

## Methow Restoration Council

November 18, 2014

### Participants

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Allen Lebovitz	WDNR
Charlie Snow	WDFW
Chris Butler	Yakama Nation
Chris Johnson	MSRF
Chuck Peven	RTT
Crystal Elliot-Perez	Trout Unlimited
David Holland	WA Department of Ecology
Derek Van Marter	UCSRB
Hans Smith	Yakama Nation
Jarred Johnson	Yakama Nation
Jeri Timm	WWP-TU
Jessica Goldberg	MSRF
Joe Connor	BPA
John Crandall	MRC
Joy Juelson	UCSRB
Julie Grialou	Methow Conservancy
Keith Douville	WDFW
Kent Woodruff	Forest Service
Kristen Kirkby	Yakama Nation
Matt Shales	CCFEG
Steve Ralph	Local Citizen
Terri Williams	Okanogan Conservation District

### Meeting Notes:

**Joe Connor: Methow Targeted Solicitation:** I am the project manager for the programmatic habitat program with Bonneville. I am here to announce the opening of the targeted solicitation for FY 16; design support funding may be available, or may be coordinated with BOR. Funding available: FY 16: 500k; FY17: 1M; FY18: 3.7M.

Proposal evaluation criteria are by biological benefit, coordination with the reach assessments, and it needs to demonstrate that it will provide Action Agency credit. We will do a risk assessment with Bureau, and will be considering cost as well. Proposals will be vetted through RTT, and then BPA will do our own analysis. Projects will be funded based on score and available funding; some projects may need to wait a fiscal year. We also will have a provisional list. We will be accepting proposals through January 13<sup>th</sup>. Applicants will be notified by March. Jessica will send out announcement and proposal form.

Chris Johnson—what about leveraging or matching through UCSRB?

Joe—cost share is always appreciated, but I will not be coordinating that, although I will coordinate with Reclamation for design as appropriate.

**John Crandall—Monitoring Update:** flagging revisited – we have had a few landowners over the last few weeks that have commented on the volume of flagging on our streams. It serves a purpose, but if we don't take it down, we are littering the stream. We need to get it out; if we put it up, we need to take it down. We've talked about this for years; if you have a plan to put it up, you also need to have a

plan to take it down. It has a shelf life, but you need to take it down once its purpose has been served. WDFW is the only group I know of that is using the biodegradable cloth, but it still needs to come down. Makes us all look bad with the landowners.

Chris J—we had an individual from the Twisp River come in agitated about flagging, and they came in and assumed it was ours; we try to get landowner agreements that stipulate that we will take flagging down; we need to do a way to do the outreach, so that we can avoid the angry landowner. We need to do a better job of reaching out.

Julie Grialou—seems like we hear this message every fall, and it isn't changing things

John—one issue is that we have a lot of outside people coming in and doing the work; it isn't just redd surveys, project design, reach assessments, etc. Challenge is to manage the flagging with all of the different players.

Chris J—we could do an outreach to the folks that are working in the basin and send out a letter.

John—will be updating the programmatic worksheet monitoring protocol; Appendix C has been approved by the board. It remains to be seen how we use that document.

Chuck—the MaDMC will be developing a spreadsheet that will be updated every year of all of the monitoring work that is happening in the different subbasins.

**Chuck Peven—Fire Impacts Report:** Derek asked the RTT to look if there were any priorities that we could come up with that would ameliorate any of the short term effects of the fires. We formed a subgroup to look at that; the focus was on the Methow, but we also looked at the other areas in the upper Columbia.

In the short-term, there can be negative effects from the fire, but in the long-term there are positive effects.

*[presentation]*

We looked at the areas that burned, and we used the maps to determine the percent of the sub-watershed that had moderate to high burn. Highest priority area was Beaver/Frazer Creek, and came up with a number of actions in priority order.

Chris J—the average that we are finding for replacing the bridges on private land is around \$110k each; would be more if public road was involved.

Chuck—the next area is lower Methow eastside tributaries. Estimated costs came from the county. Third priority was the Chilliwist.

We also thought it would be prudent to come up with some estimates for the monitoring; a minimum of 4.8 million; we now that is low.

Chris J—also the social/political impacts of the responses are the larger challenges; fish passable culverts, dykes necessary to protect homes in poor locations, etc. We may also want to prioritize funding for past inappropriate institutional decisions.

Discussion—funding decisions; deed of right/easement to keep buildings out of the floodway; landowners being pushed to make the wrong decision.

John—we have an opportunity to do some effectiveness monitoring on post-fire treatment; it would be great if we could learn from this; figuring out where to put in a treatment is difficult. The landscape is dynamic. Are we sure if we've put something out there that is appropriate, and do we want to keep track of how they work?

Derek—I think it is very important; I included monitoring in the long-term recovery report. It is something to watch very closely, and see if there is a way to get it funded.

Chris J—the county is not monitoring it; we put in an application, but haven't been funded.

John—would be great to have a shape file of where the different treatments go in

Terri Williams—the County doesn't even have a shape file of where the August mudflows happened.

John—would be good if we could try to track the treatments

Julie—we (Methow Conservancy) are mapping what we are doing, and we will do some kind of monitoring

Terri—we've gotten no money to put on the ground; the weed board has some money for weed control, but only for chemicals and seed, not the labor.

Julie—we've gotten some funding for a small amount of seed, for landowners in need through Room one, and also for our volunteer efforts, but that is all.

Chris J—if you can have the landowners do the work, then you avoid the cultural

Kent Woodruff—we are making recommendations of what people should do, and these recommendations need to be informed.

Derek—for those who live here, call your county commissioner and ask him to advocate for the long-term recovery report recommendations; both ag and natural resources are in the same report.

### **Matt Shales and Steve Ralph –Update on the Twisp to Carlton Reach Assessment:**

*[presentation]*

Matt—we have several partners in the Reach Assessment—we received funding through SRFB and HCP Trib, with technical assistance from the Bureau of Reclamation. The assessment is from RM 28-41, Twisp to Carlton. Our goal is to identify appropriate actions in appropriate locations.

We started in 2014, hired Cardno through the RFP process, we are looking at preliminary results and working on the draft. We hope to get feedback from MRC, please take a look when the draft comes around, and let us know where we might be lacking. RTT suggested that we needed more historical background.

Steve—the Silver Reach is the most complex, heterogeneous section of the entire Twisp to Carlton reach; it is quite unconfined compared to the other areas, the upper half of the assessment reach is moderately confined, the lower part is quite confined.

We used prior reports and information, got nearly two terabytes of data from the Bureau of Reclamation. The reach has a lot of long glides with little complexity; the substrate was a nice complex mix of cobbles and gravels.

The Reclamation reports from 2008 and 2010 identified data constraints and data gaps, no systematic in-channel habitat mapping or woody debris mapping. We did update the human features, geologic surface mapping, floodplain features, and temperature data.

Our approach is to protect and restore natural river processes; the premise is that habitats that support juvenile life history stages of spring Chinook and steelhead are limiting population potential.

Chuck—one of the things that is emerging as limiting is pre-spawning mortality; is there any way to include that?

Steve—is that prevalent here?

Chuck—in some years it is 50%, but the cause is not well understood

Steve—from a habitat standpoint, I haven't heard about habitat having a direct effect on pre-spawning mortality, not sure how we would address that

Chuck—holding areas, density dependency, having a lot of hatchery fish, are some of the things they are talking about

Charlie Snow—we will have some pre-spawn mortality data for summer Chinook that we tagged; we are working on the report now. We will also be doing a radio study on steelhead, but the difficulty with steelhead is the fishery that confounds the data.

Steve—if you can point me to the information that would be helpful. We've also notice a secondary issue of lack of habitat diversity in mainstem and riparian zone.

Products—we will have the report, we will have GIS data layers, also in Google Earth, the map book that provides the sub-reach scale level of detail of current conditions and identifies locations and the actions proposed.

We will also have a prioritization scheme that recommends how to select activities.

Additional needs:

- Summer Chinook and steelhead spawning locations
- Temperature monitoring locations
- Lamprey monitoring sites
- Mining leachate narrative – want to include as an appendix the narrative description from Crystal.
- Ongoing riparian restoration projects, if any

Chris J—we need to be sensitive to the landowner sensibilities in the mine description; better to characterize past uses.

Crystal Elliot—USFWS might be able to investigate the Alder Confluence for toxics; stay tuned.

Steve—rather than producing a technical memo on the results, we have an outline with some initial text, and that is what we can make available for comment.

Allen Lebovitz—when you did the Google mapping, was it for one time slice?

Steve—we looked at 2013

Allen—wondering about wood mobility, so might be nice to look at other time periods

Steve—we could do that; we don't see any apex jams forming

Allen—in terms of characterizing the conditions of wood, what metrics are you using?

Steve—we aren't, we are just noting where they are and number of pieces; it is imperfect; there isn't a lot of sources for big wood to accumulate in the channel.

Allen—have you looked at channel migration patterns?

Steve—yes; we have a historical layer that shows how the channel got to where it is

Chris J—did you look at where the wood is relative to the channel, how it is functioning?

Steve—not yet

John—Charlie, any thoughts on fish use? A lot of summer Chinook spawning

Charlie—summer Chinook don't rear in there for long, they leave soon after emerging; it is the spring Chinook that rear in the area over the winter—it is an important area for them and they are the most sensitive species; steelhead don't spawn in that reach much, may be a hatchery effect due to planting schedule; it is a dynamic situation; we don't see steelhead migrating out of the tributaries in the fall the way we see with Chinook.

Kent—with support from DNR, we just completed work on a report to document the beaver use in the Twisp to Carlton reach and will be completing the report this winter

Matt—in the Entiat, we had Map books, and we found them to be useful, but need thoughts on how to create that while balancing the concerns of showing actions on private property without talking to the landowners, thoughts on how to balance that.

Chris J—how we label and characterize the maps can help or hurt us; be cautious of that

Matt—the Bureau map books gave the actions and reasons why

Chris J—probably a good balance, to show the need and then the possible actions

**Greer Maier—Habitat Actions in the Upper Columbia:** *[presentation]* the habitat report includes 1996 to 2012, and then the annual report from 2013. The reports are now available on the web site; they were approved at the SRFB meeting in September. The report covers current status of habitat, what we've done to improve habitat, how have these actions potentially benefitted listed speciation, what are the contribution of habitat actions to recovery, and what are the key data gaps and uncertainties.

We also summarized downstream habitat in the mainstem Columbia, estuary, etc. I hoped to have more monitoring data, but that will have to be for the next iteration.

I looked at completed projects from HWS; looked at how well we did working on highest priority ecological concerns in high priority areas, and benefit to intrinsic potential for both spring Chinook and steelhead.

I looked at the restoration potential to see what is the gap and how far have we come, and looked at our regional survival gap given all the factors that affect fish survival; we are really far from that at this point.

I also looked at data gaps and information needs, based on MaDMC memo.

Kent—we are talking more and more about climate change; how does that enter in to what we are looking at?

Greer—included some of that; the lifecycle model has that built in, so it is coming up

Derek—from a technical standpoint, trying to understand climate change forecasts leads to other discussions on the landscape on forest health, water storage, etc. On the Policy side, what we are constantly talking about is that we are not going to get there with habitat restoration and protection alone; we need to work across all “H”s. More and more entities are hearing that, and we need to keep going with habitat, and work needs to go on in the other “H”s as well.

Greer—and we are really well set up. Also on our web site is the 203 implementation report; it is similar to the habitat report, but it is only looking at one year. These are projects that are completed in 2013; may have been started in an earlier year.

Chris J—struggling with the all H integration and our inability to resolve the issues, have you tried to make a graphic that shows how we are doing in each watershed?

Greer—the habitat report has a bit, but the Pie Maps for the expert panel are probably the best source for that information

Discussion—metrics, way to describe the actions

Greer—hope that people use the data in these reports, if you want to take the information and use it in your own reporting, that is great, if you want to query the database to tease out your own information, we can help with that.

**Joy Juelson—UCSRB Update:** On December 2<sup>nd</sup> we will be having an implementation team meeting at the Chelan County PUD, will have year in review, and some project presentations, including 1890s side channel, Robes and Jason will talk about Large Wood Attonement, and a small project in Entiat on an experimental groundwater channel by Joe Lange. The afternoon will be the Implementer’s Workshop.

Chris J—that is a good space to share experiences

Greer—in the spring, we are looking at bringing in people from outside the region to share what they are doing.

Joy—December 3<sup>rd</sup>, Chuck and I are going to Olympia, SRFB will make final decision on the project list. Looks like 8 of the 10 projects will be funded. Chuck and I will also be presenting the Fire Report, and requesting some emergency funding.

December 11<sup>th</sup> is the UCSRB meeting, we will have lots of updates as well as end of year business; meeting will be at Chelan County Commissioner’s room.

Greer—forest health, impacts to water yield; that group will be presenting initial findings at the meeting

Joy—we are going to put out another Upper Columbia Bulletin, if you have anything you would like to share let me know and I will get it into the bulletin.

Joy—we have a new intern, Brittany Bowles, and she is going to be working on the Habitat Work Schedule, so she may call you and ask about your projects.

Derek—for those who weren’t at the SRFB tour in September, they were very pleased with the tour and seeing the burned area, and they got behind the efforts on Frazer Creek. One of our messages in our

presentation we emphasized was that we are addressing landscape scale changes. We were connecting the fires, and what we do on the landscape to make sure that it is additive in the long term.

Joy—we put out an RFP for proposals for some outreach funds in Okanogan County, and we've been working with Char on that process. It is closing this week, criteria is that the actions need to be connected to salmon recovery in some way, and potentially to other sponsors. Interesting process.

## **Roundtable**

Kirsten Kirkby—Yakama Nation: working on report writing, will be getting back out at Hancock.

John Crandall—Monitoring Update: working on the Lamprey guide, will be regional in scope. It will be modeled after the fish guide.

Greer Maier—UCSRB: working on the hatchery report; let me know if you have any need for a workshop, there will be another science conference coming up.

Matt Shales—CCFEG: We got a PIT tag array installed at Silver with help from WDFW, USFWS, and they did some PIT tagging.

On the Twisp Carlton RA, a big part is to tease out protection actions, if anyone else needs to be involved, let me know.

Terri Williams—OCD: we've been working hard on the fire info; the BAER report is on our website. The NRCS EWP program, which was going to be installing dykes around homes may be stalled out until next spring due to the weather. We've done around 178 site visits with landowners in the burned areas, we did apply through Ecology for grants to address larger scale watershed concerns in Benson Creek and another in Chilliwist; the early stages will be determining the long term plans and overlapping concerns with roads, creek, etc. We also have applied for funds for seeding/restoration through the 319 program. Bob wanted me to let you all know that the CREP program may have less stringent parameters than we have previously used, if interested give Bob Clark a call.

Julie—any update on the sub-discipline BAER reports?

Terri—you will have to talk to Leslie

Chris J—MSRF and OCD coordinated on our Ecology applications.

Allen Lebovitz—DNR: Jarred and I have been working together to put plans in place for the Big Valley restoration project we are working on, have draft plans. Have been able to get out and tag some wood in the Big Valley and Silver Reach; looking at wood mobility. I have had the opportunity to coordinate with NE Region at DNR to look at some treatments on DNR land to deal with fire recovery. Looking at some proposed treatment methods on DNR lands above Frazer Creek, specifically, contour felling to disrupt surface waters and trap some sediments.

Discussion—contour felling, not a lot of monitoring data to show that it is helpful, mixed results; mostly it looks like it might not do any harm. From a wood perspective, not sure how much gets transported off of those slopes; the events are what is needed to develop the stream; is it better to release the sediment in a pulse, or creating a chronic sediment source over time, social perspective.

Kent Woodruff—Methow Beaver Project: there are three Beaver Project shirts left; \$10 each, first come first served.

Hans Smith—Yakama Nation: we got the 1890s Side Channel project pretty much finished, still working on plantings despite weather challenges. We've got 4 cfs going through the channel, and coho are

spawning in there enjoying the disturbed gravel. Took a quick measurement the other day, and the the water in the side channel was 50 degrees vs. 34 degrees in the main channel, so good thermal refuge. We are starting the monitoring planning with Kristen. We've presented the Middle Twisp RA to the RTT; awaiting their comments. We continue to work on the Upper Methow RA; expect updates on that in late winter, early spring. Continuing work with landowners and side channels, and we are putting in a PIT array on the 1890s side channel.

Chuck Peven—RTT: we are in the middle of reviewing the Twisp Reach Assessment, and I wanted to mention that we had a great workshop last week on the effects of fire on fish. At the next meeting, Drs. Steve Wondzell and Alex Fremier will be discussing side channels and groundwater interaction and side channel reconnection; looks like it will be at the Chelan Douglass land trust in Wenatchee. Dec 10<sup>th</sup>. Reviewing targeted for Middle Entiat, and we will be working on some comments on the Twisp River Floodplain project.

Joy Juelson—UCSRB: the outreach grant deadline is this Friday; Jessica sent out the RFP, if you need it again contact Joy

Keith Douville—WDFW/Methow Beaver Project: 38 beavers released at 13 release sites, 8 are active and showing signs of success, these numbers change as beavers move around; overall through the program we have had 33 total successful establishments where beavers have doubled the width of the stream.

We completed the field work for the downstream beaver assessment, looked at historic beaver use and ways to interact with landowners.

We had impacts at about 50% of our sites due to the Carlton Complex; we lost some equipment, one flow site, 6 temperature loggers, probably only lost data on a week scale.

Chris J—any data on re-capture?

Keith—I think we had three recaptures this year, once we get more PIT tags out there, we will be seeing them more.

Kent—the movement information is fascinating. We are getting data that no one has gotten before, because we have so many PIT tag antennas.

Crystal Elliot—TU: abandoned mine and watershed restoration—we are working with Ecology and others strategizing on the Red Shirt mill trying to find a way to get Ecology to fund cleanup while we work on the habitat restoration elements.

Working on some suction dredging legislation, working with Linda Evans Parlette

Working on design on the Myers Creek area in the Okanogan, working with Robes Parrish. Will be coordinating with Kent on beavers.

Jeri Timm—TU: MVID is still going, production wells are going in soon behind Hanks.

Charlie Snow—WDFW: we had fun putting in the PIT tag arrays at Silver Side Channel and PIT Tagging, done on probably the two coldest days of the year.

Chris Butler—Yakama Nation: we have almost 4 miles of river we plan to address on the Chewuch with USFS and WDFW; have a lot of different work planned from 11.75-15.5, a good stretch of river. We installed some piezometers last week; the upcoming thing in December working with a few high school students to gather Christmas trees after Christmas to use in projects.

Chris Johnson—Frazer Creek; the first bridge arrived this morning, it has been an interesting group to work with, we expect to have more in the next few weeks, hope to have 6 bridges installed by mid-December. WDFW has asked us to monitor the situation at the 153 culvert at Benson Creek if the culvert ends up failing.

At Twisp Floodplain, we just finishing up our work on wells to replace the instream diversions. Had a productive meeting with the Corps and Ecology, and we will be working in Category 1 wetlands, and they are not distinguishing between habitat projects and Walmart parking lots, so we will be spending a lot of money on individual delineations. I would like to see a pamphlet developed so that we can make permitting for restoration easier.

Hans Smith—Yakama Nation: we are trying to move forward with the Fender Mill Project, would include a non-consumptive water right, legal notice will appear in the Omak Chronicle.

**Next MRC December 16<sup>th</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
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.