

Working to restore viable and sustainable populations of salmon, steelhead and other at-risk species through collaborative, economically sensitive efforts, combined resources, and wise resource management of the Upper Columbia Region.



UPPER COLUMBIA LEAD ENTITY JOINT CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

Chelan Fire House
Chelan, WA

Thursday, July 26, 2018 ~ 6:45 to 8:00 PM

- Joint Committee Members:
- Chelan CAC: Rick Smith, Mike Deason, Dave Graybill, Bob Whitehall, Alan Schmidt, Bufford Howell, Jerry Gutzwiler,
- OK CAC: Bob Monetta, Louis Sukovaty, Will Keller
- UCSRB Staff: Pete Teigen/ Facilitator; Tayna Russel, Melody Kreimes, and Sarah Walker/ Staff Support,

Agenda Review and Background

Pete convened the meeting at 6:45 pm. He welcomed everyone and reminded the members of the process for the joint ranking. He reviewed that the Upper Columbia Region is unique in that there are two Citizen's Committees, which is a carryover from when there were two lead entities across the region. He said that this Joint CAC Meeting is for the two CACs to come together and develop a regional list to submit to the state. The committees will decide collectively on what projects to put forward to advance recovery throughout the region. He also discussed the allocation for the Upper Columbia this year is just approximately \$1.85 million.

Rick Smith asked if there were any conflicts of interest and there were none.

2018 Joint Ranking Discussion

Both the Chelan and Okanogan CACs scores were projected on a spreadsheet and scores were reviewed by the combined group.

Step 1: Adopting an initial list

Pete presented options for the committees to adopt a working initial list of projects to adopt. The committees were presented with options and they selected a collated list (ordered in the same manner as has been used previously, whereby the projects from each county are added in order (1, 1, 2, 2....) with the RTT score used as the tie breaker). Buford recommended the group use RTT score to prioritize among projects that received the same rank from both Okanogan and Chelan. **The Group agreed to work off the initial combined list.** Pete asked for any other discussion surrounding the adopted initial list/spreadsheet. Members discussed moving up a project.

Step 2: Finalize the list

Pete also went over the ground rules for decision making to finalize the project list:

1. A Citizen Advisory Committee member may, at any time, make a motion to move a particular project up or down on the list.
2. The Citizen Advisory Committee member making such a request must include rationale

based on the citizens' review criteria.

3. *The Joint Citizen Advisory Committee will then engage in discussion regarding the motion to move a project on the list.*
4. *After discussion, the Joint Citizen Advisory Committee will vote – approve, oppose, abstain – on the motion to move the project on the list.*
5. *The motion will carry upon unanimous approval by all Joint Citizen Advisory Committee Members (excluding “abstain” votes).*

Louis explained the rationale for ranking the riparian maintenance higher to protect investments already made through previous SRFB rounds; Okanogan members have disagreed with RTT ranking because of the longevity and economics of maintaining projects. The group briefly revisited how the ranking had been done in the past and then moved onto evaluating how reductions to cost on other large projects and removal of Burns-Garrity would play out.

Members discussed the implications of Burns-Garrity getting pulled from the SRFB list as BPA is considering. Pete indicated that the final adopted list would be set and any funding from projects removed from the list would go to the subsequent projects on the list. Members asked that Burns-Garrity be zeroed out to see the impacts that would have on the list. UCSRB staff zeroed out Burns-Garrity for discussion purposes to demonstrate for the Committee the impact that Burns-Garrity getting pulled would have on the project list.

Buford wanted to evaluate removing 10% from the top 4 projects (in terms of RTT scores and cost) and leaving Burns-Garrity amount in the spreadsheet to help with group evaluation. Jerry – noted that the group could create two lists to compare 10% reduction vs. \$50,000 reduction in Hancock Springs cost. UCSRB staff demonstrated what the list would look like if projects were reduced by \$50,000 and 10%, and also viewed the list with the inclusion and omission of Burns-Garrity.

Mike Deason – Move to accept list with 10% reduction on top 4 priced projects. Alan seconded. There was discussion about this approach, including any possible unintended consequences that sponsors may face with reduced funding awards. Bob Monetta noted they had reduced the awarded amount in previous rounds. Pete offered that sponsors can seek amendments if they need and/or they can seek additional funding from other outside sources. ***The group reached consensus to move forward with a 10% reduction to the top 4 projects (Hancock, Middle Entiat F, Burns-Garrity, and Cottonwood Flats).***

Mike Deason moved that the group switch Mill Creek and Merritt Oxbow due to amount of match brought by Mill Creek. Bob Monetta seconded. Group consented.

Buford Howell moved to adopt the list (10% reduction to top 4 projects and the swap of Mill and Merritt Oxbow) and order of priority for the projects through number 9 as starting point for discussion about remainder of the list. Louis/Okanogan seconded the motion.

Pete asked the group since the Okanogan CAC did not have a quorum present, how would they like to proceed adopting the final list. Bob, acting as Okanogan Chair suggested the group in attendance approve the list, and Pete could work with the Okanogan CAC about adopting the list in the coming days.

Will motioned to jointly adopt list (contingent on approval of a quorum of the Okanogan CAC), Dave seconded the list and all approved the final list (attached) as a Joint CAC by consensus.

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 pm



2018 SRFB/TRIB Project Scores & Ranks

Sponsor	Project Name	Subbasin	Project Type	Amount Requested			RTT Score	Joint CAC Ranking (Regional List)	County Rank
				SRFB Request	SRFB Allocation	SRFB Running Total*			
MC	MC Hancock Springs Restoration Phase 4*	Methow	Restoration	\$567,068	\$510,361	\$510,361	87	1	1
CCD	Middle Entiat River Restoration – Gray Reach – Area F – River Mile 16.2-16.7*	Entiat	Restoration/Protection	\$401,637	\$361,473	\$871,835	81	2	1
MSRF	Methow Watershed Riparian Stewardship Program II	Methow	Restoration	\$97,348	\$97,348	\$969,183	57	3	2
CCNRD	Cottonwood Flats Floodplain Restoration Entiat River (RM 17.65)*	Entiat	Restoration	\$510,508	\$459,457	\$1,428,640	73	4	2
CCFEG	Burns-Garrity Perennial Side Channel*	Methow	Restoration	\$419,000	\$377,100	\$1,805,740	78	5	3
CCFEG	Entiat Basin Fish Passage and Screening Assessment	Entiat	Assessment	\$80,008	\$80,008	\$1,885,748	72	6	3
MSRF	Methow Beaver Project - Beavers and Anadromy	Methow	Restoration	\$205,294	\$205,294	\$2,091,042	67	7	4
CCNRD	Mill Creek Fish Passage Project	Wenatchee	Restoration	\$131,476	\$131,476	\$2,222,518	67	8	5
MSRF	Twisp River Floodplain Left Bank Spring-fed Alcove Restoration	Methow	Restoration	\$41,822	\$41,822	\$2,264,340	72	9	5
CCFEG	Merritt Oxbow	Wenatchee	Design	\$80,500	\$80,500	\$2,344,840	70	10	4
MSRF	Upper Beaver Feasibility & Design	Methow	Design	\$133,793	\$133,793	\$2,478,633	62	11	6
CCNRD	Wenatchee EDT Model Development**	Wenatchee	Monitoring*	\$180,000	\$180,000	\$2,658,633	22/30	12	6
MC	Upper Methow Goat Creek Conservation Easement	Methow	Protection	\$214,700	\$214,700	\$2,873,333	56	13	7
CCNRD	Peshastin Mill-Larsen Reach Side Channel	Wenatchee	Design	\$99,010	\$99,010	\$2,972,343	67	14	7
CCNRD	Squilchuck Creek Fish Passage Barrier Removal Design	Wenatchee	Design	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$3,012,343	64	15	8
CCNRD	Sleepy Hollow Side Channel Design	Wenatchee	Design	\$125,504	\$125,504	\$3,137,847	60	16	9
CCNRD	Monitor Side Channel Design and Construct	Wenatchee	Restoration	\$249,900	\$249,900	\$3,387,747	59	17	10
CCFEG	Goodwin Side Channel	Wenatchee	Design	\$105,000	\$105,000	\$3,492,747	64	18	11
CCNRD	Larsen Creek Tributary Enhancement	Wenatchee	Restoration	\$58,863	\$58,863	\$3,551,610	59	19	12
CCD	Lower Entiat Tributaries - Aquatic Habitat Assessments	Entiat	Assessment	\$185,660	\$185,660	\$3,737,270	58	20	13
CCNRD	Chumstick Creek Fish Passage Barrier Replacement - Motteler Road	Wenatchee	Restoration	\$86,162	\$86,162	\$3,823,432	52	21	14
CCNRD	Sand Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project	Wenatchee	Restoration	\$186,691	\$186,691	\$4,010,123	48	22	15
CCNRD	The Ecology of Fear**: Does habitat diversity in Lk Wen lead to behavioral responses by spring Ch that reduce predation and increase growth rates?	Wenatchee	Monitoring	\$139,120	\$139,120	\$4,149,243	22/30	23	16
CCNRD	Peshastin Creek Barrier Removal	Wenatchee	Restoration	\$205,000	\$205,000	\$4,354,243	47	24	17
CCFEG	Wenatchee Basin Bull Trout Assessment	Wenatchee	Assessment	\$105,937	\$105,937	\$4,460,180	54	25	18
TOTAL				\$4,650,001	\$4,460,180				

* The Joint CAC decided to reduce the amount funded by 10% to allow for more projects to receive funding.

** A maximum of 10% of the Upper Columbia allocation can be used for monitoring, therefore only one project can be selected.

TU	Methow River Watershed LiDAR Acquisition	Methow	Pulled
CCFEG	Napeequa Side Channel Connection	Wenatchee	Pulled