

## Meeting Notes 10 June 2009

**Location:** Douglas Co Land and Transportation Services Bld., 140 19<sup>th</sup> St., East Wenatchee

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

---

**Attendance:** Casey Baldwin, Tom Kahler, Karl Polivka, Chuck Peven, Tracy Hillman (via phone), Cameron Thomas, John Arterburn, Russell Langshaw, Michelle McClure, James White, Pamela Nelle, Derek Van Marter, Julie Grialou, Mike Kane, Bob Bugert, Steve Kolk, Mike Rickel, Chris Jordan (phone), Lee Carlson.

**SRFB / Trib Fund process / pre-proposal update:** Casey gave an update which included:

- Pre-proposals are on the ftp site (via Becky Galaher e-mail) and RTT reviewers should download and read those prior to the site visits.
- Project tours are coming up on June 22-25. Casey documented who planned to attend each day, but needs to get a more complete tally from the whole RTT.
- Casey said the RTT will need to do the pre-proposal workshop on the afternoon of July 7<sup>th</sup> and all day July 8<sup>th</sup> to accommodate all 19 proposals.

**Review and finalize project rating criteria for 2009:** Casey handed out copies of the draft changes to the project rating criteria. There was a long discussion about the proposed scoring criteria related to the inclusion of cost effectiveness criteria. Several modifications and alterations were considered and explored. The group agreed that the two questions we had in the 2008 version were already adequate for determining if a projects budget was appropriate for what was being proposed. For cost effectiveness, several formulas were explored to allow individual reviewers to generate a personal score; however, the group determined that cost effectiveness was really determined by the biological benefit score and the total cost estimate of the proposal, which would be very simple to display in tabular form along with the RTT's ranked list. Therefore, the RTT will not try to include specific points for cost effectiveness in 2009 but will include the BB/cost calculation in the summary table and focus efforts in the comments where needed. Additional provisions might be explored to adjust the range of costs to reflect the range of biological benefit scores. This will provide another perspective on very expensive but high biological benefit proposals since the biological benefit score has a cap (100 points) and the cost does not.

A few other minor edits were offered in the other sections. Casey will incorporate the changes, finalize the document, and have Barb post it to the website by late next week.

**Entiat ISEMP: memo, discussion items, next steps:** Casey described the background for the discussion including where the group left off at its last meeting. Since then, Casey had drafted, circulated for approval, and released a memo to ISEMP stating the RTT's support of ISEMP's desire to move away from opportunistic and into a stepwise hierarchical experimental design. Casey explained that the RTT support had also included a desire by the RTT to continue to work with ISEMP on technical aspects of the study design as it developed. Casey handed out a list of questions and statements gathered from individual RTT members regarding the monitoring plan in the Entiat. Casey thought one of the next steps was to formalize the list and get it to ISEMP and others so that they can incorporate it into their planning and implementation. One of the recent hot topics was regarding the starting location and timing for the accelerated

implementation of actions. In May, the ISEMP presentation included a plan to start in the lower Entiat in 2011, then implement in the Stillwater reach in 2014. At the expert panel meeting in early June there was discussion about flipping the timing of implementation in those 2 areas. Casey pointed out that starting in the upstream location would be consistent with previous RTT guidance on priority reaches and actions, but that some RTT members thought the trade-off of delaying actions in the Middle Entiat might be worthwhile if it substantially increased the experiment's likelihood of success.

Casey asked Chris Jordan to comment on how that change would affect the statistical rigor of the experiment. Chris said that no data existed that would help sort out the potential for upstream actions to affect downstream treatments. However, it was his opinion that the overriding factor for a successful effectiveness monitoring experiment in the Entiat was that implementers stick to the spatial and temporal aspects of the design, once one was selected. Where they start will be much less important than how they implement and if they stick to the design. After some discussion, it was determined that the implementers need to figure out which reach they can do the best job in.

Mike Rickel pointed out that a group of Entiat implementers will be meeting on June 22 to do that and invited the RTT to be a participant in that meeting and others like it in the future. Casey said the 22<sup>nd</sup> would generally not be a good date for the RTT since the group will be on project tours<sup>1</sup>, but did want the RTT to be on the distribution list for those meetings in the future. Next steps include the implementers deciding which reach they can most effectively implement projects in during the timeframe laid out by ISEMP. Pamela asked that the RTT list of questions / technical input be released to ISEMP so that they could start to incorporate that in their planning. The RTT agreed to provide that list to ISEMP as a discussion draft, but that it would only represent individual opinions of RTT members. Cameron suggested that an official version of the list should include potential solutions, rather than just stating questions and concerns. It was unclear whether further refinements or an official RTT version of the list of questions/technical input would be needed. Casey and Pamela will work together to determine the utility of the current version and the need, format, and timeline for an official version.

**Review and finalize memo to UCSRB regarding RTT project review in closed session:** As directed by the RTT at the 13 May 2009 meeting, Casey had prepared a memo to the UCSRB explaining the need and justification for the RTT to review SRFB / Tributary Fund proposals in a "closed session". Although the meeting would be closed to project sponsors, the RTT would invite the appropriate State Review panel representatives as well as Derek Van Marter, who would serve as a liaison to the Board and the Lead Entity Coordinators.

Casey had received and incorporated input from several RTT members before the meeting. The group was supportive of the draft memo Casey had prepared, but wanted a few days to be able to provide wordsmith comments. Casey will circulate an electronic version and set a due date for comments. Casey said he had talked with Ron Walter about the RTT's plans to review projects in closed session and that Ron wanted the UCSRB to discuss it at its June 25<sup>th</sup> meeting. Casey will be presenting the memo and justification to the UCSRB at that meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00.

---

<sup>1</sup> After the meeting Karl Polivka volunteered to skip the project tour on the 22<sup>nd</sup> and attend the meeting in the Entiat.