

Meeting Notes

14 Jan 2009

Location: Douglas County Land and Transportation Services Building,
140 19th St NW, East Wenatchee

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

RTT members present: Casey Baldwin, Russell Langshaw, Steve Hays, John Arterburn, Tom Kahler, Cameron Thomas, Kate Terrell and Michelle McClure and Tracy Hillman (via phone).

Others present: Pamela Nelle, James White, John Monahan, Marcelle Lynde, Lee Carlson, Chris Jordan, Karl Polivka, Brandon Rogers

- 1) Updates:**
- a) Pioneer Ditch Product Review Update:** Casey mentioned that he had received the updated material for the review from Aaron Panvose and distributed to the RTT workgroup. The group decided to review the products independently, submit comments to one person, then follow up with a conference call to finalize the draft product before the next RTT meeting. Cameron offered to receive and compile the comments, which are due to him by January 28th. Casey will set up a conference call for February 5th at 1:00. The workgroup includes Tracy Hillman, Cameron Thomas, Joe Lange, Joe Kelly, Steve Hays, and Casey Baldwin.
 - b) MaDMC:** James mentioned that the Upper Columbia Monitoring Practitioners meeting had been set for February 9th in Chelan. This is the meeting to bring together those that are monitoring across the Upper Columbia to facilitate greater coordination.
 - c) UCSRB:** Casey went through a draft memo prepared by Julie, Derek, Lee, and Casey that outlined the need and plan for developing a more detailed 3-year work plan in conjunction with a coordinated funding strategy that would facilitate the funding of larger and more difficult projects that don't fit well within the past and current project funding paradigm. There was concern that the memo did not articulate clearly enough that the intention for development of a three year work plan was not to completely change the existing project funding processes. Cameron and several others supported the need for funding mechanisms that allowed for implementation of reach-level restoration and completing large, complex projects. A suggestion was made to change "line out" to "recommend" on page 3 under workshop #1 when referencing the RTT biological priorities.

Casey pointed out where the RTT fit into the process and that they were being asked to 1) provide the biological priorities for reaches and actions and 2) attend the workshops and participate with the WATs. Casey noted

that the effort would be consistent with recent RTT discussions regarding a need to update the *Biological Strategy*. Casey presented a draft format for accomplishing the task and the group spent some time discussing it. The timeline for completing the task would be the next RTT meeting on February 11th. The group agreed to take on the task and formed a work group that would meet on January 26th from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. The workgroup will consist of Russell Langshaw, Kate Terrell, John Arterburn, Cameron Thomas, Tom Kahler, and Casey Baldwin. Pamela Nelle asked if she could also attend the workgroup meeting to track the progress of the product. Casey will set up a meeting room and distribute it to the group.

2) 2009 work plan: The group reviewed the draft 2009 work plan spreadsheet and no immediate changes were suggested. There was some discussion regarding the Community Salmon Fund project review. Kate explained how it has worked in the past. Casey mentioned that he was in contact with Brian (consultant in charge of implementing the review) but did not yet know what the timeline was for the review.

3) 2009 RTT analysis workshop: Casey and James went through the changes to the planning outline developed at the last RTT meeting. Most of the workgroup effort had gone into wordsmithing the objectives, making a plan for the status assessment update, adding tasks under the objectives, and discussing what to do (or not to do) with the ISEMP habitat status and trend data.

Next steps: James and Tracy will go through the management questions after the February 11th RTT meeting. The workgroup will meet after that and focus on developing specific analysis requests from ISEMP and prioritizing the management questions that we need to focus on for the workshop.

4) Entiat ISEMP statistical design presentation and discussion: Casey explained that ISEMP was in attendance to provide more detail on the various experimental design options they are considering. In his presentation, Chris Jordan emphasized that the decision of which experimental design to select would be dictated by which questions were being asked. ISEMP needs to know what geographic scale and timeline people are interested in evaluating, and whether or not it is important to know if certain project types are effective. John Arterburn pointed out that calendar years may not be the appropriate measure of time because flow event magnitude is often what drives change to a river system and project. Casey pointed out that the temporal scale changes, depending on the geographic scale. Casey asked if applicability of the results outside the Upper Columbia were necessary in order for ISEMP to stay engaged in the Entiat. Chris said that it was not a pre-requisite for their participation and that the opportunity to learn about restoration effectiveness at the population scale was important. Several people commented on the need for a stepwise understanding of the effectiveness of project types, specifically the type, size, and configuration of instream structures in the lower Entiat. There was also interest in knowing if there were cumulative effects of the combined efforts within the geomorphic reaches. Casey suggested that if there were funding

limitations for monitoring, evaluating the effectiveness of restoring natural processes in the Stillwater reach was probably less important than determining the effectiveness of the instream work in the lower Entiat. That difference was based on the relative certainty that restoring natural processes is “the right thing to do.”

No definitive decisions were made about which statistical design was most appropriate, partially because the answer depends on defining the questions that need to be answered in the Entiat. Casey suggested that it would not be appropriate for the RTT to provide those answers, rather, the larger group including the EHSC needed to work together to define the questions and provide the answers. The group agreed that should happen at the workshop with ISEMP, the RTT, and the EHSC all present. The group thought it was important for the workshop to happen before the EHSC develops their 3-year work plan (February). Casey was unsure if Derek and Julie would be able to facilitate that workshop on that timeline.