



Meeting Notes 16 Feb 2010

Location: Chelan PUD Auditorium, 327 N. Wenatchee Ave. & Conference call

For more info contact: Casey Baldwin 509-664-3148 casey.baldwin@dfw.wa.gov

Attending:

Casey Baldwin

James White

Pamela Nelle

Michelle McClure

Lee Carlson

Chris Johnson

Cameron Thomas

Julie Morgan

Kate Terrell

Karl Polivka

Dale Bambrick (Phone)

Tracy Hillman (Phone)

Paul LaRaviere

Steve Hays

Joe Lange

Mike Ward (Phone)

Russell Langshaw (Phone)

Roy Beaty (last 1 ½ hour)

Updates:

1. UCSRB (Julie)

a. February Board Meeting Agenda:

- i. Bull Trout.—Julie presented a paper that she developed for the Board that highlighted the pertinent information regarding the resent “re-designation” of critical areas in the Upper Columbia subbasins.
- ii. D.C. Prep – The Board will be going to Washington D.C. in March to meet with congressional staffers, high level federal employees, and others. The Board’s objective is to garner federal support and educate politicians on the salmon recovery efforts in the Upper Columbia.
- iii. North American Salmon Stronghold Partnership.—Chelan County is working with them to determine if there are opportunities and to develop the mechanisms for this land protection approach.
- iv. All-H Coordination.—efforts are underway for reporting and the Board is interested in convening a forum for all-H coordination at some point.
- v. Project and Funding Coordination- will be covered in depth later in today’s agenda.

2. Community Salmon Fund – This year because state contribution is lower so the available funds for the UC is lower \$131k. Technical review will either be or in May or in November (outside the normal project review period) depending on where in the cycle we go. Staff preference is to go early and request RTT review in May. Kate prefers May. Casey said that once the dates are decided on, he will convene an RTT workgroup to conduct the project review. We will use their

scoring system and it will require probably a ½ day of reading and scoring projects followed by a 2 hour meeting.

3. USGS Methow Climate Change Pilot Study (Baldwin) – Casey pointed out that it is an effort to link physical/climate models with socio/economic models to forecast potential impacts of climate change. A similar study has been started in the Yakima basin. USGS looking to apply in the Methow. John Crandall, Jennifer Molesworth and several others from the Methow will be on the planning team. Michelle McClure said she has also been involved through the Science Center and will be part of the Methow effort as well. Casey has asked Alec Maule (USGS project leader) to come to the April RTT meeting) to give a presentation and update. This and other efforts may have relevance for future RTT analysis workshops and adaptive management of the recovery plan.
 - Cameron mentioned that there were several efforts like this and was concerned that there would be problems if they were not coordinated or at least aware and sensitive to the issue of multiple studies that might give different results.
 - Michelle was unsure how far they would be able to get in the 9 months that are remaining with funding. Number of other ongoing efforts. Always harder to be coordinated than to say “we will be coordinated”.
4. MaDMC: Casey mentioned that the MaDMC has a number of items on their plate and need to have a meeting soon.
5. Other.—Joe Lange gave an update on a symposium he attended; River Restoration Northwest. He shared some of the highlights and recommended it for others in the future. Good information and presentations are available on the web at rrnw.org.

Modification to MVID West (Chris Johnson):

- Background.—Casey presented the background information as to why the RTT was being asked to review this potential amendment. He said that Char (Okanogan Lead Entity) and Jason Lundgren (SRFB Liaison) had contacted him asking for RTT input and review of the technical merits and a decision regarding whether or not the RTT recommends it go forward. He pointed out that the SRFB Manual 18 called for local technical input and a decision on major scope changes such as this.
- Overview of Proposed Changes – Chris Johnson (MSRF) described the previous project and the proposed amendment. This is a 2005 project that MSRF adopted from MVID.
 - **Original proposal description:** MVID West application put together by USBR and MVID to work in BPA contract to replace the MVID annual push-up dam at the point of diversion. MSRF determined not to move forward with the project as USBR designed because structure was designed for diversion greater than courts and WDOE allowed. It would have made a much bigger footprint than needed for their water right.

- Proposed Amendment: Overall biological objective is similar (get fish past the diversion), but the method is different. MSRF is proposing to assist the District in evaluating and implementing efficiency improvements that could allow them to operate in compliance with the Ecology Order. Specifically, the alternatives would need to allow for an immediate reduction in irrigation diversions from the historic rate of roughly 22 cfs to an interim maximum rate of 17 cfs and achieve long-term efficiencies allowing canal operation with a diversion rate of 11 cfs or lower. The alternatives that could be implemented will likely include a combination of conveyance improvements (piping), alternative water supply/timing (supplemental wells), on farm controls (metering or sizing of turn outs), on-farm efficiencies, and water lease or trust agreements. MSRF is proposing to complete a survey of the West Canal prior to the 2010 irrigation season to identify the location of all existing takeout points, areas where failing infrastructure is contributing to water loss, and other factors likely to result in excessive conveyance loss. These areas and the canal system as a whole will be documented by establishing a series of photo points and staff gages along the canal. Following the walking survey, the main canal will be treated with a polymer soil binder (PAM) to reduce conveyance loss through canal seepage. The amendment is proposing to use \$25k and match it with \$19k of USBR funding for the work.
- Discussion / Comments
 - McClure – Before and after measurements are different – would be really helpful to get the same measurements before and after – to get as much information as possible.
 - Nelle – Currently the dam is put in annually and there is a lot of digging and disturbance to the riverbed and this project will no longer address that.
 - Johnson: Talking with YN to move the diversion upstream in integrate with a restoration project if can get down to a ~11 cfs diversion or so.
 - Cameron – They are going about it in a different way, but are trying to achieve the same purpose. The financial request is small compared to other water savings projects such as piping.
 - Bambrick – MVID has court order that says can only take 11cfs or less – spending salmon recovery money to bring them into compliance does not make sense. The flow issue has now been dealt with by the court. The previous proposal was to end the practice of in-stream dam construction.
 - Chris Johnson; without this funding they may not have the means to come into compliance, so the water will not be there for the fish. Additionally, the court order is to go to 17 cfs and then work towards 11 without a clear definition or timeline.

- Lange – was the original project specific to replacement of the structure? Did it include reduction of flows?
 - Johnson: It was designed for the structure and was designed for 40 cfs so it would have had a much bigger footprint in the floodplain than necessary.
 - Van Marter – So, to clarify, they want to use some of the remaining funds to broker something toward getting to the 11cfs?
 - Johnson—yes, this is part of a bigger effort than may avoid expensive piping by shortening the ditch and getting more people on wells. The opportunity to use the money will expire soon – so either use in a beneficial way or lose it.
 - Lange: How often does PAM need re-applied? Answer? Annual or semi-annual. There was some uncertainty but it definitely is not a permanent fix.
 - Are there toxicology issues? Someone thought no but not sure if the lab studies looked at hormones or just growth and survival.
- Casey asked the group to vote on their position, and presented 3 options:
 - Yes, it should move forward (3 votes)
 - High biological benefit
 - High certainty of success
 - No, it should not move forward (1 vote)
 - Low BB
 - Low C of S
 - NMI; it may be valid, but: (5 votes)
 - Need a full proposal, or
 - Request x,y,z
 - Other?

Additional discussion:

Terrell - Concerned with how Yes is stated – may not be high benefit but could lead to an action with enough benefit (5 or more cfs). Casey agreed and pointed out that he had presented the extreme black and white options for YES and NO and there was a continuum of grey area in between.

- A concern was raised that the certainty of success is probably low based on the history of the District not following through with implementation.
- Lange – question – thought was that the scope has changed so much that more information is needed to understand exactly what all they will be doing for the money.

- Van Marter – will need to resolve soon (by next month if possible)
- Baldwin – I haven't heard any requests for information that would change people's opinion about whether or not it should move forward.
 - Terrell – except for Michelle's comment about a better BACI design.
 - McClure –thought that the project would have additional benefits if it were implemented as a Before-After study where conveyance loss was monitored, the ditch was then turned off and the PAM applied, and then conveyance loss was measured again. This would provide some effectiveness monitoring results.
 - Johnson—would like to follow up with Michelle to be sure he understands the details and will have to ask the District if those operations would be possible.
- Baldwin – We need to determine if there is a need to deal with this again in March. The majority vote at this meeting is that we need more information. RTT members who voted NMI should articulate the kinds of information they need so that Chris can determine if it is possible to provide that information on his timeline. The group agreed to give the NMI folks 1 week to get that information to Casey and Chris. Casey will work with Chris to determine if this needs to come in front of the RTT again.
 - Lange – would like to see any additional information from USBR and see if there are any PAM treatments that were long-term¹.

UCRTT Analysis Workshop Results (Mike Ward/RTT):

- Update from Capt. Ward – broad audience including policy makers, scientists, public, etc. – call Adaptive Management Audience – Have notes, flip charts, abstracts, summaries from about half the presenters, videos – working with all that information to put together into a synthesis paper – but the synthesis paper is an RTT product, and role is as a scribe – don't hesitate to jump in and propose changes, etc.

¹ After the meeting Joe Lange submitted the following additional information request via e-mail: "During the meeting I asked Chris that I would like to see any information (BOR, MVID, or others) from any previous PAM applications to canals and indicating both the short term and long term effectiveness. Basically where has this previously been done and how did it do? How long did the initial treatment last? How much was used? Where there additional treatments? How much did the treatments cost? What type of soils where the canals constructed from and what type of soils are in the proposed canal?"

- Review Synthesis Paper schedule:
 - Intention in the adaptive management cycle is to look at the science and have a conference with the managers and the rest of the Adaptive Management audience. The paper to be presented in a workshop in September hosted by the UCSRB with RTT moderators presenting the findings from each session.
 - Morgan: Board would like a preliminary review of results from presenters before the conference. Casey confirmed that they did not want to be seeing the results for the first time when everyone else was.
 - Ward: will have to add to calendar.
 - Right now Mike is still working with technical contributors and not all of the information is in to him. Today he will present the outline and his first cut at populating it with information from the workshop.
 - Mike presented the outline and sections in blue indicated when he will engage the RTT. Versions 2 and 3 are opportunities for the RTT to review and comment. Will be at the May meeting.
 - Mike emphasized that this synthesis paper is the RTTs and he is just trying to capture what the RTT wants it to say.
 - There will be outreach to WATs in March (or April) to provide an update on preliminary results from the RTTAW – in late May or early June the WATs should receive a working draft of the synthesis report. This is part of an attempt to get the WATs results in a timeline that is useful for upcoming project proposals.
- Review outline of the report
 - Document starts with a summary of the synthesis report results – highlights the conclusions – a little bit longer than an executive summary – but something an interested citizen could look at in a few minutes and make out what we are doing – 5 technical sections after that that each start with a summary. The five sections correspond with the five sessions at the workshop. Within each of the five sections, a lot more detail. A page or two for each of the presentations in the workshop – should have more information in the presentation summaries. Have been getting more details, numbers behind tables, etc. Whatever deliberations the RTT has will be documented and reported in that section. Assume will be RTT consensus – but occasional dissent that may need to be noted. Multiple appendices including one on how the key management questions were come up with, and one talking about the process of deliberations, etc.
 - Baldwin: We will be having the RTT deliberations today and at the next couple of meetings. If there is more to cover or issues that need more attention we will need to know that so we can work on it between meetings.

- Mike: We will include information that came from non-RTT during the workshop in the summary, but formal deliberations start today. If the RTT does not agree with a recommendation or conclusion from a non-RTT member that was expressed during the workshop then we can and will address that in the paper.
- Ward; Am available to talk to folks and get things written down – if can capture things better and bring back to the group in a more refined format...Available to talk through e-mail, etc. can work one-on-one.
- Baldwin: have assumed that this will be a major agenda item at the next several meetings.
- Summary of what we learned at the workshop
 - What is the key message of the workshop? – Mike presented a list of bullets and asked the group for input.
 - Polivka, on next to last bullet – really mean spawning habitat? Or do mean rearing habitat? Don't remember a talk about spawning habitat.
 - Ward – was thinking about the presentation on barriers – because barriers are being largely ameliorated...could expand to juvenile habitat.
 - Baldwin – the presentations didn't make a distinction between spawning and rearing – may just have to wordsmith this so works with both.
 - Cameron: This list does a good job at summarizing the high points. That is good, we want to identify what worked, but we also need to highlight what did not work and what are the challenges. Thinking about limiting factors – biggest challenges left are the ones we are heading into, such as the lining up of federal, state and private landowners to do large reach-based projects. Where do decision makers need to be putting an elbow and shoulder to the wheel as we move into our next two-year phase.
 - In the next section where look at things in more detail, there are more things we don't know than things do know. Need more emphasis on uncertainties
 - Morgan: another bullet could be lack of understanding between habitat actions and population response – trying to address through monitoring (Julie has exact language for this...will send to Mike)
 - Quite a bit of uncertainty around limiting factors, and what metrics to use, etc.

- McClure – not just uncertainty – what people want to know is absolute minimum of what they have to do – and will take a whole bunch of work – there is a lot of information that we need before we can determine the minimum. This is where the monitoring of response to certain conditions is important.
 - Someone? Ties into other uncertainties like how much it will cost, and how long it will take – scientists at the workshop wanted to talk about realistic timelines – policy makers want to see things that are happening now.
- McClure – Recommend we move the last bullet forward, to highlight that we are not there yet, but then follow with all these good things that are happening, then finish with a series of bullets highlighting the most important uncertainties and challenges.
- McClure – ^{5th} clause – Adaptive Management process appears to be working bullet – don't know that we really have an adaptive management process implemented to the point where we can say it is working yet.
 - Cameron – true, we are not quite all the way through the first cycle – we have followed the process and it seems to be working, but won't be able to say we have completed until presented to the WATs and Board in the fall and have made changes based on things have learned.
 - Ward: bullets in the key message about where we are going next?
 - Cameron: May not even need an additional bullet but just some wordsmithing.
- Baldwin – move on to next section and have people think about the key points and get their written edits to Mike. Timeline TBD.
- Results of Key Management Questions – anticipate that the results of this section will be the guts of the summary for each of the five technical sections. Rather than go through now, look at the structure of how set up, and places where mike has particular questions. Some of this will be homework for the RTT to review in the next 2 weeks and get comments back to Mike. Timeline TBD.
- Key Management Questions with summaries of Workshop Outcomes and Uncertainties – Mike wants to capture the Bambrick comment (from the workshop) about putting the burden of proof on whether or not it is working, since scientists like to fuss about uncertainties and concentrate on things we don't know. Rephrasing to: nothing we heard at the workshop says we are doing it wrong.

- Could see both the second and third columns merged eventually – both what we learned and the uncertainties are outcomes of the process.
 - Mike is tracking sources of comments with endnotes for now so we know if it is coming from a particular person or presentation, but eventually that detail of referenes will not be in the final document.
 - Have a good handle on session 1 – need some more technical information
 - Will come back to session 2 today
 - Session 3 is pretty good – capture much of the back and forth.
 - Session 4 is the same
 - A lot more work on the Data Gaps session – call to Keely and Chuck for assistance.
- Session 2 – how well putting projects on the ground, limiting factors, and threats.
 - 3.1 – want to answer this more definitively. – Mike will call Derek and they will work through the details.
 - Van Marter – don’t have the implementation monitoring data to answer trajectory of implementation – however appears that are moving toward implementing the projects of high benefit. Will work with Mike on what have, the uncertainties
 - 2.1 – Limiting Factors being ameliorated so that they don’t limit the status of the population?
 - Cameron: Reasons that projects were implemented that were not in the high priority – may have been how the projects were written *** (Bullet that goes in front – this documents the struggle of massive salmon recovery under a voluntary plan) *** could say wow only got 1/3, or if looked eight-years back would have been even worse.
 - Pull out as another bullet – “there are lots of high-priority actions still remaining”
 - Morgan – have to be careful not to use projects and actions interchangeably – a project can have multiple actions.
 - Casey: For other limiting factors, which the workshop didn’t deal with explicitly – one thing that we can potentially say is that there is a need to define future desired conditions. – set a goal and make improvements until reach the goal. Similar to recovery criteria for fish.
 - Cameron: talked about culverts because it is question can get arms around – other questions are harder to answer because they are not as straightforward.
 - Baldwin: do we want to recommend one of the following paths?
 - 1) desired future conditions (define objectives and track progress towards them)

- 2) Keep implementing and monitoring and we will re-assess our progress in the future.
- Terrell – I like the concept of goal with desired future conditions.
 - Baldwin: We Have goals for fish with VSP – but we don't have the same level of understanding of what "recovery" looks like for habitat.
- Cameron: the science doesn't support a uniform goal – setting one target could be misleading because river systems are constantly changing. Also, you can change a metric (i.e. road density) and not actually affect a limiting factor (sediment).
- Juvenile status and trend (Baldwin): Casey mentioned that this was a gap in information at the workshop because there was not presentation to address this KMQ. But it is not a data gap because there are lots of smolt traps in the UC. It is a matter of accessing the data and presenting it. He has talked with Andrew Murdoch about using WDFW smolt trap data for this purpose. Casey showed a summary of smolts per redd in the Chiwawa and a table of all the smolt traps in the UC and suggested that we could bring the juvenile data into the synthesis report, even though we did not have a presentation.
 - Maybe just list the number traps and talk about what the analyses will look like in the future.
 - Hillman – smolts/redd is generally smolts/female – we have the information to calculate productivity for the Chiwawa.
 - Baldwin: unfortunately the Chiwawa is not a great place to do this with relation to habitat actions, because there are very few habitat modifications. Maybe the recommendation here is analysis of using the smolt traps for tracking status and trends in places where will be having lots of habitat actions.
 - Cameron – The Chiwawa is your control – it allows you to account for out-of-basin stuff.
 - Cameron: Include if there is a benefit to using but signpost that wasn't presented, and give as an example for the future
 - Morgan: important to include because so far up the Columbia. Also one of the main critiques of the workshop is that didn't include the juvenile data.
- **Set up communication, next steps**
 - Next check-in is March 10 –RTT members need to read the documents that Mike went over today and provide him comments and/or edits by March 1. Casey will send out reminders. Track changes is good, lists are okay too. We should have another 2 hours at the next meeting for this agenda item.

UC Project and Funding Coordination, BPA Programmatic (Julie Morgan/RTT):

- Casey introduced the topic and reminded folks that the RTT agreed at the December meeting that we wanted to be the technical review body for the BPA programmatic habitat projects. What Casey and Julie would be presenting is the outcome of the next steps as the Board staff have worked with BPA, contractors, and Casey to develop an Narrative for ISRP review.
 - Morgan: Reminded the RTT that there was a series of workshops with a workgroup of the Implementation Team, project sponsors, and then the RTT. The RTT indicated 2 things that were important: 1) didn't want BPA to fund projects from the bottom of the SRFB list. 2) there will be a potential workload issue (BPA \$ doubles the funding and increases the number and complexity of projects that we have to review).
- Building upon the guidance from the RTT on “alternative D” (from our December 2009 meeting), and the IT workgroup, Casey and Board staff developed a project selection process that we will present today. We also met with Washington members of the Northwest Power and Conservation Council and their staff and gave them this presentation (as well as 2 other presentations). Casey has a powerpoint that will go through quickly – slides that differentiate the current and new processes. Then go into what the schematic looks like.
- Baldwin – presentation was for a different audience, so will skip some slides, but want to show context of what was presenting – a combination of technical review and planning process ...
 - BPA may have more interest in LFs rather than VSP – need to talk about ways to accommodate that, either within the scoring system, or after the scoring system
 - Morgan: one of the two requests from BPA – need to be able to show that projects are addressing primary limiting factors.
 - Conceptual pathways: targeted solicitation vs current 6-step process
- Morgan: Julie presented the “Rainmaker” diagram and the group had a productive discussion around the various roles, processes, etc.
 - The timeline for the first year is compressed, we are already in February and should have started in October.
 - We do want to see if we can get at least one WAT to do the targeted solicitation approach this year. The first presentation and feedback session for reach restoration alternatives may come to the RTT in March.
 - Terrell: where is there room for new project sponsors?

- Julie: New project sponsors can interact with the Watershed Action Team at any time to get projects into action plan, or can pick up projects in the implementation schedule.
 - Its going to be a challenge to spend all the available funds from all the sources every year. Plenty of room for more project sponsors.
 - Morgan: This probably goes into the bin of project, post-project, and pre-project. Are working on sponsor development.
- Baldwin – Are there any concerns with what is in the schematic such as the role of the RTT and taking on a more detailed evaluation of the pulse projects?
 - Morgan: BPA may want a different focus on the criteria, to emphasize limiting factors.
 - Casey: The criteria for VSP have limiting factor considerations embedded within them. Each reviewer must think about how important the limiting factor is to the fish in order to give it a score for VSP.
 - Casey: I asked BPA to look at our criteria and let us know why they would not work for them, so that we could understand the need and appropriate course of action for changes. No feedback had been offered.
 - Beaty: Suggested staying consistent with previous scoring system so that can look at scores how relate to previous years, because they might be interested in a minimum cutoff score: if projects fall below the minimum score, save the money for another year.
 - Casey: Mentioned that the RTT had talked about scoring each criteria on a 1-10 basis, then using multipliers for each criteria in order to have them add up to our standard of 150 points. This system would be easier for reviewers and then if a funding entity wanted to weight certain criteria more than others they could do that.
- Mainstem Crab Creek – confusing wording on the Rainmaker diagram, need to change to Mainstem/Small Tributaries/Crab Ck.
- Morgan: ISRP narrative being developed – Joy and Roy the primary authors with significant input from Casey, James, and Julie– section F has a lot more detail about the selection process.

Casey recapped the 3 major agenda items, thanked everyone for their flexibility in adjusting to the altered day and time, and noted that the next meeting would be back on our regular day and time, March 10th, probably all day.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30