

MEMORANDUM

TO: Nick Christoph, Okanogan/Colville Lead Entity Coordinator
Mike Kaputa, Chelan County Lead Entity Coordinator
Bill Towey, Colville/Okanogan Lead Entity Coordinator

FROM: Bob Bugert, Chairperson
Upper Columbia Regional Technical Team

DATE: 18 July 2005

SUBJECT: Fix-it Review of 2005 Pre-proposals

The Upper Columbia Regional Technical Team (RTT) met with project sponsors on 13 July 2005 to provide technical advice on the pre-proposals submitted to the Tributary Fund and the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB). We reviewed 11 applications from Okanogan County and 15 applications from Chelan County (26 total). Attached are our recommendations to you on the means to improve the technical merit of the applications.

The purpose of this review is to give project sponsors advice on how to improve their proposals, and to identify salient concerns with projects. Project sponsors may modify their proposals to the SRFB Tributary Fund, based on these recommendations and be prepared to submit the SRFB proposals to the Lead Entities on 5 August and the Tributary Fund on 20 September. The Tributary Fund and Lead Entities will sponsor tours of these projects on 28 and 29 July.

Okanogan County Projects

Okanogan Weed Control Board

Ramona Pfitzer is submitting two companion proposals—one to SRFB and one to Trib Fund. The OCWCB has been aggressively addressing the terrestrial noxious weeds, and now wish to elevate the level of aquatic weed control. Detriments to salmon include sedimentation, anoxia, a reduction in stream flows, crowding, and streambank destruction. The proposal is to survey and map non-native vegetation; develop best method of treatment, likely using an integrated approach including biological mechanical and chemical control, using site specific management plans. Last component is to re-vegetate with native aquatic plants. A companion to this is an education component. Pfitzer said this work is Coordinated with similar weed control board in Canada.

Bickford asked the sponsor to include information on the means to control milfoil, and describe the efficacy of that method. Bugert asked whether the Canadian component is funded; the sponsor said that it is not at this time but they are securing funds. Bugert said that the funding organizations may be reluctant to support projects that are reliant on a high level of staffing. Ward suggested that the proposal have better documentation of effects on salmon from aquatic weeds.

Transfer Ditch Barrier and Piping

Bob Anderson presented the three miles of piping in Beaver Creek, this will be the last diversion in that system that will be converted to piping. All diversions below this site have been improved in previous cycles. Benefits to salmon include improved passage and savings of 3 cfs from transport loss. Ward suggested that Anderson quantify these stated benefits to salmonids. Bob Anderson noted the colonization of steelhead from previous projects. Kelly asked whether this savings will be directed toward streamflow. Bob responded that the water user has not committed

at this time to dedicate the savings to the Trust Water Rights Program, yet may agree to do so when project is completed. Regardless, the user will have no need for saved water since he cannot spread his agricultural production.

Jerry Marco asked that there be streamflow monitoring established to evaluate efficacy. Hillman asked whether piping is most cost effective—would lining the ditch be better approach. Anderson said the appeal to the grower is lower maintenance and pressurization to aid irrigation; it will remain gravity fed. Anderson is requesting a funding split between BOR, SRFB, and Trib Fund. Permitting has not been started, although he does not anticipate a problem—should include the costs for permitting in proposal.

Methow Conservancy

Katharine Bill gave an update on recent work to protect about ten miles of riparian shorelines in Methow. They propose to address an additional three miles of privately owned riparian areas. Fourteen landowners are involved in this project—11 are between Weiman Bridge and Big Valley Ranch. Two easements will be addressed on Twisp River and their commitments are secured. Bill said the Methow Valley is in a real estate boom, so there is a sense of urgency in conservation of riparian areas. The stewardship plans are similar to previous phases. Bugert suggested that the Conservancy link their stewardship plans with the monitoring work for the Methow. Bickford suggested that Bill include examples of management activities that are allowed in their easements.

Spring Creek Ranch

Darren Belsby said Spring Creek is at confluence of Methow and Chewuch, and is feeder stream to hatcheries. Working with NRCS they identified a system to go from 5 cfs to 1.8 cfs water use, based on a pivot system, and would dedicate the balance to a Trust Water Right. They are combination of pump irrigation system with both flood and handlines. Terrell asked for the need to modify the Foghorn Diversion—this would prevent ice build-up. Potential match would be piping from BOR. Pyper said to specify that the matches are federal dollars. Fencing and off-site watering system will be developed—this should be included in project description. Terrell asked if the design work and permitting be established; she suggested that the sponsor defer this application to next year, so that the application package could be better developed. Bugert suggested that Julie Pyper assist in development of the project. Several members of RTT suggested that this could be submitted as a phased proposal.

Methow Valley Irrigation District

The applicant was not available to make presentation on the West Bank diversion to MVID. The RTT was unable to provide substantive comments on this, as there was little information provided in the pre-proposal. More information on costs and overall approach for the west canal would be necessary to make an informed recommendation.

Aeneas Creek

Todd Thorn with Okanogan Valley Lands Council presented a proposal for Aeneas Creek, which has relatively cool and stable water. The proposal is to purchase a conservation easement for 56 acres with 0.7 mile of stream. Water rights and use are being researched by Washington Water Trust. Peven suggested that the proposal clarify the status of current landowners, and to identify the threat to the resource from current or future land management activities. Rose suggested that the proposal add information related to salmonid use of the stream and the contribution of cold water to the Okanogan. Marco said the sponsor should contact the Colville Tribes staff to look at LiDAR and FLIR information as well as the recent spawning ground information. Bugert

suggested that Thorn include an example of the OVLC stewardship plans as part of application, and suggested that he contact the Colville Tribes to coordinate on the monitoring component. Baldwin suggested the sponsor estimate steelhead rearing habitat benefits.

Twisp River Conservation Purchase

Chris Johnson presented a proposal to continue work funded by SRFB to purchase 24 contiguous acres in floodplain in lower Twisp River. This application will be the final two parcels of seven sites on the land. The sponsor is seeking the assessed value of lands. This proposal is done in conjunction with side channel development, which is essentially completed.

Native Plant Nursery

In conjunction with the conservation purchases, Johnson is seeking funds to manage a large stock native plant nursery to grow large enough to be robust to browsing. This proposal does not request for staffing or administration—only for materials. At this time, they have suffered significant mortality from browsing, so this will increase survival. Several asked about the efficacy of this approach. Johnson will provide information on the rationale for using a large stock, versus their current approach.

Okanagan River Restoration Initiative

The project sponsor was not available. The proposal is to restore 1 km of channeled river back to natural conditions by setting back dikes and re-establishing meanders. Rose asked the sponsor to identify other funding sources that have been explored. The sponsor should identify how much engineering design has been done. A detailed budget and list of activities are necessary. Given the large cost, the sponsor may consider a phased approach. Are the dikes going to be eliminated or set back—if the latter, will this be done in a way that allows channel migration. What kind of effectiveness monitoring will be undertaken? More specific information on benefits to salmon would help.

Omak Creek

The sponsor was not available. The proposal is to replace a culvert on Omak Creek. The proponent needs to re-write the section about passage on Omak Creek. Does this site present a barrier? Also, is the site downstream a barrier? There also needs to be better clarification on the language about benefits to salmon—both in sediment delivery and passage. In relative terms, how big of an issue is the sedimentation? Include language about monitoring.

Similkameen-Okanogan Confluence Restoration

The sponsor was not available. The proposal is to use large wood and rock to stabilize the bank. The group questioned the benefits to salmon of the bank stabilization and suggested that part be removed from the application. If included, the sponsor should provide detailed design specifications, and should reference the design work that has been done on this site. The information on the riparian planting appears to be incorrect. The sponsor should include a monitoring component, and should link into the Okanogan Basin Monitoring and Evaluation Program.

Chelan County Projects

White River Bridge/Wetland

Chris Parsons (WDFW) is co-sponsoring with Chelan County to conduct a feasibility study to restore a 21-acre wetland parcel. There is an illegal ditch that must be addressed, but they are unsure of correct approach to address the problem. They request funds to develop a design to

conduct the work. In addition, they would conduct a feasibility study to reconstruct the bridge. The road adjacent to the bridge is on a dike, which would also be included in the study. The RTT asked for additional information about what is required under the mitigation for this violation. Joe Lange suggested that the applicant look into the NRCS Wetland Reserve Program. The group discussed how much can be accomplished with the amount tentatively requested. Bob Rose requested additional language on how the bridge reconstruction would benefit salmon.

Henry River Access

Chris Parsons also presented a proposal to reconstruct the boat launch/ramp to the White River. The RTT saw minimal benefits to salmon from the portion of the project that restores the ramp, and no benefit to salmonids from the boat launch. Some members suggested that the applicant seek funds from other sources that are more appropriate. Joe Lange suggested that the applicant look at placing the boat launch at the bridge discussed in the above proposal.

Beebe Springs

Bill Way of the Watershed Company presented the proposal to relocate the ditch that flows from the Chelan Hatchery. The ditch has a continuous 5 cfs cold water supply, which should increase to about 15 cfs when the hatchery renovation is completed. The new relocated channel would follow the slope and the old channel would serve as rearing habitat—the latter would have about 1.2 cfs. The applicant will establish riparian habitat on the main channel. Frank Clark of the Sportsman's Club said the main component of this work is educational in nature. This area has high access and visibility, and will be managed to handle a large number of people. Bugert asked for additional information on use of substrate to address the infiltration. Woodsmith asked the sponsor to consider the role of groundwater on this channel. Marco asked the sponsor to address the water treatment issues to address the hatchery effluent. Rose noted the high expense and suggested the sponsor consider a phased approach to carry out this work. He said the sponsor consider lamprey in the proposal. Hillman asked about whether the design was geomorphically appropriate—it likely does not match the historical channel size. Wey said that this is a spring fed stream with regular flows, and they have done some background work to address this issue. The group agreed that more information on geomorphic design would be helpful. Hillman also stressed that this may attract northern pikeminnows because of the low gradient and scent from the hatcheries—he suggested that a monitoring component address this issue. Peven asked that the sponsor include a discussion of how the legislative funds will be used.

Wenatchee Water Treatment Screen

Mike Kaputa presented a proposal on behalf of the City of Leavenworth, to upgrade the intact screen. The group discussed the concept of addressing screening issue above the boulder field. Several RTT members asked for more detail on the design and maintenance plan for the screen. Also, information on the status of the permits would help.

Pollutant monitoring

Kaputa said the City of Leavenworth wants to do additional monitoring to determine the presence of phosphorous and fecal coliform, and if present, how to correct this. This application would work in concert with their Centennial Clean-Water grant. Bugert asked the sponsor to provide language about benefits to salmon from this project. Rose further suggested that this application fit into a larger approach for water quality management in the subbasin.

Web-based project management

Chelan County has developed a website that allows individuals to track the status of projects. The site has two functions: 1) find past, present and future projects which can be sorted by project type, sponsor, etc; and 2) create a data base of information related to project development. The proposal is to expand this approach region-wide. Peven asked about the continuous maintenance of the site. Rose suggested that Kaputa look at the project management system from the Grande Ronde Model Watershed Project. Bugert asked about the relation of the project to the IAC PRISM project management tool. Kaputa said they have discussed this with IAC IT folks and were not assured that they can develop a compatible system.

Sunitsch Canyon

Kaputa said that Tierra Learning Center is working with WDFW to build a rearing pond on Sunitsch Creek. This is beyond the range of native salmon. The pond will provide rearing habitat for brook trout. The RTT said that the likelihood of funding is very low because the focus is on brook trout. Kate said the sponsor consider some means to eradicate brook trout, instead of the current approach. Rose suggested that this may be appropriate as a coho rearing pond; funds may be available from separate sources, such as the hatchery programs. Lange suggested that funds for pond restoration may be available from the NRCS Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program.

Entiat instream structures

Kaputa said Chelan County will submit proposal on behalf of Entiat Planning Unit in lower and middle Entiat River. These projects come from the Alternative 5 in the watershed plan. Rose asked that this approach be considered as a sequenced approach for several structures per year. Kaputa agreed, and noted their work to identify the appropriate pace for implementation of these projects. Peven said that the sponsor should address the long-term solutions for channel complexity, noting that high floods may eradicate the instream structures. Kate Terrell suggested that projects with this scope could be addressed programmatically, and be included in the budget.

Peshastin Creek Confluence

Kaputa said this is part of the Wenatchee Channel Migration Zone (CMZ) Study. This project will address Peshastin Creek downstream from Big Y. This will create side channel for high flow retention and to restore sinuosity. Funding is requested to develop a detailed analysis, similar to what was done for Irwin and Gagnon. There is some discussion about how to approach the reach immediately upstream of the restoration site; it may be difficult to develop something that is hydrologically compatible.

Gagnon off channel

This CMZ site received funding from SRFB for hydraulic and geomorphic analyses. The report is available. This will be reviewed on site on 3 August. Hillman asked for a detailed budget.

Nason Creek off channel

This is part of the CMZ study. The proposal is to reconnect 5,500 linear feet of side channel. The RTT expressed a need to closely review this, and needs more information.

Irwin off channel

This CMZ site received funding from SRFB for hydraulic and geomorphic analyses. The report is available. This will be reviewed on site on 3 August. Hillman asked for a detailed budget. Again, the RTT stated that these projects will need support and oversight.

Site 11 off channel

This is part of the CMZ study. The proposal is close to the Gagnon site, to create a backchannel. The RTT will review this when more information is available.

White River Floodplain and Habitat Protection

The project sponsor was not available to discuss this pre-proposal for the acquisition and designation of conservation easements for riparian properties on White River. The RTT requested that the sponsor provide additional information on the stewardship plan and how it fits into the Wenatchee Intensive Monitoring Strategy.

Chiwawa River Respect the River Program

The sponsor was not available. This proposal is to redesign, relocate, or close camping areas and roads to campgrounds on the Chiwawa River. Hillman asked about the River Bend and Phelps campgrounds—will those be in a second phase? Does the sponsor anticipate subsequent phases? The RTT asked for language about long-term maintenance.

The Regional Technical Team appreciates the opportunity to serve in this important process, and thank the project sponsors for their positive responses to our recommendations during the “fix-it” loop. Please feel free to contact me (509-662-1127) if you have questions or comments.

Cc: Upper Columbia Regional Technical Team
Chelan and Douglas HCP Tributary Committees
Denny Rohr, Priest Rapids Habitat Committee
Mary Hunt, Chair, Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board
Barb McIntosh, Salmon Recovery Funding Board
Britt Dudek, Foster Creek Lead Entity Coordinator

Attachment

**Attachment: Participants in the Upper Columbia Regional Pre-Proposal Review Process
2005 Cycle for the Tributary Fund and SRFB**

- Casey Baldwin, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Shane Bickford, Douglas County Public Utility District
- Bob Bugert, Biophilia (non-voting member)
- Brian Cates (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)
- Tracy Hillman (BioAnalysts, Inc)
- Joe Kelly, Bureau of Land Management
- Joe Lange, Natural Resource Conservation Service
- Jerry Marco, Colville Confederated Tribes
- Chuck Peven, Chelan County Public Utility District
- Bob Rose, Yakama Nation
- Kate Terrell (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)
- Mike Ward (Terraqua, Inc.)
- Rick Woodsmith (Forest Sciences Lab)

Others present at review:

- Becky Caputo (Chelan County PUD)
- Julie Pyper (Chelan PUD and Tributary Fund)
- Carolyn Pearson (EcoAIM, Inc.)
- Russell Langshaw (Grant PUD)
- Tom Schott (Anchor Environmental)
- Ali Wick (Anchor Environmental)
- Dennis Beich (WDFW)
- Mark Cookson (WDFW)