

## Methow Restoration Council

May 17, 2016

### Participants:

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Chris Johnson	MSRF
Eric Doyle	ICFI
Greer Maier	UCSRB
Jennifer Molesworth	Bureau of Reclamation
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
Jim Pacheco	Ecology
John Crandall	MRC
Joy Juelson	UCSRB
Kristen Kirkby	CCFEG
Lynda Hofmann	WDFW
Paul Wagner	Colville Tribes
Ryan Fortier	WDFW
Susan Crampton	Public

### Meeting Notes:

**John Crandall – Monitoring Update:** not a busy time in the regional monitoring world. A monitoring data gaps assessment was completed by MaDMC. First done in 2012, and then went through a ranking process, attention was paid to how they addressed VSP, etc. Some very specific, some very broad. There are categories of key management questions that are taken from the Recovery Plan – NOAA needs these criteria to determine how they assess delisting. Has columns with Category, Question, Description, Area of concern, Species, Importance, Comments, and Status for 2012 and 2016. Some data gaps will be removed if they are determined not to be data gaps any longer. We are in the process of updating the 2016 column through MaDMC, and we are trying to revise it to be more usable. Prior to this year, it wasn't well utilized, but now there is funding that is available to address data gaps through SRFB.

Kristen Kirkby – was this all done by MaDMC? Or was there outside input?

John – yes, outside input, and there was a prior effort by Chuck Peven and Keeley Murdoch in 2010 that gave a lot of starting information. Two documents are out there, may be on a web site

Joy Juelson – they are the best information available, but since they are in draft form and/or out of date, people need to request them if they need them.

Discussion – those interested can request the documents from Joy

Chris Johnson – seems like it would be good to have it be more specific to each subbasin

John – it shows there are many areas where more information is needed, and we are in the process of updating, but also trying to figure out how to accomplish that

Joy – the new SRFB funding category is a driver of this need; it is a little bit in limbo, but it is important to the board because of the new project type, and we need to be able to provide guidance to sponsors.

Need information on data gaps, because the monitoring is for data gaps, and not for project effectiveness. Every region is doing the monitoring project type differently. Our board decided that every year they would look at the state of data for the monitoring project type, and we could tweak it each year, may be a prioritized list that would make it really clear what we do in the region. The board

has to certify the projects, which will be based on the RTT criteria. It has to have good scores to be certified by the board. Some regions are putting out an RFP for the highest priority

Chris – I would like to see it at the WAT level so that the local group can determine what the watershed need is.

Jennifer – the RFP would come to the WATS, don't think that the WATs should be developing the RFPs, rather the WATs need to be involved at the Implementation Team level to make sure that the gaps meet the broader data need. Then it wouldn't exclude any local groups from putting in a proposal.

Joy – these are just ideas, those monitoring funds are taking money off the ground, so we need to make sure that they address the highest priorities.

Jennifer – is there a crosswalk with the other monitoring/RME efforts?

John – no

Joy – there are opportunities for that conversation, to coordinate

John – the RME stuff is another monitoring project, so if they are addressing a data gap we would have that information and then it would no longer be a gap

Discussion – data management, making sure that things are well coordinated

John – this is something that has been in existence for several years, a lot of work went into it, all the monitoring projects matter, and you need to have a data gap identified to address with the monitoring.

We are trying to do the 2016 update, there could be omissions of important data gaps, but it all needs to link back to recovery.

Chris – feel like we really need to know what the data gaps on the ground in the area where we are working

**Jennifer Molesworth – Expert Panel Update:** the Expert Panel is the process where we track our project accomplishments through the FCRPS BiOp, so it includes projects funded by BPA and Reclamation, and also looking at projects out into the future. We just did the look-back earlier this year, looking back to projects completed in 2013-15. The look-forward will be in June, and projects that will be finished in 2016-18 funded by Reclamation and/or BPA. Projects that I have on the list are Barkley Diversion, Barkley Bear Habitat, MVID, Twisp River Floodplain Phase I and II, 2016 Silver Side Channel Revival. There are also many Yakama and Colville projects, and UCSRB is working to account for those Fish Accord projects for the BiOp.

John – acquisitions?

Jennifer – not for this BiOp, maybe the next one. Don't know what the next process will look like

Paul Wagner – all of our projects are BPA funded

Jennifer – MarySutton is working on the Accord projects for UCSRB

Jennifer – the morning of June 22<sup>nd</sup>, we will want to have a representative from each project sponsor there that has a project on the list to help us understand the projects, will need to know limiting factors addressed, metrics, etc. We think that will be the last Expert Panel. We think the Methow meeting will be the morning of June 22<sup>nd</sup>. The will develop a new process for the new BiOp, but don't know what that will be.

**Jim Pacheco – PHABSIM Study Update:** I am the instream Flow Biologist for Ecology Water Resources, and the purpose of this call is the PHABSIM studies; I have been tasked with looking at restoration and stream habitat in areas where the studies were done earlier. What I'm looking for is stream restoration projects that would affect fish habitat, anything that would add cover, gravel, stabilize the bank, etc. I would do a follow up PHABSIM at that site and do a comparison to see if there is a difference. I've already looked at the RCO site, and found a dike removal at Early Winters and work near Weeman Bridge, wondering if there are any others.

John – I sent you an email a few weeks back. Several habitat projects are proximate to your sites, but depending on their designs, they may not be well positioned to existing sites.

Jim – I need projects that are at least five years old so the river would have had time to adjust

Chris – both of the projects that you referred to, the one at Early Winters and the one at Weeman Bridge, either have had additional work done on top of them, or have work scheduled to happen soon.

Jennifer – we have some large projects on the mainstem that we have a lot of pre-project data on that we could give you data to reconstruct a pre-project PHABSIM

Jim – PHABSIM needs very specific data

Chris – we have a lot of projects coming up, would it make sense to look at projects that are coming up and set yourself up to be able to come back and redo them in five years?

Jim – will be talking to my boss today and will ask him. Some of the existing sites were done 20-25 years ago

John – how do you assign effectiveness from a project at that large of a time scale?

Jim – we are operating under a theory of dynamic equilibrium; but I know that the question that I ask, that the work I am doing may not answer it. Will look at the possibility of doing a PHABSIM in areas where work is planned and then wait five years

Jennifer – we also do have a lot of data, and it might be useful to you, it is incredibly robust.

Jim – I will look at that. At this time we are looking for site locations and project descriptions, then would do a site visit to determine if we would do a second PHABSIM

John – also CHaMP – they have sites with full digital elevation models, based on repeated transects, you would have a full topographic surface; all available on their web site

Jennifer – if you want to try to use existing data, I could put you in touch with Jennifer Bountry at Reclamation who understands the data better than anyone does

John – for the CHaMP data, you need to get a password, and then you can get in and download the DEMs for the sites, several of which should be proximate to your sites.

Jennifer – there is a ton of pre-project data that you should be able to use.

Joy – if it's helpful, UCSRB manages a database called the Habitat Work Schedule that has descriptions and locations for all of the project sites that might help you find project sites and identify the project sponsors, has maps and other information. HWS also has information for projects in other areas of the state.

**John Crandall – Outreach and Education Update:** We are having an Outreach and Education Coordination meeting May 25<sup>th</sup> at 10 in the RiverBank conference room. We are trying to coordinate our activities at a finer scale.

I have been working on our Outreach and Education Plan for the MRC, which gets at a lot of what we are trying to accomplish. The plan has key messages for target audiences. We hope that our outreach and education programs consider these messages. We would like to do a better job of informing the community about what is going on and what we are trying to accomplish. The key messages have been fleshed out with specifics. We will take a hard look at this on the 25<sup>th</sup> and discuss the plan, whether we want to revise it, etc. The plan has been sent out to the MRC before, and is available from John or Jessica.

There is a request for people to help out at Watershed Watchers on the 20<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup>; contact Rob Crandall if you can help out.

Jennifer – National Fishing day is June 11 at the Winthrop National Fish Hatchery; gates are open from 10-2, they have really big fish and this year they should be hungry. If anyone wants to come help out,

Julia Pinnix with USFWS is coordinating. Her contact is [julia\\_pinnix@fws.gov](mailto:julia_pinnix@fws.gov). Volunteers get T-shirts; this is the 25<sup>th</sup> National Fishing day event at the Hatchery

**Joy Juelson – UCSRB Updates:** Many of you have heard that we have a new executive director, Melody Kreimes. She has been working for the board for about 3 ½ years; she has background in professional facilitation and as an environmental consultant.

Joy – We just had our SRFB tours on May 5 in the Methow and the Wenatchee tours were last week. Next we have RTT presentations that the board will be hosting on June 8. Location TBD; if you are a project sponsor plan to be there, other interested parties. Usually there are many presentations and not a lot of time.

The RTT has decided to have more discussions about how they want to move forward with the chair position, Casey Baldwin is the acting Vice-Chair, and they may not select a chair until the end of summer. They are committed to completing the SRFB process

Jennifer – we aren't getting the meeting announcements or notes like we used to

Joy – the last meeting was just an internal meeting with the RTT, a board member, me, and Melody. We were there for an hour, it was an executive committee, so no notes from that meeting. They are doing a bit of a self-audit, conversations are continuing. Their next meeting is the SRFB presentation meeting in June. The July meeting will be the scoring meeting, which is closed, so the first potentially open RTT meeting will be in August. I will talk to Casey about information distribution.

Chris – between the Methow, Okanagan and Wenatchee, we have certainly exceeded the amount of SRFB funding available. If there are a number of worthy projects that are not funded, is there a discussion about the Tributary Funds' surplus?

Joy – a good question. For project sponsors, you can apply for those funds at any time of the year.

Chris – wondering about formally asking the question to the Tributary Committees, rather than waiting for them to come in at the end

Joy – a long history with them, and the message that the SRFB funding is going down is a good one. I will ask Tracy.

Joy – Implementation Team meetings – these are quarterly meetings, usually the first Tuesday of the month, but we are having a hard time scheduling this one. We believe that it is an important meeting, will be talking about adaptive management, and the role of the IT. We have a five-year adaptive management cycle, and we need key stakeholders to be involved. Will need some data collection, will ask the RTT to form a steering committee, goal is to come out with an updated Biological Strategy, prioritized project list, etc. It's an important time because of the BiOp. Encourage those who are interested to attend; will send out the dates and location for the meeting.

Joy – Forest Health – the Forest Health Collaborative has been working with the Forest Service to help them align their priorities, the results will be presented in June at their meeting. Also helping develop an aquatic model

Greer Maier – there is a process for the model, a lot of players. A group of us are trying to help ground this in a process that works for the collaborative, trying to help the district. A work in process, and trying to reconcile the interests of the three groups. Hope is to have something similar to a reach assessment but at a watershed scale that will identify projects. Multiple interest groups – Forest Service PNW Research Station, the supervisors' office, and the group of us that have been working together with them, and the services, stakeholders from the collaborative, and district fish bios. Needs to be a good framework that comes up with fundable projects that are well-justified.

Jennifer – needs to have NEPA done to FS standards also

Greer – the Restoration Strategy is the beginning step of the NEPA process, should set up for NEPA, goal of the aquatic module is to provide all of the information that would be needed for NEPA. That is the goal, but so far, we haven't had a good framework for aquatics analysis.

John – what is the process for the private lands?

Greer – the analysis would include private lands, but the projects identified would be only for public lands. However, the restoration strategy will address the whole watershed, so private sponsors can use the strategy to identify projects in the private areas.

Discussion – NEPA, analysis, projects can fall off in the NEPA process.

Greer – I will try to keep people up to speed, and we will move to get this done

Joy – last week Greer and I went to the NW Conservation and Power Council Meeting. A person from the Klamath basin presented on a fish kill alert system they have developed. They have a web site, a lot of stakeholders, all voluntary. Brought about discussions about our fish kills here last year, and a discussion of potential for a system in the Upper Columbia. The Power Council is going to facilitate some discussions around that; could also do something at a smaller scale locally. The Klamath site is the Klamath Fish Health Assessment Team's site <http://www.kbmp.net/collaboration/kfhat>. The Power Council is going to set up a call and we hope to have other conversations about that.

**John – Goat Creek Project Update:** we did the first Bull trout specific habitat project last year with NFF funded by SRFB on Goat Creek. We have migratory bull trout, this is downstream of an area with spawning, was logged and not a lot of spawning gravel. We located two areas of intensive wood treatment in areas of low gradient. The two areas are about a mile apart, and in between we felled 27 trees into the channel, no cables. Designed by Robes Parrish, goal was to increase areas available for spawning, catch gravel. Also possible area for steelhead to spawn. Expect that there was a lot of pool formation at high water this year. Didn't see a lot of wood movement. Unlikely that any of the wood would end up in the mainstem Methow.

Chris – wondering if we want to put together a work party to clean up campsite related garbage; we have a little funding left

John – was an effort between SRFB to a grant to NFF through the Treasured Landscapes program, the Forest Service, MSRF, USFWS. The area is also used for camping for hunters, and they have left a lot of garbage, could also do more fencing, etc.

Susan Crampton – would some kind of education signs be good there?

John – yes, the NFF is funding signs and they are coming

Chris – built some good community connections with that first work party, so it would be nice to build on that

Paul – what river mile?

John – about RM 8

Jennifer – when we replaced that culvert, it was the first culvert replacement on the Forest. There was some concern about brook trout moving in there, but they haven't been documented

John – when we defished, it was mykiss and bulls

Chris – will there be a follow up sample to see if there is any change?

John – we know steelhead are in Goat Creek, but we don't know where and we don't know if they spawn. We tagged a whole bunch of fish with WDFW.

## **Roundtable**

*Joy Juelson – UCSRB:* I want to thank Paul Wagner for driving on the SRFB tours.

*Kristen Kirkby – CCFEG:* Silver just went out to bid for earthwork and riparian planting; construction is the beginning of July

*Paul Wagner – Colville Tribes:* my contract cycle with BPA ends June 30<sup>th</sup>, ending projects for 2015 and will be starting new 2016 projects in July.

Paul – for EDT – we have previously talked about adding bull trout, if we would add that in, we don't currently have funding for that. ICFI will establish the reach breaks, if we were to incorporate bull trout we would have to increase the range to include bull trout.

Eric Doyle – we would potentially need an additional \$10-15k to expand the reach breaks to include bull trout.

Paul – think it would take \$80-100k to do the analysis for bull trout

Discussions – bull trout are mostly in the anadromous zone, only a few populations that are above the barriers. If you cover the anadromous zone, you would get almost all of the migrant bull trout

Eric – we had talked about some expansion of the reach networks in the model to include new areas where we know there are steelhead; that may cover the areas where there are bull trout

Jennifer – it would be good to know where the boundaries of the reach networks are

Eric – there is the current model developed in 2004, somewhat limited in coverage extent. Part of the current scope is to expand that, but contract hasn't started yet. Work would use the most current understanding of the fish distribution.

John – you have the state stuff, and the Methow Ranger District. If you think you are dealing with steelhead adequately, you will have most of the bull trout, except areas where you have only resident populations

Eric – for modeling bull trout using EDT, it is best suited to looking at migratory life history forms for species moving across large areas of the watershed. So we need to decide if incorporating resident fish into the model is a worry. We have a provisional rule set for bull trout that have never been used, based on a larger size and age. If everyone is comfortable with the steelhead distribution being representative of the migratory bull trout, then we can use that.

Discussion – we need to look at it. MRC should look at all of the distributions for the fish

Chris – do you have budget for ICFI to work with MRC to work on the data?

Paul – yes

Eric – we would get the raw data and then do a workshop/webinar where we would go through it to get a final product. When we were ball-parking scope for bull trout, we assumed we would need to add a lot of new reaches. If there are only a few spots, we probably wouldn't need to expand the scope to accommodate that and instead should reserve any extra budget to work on bull trout rules.

John – would be good to know what the source is for the distribution so that we can know what we are starting from

Eric – in the subbasin plan but can also send the spreadsheet to you

Paul – the other thing we are talking about is adding Pacific Lamprey, and they would be in the anadromous zone for steelhead and spring Chinook. What we would be talking about was to establish the rules for lamprey. We aren't sure how much information is out there for lamprey that would be useful for the model we had talked about having a workshop to discuss the information available for lamprey – a one day meeting with people to talk

John – we have the distribution information

Paul – life history stuff, egg to fry

John – doesn't exist – you have habitat use, dam counts, but beyond that you will have nothing

Eric – model has three components – reach, environmental attributes, which are species independent. Then there is information about the life history of the species – where they show up and when, where they spawn and when, how they move through the watershed and when – independent of the habitat.

Finally, there are the rules, which are the benchmarks for the species – optimal survival and density for each life stage, and then the rules are used to degrade the benchmark under different habitat conditions in the watershed. Suspect the last thing is what we are lacking for lamprey. If we have good life history, then we can build a good dispersal model in the watershed. We don't need to go all the way to a complete EDT; can go part way and keep it in reserve until we have the information.

John – I think the information we don't have is not coming any time soon. Lamprey are very difficult to age, and how they move. We know when pulses of lamprey move through the screw trap, but we don't know if they are leaving or just moving around. They are difficult to monitor, and there is not much funding to track them. We have the extent of adult spawning. We don't know where they spawn; we can only guess when they spawn. The dynamics are not well understood and that will not change any time soon.

Ryan Fortier – most of the lamprey funding is going towards the PUDs to modify the passage structures, because the biggest constraints are the dams right now.

John – so with the information we have, is that enough to make the exercise useful?

Eric – at this point I would say no, the endpoint would be largely hypothetical. Suggest tabling lamprey for the time being. Since the reach areas will be covered, EDT would be ready to accept lamprey into the future.

Paul – we were talking about doing another Frazer Creek survey last year in the spring under Ryan's permit; we would love to get back in there and repeat it

John – that would be great, and also I would love to repeat that reach in Beaver Creek

Jennifer – we should do the Beaver Creek one in the fall, the same time it had been done before

Chris – suggest John, Paul, Brian and Ryan coordinate

Paul – Also, last year we borrowed the two-phase electrofisher for lamprey; should do that again. Also, if you are doing the bull trout eDNA, could help with doing the analysis for lamprey

John – they aren't in any tributaries, and not in the Methow above Winthrop. They are from the mouth of the Methow to Thirty Mile in the Chewuch. Pretty confident – if lamprey are around, they are pretty easy to find. We try to look for them based on evidence.

*John Crandall – MRC:* we are going to revise and expand the Methow Fish Guide, and hope to have it out next winter. Will add fires, floods, and restoration project effectiveness. May be looking for partners to help publish it. New photos coming too.

Joy – we just spent some money on getting some photos, so we may be able to help

*Chris Johnson – MSRF:* Silver land acquisition – we continue to work with the landowners. They also would like to sell out the hillside if they sell out the other property. A lot of wildlife habitat value on the hillside, previously authorized by county commissioners, Scott Fitkin wrote it up earlier. Think that will be what it takes to have the Hills sell all of the property that we are interested in buying. Looking at many avenues to make it work.

We started working with the Devaney property back when it was the Hottel property, many partnerships, latest with the Colville tribes and now have a minimum 75 ft. setback from the Twisp River throughout the whole property – formerly was only three feet.

We had a challenge at Twisp River Floodplain with a short fish window and an eagle's nest. We coordinated with USFWS, and it now looks like we will be able to manage it to get all of the elements constructed.

At Mike Port's property just below the Twisp bridge on the Methow River, a lot of erosion is happening through there, Mike is interested in a trail – would be good for property value and would like to address the continuing bank loss. He is willing to donate a riparian segment through the property so that we can do good things. The property is currently on the market for sale, so it would be good to have the donation before it changes hands. Think there is a project out there, looking for partners and interest in identifying what we could be doing.

Discussion – Twisp to Carlton RA still needs fieldwork, it is not too late to identify actions in the area in the RA

**Next MRC meeting June 21<sup>st</sup>**

<b>Definitions of Commonly used Acronyms</b>	
AEM	Action Effectiveness Monitoring
ANS	Aquatic Nuisance Species
AREMP	Aquatic and Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring Program
BACI	Before, After, Control, Impact (study design type)
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

OCD	Okanogan Conservation District
OBMEP	Okanogan Basin Monitoring and Evaluation Program
OWL	Okanogan Wilderness League
PCSRF	Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (pronounced "Pacsurf")
PHABSIM	Physical Habitat Simulation
PIBO	PACFISH/INFISH* Biological Opinion
PNAMP	Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Partnership
PUD	Public Utility District
QAQC	Quality Assurance, Quality Control
RA	Reach Assessment
RCO	(Washington State) Recreation and Conservation Office
REI	Reach-based Ecosystem Indicators (used in Reach Assessments)
RFEG	Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group
RFP	Request for Proposals
RM	River Mile
RPA	Reasonable and Prudent Alternative(s)
RTT	Regional Technical Team
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act
SMP	Shoreline Management Plan
SOAL	State Owned Aquatic Lands
SOW	Statement of Work
SPIF	Specific Project Information Form (used with the Corps ESA programmatic)
SRFB	(Washington State) Salmon Recovery Funding Board ( pronounced "surfboard")
SRP	State Review Panel (for SRFB funding applications)
STEM Database	Status, Trend and Effectiveness Monitoring database at NOAA's Northwest Fisheries Science Center
UCSRB	Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board
TRT	Technical Recovery Team (NOAA)
USFS	US Forest Service
USGS	US Geological Survey
VSP	Viable Salmonid Population
WAT	Watershed Action Team (the MRC is our WAT)
WDFW	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
WDNR	Washington Department of Natural Resources
WNFH	Winthrop National Fish Hatchery
WWP-TU	Washington Water Project of Trout Unlimited
YN	Yakama Nation

\*PACFISH/INFISH The PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinion (PIBO) Effectiveness Monitoring Program was initiated in 1998 to provide a consistent framework for monitoring aquatic and riparian resources on most Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands within the Upper Columbia River Basin.