

Meeting Notes 10 March 2010

Location: CPUD Auditorium, 327 Wenatchee Ave.

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

9:00- Executive session: notes are separate.

10:00 Review and adopt the agenda, introductions. Paul L. asked for one additional agenda item under the updates.

RTT Members Present: Casey Baldwin, Kate Terrell, Chuck Peven, John Arterburn, Tom Kahler, Steve Hays, Karl Polivka, Tracy Hillman, Michelle McClure (via phone).

Others present: James White, Charity Davidson, Mike Ward (via phone), Steve Kolk, Paul LaRiviere, Chris Clemons, Jason Breidert, John Soden, Joy Juelson, Mike Kane.

UCRTT Analysis Workshop Results / Synthesis Paper (Mike Ward, RTT)(2hrs)

Process / timeline etc.

- Mike provided an update on the status of the synthesis document. Only a couple of people provided feedback after the last meeting, which he combined with what he heard over the phone at the 16 Feb meeting. He went beyond incorporating new comments and pushed forward into formulating recommendations. A number of potential recommendations are drafted in the tables.
- Mike said he is still on track for a client copy of the document at end of March. In the document most of the presentations will be summarized and the tables in a different format once we decide that the table format is no longer useful.
- Mike asked how best to get feedback? He was hoping for more direct feedback from members of the group after the Feb RTT meeting. Maybe we need to consider a different approach? There are lots of opportunities for people to participate along the way, and maybe it would be more effective for the RTT to wait for the more polished document-- if so, Mike needs to plan for time to deal with a slug of comments later.
 - Casey- that approach will require people to review a much longer document, our current strategy was to chip away at it a little each month.
 - Casey – we have set up the two hour blocks during RTT meetings with the assumption that people will spend an hour or two at their desks in between.
 - Chuck – I just don't have time to look at the document now. Realistically won't have time to look at the document in the timeframe that you need comments.

- Kate – I have faith in Mike’s work. I have skimmed through and will read a draft, but no comments means think going ok.
 - John – I also skimmed through and saw nothing glaring so I did not spend any time on it.
 - Mike – That is good to know, it would be great if you could let us know you’ve done that so we are capturing the general agreement.
- Casey – so a core group might identify key points that might be controversial that need to be discussed by the group. We need to get as much out of the RTT during meetings. People are too busy with other stuff in between.
- Tracy – it might be helpful to set up some time during the meeting to go through the document section by section, page by page, so we don’t end up with a take-home assignment. Might be best to just go together as a group.
- John – Would help to have a line drawn in the sand for time and content: this is the draft that needs an in-depth review – would be willing to fit in that review when he knew it really mattered.
- Karl – it would be helpful to have the summaries in to make the connection with what is in the tables. The current format is difficult to follow and comment on. Others agreed.
- Mike – the next version you get will be more complete, and can include a printed hardcopy. Might be the first real draft as a focus for review. The final version that will come in August will also be something that you will want to look at. Ok with the suggestion to work on in meeting. Would need to plan more than a couple of hours to do.
- Casey – I have heard a couple of people say they need more information in along with the tables.
- Kate – also as summaries are added in, will be more to add into the discussion.
- Mike: review should get easier over time even though there will be more and more information because the summaries will be tighter and tighter. By the time are done with this, if agree with what is in the global summary and the chapter summaries, will be in a good place.
- Steve Hays asked what his role should be since he did not attend the workshop.
 - Mike said he thought a fresh set of eyes and perspective would be good.
 - Casey – This is an RTT product, and will benefit from comments of all, even those who weren’t at the workshop.
- Will suggest a tweak to the schedule to have main work session in May or June. All day may be needed to grind through the bigger document.
- Mike- it is in a dull white paper format today, but will eventually have a colorful layout.
- Recommendations and Findings – global summary – check back on the adaptive management workshop – Workshop was just one tool. Didn’t get everyone at the workshops, and more information coming in – Talked about the recommendations and findings at the last meeting. Made those changes, which were not major.
- ESU and Population Status – still in tabular format, tracking by key management question. Could see that as not the easiest way to read this. May organize this information differently before next time.

- Tracy – why the format with Recommendations in front of the science summary? Typically the science would be reported first and then the summary.
 - Mike: That was a deliberate attempt to put the outcomes first, to be more effective for audiences that do not want to wade through the science to get an answer.
- Kate – understood that the document was for the science folks – and a more condensed document would go out to public. I would not want to have to jump around the document to get the science if it is broken up or buried in the appendix just to meet a formatting or appearance limitation of 2 page spreads.
 - Mike –I believe that this is the document that will go out to everyone – may need to be a double check of expectations.
 - Casey – Need to check with Julie and the Board. There may be confusion between the development of the document and RTT expectations. Will work with Mike and Julie on formatting and two product questions.
 - Mike –whatever way we go is largely formatting and that is not a problem.

Casey made sure there were not more process or format questions and then moved the group into a discussion on the content of what Mike had prepared.

Mike started with a detailed look at a specific science summary – starting with the Habitat Effectiveness Session and the Polivka presentation.

- Casey – At a recent Entiat Habitat Sub-committee meeting, Karl gave this presentation. Someone then asked Casey if the RTT would be recommending more of these structures, as an outcome of the RTTAW. So Casey wanted to have a directed conversation about what Karl's research means in terms of future implementation in the lower Entiat so that the RTT could give clear guidance to that WAT.
- Kate suggested that one year of data for a handful of structures is not robust enough for broad scale implementation.
- Karl – True, but it was intense one year of data.
- Tracy— suggested that he knows RTT member (not at the meeting) who would argue that putting structures into streams may have short term benefits, but it is still a band-aid approach, and we should fix the processes that are causing the problems.
- Chuck- yes, but it's been broadly acknowledged that there is little more you can do in the lower Entiat to restore processes.
- John – a question to be asked is what you get from enhancing the Lower Entiat rather than working in the upper Entiat and tribs...
- Someone pointed out that the IMW does have them working on the higher priorities in the Stillwater reach first, but they will need to know what to do when they get back to the lower Entiat in 2014.
- Casey – We talked about the Lower Entiat in the Biological Strategy. We said that because it is a small simple system that instream work will need to be done in the Lower Entiat because there just aren't enough other options. I think we may

- want to accomplish two things in the deliberations section for the paper: 1) comment on Polivka study and what it means for implementation. This would include appropriate siting and scaling and some good suggestions we have heard regarding these smaller wood structures in the past (i.e. don't rip out a bunch of riparian trees just to embed a couple of logs in the bank). Use them where the riparian is already trashed or as an add-on feature when you are already in the river doing one of the higher priority actions such as channel spanning pools. 2) Put these structures in context with the bigger picture approach in the lower Entiat
- John – Why are they concentrating on creating large pools in the Lower Entiat?
 - Kate - Long migration and not a lot of resting and feeding.
 - John – haven't they already installed some structures to provide those pools?
 - Kate – The initial test structures were inappropriately sited – they were demo projects that were put in where they had landowner acceptance and it was visible to public.
 - Casey- the USBR has learned a lot about placement and has some guidelines that appear pretty good for increasing the longevity of the channel spanning rock structures.
 - Karl – larger pools may attract predators – I think it is important to have some smaller pools as compliments for juvenile attraction.
 - Casey - so a combination of structure types provides diversity and meets multiple biological objectives such as prespawn holding pools, edge habitat, juvenile rearing cover, etc.
 - Karl – hard to compare structure types (log and rock), which makes it difficult to look at growth data.

The group took a break and Casey put together a draft of some potential recommendations:

- It is encouraging that these smaller wood structures appear to benefit juvenile fish but the studies have some sample size and duration limitations. We recommend continuing with the studies to increase sample size and evaluate the effectiveness over multiple years and seasons.^[U1]
- When properly sited and in combination with larger channel spanning pools, these structure types may be part of an intermediate-term enhancement strategy for the lower Entiat.

There was general consensus in the group of these written recommendations.

Other thoughts captured on the flip charts included:

- Longevity- the duration that these structures will remain in place is unknown, but they will not last forever and the current approach in the lower Entiat will require continued application of the structures as they break down or fail.
- How many large pools are needed in the lower Entiat?
- More cover in the large pools adds to diversity.

Next we moved into one of the potential recommendations under the Habitat Status and Trend section.

Michelle recommended that we emphasize measuring smolts (or other juvenile survivorship) and link that to habitat conditions or changes in status and trend. The group agreed that was a good recommendation.

We also need to offer general support of the overall monitoring effort and highlight its importance to our ability to conduct adaptive management.

Casey had offered some candid feedback in between meetings to Mike to re-emphasize a point made during the AW and Mike had turned that into a formal recommendation (pg 8 of printable version). The recommendation was that the RTT and ISEMP needed to work together to link up the data coming out of S&T monitoring with the key management questions (KMQ).

Casey pointed out that Chris Jordan had proposed a whole different set of questions, but those questions were really about the indicators and how to tell if the indicator would really work to answer a KMQ.

Mike – For many actions there is an implied sponsor. Instead of suggestion, as currently written, for ISEMP to do x or y, recommendation for RTT to work with ISEMP to accomplish x or y.

- Chuck – what would the end product be – a condensed version of answers from monitoring to the policy folks. Who would use it? Ultimately wouldn't it be the Board and NOAA?
- Chris Jordan slide was all about data and how you collect them. Key Management Questions were asking about the results of those data. Middle ground between the questions and the raw data – Jordan question about which metrics are useful.
- Chuck – so possible reframe appendix P?
- Want to be making sure that collecting information in such a way that when NMFS do 5 year review can determine if we are on a path towards recovery or not.
- Other questions were raised regarding the feasibility of bringing the groups together, under what jurisdiction, guidance, and process?
 - Is the RTT leading that process or are we just a part of it?
 - Do we wait for the Board to ask or just tell them this is what needs done and we are going to ask ISEMP to work with us? Casey suggested that we

do not ask them to ask us, but that we let them know it is an important step and tell them we plan to pursue it and ask them if they have any concerns or reservations. Maybe Board staff would facilitate it? NOAA would need to understand and contribute if the outcome is going to change the Recovery Plan.

- One outcome could be that certain KMQ would need to be dropped, added, or modified. That is where we would hand off the science and management justification to the Board and NOAA and let them decide to adopt or reject the changes

Review Synthesis Paper schedule, set up communication, next steps.

- Mike: Based on earlier discussion we need to block out a big chunk of time for review in May or June. Mike was not sure he would be back by May 12 but Casey indicated that a second meeting in late May would not be feasible. The June RTT meeting is June 9, but we will be starting in on our project review (pre-proposals are due to the RTT on June 4). Casey and Mike will work with Julie to determine what needs to happen.
- Casey – not asking folks to comment on any more than we have now. Will save comments for bigger version.
- Mike – don't want to discourage anyone from sending comments.

Entiat “target solicitation” for BPA programmatic funding.

Casey introduced the topic and started by pointing out that the process for targeted solicitation under the BPA programmatic is not finalized. Even so, the Entiat implementers were at a point where they wanted RTT feedback. Casey and Derek worked with Cascadia and USBR to set up this presentation and feedback session. Casey emphasized that the objectives were to 1) inform the RTT of the progress and current situation with implementation in the Stillwater reach and 2) for the RTT to provide unofficial feedback to Cascadia and USBR on the current concepts, project ideas, and progress to date. Casey emphasized that the feedback would be informal and comments from individual RTT members should be taken as such.

Heather Java gave a presentation that emphasized the IMW approach, history of assessments in the Entiat, landowner interactions in the Tyee Ranch portion of the reach, and initial concepts for project ideas.

Discussion points and feedback:

- Paul L. asked if there were water rights associated with the property. CCD did not think there were any surface diversions but that they had a well that was far from the river. Livestock are currently allowed to access the river but fencing exclusions from the riparian would be part of the restoration strategy, perhaps in coordination with NRCS. Karl suggested that monitoring the water withdrawals would be informative.
- Kate – landowner comments about wanting meadow to be protected – how much of the meadow, and how far would they allow the levee to be pushed back?

- Still trying to design something that will work. The USBR is considering several options. It will probably be a combination of options at different points along the line.
 - Protected means the river doesn't move into the meadow – but they have no problem with inundation during high flows. There is no intention of restricting flood flows into the meadow.
 - Chuck – What are you hoping to get from the RTT?
 - Heather—We want your input on the restoration alternatives. We don't want project turned down or changed drastically later after having invested money in designs. We also want feedback on ways to improve the project.
- Chuck- It appears that you are trying to restore processes, which is something that typically scores high when we evaluate proposals.
- Heather: In upper levee, there are a number of different ways to address it – total removal is the most expensive, selective breaching less so but what are the biological benefit tradeoffs?
- Tracy – would both options provide permanent flow?
 - Downstream breach would provide permanent inundation (backwater) but only seasonal flushing from upstream end during high flow.
- **Upper Levee**
 - Casey – costs aside, is it better to remove the entire levee or would they get similar benefits from selective breaching?
 - Chuck or Kate – taking the whole thing out would be best.
 - Arterburn – breach the dike in at least two places (upper and lower ends), and connect bottom to alleviate potential fish stranding. This may be more cost effective and accomplish most of the biological benefit.
 - Kate – would it make sense to use the fill from the levee to protect the meadow?
 - Kolk – unknown makeup of the levees – may contain some of the materials that need, but mostly alluvium – if we took and tried to make a migration barrier with it, just wouldn't work and we don't want an above ground structure that prohibits floodwater from accessing the meadow.
 - Tracy – maintaining connection at all seasons has higher biological benefit so it is not just a high water refuge. More edge habitat and diversity of habitat types.
- **Lower Levee**
 - Kate – a floodplain fence is being installed near Ellensburg in Upper Yakima – should watch this project because these haven't been put in on East side.
 - Casey – I assume that we would have a similar recommendation as the upper levee, which is that full removal is the most beneficial option.

Earlier you mentioned only breaching it at the downstream end, why the different approach here?

- Heather-there is risk to the downstream landowners if we remove this levee. It is important to the Tyee landowners that they do not do anything to harm or jeopardize their downstream neighbors.
- Kate-Have you talked with the downstream landowners about buying them out or an easement that would allow the river to move where it needs to?
- Heather-the downstream landowner was not interested in working with us in the past and has been dealing with the county on some legal issues. Maybe it is time to approach them again.
- Casey-a recommendation that the RTT has made in the past in similar situations is to not preclude being able to do the number one option in the future if landowners change, etc.

○ **River Right Reconnection**

- Casey – what kind of actions are you thinking about here? How frequently is this sidechannel getting activated?
 - Kolk – side-channel working now as natural as anything else in this reach, activated at about 2 yr flow event. We could increase the frequency of connection at the upstream end.
 - Soden- there are also options for increasing connectivity at the downstream end, should get to groundwater pretty easily and could excavate a channel.
 - Heather- the landowners offered this up right off the bat and they would feel good about something happening over there.
- RTT feedback-
 - If it is functioning properly and naturally then doing actions here just because you can may not be the right thing.
 - If you excavate at the upstream end it will likely not last or require too much engineering.
 - How would you access this site? Permitting might be a problem due to access through this spawning reach.
 - Would the downstream end enhancement allow it to flow? If so, a cool groundwater channel and lots of shading and wood would likely benefit juvenile rearing.

○ **LWD**

- Heather- we want to use wood to “kick start” the reach. It has been assessed and determined to need more wood. Past practices have reduced wood recruitment so we want to add wood to increase function until the riparian areas upstream can recover and start recruiting wood again. We want it to provide habitat (cover) and to contribute to channel processes.
- Whether LWD or ELJ depends on goals of the site looking for channel response

- Karl- more ELJs like the ones I have been studying in the lower river would offer a nice opportunity to expand the spatial component of my study and give us a better understanding of the effectiveness of the structures.
- Someone-You may want to use similar types of structures and strategies as the YN is doing up in 3D so that there is a consistent approach.
- John-It appears that your potential locations are on outside bends and may artificially reduce channel migration.
- That was not our intent; many of those locations (outer bends) have deep pools with no cover.

Casey-Whatever your prescription, be sure that goals and objectives are defined. It is important to know why wood is being added in each location in order to evaluate its biological benefit and certainty of success.

- Steve or Heather- we are still very early in the LWD planning and design and debating even discussing it here because of that. We certainly intend to have clear design goals and objectives when we get further along.

Next steps: A site visit next month to see the property. At the RTT meeting (April 14) we could see an update on the progress with the alternatives and then go visit the site. We will probably need a couple of hours to see it all. Mike Rickel offered to try to obtain the fire station or the Grange in Entiat for the RTT meeting. Casey suggested that we could cover other topics in the morning and then go out in the field in the afternoon. The group agreed. Casey thought that it would be important for the Entiat group to get the notes ASAP from today's meeting. Casey asked the RTT if he could release the draft notes to the Entiat folks so that they could see what had been captured in the notes and use it to prepare for the April meeting. The RTT supported the early release of the draft notes as long as it was understood that the notes might change upon later review.

Updates: 1) UCSRB: Casey mentioned that Derek and some Board members were in Washington D.C. meeting with politicians, staffers, and federal agencies to inform them about the salmon recovery efforts in the UC. James mentioned that the ISRP narrative for the BPA programmatic habitat project had been submitted and was being reviewed.

2) draft timeline for SRFB/Trib: Casey projected a draft regional timeline and handed out a spreadsheet with 2 alternative timelines for RTT interaction, deadlines, and meetings. He said the whole thing had been moved up a week again this year and we have to work backwards from August 25th. The SRFB is making things tighter for us and without starting sooner we are having to do everything in a shorter timeframe. A quorum was not present so no attempt was made to make a decision on which dates to choose. Kate mentioned that she liked the alternative that used our original meeting dates (July 14 and Aug 11) because that gives the RTT more time to review and score projects. Casey mentioned that if we don't move the July meeting (pre-proposal workshop) to July 7th then there would be too little time for

project sponsors to incorporate feedback. Maybe a hybrid where we move the July meeting to the 7th but leave August where it is (11th). Joy pointed out that by not moving the August meeting to an earlier date we are really making it difficult for the citizens committees to meet within this timeline. Casey asked the group to consider the possibility of moving the August RTT meeting to the 4th, 9th or 10th. Casey said he would work with Derek upon his return and get feedback from the RTT via doodle poll for potential meeting date changes.

3) MaDMC: James said that there are several important items that the MaDMC needs to discuss. A meeting is needed and he has been unable to get a hold of Keely. Given Keely's busy schedule there was concern that she was able to put the time in as Chair of the MaDMC. Casey offered to talk to Keely about that and see if she still wants to chair the MaDMC.

4) Community salmon fund tech review and timeline: Derek had successfully negotiated the CSF process that included getting it done before the end of May (which was a preferred alternative for both the RTT and some project sponsors). Brian F. had responded with a timeline that included proposals due April 12, available for technical review about April 19, with a follow up technical review meeting and final scoring the week of May 3 (3rd or 5th were the days preferred by the CSF folks, but we need to find a day that works for us too). Casey asked for volunteers to form a workgroup and review the projects.

- o Workgroup Volunteers
 - Kate (both days fine)
 - Casey
 - Joe Kelly (?)(Casey offered to follow up with him since he did it last year)
 - John Arterburn (right now both days open, would prefer 5th because not a Monday)
 - Karl (5th won't work, 3rd would)

Casey will follow up with the workgroup, set a day, and people should look for a packet of info sometime around April 19th.

5) MVID West Amendment: Casey said he was waiting on a re-draft of the write-up that Chris had submitted to the RTT before our Feb meeting. This re-draft was supposed to address the NMI requests. At that point, we can look at what they have provided and determine if we agree that the amendment has technical merit.

6) Other (5 min)

- Paul La Riviere gave an update about the State's drought declaration situation and some possible activities if a drought were declared. There is a water supply advisory group, who advises the governor based on conditions that have been forecasted in various regions of the state. Some areas are okay (Olympic Pen. ~100%), others are real bad (Central Puget Sound <50%), and the Upper Columbia is in the middle (79% of normal). If a drought is declared then funds could become available to help with fish projects. Could be a drought declared

based on hardship due to the fisheries. If a drought is called because of fish, might be opportunities to help out. For example, could pay for water to stay instream rather than irrigation on a one-time basis. More news will come out March 18 or 19.

- Casey – who and how are projects funded or formed?
 - Money comes from legislature and goes to Ecology. Ecology will contract with WDFW. Don't know how other entities tap into these funds. But first, drought has not been declared, and second, legislature has not authorized funds.

Casey- thanks for that update, we have not been up to speed on that in the past and it is good to know about those options. Please keep us posted as it develops.

Update from CCNRD on the RR in Nason Creek: Mike Kane gave a presentation on the current situation with project planning for two potential projects in Nason Creek, both large channel reconnection in the Lower Whitepine Reach. These were high priority action identified in the USBR reach assessment and are consistent with high priority actions identified by the RTT. They have formed a design team and begun the alternative identification process. They want to have selected alternative by May, 30% engineering designs by July, and hope for construction starting July 2011. The RR has told them that there is a construction window in 2011 and then it would be impossible for 4-5 years after that.

Kate – understand that railroad has created this constrained timeframe, but need to make sure that biological benefits are going to be there and need to be able to wait if needed. Casey supported that notion and discussed the continuum of potential benefits from the highest (large bridges) to the lowest (small culverts). At some point in between the feasible alternative might not be enough biological benefit and it would be better to wait until a bigger project could be feasible.

Today they are wanting direction on how to interface with the RTT. Casey suggested that bringing alternatives to the RTT as part of “step 1” of the targeted solicitation process would be an option. Mike plans to come with list of alternatives next month. He will need to work with Derek and Casey on the process, timeline, and content. Casey thought that Derek would be in charge of the process end of the interaction and how it may fit into the potential future programmatic project with BPA. Casey thought there would be time for an update and feedback session on their alternatives at the April 14th RTT meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 15:15.