to point out an inconsistency in the Biological Strategy, in the priority assessment units. I will send out an addendum, Greer has pointed out some other inconsistencies. I would encourage you to always go to Appendix E for the real thing. I will not be revising the document, but will make the changes in the addendum.

Julie—when I was looking at priority areas vs. priority actions, in Appendix E, I was a bit confused

Chuck—page 22 gives a good summary

Julie—so priority areas and priority actions are different things?

Chuck—yes

Julie—and also ecological concerns?

Chuck—yes, which are also ranked

John—from a monitoring standpoint the information is laid out really well, I don't agree with all of it, but it is all really there.

Julie—I think that the various terms might end up confusing the CAC, but it all comes out in the project description

Brian—there is an inconsistency, particularly in the Middle Methow, with the NOAA criteria for the major/minor spawning areas; is that an intentional discrepancy?

Chuck—need to look at the boundaries of the Assessment Units, for the values for the intrinsic potential, there is a possibility that the geographic boundaries don't mesh in the TRT

Brian—I looked at it and the boundaries are pretty close

Chuck—in Table 3 I tried to define the Assessment Units so we can all talk about the same things. They have shape files for the Assessment Units on the UCSRB web site. They started with subbasin planning, were refined through the recovery plan and the WAT planning processes

Chris Johnson—Landowner Liability Discussion: House Bill 1194, liability legislation, how people are interpreting what this means for the projects. What does the new law mean? Obviously it was intended to respond to concerns raised by the YN and the UCSRB to address liability for landowners who participate in salmon recovery projects. The bill was amended by Linda Parlette at the last minute. In order to meet the requirements, the project has to meet 5 criteria. The first is that the project be included on a list—question is which list, whether it is the HWS; I'm hoping Joy or someone at UCSRB can look into that.

The second criterion is that the project is designed by a licensed professional engineer or a professional geologist with experience in river restoration. Need to know what that means when it is designed by an engineer, but one who doesn't have a stamp like Bureau or state engineers.

Allen—we have had that issue, usually licensed means that they stamped it. Our district's policy is that if you have a licensed engineer we want to see the stamp.

ChrisJ—the criterion that I have the most heartburn with is that the structures have to be designed to meet the 100-year flood; in some places this could create avulsions if you create a hard point in an inappropriate location. For our projects, we may choose to not do projects in places where there is opportunity but the 100-year standard would not be appropriate and we want to work with landowners Discussion—places where natural structures are persistent; naturally persistent structures, but it's not necessarily the same wood in the structures over time

ChrisJ—I am interpreting this as that structures are supposed to stay together, you have to stamp each piece and make sure that it stays there

Allen—concerned about that, we have been trying to look at a more dynamic approach, and this moves us away from that

ChrisJ—the standard is one that we usually meet, but the unilateral nature is what is disturbing

Allen—we may be setting deep precedents that we could have a hard time changing down the road

Jennifer—it is significant that we are having the discussion out in the public with our legislation. It is still significant that we have recognition that wood in rivers is needed. I have a lot of heartburn over the word "may" in the legislation; you will still go to court and so you didn't accomplish anything

ChrisJ—and we have a new standard to meet. We have come a long way in our local shorelines code; I'm wondering how that will affect the exemptions?

Char Schumacher—the commissioners are just beginning to work on it, I have no idea how it will come out

ChrisJ—think that we need to discuss it as a group. We are about to implement a large project that adds a lot of wood, and we are modifying the project accordingly; WDFW did not require it, but we have three private landowners that we want to protect.

Discussion—DNR process, safety checklist, due diligence for project sponsors in risk assessment

Allen—the public safety checklist approach is good because it gives structure to a process that shows how the analysis was done, what you did with the outcome, and how it was documented, gives the ability to fit into the specific situation

ChrisJ—Derek Van Marter suggested that we keep track of how this affects our project implementation on the ground, so that we can document it and help the UCSRB track whether or not this is helping or hindering getting projects on the ground

ChrisJ—I have also been talking with the Methow Conservancy

ChrisJ—the fourth criterion is that it not be within ¼ mile upstream of an established boat launch, not clear what that means, what qualifies as a boat launch

Jennifer—seems like we need the UCSRB to keep working on the next iteration of this; it was kind of checked off, but think we need to continue working on the issue; do we need to see how it works for awhile?

ChrisJ—need to understand what people think it means, we need to follow Derek’s advice about keeping track of how it works, but we need some understanding of what it means; consistent interpretation

Projects also have to allow adequate response time for boaters to avoid it.

The fifth thing is that each log over 10 ft long and greater than 12 ft diameter has to have a unique identifier on it.

Jennifer—doesn’t say it has to be tied to a database, though.

Hans Smith—the only real concern that we have at this moment is how the messaging happens; we need to make sure that we are synchronized in what we are saying about it; think it would be good for the UCSRB to take a shot at interpreting what it means, think that whatever we say will spread quickly, and can affect all of our ability to do work.

ChrisJ—we have been advised that we need to notify all landowners where we haven’t started work that this exists; my attorney says that we need to notice any private landowner with the information, provide it for them to review and have them tell us if they want us to meet it.

Roundtable

Chuck Peven—RTT: I will be working on an addendum to the Biological Strategy. Later this week RTT is meeting with Reclamation on the 2016-17 projects for the Entiat, should assist project sponsors in developing a list for implementation. Has not been anything planned for the Methow; but if there is an interest in doing something like that, come and talk to Chuck. Has been an evolving process for the last two years.

Jennifer—I think it would be helpful for the next round of targeted proposals for Reclamation and BPA to review. Now is a really good time to shape the out-year effort that is out there. Also prioritizing the reach assessments, should we look at Silver, Upper Methow, or stay in the Middle Methow?

Chuck—let’s talk some more.

John Crandall—Monitoring: I am working on the Methow Monitoring Plan, Appendix C to Appendix G of the Recovery Plan. It is all inclusive of the different types of monitoring, key management questions; it will address how they are being met in the Methow. Also the modeling effort that USGS is working on with Reclamation will kick off in June; they will monitor dissolved oxygen, will be year round. New for data collection to be year round. The data will feed their model, and the hope is that the model could be used to inform restoration. I have encouraged them to present their scaffold of work to the RTT. We are also funded for a Columbia basin-wide lamprey instream and riparian habitat restoration guide. Bureau will help with technical design, NRCS, CRITFC (Columbia River Inter-tribal Fish Commission) also partners.

ChrisJ—John also put forward an application to EcoTrust to do a fish-use assessment that shows how fish are using the structures; it wasn't funded, but MSRF will be working on getting that into our next agreement with Reclamation.

John—we are trying to get around fish capture in tracking fish growth and survival, trying to use presence/absence and somewhat relative abundance to get at the information

Chris Butler—Yakama Nation: the Chewuch RM 11.75—13 project will be constructed in July if everything goes well.

Julie Grialou—Methow Conservancy: happy to report that one of our 2009 SRFB projects finally closed; it was down to the wire, included a FS land-swap, but it finally happened. It was around 70 acres up the Twisp River

Jennifer—it is some of the best Twisp River habitat, great for Spring Chinook

Julie—Back to the Biological Strategy, is the priority for Ecological Concerns by Assessment unit for restoration or protection actions or both?

Chuck—for restoration

Julie—not clear

John—should not be specific for restoration or protection; it should be the background information

Chuck—these are the ecological concerns, usually there aren't many concerns in areas that you want to protect; the concerns are usually the things that you want to address during restoration. One of the universal concerns is protecting good quality habitat, but in table 12, we talk about tiers for protection

Matt Shales—CCFEG: the Judd riparian planting on the WDFW land is starting. We are also doing groundwater monitoring on three different WDFW properties, which will go through October

John—would like to have a copy of the protocol for the monitoring

Matt—we have one

Jennifer—Reclamation is funding a 2D model for the Silver Reach; Jennifer Bountry from Denver is doing the work

Allen Lebovitz—DNR: we are working with YN on the first steps for a project in the Big Valley Reach, the first steps for a public safety analysis. We are also working with WDFW on the Silver reach. I would like to get input from this group as we move forward. We are also working with WDFW on the Lewisia site; I know that there are other projects in that vicinity, and I want to make sure that it is consistent with the bigger picture. Also making a strong effort to work with the WDFW wildlife management program, and want to coordinate more closely. We are two state agencies, and we need to stay coordinated with each other and with other organizations in the valley.

Q—What is proposed at Lewisia?

Allen—what is being proposed is creating a grade break in the channel to increase inundation in the side channel, still working on the details, and the actions on both banks need to be coordinated. Gina and Tom McCoy are leading.

Matt—one of our monitoring sites is at Lewisia.

Allen—at Silver, there is discussion on how to improve flow in the relic side channel, more about groundwater at this point, there are complex landownership issues, groundwater monitoring should help, DNR is participating in how the plan is crafted. The idea is to be active co-managers.

Discussion—DNR ownership, if it is there, boundaries not necessarily important to know in all cases

Chris Butler—YN: we started our river use assessment on the Big Valley, Chewuch, and Twisp rivers. Tried to do trail cameras to capture floaters, but we got mostly wood racking, water use.

Jarred—There is a river use survey link for the Big Valley on the MRC web site; if you have boated the Big Valley reach from Weeman to Winthrop, please fill out the survey.

Allen—we are helping to fund this effort on the big Valley, part of the public safety checklist process, a way to assess and document. Our communications person in Olympia is also helping with the outreach, also helps with the general PR. It has been really educational. Want to preserve the ability to interpret the results and use our best judgment.

ChrisB—the river use assessments affect what we are designing, we are building on what we find out.

Char Schumacher—Okanogan County Natural Resources: there will be a revised draft of the Comp Plan tomorrow, there will public hearing June 24th in front of the planning commission, includes public comment

The Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) is in front of the commissioners, and the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) is also out, but they haven't done anything with either.

ChrisJ—it seems that they have combined the CAO into the SMP, which surprises me, because it then becomes state law and can't be changed without changing the SMP.

Char—other s have made the same comment

Joy Juelson—UCSRB: the UCSRB Board has a staff work group, at the last work group I was tasked with two things, one is how to recruit new CAC members. There are a variety a ways this can be done, and I'm looking at how other areas do things, what is legal; it should be citizens driven. The other thing is to put together a work group on technical needs of project sponsors, what is the line in involving the RTT; also RCO is asking for more design review on designs before they go into the process for implementation funds. If you have opinions, comments, complaints, talk to Char on citizens, Jennifer on tech support

Jennifer Molesworth—Reclamation: Fishing Day is June 8th; will be fun.

ChrisJ—we are still working on the calendar with Methow Arts

Jennifer—on June 4th, we have a Upper Columbia IT meeting; I will be there. Jude Trapani (new Joe Spinazola) from Reclamation, will bring the Pie Maps, should be pretty interesting, where the expert panel process is,

Reclamation is doing the Silver modeling this summer, will go to Twisp, downstream line will be based on geomorphology, data collection will go to Carlton, Bathymetry

Jennifer—MVID, advisory vote from the shareholders coming in, and is now closed, so far overwhelmingly in favor of the proposed change including abandoning the diversion in the Twisp River.

The overall price tag is 9 million; they have a chunk in hand, depends on the legislature. It is a pretty historical moment in the Methow, more than 20 years in the making. A huge effort, benefit to both agriculture and fish. Board and TU have been working hard. Also hope to put pipe in the ground for the Chewuch. We will build M2 O'banion (WDFW) project. Beaver Creek complexity project moving forward, and adaptive management on several weirs where the design hasn't held up over time.

Reclamation is funding the construction, which normally don't do. We have construction authority if our designs don't work as planned, but the consequence is that it takes funds out of the project development. We are also getting started on the Twisp River Floodplain in the location of the old MVID West diversion, and upstream and downstream. It is pretty exciting.

We are also getting ready for this summer's pump installation at Barkley.

BBQ at Jennifer's house on the 29th; will be pot luck, other details to follow. Jennifer and Joy like a head count of how many people are coming.

Jeri Timm—Trout Unlimited: Crystal Elliot is working for TU on the mines restoration project. She will be working across the street at the TU office here in Twisp.

Grace Watson—USGS: we are operating the rotary screw trap, fish monitoring, our fourth year of full year monitoring, with help from YN coho project, we are able to run the trap 7 days a week; we will continue all summer until need to pull out in the winter. We will also be working in the Whitefish Island project area, sampling methodology work, trying to get population numbers out of the new structures. We did a snorkel survey this spring, adult steelhead spawning and holding in pools, juvenile coho and spring Chinook, bull trout. We are hoping to get population estimates. We will also be doing a lot of sampling work in Beaver Creek, and population estimates in the index reaches, also helping with dewatering fish removal for projects, and we will be doing a pool survey on beaver creek. We are hoping to get a better idea of distribution basin-wide.

ChrisJ—let us know and MSRF will help with landowner access on Beaver Creek.

Jennifer—Fort Thurlow is a pretty big barrier, will be fixing it this summer.

ChrisJ—we should look at temporary passage in the interim; we will talk about it

Grace—we will continue operating our tag interrogation systems, we have the newest 12-antennae system just above the town of Twisp—we will be able to get directional passage, and we will also install one in Carlton upstream of the bridge in August. Three of our sites we had to give up, Wolf Creek, Gold Creek, and Libby Creek, but WDFW is taking them over for us. Our final project is our stream metabolism project; we will utilize CHaMP sites and habitat info and John's loggers to put into the model, the idea is to simulate potential impacts of restoration activities, will be 12 sites all over the basin. Ryan Bellmore is the contact for information on that.

ChrisB—if you are collecting dissolved oxygen, are we anoxic?

John—no, but it is a primary indicator of productivity, so the data will help model the productivity

Grace—we will be taking a variety of sample types, main channel and some tributary sites, Beaver Creek, Boulder Creek, and Early Winters. Ryan Bellmore at USGS is the contact if you have more questions. Our partnership with the coho project gives us 2-4 people helping us in July and August. There are also two graduate students doing work in conjunction with the project, so we will also be getting some help there. Ryan would know more about that.

Hans Smith—YN: on the Twisp River, we are moving ahead with a pretty ambitious design schedule from RM 3.5 to the mouth, working on designing everything in the RA, intense design schedule and landowner outreach. We will also have some spotty areas upstream of there for some wood enhancements. Probably starting in the fall we will do middle Twisp RA, War Creek to Newby Creek. All is going well. On the M2, we are doing the Sugar Dike large wood enhancement this year, moving forward, still pursuing 1890s Side Channel and the Two Channels projects; we hope to implement them next year. We finally did a feasibility assessment of the Eagle Rocks side channel project, but the cost benefit did not pan out. We are planning to implement the Beaver Creek (MSRF property) project this year as well.

Chris B—we did award a contract for post-implementation monitoring of engineered projects to InterFluve.

John—they have a good protocol. It would be nice if all project sponsors followed the same protocol for implementation monitoring, and the YN process would be a good template.

Hans—the signage campaign is moving forward. We have around a dozen strategic locations; we still have to do cultural resources at the locations. We have two versions of the sign.

Discussion—content, consistency, QR codes, additional opportunities on some of the structures for additional outreach material

John—this is a good opportunity to have consistent messaging across the basin.

Hans—YN is providing the signs, but not necessarily the structures that hold them or the additional materials. We do have two signs; one is 8 ft width, the other is 4 ft x4 ft. There is a spot for project partner logos on each sign, and we will be doing outreach to project partners to see who wants to be on there.

Next MRC Meeting June 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.