REGIONAL TECHNICAL TEAM MEETING
Draft AUGUST MEETING SUMMARY

Date: Wednesday, August 14, 2019
Time: 9:00 AM to 12:30 PM
Location: Community Foundation of NCW, 9 S. Wenatchee Avenue, Wenatchee, WA

_____

Members Present: Brandon Rogers, Jeremy Cram, John Arterburn, Steve Fortney, Catherine Willard, Keely Murdoch, Justin Yeager, Kate Terrell, and Tracy Hillman (Chair).

Others Present: Sarah Walker/UCSRB, Pete Teigen/ UCSRB, Matt Schwartz/BPA, Robin Pepin/Aspect Consulting, Emily Johnson/OWNF, Erin McKay/CCNRD, and Steve Kolk/USBR.

_____

Tracy Hillman welcomed everyone to the meeting and participants introduced themselves.

Members present reviewed and approved the draft agenda. Carry-over action items are identified below.

Carry-Over Action Items:
- Greer Maier will create a GIS layer of redd survey reaches and upload it to the data portal for RTT use in evaluating spawner surveys.
- Greer Maier will work with RTT members (Jeremy Cram and John Crandall) to update the fish use spreadsheet. Data sources and data gaps will be noted for the MaDMC.
- Robyn Pepin and Greer Maier will create some maps of prioritized AUs that show various alternatives for how habitat quality could be scored.
- Pete will work with RTT-CAC on ideas to reduce the number of applications (when necessary) and improve the review process.
- Greer Maier will provide the Barrier Working Group with a "heat map" of barrier density in the Wenatchee to identify potential areas for complexing.
- Greer Maier will convene the Barrier Working Group to continue discussion of complexing in the Wenatchee.

UCSRB and RTT Updates

SRFB 2019 CAC rankings

Tracy Hillman walked members through the CACs joint rankings. The PRCC Habitat Subcommittee funded the Nason-Kahler Confluence project. As such, funding will shift down to pick up the Lower Wenatchee Instream Flow project. The project sponsor (CDLT) has not yet pulled Nason-Kahler Confluence project from the SRFB list.

Pete Teigen reported that $106,000 from the Lower Columbia will be used to help fund the Monitor Side Channel project. That will leave $42,000 remaining to be funded. The CAC identified the Monitoring Side

Channel project for funding. Pete will enter projects in PRISM as alternates, so that when projects are pulled, trickle-down occurs to the next highest priority.

Tracy Hillman noted it was sometimes challenging trying to explain or understand why the CAC ranked some projects the way they did. The RTT discussed the CAC comments regarding the number of large projects going into the Entiat. Because of the number of large projects going into the Entiat, some CAC members believe smaller, simpler projects should be implemented within the lower Entiat. These comments from the CAC were driven mostly by social issues within the Entiat. RTT members noted the challenge of remaining focused on complex projects with sustainable, long-term results. Also, other funding is available for smaller, less expensive projects. The CAC also considered improved landowner relations and equity between counties as rationale for their rankings. However, this year, they did not use a straight-forward "zipper" approach to combine Chelan County and Okanogan County projects. Pete reiterated that the CAC values the RTT's work immensely and uses it in their considerations. He said the CAC is interested in engaging with the RTT on evaluation of projects.

Action Item:
- Pete Teigen will investigate an RTT-CAC debrief meeting for late October-early November to discuss process improvements.

SRFB 2020 Schedule

Pete Teigen said he is developing the 2020 schedule based on comments from the RTT and WATs. He will try to move presentations earlier into the process.

RTT Scoring Criteria

Tracy Hillman asked if there are changes that need to be made to the scoring criteria. He said he will be working with Greer Maier on updating the IP tables in the back of the criteria document. Justin Yeager recommended a "Do Not Fund" category. This was used in the past but was later dropped because of concerns from the Lead Entities, CACs, and project sponsors. The RTT discussed the option to submit stronger recommendations to the CACs. The RTT would like to discuss this with the CACs during the debrief meeting later this year. Overall, RTT members said the scoring criteria worked well this year.

Implementation Schedule Updates

Sarah Walker said Greer Maier is asking for comments on the 2018 Implementation Report and 2019 Implementation Schedule. Comments are due to Greer by 3 September 2019.

Implementation Team Meeting

The IT will meet on 3 September in Pateros. At that time, the IT will review and approve the Implementation Report and Implementation Schedule.

MaDMC

Greer Maier and Carlos Polivka are the co-chairs of the MaDMC. The RTT appreciated and complemented John Crandall for his years of service as the MaDMC chair. Next MaDMC meeting date is to be determined.

Prioritization Step 1

Tool Review

Tracy Hillman briefly described the status of the Prioritization Tool. He said AUs have been identified at the HUC 12 scale, as well as reaches within those AUs. Step 1 addresses prioritization of AUs for restoration and protection. Step 2 identifies actions at the reach scale based on limiting factors, limiting life stages, geomorphology, etc. The Prioritization Subgroup has met frequently to develop the Step 1 tool, which is nearly complete. The tool is very transparent; all data used to drive the tool are in spreadsheets along with scoring and weighting rules. The summary tab shows results (ranking of AUs). Tracy noted there remain data gaps and those are identified within the spreadsheets. He said the tool is not perfect, but it is close to being completed. He thanked the Yakama Nation and UCSRB for funding the effort and thanked Greer Maier, Robyn Pepin, and the RTT subgroup for all their efforts in developing the tool.

Robyn Pepin walked the RTT through the architecture, data, and calculation processes of the Step 1 Tool. Each metric has raw data that can be reviewed and updated. The spreadsheet is based on a GIS attribute table, which is easily updated after recalculations. Some data are not spatially-derived (generated by ArcMap). For example, fish-use data are manually input. Those data were collated by Greer along with notes regarding where the data came from.

As expected, restoration and protection scores are different. Scoring rules are in Look Up Tables (LUTs)/metric tables. Weightings are also displayed and used in calculations. Each metric has its own score. The tool calculates an overall score for each species (spring Chinook, steelhead, and bull trout). Scores are based on a total of 100 points. Robyn walked the RTT through the tables and calculations and emphasized the need for RTT review of outputs. It is important to look for anomalies.

RTT Input and Discussion

Tracy said there are some unexpected results (anomalies) that may be related to issues associated with IP. The issue is IP is reported as a percentage. That is, the percentage of IP occupied by fish among AUs is not useful. However, the amount of IP used or not used by fish within AUs is useful. Robyn said she will separate IP into two metrics: total length and length occupied. This should address some of the anomalies in the results. There are also challenges arising from the fish distribution data. Emily Johnson indicated the fish distribution maps used in the tool may not be the best available information. She will work with Greer and the subgroup on which distribution layers should be used.

Tracy asked if geomorphology should be included in Step 1 or 2. It is currently identified in Step 2 but could be used to help prioritize AUs in Step 1. This metric may help filter out AUs such as Tumwater Canyon as an important AU for restoration work. Given the confined nature of the canyon, there are limited opportunities for restoration work there. Morgan Bond's recent paper may be useful in this effort. Steve Fortney is currently reviewing the data from Morgan Bond and will see if the information will be useful in the prioritization strategy. The RTT recommended keeping the geomorphology attribute in Step 2.

QA/QC Process

Robyn said she will make adjustments to IP and the scoring rules. The Subgroup can then review the results and make further adjustments to weights and rules as needed. Once the subgroup is satisfied with the results, the RTT will review them. After RTT review, the tool can be shared with the WATs and IT for their feedback. To aid in the review, the RTT will identify specific questions for the WATs and IT.

University of Washington Products

Robyn Pepin provided an update on the UW products and datasets for prioritizing protection actions under Step 2 of the Prioritization Strategy. Deliverables included: percent area protected based on ownership (including conservation easements and acquisitions), connectivity of protected areas, and percent area degraded (based on existing power lines, roads, etc.). The information was compiled at the reach scale. The class also examined the potential for zoning. The UW information will be made available on the website.

Action Items:
- Jeff Jorgensen (NOAA Fisheries) will present the status of the life-cycle model (including information on life-stage bottlenecks, how habitat and hatchery component integrate, effects of predation within the estuary and climate change, and how the information will inform or be used in the FCRPS) during the September RTT meeting.
- CCNRD staff will share their running list of Stream Type determinations they completed for DNR.
- Robyn Pepin will split Intrinsic Potential into two metrics (total length and length occupied) to generate two separate scores and weights.
- Tracy Hillman will work with Greer Maier to reconvene the prioritization subgroup before the September RTT meeting.

Next Meeting

The next regular meeting will be on Wednesday, 11 September.