

## UPPER COLUMBIA REGIONAL TECHNICAL TEAM MEETING NOTES FOR 11 April 2007

RTT Members Present: Baldwin, Hillman, Peven, Carlson, Kelly, Murdoch, Terrell,  
Ward and Bugert

Others Present: Pamela Nelle (Terraqua), Carolyn Pearson (ECOaim), and  
Derek Van Marter (UCSRB)

---

### 1. Review and adopt proposed agenda

The group reviewed the proposed agenda, and added to it an update on the ISEMP project (Ward and Nelle) and the BiOp process (Hillman).

### 2. RTT Chair

In coordination with the RTT and the Chair of the UCSRB, Casey Baldwin was approved as the new chair of the RTT.

### 3. Update on ISEMP Activities

Mike Ward first provided a personal update. He is planning a two-year sabbatical that will begin July 1, 2007. This means he will have to go into the “inactive” list of the RTT, and the Monitoring Committee, until his return.

The group agreed that Keely Murdoch will assume duties as the new Monitoring Committee chair and this will be formalized at the next Committee meeting after Keely is better informed of the chair’s scope-of-work. Casey Baldwin will be added as a committee member, and Rick Woodsmith will also be added at his request. Pamela Nelle (Terraqua, Inc.) will also be added as a non-RTT member to the committee.

As far as ISEMP is concerned, Terraqua will maintain its contract with BPA and will continue to perform ISEMP related tasks using other employees. Pamela Nelle will take over running the ISEMP project; Jeremy Moberg will continue leading habitat work in the Entiat, etc.

Meanwhile, monitoring work continues for the ISEMP project. Mike provided an update on implementing PIT tag arrays in the Entiat and in the Peshastin. ISEMP is working closely with the Entiat Watershed Planning Unit to develop a feasibility plan for accelerated implementation of their project schedule. ISEMP may also become a bigger player for monitoring in the BiOp schedule of implementation, although details are unclear at this time.

### 4. Update on BiOp Remand Process

Tracy Hillman provided an update on the BiOp remand process. The action agencies are looking to update the implementation schedule from 2010-2017. To date, the focus has been on identifying ways to measure habitat change in the short-term, and now they want to focus on the long-term. The action agencies requested the RTT’s (or regional biologists) help on identifying the potential habitat change from the estimated long-term actions. After some discussion, the group decided that the task and the timeline were unrealistic. The RTT as a formal group would not be willing or able to provide that service to the BiOp remand process. None of the RTT present was interested in participating as a non-RTT local biologist either.

Tracy is going to report back to the action agencies that giving the RTT a couple of weeks to review the list of long-term actions is impractical. He will say that the RTT respectively declines the request for help. Additionally, the RTT suggests implementing a performance standard more closely aligned with adaptive management, which is how the regional recovery plan is organized.

#### 5. Update on Data Steward Position

Derek Van Marter provided a brief update on the status of the data steward position. The UCSRB supported the idea of pursuing the position during its meeting last month. They requested a paper describing the possible funding sources and a scope of work for the position.

Bob Bugert suggested a letter be drafted to each of the possible funding sources describing the need, and indicated that a similar letter had been drafted by the RTT a few years back but it was never sent. The description of the funding sources, the revised scope of work and a draft letter to the potential funding sources could be presented to the UCSRB at its May meeting.

The group agreed that the Monitoring Subcommittee would meet May 2, The current time/location, which is subject to change, is Port of Chelan offices, 125 Easy Street, Wenatchee, from 10:00 until 4:00.

#### 6. 2007 SRFB Review Process

Bob Bugert suggested that the RTT identify members to work on the regional SRFB process for the 8<sup>th</sup> round. He suggested creating a project review committee. Several RTT members at the meeting committed to being available for the process. Casey will follow-up with those members that were not present at the meeting to seek their assistance in technical review of projects for the upcoming SRFB/Trib Fund process.

Casey said that a small group of RTT members will go to the April 24 Lead Entity kick-off meeting to present the technical criteria and review the pre-proposal form. That group will probably include Casey, Chuck, Kate, and Keely. Anyone else would be welcome.

#### 7. Revised Biological Strategy

Casey presented the revised the technical scoring criteria to the group. The content organization and general approach did not change. Generally, there is more emphasis on biological benefit compared to the 2006 criteria and the greater number of points will allow for better differentiation between the potential benefits of projects. The implementation monitoring criteria was moved outside the “certainty of success” category and it will not be considered “extra credit” when adding up the points. However, the group thought it was important to keep it in the review so that projects that have it can be highlighted. One source of contention in the past has been the technical review of project costs. The group reviewed the cost related criteria and agreed that the current cost criteria are appropriate for RTT review. The group agreed that the revised project scoring criteria should be implemented in 2007.

Casey said that the tiered system that the RTT subgroup used for revising the biological strategy is based on the old scoring system. The group agreed to use a 39% multiplier that Casey applied to the criteria from the last round. The work of the subgroup to rank biological benefit will also have the 39% multiplier applied to them, if any of the Watershed Action Teams ask to see the raw scores from ranking project types on the implementation schedule.

Casey handed out an additional section in the revised Biological Strategy about understanding ecological processes, written by Tracy Hillman. Other than adding a few more references to the section, the group agreed that it was a good addition.

The group discussed a revised section of the integration of habitat actions and hatchery supplementation programs, and ESU level priorities. The group proposed several further clarifications that were integrated into the draft. Casey will circulate a revised draft to the full RTT later in the week for further review and comment. After the addition of a few more small sections and approval from the RTT the revised biological strategy should be ready for external review by the next RTT meeting (May 9).

#### 8. Update from the UCSRB

Derek presented the revised RTT roles to the group, as discussed at the last UCSRB staff meeting. The group agreed to one minor revision in the additional RTT role articulated by staff. Bob Bugert commented that it was important that the RTT retain complete control over the additional RTT role. The group agreed that was critical in order to not interfere with our 3 primary roles as defined by the UCSRB.

Derek also presented the schedule of implementation team meetings. The first meeting is scheduled for May 1, followed by a meeting on June 5, and quarterly thereafter, or more often as needed.

#### 9. Update on USBR Activities

Casey is going to attend the Methow Restoration Council meeting next week, where they will be discussing the Methow Monitoring Plan. He suggested that this topic be added to the M&E subcommittee meeting as an action item for follow-up. Mike Ward agreed to send Casey the ISEMP Wenatchee document that serves as the Monitoring Strategy appendix A. Mike also noted that the Entiat appendix should be ready before he leaves in July. Casey said he would follow up with John Arterburn about the Okanogan appendix and if the OBMEP planning document was ready to serve as that appendix.

The Bureau team is going to the Wenatchee Habitat Subcommittee meeting on June 7 to roll out their ideas for implementation of projects in the Wenatchee Basin (perhaps only Nason Creek). They are interested in having RTT input on projects in the Wenatchee sub-basin. Casey will likely attend this meeting, as well, and suggested that several members try to attend.

#### 10. CCNRD Monitoring Plan

Carolyn Pearson handed out four documents for the group to consider in response to their feedback from the last meeting. She again requested the RTT provide technical review for five items:

- Gagnon monitoring plan
- Nason monitoring plan
- Review culvert priorities
- Evaluate project features for proposed CCNRD 2008 and 2009 construction projects
- Minimum requirements by project type

Carolyn said that Nason currently has monitoring money, but Gagnon does not. She was specifically asking for input from the RTT to pursue the monitoring plan for funding.

While there were not enough RTT members in attendance to constitute official agreement, the group provided some general suggestions. PIT tag detectors would be a good addition to the monitoring plans. The group also suggested contacting USFS, USFWS and Yakama Nation to get input from them on their input for the monitoring. Once their input on QA/QC data protocols were incorporated, it would be good to submit the formal request to the Tributary Small Projects Fund for review by next month. There is a three-month turnaround on project review. Additionally, the group agreed that the M&E subcommittee would review the materials at its May 2 meeting and provide comment to Carolyn.

Casey mentioned that the draft culvert priority document that Carolyn was using was not an official RTT document and so using the priorities from it did not necessarily constitute an RTT recommendation. Kate mentioned that the culvert priorities (high, medium, low) were never put in perspective of their importance relative to other types of restoration projects. The recent effort to rate the biological benefit of all the actions on the Implementation Schedule should point that out when the revised RTT Biological Strategy is released. Casey commented that since the money was already obtained, not in competition with other projects, and targeted for culverts the prioritization that Carolyn presented was a reasonable approach.

Carolyn asked for input and endorsement of the 2008 and 2009 programmatic projects that the CCNRD intends to implement in 2008 and 2009. She provided a several page summary of those projects. The RTT declined to provide approval outside of a formal review process. Casey said the RTT would see what level of supplemental review the other subbasins might need. Then the RTT could evaluate their ability to provide supplemental guidance on project development and prioritization of programmatic actions that are already funded.

#### 11. Review and Adopt January and March Meeting Notes

The RTT will discuss ways to adopt the meeting notes without the need for a quorum at the meeting. The group suggested getting e-mail approval from each of the members that was present at the meeting for approval of those summaries.

#### 12. Wrap-up and Next Steps

Casey adjourned the meeting at 4:00 PM. The next meeting is set for May 9, 9:00 a.m., at the BLM conference room in Wenatchee.

The following are possible agenda items:

- Revised biological strategy (finalization and approval for outside review)
- RTT membership
- M&E subcommittee items
  - Data steward position
  - Methow monitoring plan
  - Wenatchee sub-basin monitoring plans (Gagnon and Nason)

Meeting notes by Derek Van Marter ([derek.vanmarter@ucsr.com](mailto:derek.vanmarter@ucsr.com))

Approved by, or comments received from: Casey Baldwin, Bob Bugert, John Arterburn, Tracy Hillman, Mike Ward, Kate Terrell, and Chuck Peven