

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.



**Meeting Summary**  
**Okanogan Citizen Advisory Committee**  
**Ranking Meeting**  
**Thursday, July 26, 2018 ~ 5:45-7:00**  
**Chelan Fire House - Chelan, WA**

- Committee Members: Will Keller, Bob Monetta, Louis Sukovaty. Rankings were provided by John and Sam.
- UCSRB Staff: Sarah Walker, Greer Maier, Pete Teigen

Bob Monetta convened the meeting at 5:45 p.m.

Bob reviewed the agenda and asked for approval. Will moved to approve and Louis S. was the second. The group reviewed the scoring, ranking and collating process with Okanogan County projects.

**Conflicts of Interest:** Bob ask the Committee about conflicts of interest and members did not express any.

**Scoring – Greer Maier, UCSRB**

Greer provided an overview and summary of the CAC scores for the Okanogan County Projects based on the scores submitted prior to the meeting (table below). They discussed accepting the projects in order by score an/or by rank.

**Okanogan CAC Project Rankings:**

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Rank</b>
Hancock Springs	132	1
Methow Watershed Riparian Stewardship	116	2
Burns-Garrity Perennial Side Channel	109	3
Methow Beaver Project: Beaver and Anadromy	105	4
Twisp Floodplain Left Bank Alcove	104	5
Upper Beaver Creek Feasibility and Design	103	6
Upper Methow Goat Creek Conservation Easement	97	7

**Hancock Springs:** Clearly number 1 Consensus. Bob: lots of momentum, not going away. Consider at some point looking at the dollar amount. Members agreed and the suggestion was made by Bob to consider the members recommend that it be funded at \$467,000.

**Riparian Stewardship:** Louis mentioned that he thinks maintenance is an important part of projects, so he pushed it up a bit higher. Bob and Will discussed where they had landed on the project. The group offered that the CAC should discuss earmarking 5 to 10% of funding for maintenance (watering, weeding, etc.) annually. Members asked if they could send a recommendation to the state to allow for maintenance

outside of the 2-year contract (e.g., for a longer period of time). Will motioned that the state board that they make riparian restoration a longer contract (5 years). Seconded by Louis. Greer clarified that this is a 3-year contract; this is the second 3-year request. The members agreed to keep it at Rank 2.

**Burns-Garrity:** Will questioned the sustainability of the project based on a site visit a few years back and the gravel material. Bob had concerns about cutting through the channel; however, favored it overall. The members agreed to leave it at Rank 3.

**Methow Beaver Project:** Rank 4. Bob noted it has lots of community support and gives landowners more options. Although indirect benefit to fish, very positive program. Bob asked for the amount (\$205,000), and clarification about the rank showing for him (4 was accurate). Seems a lot for two years. The group agreed to leave it at Rank 4.

**Twisp River Floodplain Alcove:** Will noted it would likely be funded easily by others; total budget \$41,000. The members agreed via consensus to leave it at Rank 5.

**Upper Beaver Creek Feasibility and Design:** Members expressed concern about the cost for design and discussed the other elements included in the cost estimate. Will noted he ranked it higher because of nearby irrigation ditches. Bob asked if they needed to move it from 6? The members agreed to leave it at Rank 6.

**Upper Methow Goat Creek CE:** Members discussed the “value” (effect) of the easement, given existing stream setbacks that would preclude development in much of that area. They also noted the land being acquired seemed less than high quality habitat based on local knowledge and participation in the field tour. The members agreed to leave the Rank at 7.

Greer shared the RTT ranking and scoring sheet with running totals to help members evaluate projects and ranks within context of the overall funding line/amount. Members asked Pete about how funds would be distributed among Okanogan-Chelan projects if Burns Garrity is funded by other source. Pete said once the final ranked list is established, funds trickle immediately down the rank order of the final combined list.

The CAC discussed the possibility of reducing the amount awarded to the really expensive projects, and Pete indicated that was the CAC’s prerogative. The CAC indicated that by potentially reducing the amount funded to the expensive projects they could increase the number of projects receiving some funding.

The members briefly discussed whether they should have different scoring criteria for different types of projects, like the RTT, in future rounds.

Louis Sukovaty motioned to approve the OK. CAC project list , and Will 2<sup>nd</sup> on the list and all approved. The meeting ended at 6:36 pm.