

UPPER COLUMBIA REGIONAL TECHNICAL TEAM (RTT) MEETING NOTES FOR 9 May 2007

RTT Members Present: Baldwin, Andonaegui, Arterburn, Hillman, Peven, Carlson, Cates, Kelly, Murdoch, Terrell, and Ward (via phone)

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

1. RTT special closed session

The RTT discussed the loss of several members and the need to increase membership. Several candidates were discussed and the group agreed to ask several people to join the RTT. Casey will follow up by contacting those individuals and determining if they are interested in joining the RTT.

2. Review and adopt proposed agenda

RTT members present reviewed the proposed agenda, and approved it as drafted. Mike Ward added that he and a few others are planning a celebration for the afternoon of June 13 to recognize all of the hard work many across the region have put into salmon recovery efforts over the years. He said he will distribute logistical details to the group.

3. Revised Biological Strategy

Casey Baldwin passed around a copy of an email he sent to the RTT on April 13 regarding the list of remaining action items toward revising the Biological Strategy. The group focused on the following items:

- M&E section – the group agreed to add a statement to the end of Table 6 indicating the RTT’s intent to sequence and prioritize actions sometime in the future.
- Appendix D – the group discussed the difference between implementation and effectiveness monitoring, and the purpose of attaching a score to project monitoring when it may not be a requirement from the funding source. Some in the group expressed concern with awarding any points for monitoring if it is not a required component for funding. Additionally, some were concerned that there are so many factors that go into conducting a good monitoring program that perhaps its not appropriate to expect project sponsors to do it. Counter points were made that supported implementation and level 1 effectiveness monitoring by project sponsors.

Ultimately, the group agreed to delete the proposed scoring system for monitoring, but to keep the section on monitoring with some clearer definitions. The RTT will still evaluate and provide comments on the adequacy of a monitoring plan if its included in the proposal. Those with acceptable monitoring programs will be appropriately marked with an identifier (e.g. a flag or letter).

Casey will add definitions for the different types of monitoring the group discussed and re-circulate to the group by Friday morning with the intention of getting it back by Monday morning. The group also agreed to several other clarifications throughout Appendix D.

- ESU Priorities – the group agreed to several clarifications and additional information previously drafted by individual RTT members.

RTT members also discussed the possibility of conducting site visits of past projects throughout the region. The purpose of the site visits would be to examine if the project proponent was able to implement just what they had proposed, and to identify successful projects. Scheduling site visits after implementation would enable the RTT members to gather regional knowledge about what types of projects can be implemented successfully, and to learn from mistakes. The group agreed to add this as a topic to the agenda for the July meeting.

4. Monitoring and Data Management Committee Update

Keely Murdoch provided the following updates on recent Monitoring and Data Management Committee activities.

Data Steward

She presented information on the development of a data steward position and a data stewardship strategy. She relayed some concerns from Bob Rose regarding administration and oversight (page 8) of the data steward. Keely said that the Yakama Nation has some concern about giving up control data management. John Arterburn did not think the CCT had a policy issue with the UCSRB administering the data steward position. Keely suggested that RTT members of the co-managing agencies discuss the issue of oversight and management of the data steward with their policy representatives in the respective organizations. Mike Ward suggested that before the group proceeds on discussing the current draft proposal for the data steward, he speak with Bob Rose and attempt to reconnect with the group prior to the end of the meeting.

Data Steward Follow-up

Mike Ward called back into the meeting to summarize his conversation with Bob Rose regarding the first discussion topic in this update. He recommended that the “Administration and Oversight” paragraph on page 8 of the draft proposal be removed to satisfy Bob’s concerns. Several people thought that the proposal could not go forward to a potential funding agency without a section that describes administration and oversight. The RTT identified it as a policy issue that the Board, not the RTT, should work on for possible solutions. After a lengthy discussion, the group recommended forwarding the proposal with the section included, but instead flagging the section as a policy issue that the Board needs to discuss. Keely and Mike both expressed reservations about leaving the section in the proposal. Mike will develop a presentation for the Board, and asked that anyone who has additional comments on the proposal to get those to him by close of business on May 11.

Methow Monitoring Plan

Keely continued her updates by saying that the Methow Monitoring Plan (Appendix C) of the regional salmon recovery plan is currently being developed. John Crandle has been talking with Gregg Knott and others on the Methow Recovery Council and is looking for input from the RTT on how to proceed in the development of the Monitoring Plan. The RTT members present said that their role should be to provide input on a draft plan, as it did for the other monitoring plans in the regional salmon recovery plan. Casey had provided John Crandle with the Upper Columbia Monitoring Strategy (2006) and will get him the Wenatchee, Entiat, and Okanogan sections when they are ready (3-weeks for Wenatchee; Late June for Entiat; Okanogan?).

Gagnon and Nason Monitoring Plans

Keely said the Committee also recently discussed the Gagnon Creek and Nason Creek Oxbow monitoring plans presented by Chelan County Natural Resources Department (CCNRD). Keely

said that the Yakama Nation was approached by the County to implement the plans if they are funded, which she wanted the RTT to know prior to discussing the plans. She then summarized the suggestions that the Committee provided Carolyn Pearson regarding both monitoring plans. Keely will forward the revised monitoring plans to the RTT. She asked that members provide comments to her no later than close of business on May 18.

The group did discuss some concerns regarding the Nason Creek Oxbow project in general, particularly that the current project is a deviation from the original proposal that the RTT highly ranked on technical merit.

Keely and/or Casey will cull the final comments from the RTT and draft a letter to CCNRD endorsing support for the monitoring plan of the current project. The letter will also caveat the RTT's support with an explanation that it is not the same project that the RTT had previously ranked for the SRFB process.

After the meeting several RTT members expressed reservations about officially "endorsing" the monitoring plan. The RTT needs to decide if it supports these monitoring plans enough to officially endorse them or if it wants to acknowledge that it reviewed them and offered some input and feedback.

NMFS M&E Plan

Keely also reported that the Committee was approached by NMFS (Russell Scranton) asking for RTT review of the M&E Plan (Appendix P). Russell had drafted a set of questions that NMFS wanted the RTT to answer / address but those were not made available for the Committee meeting. The Committee suggested that Russell provide the RTT with the list of questions that and that the group would review them (today) and then get back to him. Casey distributed a list of draft questions from Russell, which the group reviewed and discussed.

Tracy suggested that it would be helpful for Russell to read Chapters 5 and 6 in the recovery plan to identify answers to some of his questions. The group cannot answer the questions in bullets 2, 4 or 6, and only portions of bullets 3 and 5.

Casey will incorporate the edits to the questions and let Russell know which questions will and will not be addressed. The group agreed to review appendix P on their own and spend a considerable amount of time on it at the July meeting. The monitoring committee will follow up on the morning of July 12 and finalize the RTT response.

5. Update on UCSRB Activities

Derek Van Marter provided the RTT with the following updates from the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board.

UCSRB Plan Approval Timeline

- **April 19** UCSRB receives a copy of the synthesized comments per agreement at the March 21 meeting in Lake Chelan. The comments have been summarized by issue and NOAA has begun to develop responses.
- **April 20 – May 11** Domain team drafts responses to comments.
- **May 14 – 25** NOAA senior staff review and complete comments.
- **May 24** NOAA attends UCSRB meeting to summarize responses to public comments.

- **April 19 – May 11** UCSRB review final Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Plan containing edits from March 21 meeting.
- **May 1 - June 1** NOAA develops *Federal Register* Notice #2.
- **June 1 – 29** Internal NOAA review of FRN 2.
- **June 29** FRN 2 published.

Implementation Schedule

Derek explained that Julie Morgan, UCSRB Executive Director, had received some comments about whether the correct implementation schedule was published in the first *Federal Register* Notice. He said he followed up with Lynn Hatcher, NMFS, today and he had apparently discussed the issue with Kate Terrell. Lynn also said that he spoke with Mike Kaputa about the apparent discrepancy, but was not able to ascertain whether there was indeed an error in the published implementation schedule. In the end, Lynn suggested that the correct version of the implementation schedule had been published with FRN 1. However, Lynn did say that certain fish passage actions at Enloe Dam in Okanogan County had been removed from the implementation schedule that were, as he understood, not supposed to be included.

Implementation Team Update

Derek said the first IT meeting occurred on May 1, 2007 in Chelan. The focus of the first meeting was largely procedural, although the group did discuss the issue of funding coordination. He said that draft notes of the meeting had been distributed to those that were present, and would soon be widely distributed. The next meeting is scheduled for June 5 at the Douglas County PUD auditorium in East Wenatchee. The focus of that meeting will be on research, monitoring and evaluation.

Lead Entity Update

Derek reviewed the final regional timeline with the RTT, and said that a Citizens' Committee Meeting is scheduled for May 29 in Okanogan. The May 30 meeting in Chelan has been postponed for a later date. Derek said he will follow-up on the latter meeting with the Lead Entity Coordinator for Chelan County, Joy Juelson.

He reminded the RTT that pre-proposals are due for the Trib Fund and SRFB processes on June 1 to the respective Lead Entity Coordinators. The pre-proposals are scheduled for delivery to the RTT on June 4.

The pre-proposal presentation workshop on June 13 is scheduled to take place all day (8:00 AM to 4:00 PM) at the Chelan County PUD auditorium in Wenatchee.

UC RTT Logos

Derek presented four draft logos that he had a consultant develop for the RTT. After a review and discussion, the members present at the meeting chose logo #2. Derek said he would follow-up with the consultant to get the final logo completed for use on documents and the website.

6. Project Review Committee

Casey confirmed the current Project Review Committee roster that included: Keely, Dennis, Tracy, Chuck, Kate, Joe Kelly, and John A. Joe Lange and Bob Rose were both "maybes". The group agreed to hold June 14 as a contingency day, if needed, for continued review of project presentations. Once the number of pre-project proposals is known (June 4), a group including Casey, Derek, and the lead entity coordinators will convene and determine if all can be done in one day.

After the meeting, several new members were confirmed and intend to rate projects in 2007; they include Cameron Thomas, Russell Langshaw, Tom Kahler, and Steve Hays.

7. Review and Adopt January Notes

Casey will send to the RTT via email the January notes with the draft May meeting notes.

8. Wrap-up and Next Steps

Casey adjourned the meeting at 3:30 PM. The next meeting is set for June 13, 8:00 a.m., at the Chelan County PUD auditorium in Wenatchee.