

Meeting Notes

7-8 July 2009

Location: Chelan PUD Auditorium, 327 N. Wenatchee Ave., Wenatchee

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

These notes represent Casey Baldwin and Derek VanMarter's attempt to capture the comments, questions, and answers, but are not a comprehensive record of the discussions at the meeting. Comments and questions at the meeting and in these notes do not represent the consensus opinion of the RTT or Tributary Committees. Due to time constraints, the RTT will have limited time to review these notes so that the notes can be circulated to project sponsors soon enough to be useful for final proposal preparation.

July 7th 13:00-17:00; Attendance: Casey Baldwin, Cameron Thomas, Julie Grialou, Gina McCoy, Keith Truscott, Becki Gallaher, Char Shumacher, David Morgan, Russell Langshaw, Keely Murdoch, Joe Kelly, Joe Lange, Joe Miller, Chuck Peven, Tom Kahler, Tracy Hillman, Kate Terrell, Ken Bevis, John Arterburn, Derek VanMarter

1. **Tawks II and Hardy conservation easements** (Julie Grialou, Methow Conservancy). The budget had increased by 5% due to an oversight on administration costs.

Hardy Property

- Can the family further develop motorized trails? → no, it will be restricted to current trails and there will need to be an exemption for Mr. Heath to access his property.
- Does the motorized vehicle exemption disappear when the Heath's pass away or will it continue with Hardy? → It is likely that the motorized access disappears when the Heath's pass away. This will be part of the negotiation with the landowner for the easement.

Tawks Property- why so many redds up in the woods? There is a spring creek there which gets a lot of steelhead spawning.

2. **Lower Libby Creek Acquisition** (Ken Bevis, WDFW)

- It appeared as though there were some plantings on the site? → landowner completed those to improve site value
- Probably not "good" spawning gravel, but there is spawning gravel on the site and the fish use it. Steelhead are known to spawn for several miles upstream.
- We don't really know whether bull trout use this area; there is one documented fish from last year.
- Has the agent said if there is any interest in buying this site right away? Ken was unaware of an active buyer, but this is inexpensive land for the Methow and the seller is motivated.
- If the YN contributes to the purchase they may want to acclimate hatchery coho. It is important to include the kinds of actions and structures that would be allowed so that technical reviewers can evaluate the protection benefits.

- What else would be included in the management plan? Include some specifics of what is gained/lost with the project.
- What category watershed is Libby Creek considered right now in the Biological Strategy? (Category 2)
- You should read the Trib Fund guidelines for funding projects. There is language that excludes the direct funding of hatchery related facilities and operations.

3. **McGloughlin Falls** (Ken Bevis, WDFW)

- If you have upland habitat, the budget should specify which source will go towards the uplands so that salmon recovery dollars are focused in the riparian.
- The current lack of specificity will make it difficult to rank biological benefit of the project. If there are parcels that are not ready to go, leave them out of this proposal.
- Make the focus of the proposal what is being funded this year, if one specific property is not ready to go then this proposal is premature.
- It is good to provide the overall context of the four parcels in this reach and potential benefit of the bigger picture effort.
- Be specific about how much of the proposed property is unconfined floodplain?
- Is there documented spawning in this stretch of the Okanogan? Yes, but not a lot. Although it is a targeted area for expanding summer Chinook spawning.
- Is there much juvenile salmonid presence? Only portions of the reach have been randomly surveyed in the past and no steelhead were detected, most likely due to high temperatures (check with John A.) Should juvenile Chinook steelhead be present, it is expected they would be found in high density pockets associated with thermal refugia.
- Is there any FLIR data on this site? → the data collected is based on surface temperature and the values are lethal to juvenile salmonids at low flow. The methodology is incapable of indentifying sub-surface cool water. No surveys have been completed to date that identify micro sites capable of providing thermal refugia, therefore the possibility of thermal refugia is unknown. USGS has a temp gauge in this area since ~ 2004.
- Looks like there are opportunities for restoration on these sites. A suggestion was made to include options and possibilities for restoration, where needed, in the final proposal.
- Volker does want to maintain an active ranch. It is important to include the basics of the management plan, highlighting what will and will not be allowed to happen in the riparian zone helps the technical reviewers evaluate the potential biological benefits.
- Having landowner commitments will increase the certainty of success when reviewed by the RTT and will be a requirement for the SRFB before the project can proceed.

4. **Driscoll Island** (Ken Bevis, WDFW)

- It will be important to include quantitative details in your final proposal. I.e. – quantities of flow and temperature differentials between the Okanogan and Similkameen.
- Is the structure in the cross channel part of this proposal? Yes, but its size and shape depend on the engineering report that is due out any day.
- WDOE funded the engineering report and will contribute to implementation as well.
- When the engineering design is done and final proposal is in, the land manager needs to be supportive of the preferred alternative.
- If the ford is just to allow WDFW to farm the island for wildlife then these funding sources may not be appropriate unless you are only looking to remove the ford. It would be helpful to identify and justify the benefits of re-installing the ford for salmonids. – Answer... There are some opportunities for cold water refugia and WDFW's commitment to restoring native vegetation. Those should be highlighted and quantified in your final proposal.
- 8-10 years ago CREP funded the restoration of native vegetation, what was implemented from that effort and how does that relate to this effort? Not sure of the status or history. More details, including a timeline, regarding WDFW's commitment to restoring native vegetation communities should be included in the final proposal.
- Can you have both a functioning ford and higher flows in the mainstem?
- Need to clarify the link between the ford and the structure in the cross channel and determine if there is a sequencing issue.
- Could you use the structure to access the Island from the North and eliminate the ford?

Wednesday, July 8th 09:00-16:00 Attendance: Casey Baldwin, Cameron Thomas, Keith Truscott, Becki Gallaher, David Morgan, Russell Langshaw, Keely Murdoch, Joe Kelly, Joe Miller, Chuck Peven, Tracy Hillman, Kate Terrell, Ken Bevis, John Arterburn, Derek VanMarter, Karl Polivka, Nancy Warner, Dale Bambrick, Steve Kolk, Mike Kane, John Soden, Martin Fisher, Joy Juelson, Alan Schmidt, Mickey Flemming, Bob Bugert, Robes Parrish, Aaron Penvose.

5. **Foreman Floodplain Channel** (Alan Schmidt, CCNRD)

- Have you excluded the new idea proposed on the site tour? No, but we have not made any progress on it and do not think it can happen in the short term. We don't want to alter from what the landowner has already agreed to or we risk losing his cooperation. The proposed project would not exclude expansion to a larger project in the future once the landowner is on board.
- If you were to modify the approach, do you have a sense of the effort and extent that would be needed? → probably prohibitive to pursue due to the complexity of a purchase or easement involving the orchard.
- Will the new channel intercept ground water? → We think so, there is standing water out there now.

- At what flow levels will this channel be activated? → the downstream end will be year round backwater and the upstream end should receive flow every year at high water but the exact elevation and cfs have not been determined. This is important information when evaluating potential biological benefit and should be included in the final proposal.
- Is there any post project monitoring intended for the project? Is it part of ISEMP or done individually? → CCNRD will do implementation monitoring and then coordinate with ISEMP for the effectiveness monitoring. We believe that the landowner will be on board for higher intensity monitoring under the ISEMP design.
- Is the LWD structure necessary to activate the sidechannel or is it just an added habitat feature? Probably both, though all the modeling has not been completed to determine the need for it for activating the channel.

6. **Peshastin Creek Channel Reconnection** (CCNRD; presented by Martin Fisher)

- If this is a chronic deficiency for DOT then why don't they fix it? They only get funding for fixing this site during an emergency, and the solution has always been to add more rock. If the project gets some traction under their "Chronic Deficiencies Program" there may be more options for bringing in other funding sources.
- It might be helpful to know how much money DOT has spent on fixing this site during emergencies? We should at least be able to get the figures from the 2009 fix. It was thought to have needed repair 3 times in the last 19 years. Does DOT have a list chronic deficiencies and if so how is Peshastin Creek ranked? It is on the list, but not sure where it ranks.
- How many different property owners and houses are involved in this reconnection? Thought to be about eight, two of the properties appear to be for sale, but figuring that out is part of the outreach portion of the proposal.
- Can you include how many landowners would be involved and some details on whether or not the flows will be split between the channels? The feasibility issues are important for gauging certainty of success. The flow splitting options would be part of the assessment and alternatives report. It is doubtful that splitting the flow during low flow periods would be a preferred alternative.
- The proposal includes a deadline that needs to be met at the end, but the timing seemed inappropriate since the meeting with landowners and the chosen alternative appeared to be on the same day. You may need a lot of time between presenting alternatives to DOT and landowners and choosing an alternative.
- The appropriate fix that would likely solve DOT's emergency maintenance problem will likely have a price tag that would far exceed the cost effective benefits to fish for this short stretch of restoring river processes. The big picture fix is for the road to not be in the floodplain at all. The problems with

the road washing out at this site multiple times are evidence that the road never should have been put there in the first place.

-However, if fish money can help get the alternatives designed and DOT and the landowners engaged then perhaps an alternative can be selected and funding for implementation can mostly come from non-salmon recovery related sources.

7. **Habitat Farming** (Nancy Warner, IRIS).

- This is currently a different proposal as a result of technical feedback on the original pre-proposal.
- It seems like you need to secure easements before installing habitat projects. There could be a good link to an expanded or modified version of CREP, one that works for irrigated agriculture and orchardists.
- Hopefully this will also promote natural connections of the floodplain with the river. → CREP takes into account 35-180' buffers, which would take into account this issue
- Please be clear about the longevity of the agreements. Many different time periods have been mentioned between the proposal, the site tour, and the presentation. Original pre-proposal valued short-term lease (i.e. 10-15 years) for around \$15k/acre. This is not competitive with current conservation easements or acquisition in the Upper Columbia. Will it get more competitive with current CE acquisitions based on this new approach? You should be clear in your final proposal how you will change the economic model in order to make it competitive.
- The final proposal should clearly demonstrate the opportunities and temporal scale for the benefits. Riparian restoration is a really long-term endeavor. 10-15 years does not meet that long-term need.
- Payments could increase over time as landowners stay in the program, consistent with the progression of the riparian plantings and their benefits.
- Describe how this proposal buys time and keeps landowners working their orchard. Might consider this a protection versus further degradation should the farm be sold and developed.

8. **Tyee Ranch Acquisition** (Mickey Flemming, CDLT)

- There are a couple of levees and some other opportunities for restoration. It would be helpful to provide context of potential restoration opportunities on the property and surrounding properties in the final proposal.
- We will probably have to evaluate this as a design proposal. Advise to look at project design and protection criteria and determine whether the appropriate information is in the final proposal.
- What are the risks of development since there is a family trust? The trust currently limits subdivision and sale, but does not necessarily mean further structures won't be developed under the existing trust. The current trust is no guarantee that the property will remain in trust in the future, as a descendant

or descendants could challenge the existing trust in court for a variety of reasons.

- Are you still planning to apply for SRFB \$ only. Yes.

9. **Troy Protection** (Mickey Flemming, CDLT)

- How did the title transfer from the timber company to private ownership? *An answer was provided, but this question was not relevant to the merits of the proposal or the site.*
- The upland areas have little to no bearing on fish or floodplain function. It appears only one building site is possible above the road and severely limited by the steep rocky slope. Could you split the property into two parcels? The land owners are not interested in that option. Have you considered selling the property across the road separately then using the proceeds for restoration on this or other sites? That could be possible.
- How many home sites are on this property? The area is zoned for 20 acres parcels. Realistically, there are probably 2 sites, one above the road and maybe one below the road.
- An appraisal has not been conducted and the price will adjust based on the appraisal.
- If the CDLT retains the title then will there be public access? Yes.
- They are asking 85% from Trib Fund and 15% from SRFB. Bob Bugert clarified that they would be glad to adjust those percentages if some other combination made more sense.

10. **ENFH Habitat Enhancement** (Robes Parrish, USFWS)

- Robes clarified that CCD is the official project sponsor and USFWS is a “primary partner”.
- Cherry stem roads and wells will not need much maintenance, right? Will they require much maintenance?
- The floodplain would be more functional without the existing road prisms and the culverts are likely to fail during floods. Why do you need to access the wells during a flood? If you do need to access the wells during a small flood a rock ford might be adequate. During larger floods perhaps you could access them with a skiff. There may be some pipes in the road prism that would make the ford option more difficult, Robes agreed to look into it as an option for the final proposal.
- This project will encourage floodplain activation, rather than develop it.
- Is most of the infrastructure above a normal 10 year flood event? Yes, only the 1948 flood reached the hatchery buildings.
- Is there any channel excavation in the floodplain? No, it is just breach the dike and let it go.
- Are the LWD structures necessary for encouraging activation of the floodplain? We think so, but all the modeling is not yet completed.

11. CMZ6, Monitor flats sidechannel (Mike Kane, CCNRD)

- The large project on the opposite side of the highway would do more for restoring processes to this reach? Yes, but this smaller project is feasible now and the larger one is not due to DOT and landowners. The current proposal would not preclude the larger option at a later date if it became feasible.
- Why couldn't you go further up stream than where you are currently proposing? Some expansion would be possible but would require taking out more mature riparian vegetation. Also, we would not want to go up to where the depositional area would affect the upstream end.
- Given the energy of the river at this location there are concerns about flooding, erosion, and other unintended consequences at this site and on the other side.
- At what flow level will it be activated? Year round backwater at the downstream end and 3-4 thousand cfs at the upstream end.
- How much riparian vegetation would need to be removed? Although it appears thick, we think it will only be about 6 large (12-15" dbh) cottonwoods and they will be used for wood features on-site.

12. White River Tall Timbers Easement (Mickey Flemming, CDLT)

- Can you explain the significant difference in price per acre between this and the Nason View CE? The Nason View property value was reduced by the amount that the landowners had received for a FPA compensation for not logging it. Also, an appraisal has not been completed for Tall Timbers so it might come in lower.
- Is there an opportunity to split the two parcels since the Napeequa has limited use by listed species? Could you perhaps split the project and target the PRCC NNI fund since they have a strong interest in sockeye? The source of the funds is entirely negotiable and they will consider other configurations that make sense. Casey noted that the sponsor should work with the Tributary Committees, the PRCC Habitat Committee, the LE coordinators, and Derek VanMarter to work out that funding coordination issue, rather than the RTT.
- Who owns the property between Tall Timbers and Nason View? → Various owners, the valley bottom is all private property.
- What activities would be allowed with the easement? The USFS plans to do maintenance on the engineered log jam. Some firewood removal and non motorized recreational trails. *(note: on the site tour the sponsor also indicated that access for fish and habitat monitoring would also be a requirement)*

13. White River Nason View Acquisition (Mickey Flemming, CDLT)

- What is the long term stewardship? The CDLT generally asks the landowner for a donation to help cover long term monitoring and stewardship.

14. Nason Ck Lower White Pine Floodplain Reconnection Assessment (John Soden, J&S presenting for CCNRD)

- Is there a direct link between this project and the previously funded project to work with the railroad? No, it is indirect. This is the next step of developing something tangible for a specific location.
- Why doesn't the BOR do the assessment and alternatives report and 30% design, and then the proposal turns into just the outreach project that helps to move the project forward? That might be possible.
- Why only 30% design? Because they need enough detail to approach the railroad and landowners with, but not too much that they have invested in an unfeasible alternative design.
- Why do you need an assessment if you have the Reach Assessment and you know what the problem is? Scale and site specific details (culverts versus bridges), landowner issues, split flow, the existing channel.
- Why not just do a NEPA? We need something tangible to work with the railroad before going that far.
- Do you need to know if the landowners are agreeable to it since it will affect how the river interacts with their property? Yes, that is the outreach part of the project and the reason we need some alternatives to present to them.

15. Nason Upper White Pine Floodplain Reconnection (Mike Kane; CCNRD)

- When will the cross-sectional evaluations be available?
- One suggestion on the site tour was to use the fill from the breach to reinforce the poles. A suggestion was made to include that option in the proposal with some wiggle room for other options based on negotiations with the PUD.
- Will there be LIDAR confirmation? That would help with determining what needs done with the power poles.

16. Lower Wenatchee Instream Flow (Aaron Penvose, WRC)

- They did not get economic stimulus funding but the project has changed since the City of Wenatchee appears interested in taking over the Southern portion. That will reduce the cost and the need to cross the Wenatchee River.
-those changes will need to be detailed in the final proposal

Other:

Chuck mentioned that he had completed a write-up of the data gaps analysis that the MaDMC completed a couple of years ago. The MaDMC now needs to review it and then eventually it will go to the RTT for further review.

An additional agenda item included a discussion with the honorable Ken MacDonald. He described a process that CBFWA was now in charge of implementing that intended to line out a monitoring inventory and gaps assessment for the entire Columbia Basin. The assessment would focus on monitoring in 3 general categories; VSP, habitat effectiveness, and hatchery effectiveness. The upcoming step in the process that the RTT should be aware of are the “sub-regional workshops”. These workshops will be held in each area and will bring together local monitoring practitioners to verify summarized information in each of the 3 categories. Julie Morgan will be helping to organize the UC workshop that will be facilitated by either Ken MacDonald or Bruce Crawford. However, look for direction and guidance from your respective CBFWA representative (if applicable) since that is Ken’s primary focus for planning and distribution. Ken did agree to expand his direct distribution list to include people identified by local recovery boards, where applicable. Julie Morgan had already generated a first draft list of people who she thought needed to be there. Next steps: wait to hear from Ken/Julie via e-mail or doodle appointment as they try to find a date that works for most people.