

## Methow Restoration Council

May 16, 2017

### Participants:

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Amy Martin	Okanogan Conservation District
Chelsea Trout	Okanogan Conservation District
Chris Butler	Yakama Nation
Chris Johnson	MSRF
Crystal Elliot	TU
Hans Smith	Yakama Nation
Jason Lundgren	CCFEG
Jennifer Molesworth	Reclamation
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
Joe Connor	BPA
John Crandall	MSRF
Joy Juelson	UCSRB
Julie Grialou	Methow Conservancy
Keith van den Broek	Terraqua
Kristen Kirkby	CCFEG
Maddie Eckmann	Yakama Nation
MarySutton Carruthers	UCSRB
Paul Wagner	Colville Tribes
Rick Golden	BPA
Rob Crandall	Methow Natives

### Meeting Notes:

**John Crandall – Monitoring Update:** The paper of the month: Age and method of release affect migratory performance of hatchery steelhead trout *Oncorhynchus mykiss* (Tartara et al). The work was locally derived, started about 4 or 5 years ago with some folks from NOAA and USFWS, USGS, looking at the survival and life history of steelhead smolt released at age 1 vs. age 2. Survival was better for 2 year old smolts, made it down about a week faster, were bigger. Was a large PIT tag study. These guys were up here for many years tagging fish. It's a great read – Jessica will distribute.

Next topic is related to something that people got in their inbox from Jessica that came from the folks from PNAMP, which is a regional coordinating body. They work to coordinate monitoring; they have methods, not so much results, a lot going on there. One of the things they are doing is looking for tools they can use to help inform them to what is going on region-wide. PNAMP is looking at a list of indicators on watershed health, and they have come up with 4 areas where they are going to focus on regional indicators, flow, temperature, macroinvertebrates, and water quality. They are looking for what is being collected, reported, and the importance of it. They are collecting information from the masses with four surveys that each take a short time to complete. The more responses they get, the better the results they get will be. If you do work in any of those four areas, please take the survey. They are trying to figure out what is the common currency with indicators so there is equal comparison across the Upper Columbia. Deadline is May 18<sup>th</sup>.

MaDMC is continuing to work on the data gaps update; we had a meeting about a month ago, and we went through the data gaps list that exists. We are making a significant update to the existing list, which

going to be quite different than before. The new list will be better at using existing information. Nothing is getting lost, but gaps that have been addressed are going into the archive. There is also an opportunity to add new data gaps. Starting in 2012, there was an effort to tie the gaps to the key management questions, so new gaps need to be tied to a recovery need. That process is underway, but we are having a meeting on June 14<sup>th</sup> to flesh out the list and add new gaps, and then we will score them. It will be a much better list than it is currently, easier to use.

MarySutton Carruthers – do you anticipate this being an annual process?

John – no, but it is a living document. We are doing this somewhat in response to the increased weight that data gaps carry in terms of SRFB funding for monitoring, so we want the list to be really relevant.

Chris Johnson – is there any plan to link this to BPA's effort to prioritize projects?

John – no. The RTT is going through the process of updating the Biological Strategy; it will be much more detailed this time around, the geographic scale will shrink, and we will likely end up with a much more specific list of ecological concerns per assessment unit. That process will be much more tied to BPA's prioritization stuff. The data gaps will be much more overarching, such as these data gaps are tied to these ecological concerns. Our understanding of the ecological concerns are largely based on opinion, not data. An elusive bit is trying to quantify the ecological concerns. We don't know which ones are the bottlenecks for fish.

MarySutton – alongside some of the habitat metrics with the biological strategy update, there will be some information mapping of the fish data we have. It would be nice to have that incorporated into the MaDMC data gaps list.

John – it would be nice to go through the list every year and identify things that have changed. It would be relatively easy, and it might be possible to add new ones at that time.

#### **MarySutton Carruthers & Joy Juelson – UCSRB Updates:**

MarySutton – Regional BPA Targeted Solicitation – this is for BPA funding that the board helps to facilitate. We had a funding solicitation this year, there were ten project funded that are now on the targeted track. There are two provisional projects; those will hopefully be funded, but there needs to be resolution about some issues. There are 9 proposed projects that will not be funded at this time.

Joe Connor – not all of the final budgets have been worked out, but they are close.

Joy – the funding amounts may be different than the requests in some case. I can send the list to those who are interested.

Joy – we are thick of the SRFB grant process now. We are moving forward, and the PCSRF funds from 2016 are included in the continuing resolution, so there is 65 million there. We will see how it goes but it is looking a lot better. Full request is 2.7 million. Next year will be tougher; we've been working hard to start talking about that with law makers. Two weeks ago board members and Melody went to DC to talk to multiple lawmakers and NOAA, and to other folks there. Last Friday we took US Congressman Reichert up in a LightHawk plane to look at salmon recovery projects. We are hoping for continued support on PCSRF from him. We've also reached out to Congressman Dan Newhouse. Right now we are doing tours, last week we went to Wenatchee and Entiat. This Thursday we have 4 projects in the Methow.

Joy – we have two openings this year on our Okanogan CAC. We received 7 nominations. On Monday we will be going to talk to the Okanogan County Commissioners, and they will select their top 2 candidates, then the UCSRB board will look at those and likely approve them at their board meeting on May 25<sup>th</sup>.

We have rescheduled the June IT meeting in Chelan on June 27<sup>th</sup>; there will be a discussion on EDT and its relevance to prioritization.

MarySutton – This year the CACs are discussing meeting together, rather than just three representatives, so the list may not collate the same way that it has in the past.

Joy – that is not final; the Citizens will make the final decision on how we move forward with that. There is a potential that there will be fewer night meetings and they would come together to rank the projects.

Discussion – project lists

MarySutton – last year the RTT was concerned about the scoring scheme for the monitoring project.

This year the monitoring projects will be scored separately.

The adaptive management implementation plan (AMIP) group goes on tours every year, and this year they are coming here. They are coming the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup>, and the tours will be on the sixth. Greer is hoping that that people will connect with her on planning.

Thanks to people who gave feedback to the NWPC, they are coming to the joint Wenatchee and Entiat WAT meetings and that feedback will go to the council.

Independent Scientific Advisory Board will be in the region July 20-21 reviewing spring Chinook. They are coming to the area; they developed a draft list of questions they want to take a look at, Tracy Hillman, Greer Maier, and Andrew Murdoch all weighed in on some of those questions, not just habitat in our region, but also outside of the region, comparing our spring Chinook to other populations.

The PNAMP folks also look at high level habitat indicators, may help with projects, information available at streamnet.org website. If you have feedback on the usability on the data, we would happy to share that with them.

Spring Chinook are late to arrive at Bonneville dam, we are still waiting to see

**Keith van den Broek – CHaMP/ISEMP Update:** I work for Terraqua, and this is my first time coming to the Methow. It sounds like there has been a bit of an information lack up here. BPA funded the CHaMP program, the principal investigator is NOAA, and Terraqua is the contractor. We also do ISEMP, which is the fish side, but we don't do that in the Methow. Site selection is a probabilistic design, stratified by Beechie class and land ownership throughout Methow mainstem and all of its tributaries. It started in 2011, the final protocol completed in 2015, and we have been using that ever since. 45 sites per subbasin, 10 annual and 15 rotating. We are shifting toward analysis products, dropping the annual panel sites starting in 2017, so there will be a total of 15 sites. Fresh with rotating panel 1 this year, and beyond 2019 it is up in the air.

We start out with landowner coordination, and we have to have suitable river conditions – it must be wadeable. We need 3-4 person crews, with a summer fall work window; we start in July and try to be wrapped up by September. We are dropping macroinvertebrate sampling in 2017. Site visits every year, with some variability.

2017 study design: 15 rotating sites, and no annual sites. We will take the formerly annual sites and divide them up and add them to the rotating schedule.

Analysis products – will be happy to take requests for data, and you can coordinate from John or Jessica  
MarySutton – are there now questions that you won't be able to answer now that you are not going back every year?

Keith – no, we are finding that there isn't a lot of change every year, but we may miss some things like from landslides and flooding

John – are there thoughts on providing summaries and reports on local Methow information? How detailed will some of the reporting get? I think a lot of people would be interested in seeing DEM change; it may be useful to project sponsors.

Kieth – it is a basinwide effort, so the Methow isn't highlighted, but there a lot of the analysis tools that are coming out that will be useful, information is available online. I can come back and give a presentation at the end of the season. We are responsive to data requests, but much of the information is dependent on the funders

Kristen – so the analysis tools are available online? I have downloaded data but haven't seen any tools

Keith – maybe we could have someone come down and give a workshop.

Discussion – direction of the program, how does this help us develop better projects

John – it is easy to pull the DEMs off of the site; they will help with the Lower Methow Reach Assessment

**Chris Johnson – Contingency Planning:** Upper Beaver Creek peaked on May 5. There were 11 debris jams upstream of the [Upper Beaver/Batie] project site, and water went into the county road rather than the constructed overflow channel, and due to undersized culverts, there was a large impact to the county road. Normal infrastructure projects have contingency funds, but with the salmon projects we have short funding windows and when the project is over there is no more funding or construction authority. It is a very hard situation with no funding or construction authority and a high degree of expectation from the public.

We had a flow higher than most people remember since 1972. We have a post-fire reality that is very difficult to move forward with. I'm looking at a model where there is a contingency fund that is managed by a group like the WAT or UCSRB, where they recommend that 3% of construction costs are placed in a fund for a "simple" project, and up to 15% of construction costs for more high risk project. If all projects are contributing to a contingency fund then we have a publicly viewable, accountable method to fund things that come up outside of 18 month funding windows.

Discussion – 79% of Beaver Creek watershed burned, frequency of record flows, undersized culverts, roads in the floodplain releasing sediment

Chris J – each of the parties at the table need to understand that when they sign off on a project that there is some kind of risk in the future. We will be talking about this with RCO, and I have been talking with BPA and Reclamation. I'm curious how other project sponsors feel about the need for a contingency fund. I think it is a region-wide reality.

Kristen Kirkby – is there a deciding body in the examples that decides whether something is eligible for the funds?

Chris J – haven't seen that, my thought was that it would be done through UCSRB; the WAT could try to provide a recommendation. MSRF maintains a contingency fund for lands we own, but we haven't been able to convince funders to include that as a line item in construction projects.

Kristen – so the board will make the decision?

Chris J – yes

MarySutton – and we would have to go to our funders

Jennifer – so you would have it be a percent of construction costs?

Chris J – some sort of agreed upon method for that – do we want to pay more for engineering or pay into the fund

Hans Smith – we have on-call contracts that we carry through our funding, they only extend out a year or two in advance of the current calendar year, not in perpetuity, but they are for emergency response, we can call on a contractor to come do work. We have a lot of flexibility and we have money obligated for those purposes. We are approaching the end of the Accord, and it is not clear to me what that means for the scope of the larger project. That is the framework we have been operating under, but we haven't had to deploy that in an emergency yet. Whether the tribe would want to participate in a WAT level or regional level contingency fund I'm not sure, but we would want to be part of the discussion.

Chris J – when you go to outside funding, it would be nice if all of the funds were treated the same way.

Maddie Eckmann – could the resources be property that you acquire, and then could sell if need be?

Chris J – for the majority of our properties, there is no opportunity for resale due to the funding agreement

John – did you learn anything about contingency at the Newby project?

Hans – no, we had a contracted project, so there was need to use emergency funds

Chris J – the closest we had was on the Chewuch at the Fulton project where we had a contractor that wasn't qualified, but it was a lot easier to deal with during an active grant period. The contingency is needed when the event happens years later.

Discussion – disaster declarations and how it relates to funding availability

Amy Martin – we are fortunate because we have the conservation commission to support it, but it would be nice to have a contingency available

Chris J – infrastructure projects have a requirement for it, but fish projects do not

Discussion – have had negotiated O&M costs included in funding agreements, but isn't a contingency

Joe Connor – with the administrative contract with UCSRB, we have a work element for monitoring and maintenance, we haven't had to use it, but it is there. We also have an emergency fund we can use.

This conversation is very familiar to the insurance conversation we have had in the past

Keith – the Wenatchee and Entiat WATs would probably be interested in having a similar conversation.

Chris J – will write up my thoughts and send it out as a white paper that Jessica can send out for comments.

MarySutton – would 3% of construction costs cover the need at Upper Beaver?

Chris J – may cover a share; we are not responsible for the whole thing

## **Roundtable**

*Crystal Elliot – TU:* I'm still working on abandoned mine restoration; we have the attention of the funding agencies, but there is no money available. Currently there is a rule making process for Ecology's 319 funds. They have a line in their current WAC disallowing toxic cleanup by nonprofits with these funds. I encourage you to comment that these abandoned mines are affecting our waterways and that they should be allowed to use the funds for cleanup.

Also working on other abandoned mine cleanup stuff, Methow Headwaters campaign has elevated the issue of mining, and I will be talking to the Community School.

Still trying to work on common sense permitting for suction dredging, didn't have success in the current legislative session, but we aren't giving up. Will be setting up a citizen science opportunity to document things they see when they are out and about. Still working with the Forest Health Collaborative projects.

*John Crandall – Methow Monitoring:* the Lower Methow Reach Assessment is taking shape, the project will roll out in August. We are working on an update to the Methow Fish Guide, revising and adding a new species, adding section on fire and floods. We're having a meeting today for the outreach and education subcommittee

*Ryan Fortier – WDFW:* I was on vacation and came back to tons of information about Beaver Creek, any time something like that happens, would be nice if the MRC could send out a press release

Chris – we contacted Lynda, but in the future we can include you as well

*Jennifer Molesworth – Reclamation:* next Tuesday, Jennifer Bountry, the Reclamation Engineer who did a lot of the sediment analysis for the removal of the Elwha dam is coming out. We will be doing a field education site visit at WDFW with school kids and adults and then she will be giving a first Tuesday event on comparisons between the Elwha and the Methow

On Beaver Creek, most of the sediment that came down was from a blocked culvert, as it moves downstream the channel can't carry the water and the sediment so it attacks the banks and creates more sediments. Those undersized culverts are really an issue. We will continue to have fires, and when those culverts become overwhelmed they cause a lot of damage, we need to look at those.

Failing undersized culverts, the Volstead event is an example.

Chris J – both public and private culverts

Jennifer – tens of thousands of cubic yards of material – an unbelievable amount came down

*Chelsea Trout– OCD:* I will be at the education event on May 30<sup>th</sup> as well. Amy and I have been working on salmon outreach materials for this summer, good information for people with a historic feel for Okanogan

*Amy Martin – OCD:* we are busy wrapping our fire recovery funding projects, mostly fencing, and they will be done June 30<sup>th</sup>. Don't think we will have more from the state, but I don't think we have seen an updated budget. Leslie has been working on irrigation; we have been doing technical assistance and site visits. The culvert message is a good one, we are seeing erosion even in non-fire areas. We are recommending that people upsize whenever possible. I do a lot of education about the importance of having shrubs and trees on the streambank.

Jennifer – a lot of good opportunities for photos that demonstrate that

Chelsea – if people have photos and can share, that would be nice

Amy – riparian photography would be nice

Kristen – if people are talking to people about culverts on private property if it has even a small amount of forest, consider the FFFPP program – they don't get a lot of applicants in the Methow

*Rob Crandall – Methow Natives:* I have been continuing work at WDFW floodplain doing outreach and initial work on the trail. We have been taking out deer enclosures after 3 years. Tomorrow we are having Pascal Sherman School to meet up with Liberty Bell 8<sup>th</sup> grade, combining outdoor education with reconciliation. There will be a Salish language station, and some Methow elders will be there.

*Kristen Kirkby – CCFEG:* we are proposing a fish barrier assessment in the Methow. I have gotten good support. USFS will be doing some work on that up the Twisp as well.

At Burns Garrity we have been meeting with WDFW, private landowners, and we are hoping for a conservation buyer for the upstream property. Looking at Silver during high flows. I have been getting out with Rob for education. Went to the Kiwanis this morning; they gave a small amount of funding for a snorkeling program with kids.

We are holding another meeting for people interested in working in the Twisp to Carlton Reach; there will be a Doodle poll

*Paul Wagner – Colville Tribes:* Our BPA contract cycle is finishing up, includes M2 Trail Loop and signage, and we are getting the next cycle underway, includes Volstead Road, donated some willows for Frazer Creek

*Chris Johnson – MSRF:* we are still working on the Barkley Bear project. We are almost at the 30% design concept. Still working on Twisp River Floodplain Phase II planning; part of that is evaluating how Phase I functions through high water

Beaver Creek and Frazer Creek are taking a lot of time now, two bridges on order, all in process.

Working on 3 appraisals through Colville tribal Funding.

I had an interesting complaint at Twisp Ponds last week that placement of public art in a natural place was distracting; I have never heard that previously.

**Next MRC June 20**

<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)
BDA	Beaver Dam Analogue
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 (newer acronym is CTCR – see below)
CTCR	Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation (older acronym is CCT – see above)
CHaMP	Columbia Habitat Monitoring Program
CMZ	Channel Migration Zone
CREP	Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program
CSF	Community Salmon Fund
EDT	Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment
EQIP	Environmental Quality Incentives Program
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
ISAB	Independent Science Advisory Board
ISEMP	Integrated Status and Effectiveness Monitoring Project
ISRP	Independent Scientific Review Panel (reviews BPA projects)
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
Snerd	Fish Capture-Snorkel Herding
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.