

Meeting Notes 9 January 2008

Location: BLM office, 915 Walla Walla Ave., Wenatchee
For more info contact: Casey Baldwin 509-664-3148 baldwcomb@dfw.wa.gov

Executive session (0900-1100) Tom Kahler, Chuck Peven, Carmen Andonaegui, Kate Terrell, Keely Murdoch, Cameron Thomas, Casey Baldwin, Tracy Hillman, Joe Kelly, Joe Lange, Michelle McClure, Russell Langshaw, Bob Rose

- 1. Operating Procedures:** The RTT reviewed and discussed the proposed changes to the operating procedures. Several additions and subtractions were made; the changes were accepted and approved by all. Casey will put together a cleaned-up version, distribute it to the group, and have the document updated on the UCSRB website.
- 2. CCNRD Request for review of CMZ site 2:** Casey explained the background of this request, and that the sponsor had provided more detailed design information in the form of a JARPA document with drawings. The RTT read and discussed the request for review. The group decided that the RTT would do the review. A workgroup meeting was scheduled for January 30th from 9-11 a.m. at Casey's office to discuss the project and complete the first draft of the Review Summary Statement. The Review Summary Statement would then be finalized at the February 13th RTT meeting and distributed to the Applicants at that time. Casey will e-mail a reminder for the workgroup meeting and have a conference line available on the 30th.
- 3. CCNRD request for review, barrier prioritization framework:** Casey handed out the Request for Review along with the RTT's draft barrier prioritization framework. He explained that the RTT was being asked to complete a draft technical memorandum that was started several years ago by a workgroup of the RTT. After some discussion, the group agreed that they should complete the draft barrier prioritization framework, which would fulfill the CCNRD request. Kate Terrell, Joe Kelly, Cameron Thomas, and Casey Baldwin agreed to complete the next draft of the framework, then present it to the rest of the RTT for further input and approval.
- 4. Request for completion of the biological benefit portion of the Nason Creek Prioritization Framework:** Casey handed out the Request for Review and the draft Prioritization Framework for Nason Creek restoration that the Wenatchee Planning Unit Habitat Subcommittee (WHSC) had prepared prior to the previous RTT meeting (and USBR presentation, 12 December 2007). The RTT read and discussed the request. Chuck and Bob pointed out that the RTT project rating criteria would not be directly applicable to this task, and modifications would need to be made. Casey emphasized the importance of using the best available science for this task, because it will serve as the primary justification when trying to convince the railroad and WDOT that projects need to be conducted on their property. Bob suggested that the task would take a considerable amount of time and effort in cooperation with the USBR in order to fully take advantage

of their very detailed geomorphic reach assessment. Several people were concerned that the timeframe for completion of the task was not realistic, considering the difficulty, importance, level of detail, and everyone's workload. The RTT agreed to fulfill the request, but thought that more time was needed. Casey mentioned that the driver for the timeline was that the WHSC wanted project sponsors to have access to the information for the next SRFB cycle. The group agreed that getting it done right was more important than getting it done quickly, but perhaps several projects might be obvious high priorities within the timeframe specified by the WHSC request. Casey will work with MaryJo on the timing and the need to fulfill near-term requests for likely high priorities. Carmen, Cameron, Bob, Kate, Keely, and Casey, agreed to meet on January 28th from 9-3 to begin laying out the criteria and methods for the biological benefit ranking.

5. Matrix of Pathways and Indicators meeting, January 29th; Casey mentioned that Jennifer Molesworth had followed up on a request at the 12 December 2007 RTT meeting. A group of people in the Methow Subbasin would be getting together (probably in Twisp) on January 29th to follow up the discussion about the USBR use of MPI in their assessments and project monitoring. Casey extended Jennifer's invitation for RTT members to attend. Cameron said he was planning to attend. Casey will forward the official meeting notice to the RTT when he gets it from Jennifer.

6. GSRO short-term priority list: Casey handed out a table and explained that the GSRO had requested a list of short-term priorities and that the UCSRB staff had been working on this table. The objective was to identify salmon recovery related priorities for state and federal agencies to work on during the current biennium. Julie had asked if the RTT could take a quick look and let them know if there were any "red flags". The RTT did not have adequate time to review the table in a comprehensive manor. A few points were made, which included:

1. Without prioritization the utility of the list might be limited.
2. There was inconsistency in the level of detail of the actions, some were very general and others quite specific. This might lead users of the table to gravitate towards the more specific requests, even if they were not the highest priority.
3. The objectives for the WSDOT projects listed should include focus on getting WSDOT to engage and implement on floodplain function projects, rather than their status quo of only working on passage related culverts and bridges.

7. Project summary examples: Casey handed out 2 "project summary examples" and explained that these were developed by the Tributary Committee, based on the summary statement that Casey had put together for the November RTT meeting. Tracy explained that the Tributary Committee planned to make these summary statements a requirement of project sponsors in the next round of projects proposals. There was a recommendation to have the summary statements be a requirement for SRFB projects as well. Casey

agreed to work with Derek on the possibility of making it a “local requirement” for SRFB projects. Chuck suggested that there may be an opportunity to recommend it to the statewide SRFB process, because they are currently seeking comments on the process for the next round. Casey will follow that up with Derek as well.

8. M&E subcommittee update: Keely presented the results of a workgroup session to prioritize all the data gaps identified in the Recovery Plan and Biological Strategy. She noted that there was still a little more work to do to incorporate data gaps identified by the RTT during the Appendix P review last summer. James gave a synopsis of the upcoming series of meetings to assist with the plan for coordinated monitoring in the Methow. The group discussed the proposed date (Feb 5) for the monitoring practitioners coordination (Chelan) meeting and the urgency of needing to finalize the date and contact everyone. Keely agreed to check on the room availability, solidify the date, and contact everyone about it. *(note from after the meeting: Feb 5 will not work for that meeting location. Day and location are still TBA).*

9. No additional items were proposed, Casey thanked everyone for coming and the meeting was adjourned at 12:15.