

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE TRANSMITTAL REPORT

Upper Columbia Region
6/23/2011

INTRODUCTION

The Upper Columbia Implementation Schedule is a report to NOAA, generated on an annual basis for each of the ESA listed species covered within the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Plan. The purpose of this report is to provide timely, relevant, and consistent information on the status of recovery efforts in the Upper Columbia region.

NOAA Fisheries formally adopted the Upper Columbia Spring Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Recovery Plan in October 2007. The UCSRB approved a formal process to transmit annual implementation schedule updates to NOAA Fisheries. The following is a summary of the habitat work completed in 2010.

2010 ANNUAL REPORT OF IMPLEMENTATION

In 2010, there were 48 projects completed in the Upper Columbia region. The projects were started in different years, but were all completed last year. These projects were located across every subbasin as shown in Figure 1.

Generally, projects are split into a handful of project types: Habitat Restoration, Acquisition, and Non-Capital

projects. Habitat restoration projects restore habitat to benefit a diversity of salmon lifestyles, and usually involve some amount of contractor work in or near the stream. Acquisition projects involve fee-simple purchase of land or conservation easements for land that offer protection of functioning riparian habitat. Occasionally, acquisition is tied to future or current restoration work. Finally, non-capital projects are activities, such as reach assessments, feasibility studies, or designs not directly involved with habitat or protection work.

Figure 2 shows the projects, by project type, completed in the Upper Columbia region in 2010, 37 were habitat restoration projects, six were acquisition projects, one was both acquisition and restoration, and four were non-capital projects (i.e. reach assessments).




Figure 1: Map of the Upper Columbia projects




Figure 2: Upper Columbia Projects by type

Across these projects, there were \$12.7 Million in federal, state, and local funds spent on implementation. Figure 3 shows the cost breakdown across sub-basin and funding source.




Figure 3: Bar graph of overall funding, each bar is a sub-basin with the bar split by funding agency

SUB-BASIN REPORTS

OKANOGAN

The Okanogan sub-basin implemented 19 projects with nearly \$3.7 Million in funding. Five of the projects were acquisitions with the remaining 14 being restoration projects. Of particular interest is the work that the Colville Confederated Tribes have been doing to develop cost effective ways to replace culverts across the sub-basin. Through good planning and innovative thinking, the project sponsor is leading the way in developing a cost effective model to barrier replacement that the entire region is learning from.



Figure 4: Before and After at an Upper Omak Creek Culvert Replacement

METHOW

The Methow sub-basin implemented twelve projects with over \$1.2 Million in funding. Eight of these projects were restoration projects and one was a combined restoration/acquisition project. The final three projects were non-capital reach assessments. A key reach assessment completed last year was the Middle Methow Reach Assessment. Led by the Bureau of Reclamation, the reach assessment plays a key role in identifying project needs within a sub-basin for future habitat actions.




Figure 5: Middle Methow Reach Assessment Cover

ENTIAT

The Entiat sub-basin implemented six restoration projects, with almost \$2 Million in funding. Of particular interest is the RM 21.5 LWD and Riparian Planting project sponsored by the Cascadia Conservation District. This project replanted 1.9 acres of floodplain habitat while adding 14 logjams to 645 feet of rapidly eroding bank. Through this

work, the Cascadia Conservation District has started an area of new riparian and instream habitat while minimizing bank erosion and channel widening.



Before

After

Figure 6: Before and After at the Entiat River Mile 21.5 Project

WENATCHEE

The Wenatchee sub-basin implemented eleven projects with \$1.1 Million in funding. While ten of the projects involved habitat restoration, partners completed a Peshastin Creek Reach Assessment and acquired a 280 acre conservation easement that was donated to the Chelan Douglas Land Trust. Habitat work in the Wenatchee basin included continuation of the Chumstick Creek Restoration Project and its goal of providing expanded passage to 78 mi² of habitat. In the 2010 season, the Chelan County Natural Resource Department replaced a barrier identified in 2009 with step pools as a way to increase the aesthetics for the landowners while providing habitat that fish could navigate during their upstream migrations.



Figure 7: Step Pools at the Chumstick Creek 2010 Restoration Project

RECENT CHANGES TO THE IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

The annual implementation schedule update was generated directly from an online database. In past years the Implementation Schedule has been maintained as multiple spreadsheets updated manually by the Watershed Actions Teams and the Implementation Team. In 2010, the UCSRB completed a three-year process to migrate from management of the implementation schedule in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet to the use of an online database, called the Habitat Work Schedule. This new format allows us to:

- Consistently enter data regardless of the number of users with the use of a regional guidance document;
- Simplify the update process by keeping the database up to date throughout the year;
- Provide live links in the schedule to the database that provide additional detail (e.g. descriptions, pictures, metrics); and
- Offer a public portal (<http://uc.ekosystem.us>) for the variety of interests represented in Upper Columbia salmon recovery.

Except for the fact that the Implementation Schedule was produced using data from the Habitat Work Schedule, the update process was very similar to past years. A draft Implementation Schedule was presented to the Watershed Action Teams. The Watershed Action Teams then had an opportunity to make updates to information in the Habitat Work Schedule. Finally, minor modifications were made to the format of the draft Implementation Schedule based on feedback from the Watershed Action Teams, and a final Implementation Schedule was produced from updated Habitat Work Schedule Data.