

Methow Restoration Council

May 20, 2014

Participants

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Charlie Snow	WDFW
Chris Johnson	MSRF
Jarred Johnson	Yakama Nation
Jenni Novak	WDFW
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
John Crandall	MRC
Joy Juelson	UCSRB
Julie Grialou	Methow Conservancy
Kent Woodruff	Forest Service
Ryan Fortier	WDFW
Terri Williams	Okanogan Conservation District

Meeting Notes

John Crandall—Outreach and Education Update:

Upcoming events in the fantastic world of outreach and education around the MRC partnership:

- Saturday June 7th River Art Walk 4-8 pm; also the opening of the “Our River” show at the Confluence Gallery
- On the heels of the “our River” art show, we have a panel discussion on the river at the Confluence Gallery on June 13th, 5:30-8:00.
- June 14th is Fishing Day at Winthrop National Fish Hatchery. There will be one more fishing day meeting, don’t know the time yet, call John if you are interested.
- Watershed Watchers on May 28th and the 29th
- We are developing our interpretive display at the interpretive center. Jennifer went and painted it with blackboard paint as a temporary measure; kids will be able to draw their own river until the final is ready.

John—we are also doing a water quality survey; trying to gage what people think it is, people’s understand, and what they think of the state of water quality; will try to pre- project, and then a post, trying to see how people’s perception changes.

Chris Johnson—on June 21st we are doing an art installation of Steve Love’s piece at Twisp Ponds; Amanda Jackson-Mott and I will be working on that. They laid the foundation for the piece last week. It is a cast aluminum sculpture, a fun piece.

Erik Portman has finished the third of the outreach kiosks for the habitat outreach signs. There is one at Twisp Ponds, one at Whitefish Island, and one at M2 WDFW Floodplain. Still working with Winthrop on two there—one at the Barn and one at the Susie Stephens bridge. I have encountered people on site who gave positive feedback on the signs.

Kent Woodruff—The Beaver Project also has signs that we worked on with Chris Pasley, seven signs that will be installed at the Winthrop Hatchery in the next few days. They will be up for Fishing Day.

John Crandall—Monitoring Update: Appendix C Monitoring Plan for the Methow; the RTT has it, hope that it is done. After that it will go to the full board for adoption into the monitoring strategy, which is an appendix to the Recovery Plan.

There is a new monitoring program in town - the Action Effectiveness Monitoring (AEM) program, it is through BPA. They are trying to get a handle on the monitoring in response to comments by ISRP. It is very difficult to assign effectiveness to a specific action. AEM is BPA's attempt to piggyback on the statewide SRFB monitoring program. SRFB took actions and put them into Classes, BPA is going to use the same approach, but changing the protocol. Each Class has a clearly defined protocol; finding control sites is difficult; the design is to monitor before and after project implementation. The power of the analysis depends on the number of sites. BPA is going with that but also adding in more detailed habitat data at each site. The five Classes are fish passage, instream structures, off channel and floodplain, riparian, acquisition and protection. The problem is when you have a project site or reach that has several Classes, it is a little confounding; they are trying to work it out. Will use a "Before, After, Control, Impact" (BACI) design, and they will try to get two years of pre-data, may have the data collection for the second year be right before construction, then 6-10 year after construction. For projects that have already happened, they have an "Extensive Post-Treatment" (EPT) plan with lots of monitoring. In the Methow, we have two YN sites in the Chewuch, on the Methow, there is the Fender Mill Side Channel (YN), 1890s Side Channel project (YN) out of Twisp, Two Channels (YN), Silver Side Channel (CCFEG), Twisp Floodplain (MSRF). These are the draft list, may change.

Chris—There have been concerns about the methodology and potential mis-representation of what happened at the site because there isn't recurrence in the monitoring. I have the same concerns. If we understand the methodology, can we take classes so that we can gather our own data?

John—there will be training. All information is also on the PNAMP website (<http://www.pnamp.org/>)—all the protocols, everything you need. Tetrattech is leading the effort. John will send out the information on the trainings when it comes out. It will probably be a big training.

Jenni Novak—will the control sites be spread across the state?

John—they will try to be in the same watershed, but may be Chewuch/Twisp, etc. It may be more of a reference site than a control site.

Jessica Goldberg—how will they prevent people from working in the "control" sites?

John—they are trying to find sites that there is relative certainty that there won't be a project; it is difficult.

If you notice the categories of projects, instream flow restoration is a very different type of project type than everything else, instream flow transcends locations, and there is no class for that. NFWF, through their Columbia Basin Water Transactions program, is working on a monitoring program, but they are not well tied in.

Jenni—are they open for comment on their protocol?

John—if you have comments, you should give them, but I'm not sure if they will change anything. Talk to Jennifer O'Neal at Tetrattech

Charlie Snow—this isn't something that comes with BPA funding, isn't it more at a regional scale? Does it include projects that they don't fund?

John—no, only projects that they fund

Chris—they are taking the same SRFB approach of having a third party doing the work

Charlie—seems like it would be difficult to be effective if they are only doing fish sampling on one or two days

John—they are doing one snorkel survey once in the project on a day of their choosing

Kent—they would need many samples to have the statistical power

John—they are relying on multiple sites for the power, rather than multiple surveys per site

Chris—that is why we have told BPA that if they provide our folks with the training that we can do multiple samples. But the question is whether they would use the data.

Discussion—statistical power, relative difference in fish use at a specific site over time, seasonal biological response, monitoring things that move in the same way that you monitor things that don't move.

Charlie—it would be great if they said here are the five types of projects that we monitor and this is how we monitor them, and we have a regionally vetted protocol, that would be great. It seems like they are not solving the original problem.

Discussion—difficulty in funding the work, a suggestion of having the watershed action teams do the fish monitoring would save on per diem and travel, would create a feedback loop on project development, peer review would help vet the data.

John—the Bureau of Reclamation, through the RME program with USGS, they have developed a model on aquatic productivity, they have done a run on it; it looks at fish biomass at a site over time. There are lots of inputs, not too difficult in how to populate the model. The model is now going, they ran it for Whitefish Island, and it showed a big increase in biomass at the site. The project created more area, so more fish. Some fine tuning is still needed—it doesn't do a good job of defining discrete habitat elements or species specific, but that is coming. Next step is running it for Twisp River floodplain, and it may influence design. There is also a cool temperature modeling tool, intent was to help project sponsors to say something about temperature benefit, think it would be cool to get it here.

Chris Johnson—M2 Monitoring and Reporting: when we initiated the project at M2 WDFW Floodplain, we entered into an agreement with the state to capture everything we did on the ground. We developed a monitoring matrix. We have a series of standardized yes/no questions and we can go out; we have a monitoring team that can go out and look at the site. We have an agreement with WDFW and WDNR, the wood becomes theirs after three years; the monitoring program helps the state agencies have a certainty. We are also doing it at Whitefish Island and RiverMile 46. We are looking for comments/peer review on the methodology, and also other eyes on the site. If anyone is interested, Brian Fisher is leading the effort, and we would like the three-year period to be as robust as possible. Would like to be able to tell the story of what the project does in the time period. Trying to determine if the structures are functioning as intended. If we see something that is concerning, we will ask Reclamation to come out and survey to get additional information, look for potential adaptive actions. Brian is the lead, so feel free to contact him if you have any questions

Charlie—you could overlay the redd data in there; we will be surveying in there annually

Discussion—flights/videos

Jennifer Molesworth—we will have our helicopter flight next week, if anyone has anything specific they want photos of let me know

Joy Juelson—UCSRB/Lead Entity Update: we had SRFB tours last week. We started with 27 projects last year, and this year we have 12. Only four in the Wenatchee and all of those are design only. If one or more of the projects is funded by others, it is possible that all projects could be funded.

Methow Projects:

- The Goat Creek project is the first bull trout only project.

Jennifer—when I had Gene's job, that was the one place on the National Forest that I thought could use more large wood.

Joy—think that it would help the project for the RTT to hear why this is an important area

Kent—this is a key remaining piece in the area

Discussion—how to support the project, show how it is important to bull trout, and show where that is documented, RTT is meeting on June 4th, so get Joy information before then, after the meeting the RTT will send out comments and questions

- Poorman Creek CE, visited a new site from last year
- Lewisia—a design-only project in the Middle Methow to put in a sustainable connection to the floodplain
- Barkley Bear—a project to eliminate the diversion and move it downstream with a pump station.

Jennifer—the Barkley intake is one of the major sources of mortality in the reach; the habitat project not ready, focus in phase one is on the irrigation, which is the TU part. MSRF will do phase two, the habitat piece. The diversion will be a pump station in the river.

Discussion—during the tour, it appeared that the proposal was to eliminate the pump and put in a groundwater well.

- Burns-Garrity project—a design-build project; the project expanded right before the proposal was due, they are looking at a groundwater fed flow-through channel.

- Methow Riparian Stewardship—looking at keeping existing riparian plantings alive.

John—what we are seeing is that where survival is high, that is attributable to long-term maintenance, having the ability to maintain the sites will give us the ability to maintain the gains from previous funding

- Methow Watershed Beaver Reintroduction—a multi-year, multi-site program to reestablish beavers in the watershed

- Silver Side Channel Project—objective is to enhance 4000 ft of the side channel

Charlie—we did some shocking in the silver site, there is a relic beaver dam, and there was a lot of fish in there. The federal hatchery had just released a lot of age zero spring Chinook, and there was a lot of those fish in there, there were coho, wild spring Chinook

John—I found lamprey in there

Jennifer—did they overwinter?

Charlie—don't know, we did tag, so could look at the hit data, hard to shock in all the areas except along the margins but also in the relic beaver pond

Kent—it doesn't freeze over the winter

Joy—Derek went to DC with NOAA a few weeks back, a few exciting moments with the PCSRF funding while he was there.

The next Implementation Team meeting will be on June 3rd, there will be a Wanapum Dam fish passage update, fish passage at various dams including Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee. Meeting will be at Chelan County PUD. In the afternoon, will have a WDFW discussion on fishing, final topic is action effectiveness monitoring—information we need to build better projects.

Joy—the life history workshop was well attended, Greer is interested in help you do a mini-workshop in each of the subbasins to give people more specific information.

Roundtable and Public Comment

Kent—we just hired the beaver crew; they started yesterday. We are behind from where we want to be. We have one hire from Texas who needs housing.

Jennifer—Reclamation will have two student interns who will also need housing, approximately June through September.

Next MRC Meeting June 17th

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 (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
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)
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
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
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
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. 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.