

RTT Prioritization Work Group

October 5, 2020

Agenda:

- Overview of progress since our last meeting
- Update on watershed workshops
- Goals for today

Action Item List:

- Add LS Priority to Table
- Pools- Modify Quality Pool Rating- default to REI when available, use pools per mile (modified for stream width), and deep pools (only for larger stream and only 1=no deep pools 3= JC can help define cutoffs)
- "Pool Quality and Quantity" and "Substrate Quality"
- WDFW- Entrainment Issues
- Revisit stream width categories (>5m and <5m)
- Updated 305b flow ratings
- QAQC life stage use data- especially for streams in Tier 1 watersheds

Updates:

Change to all "1=unacceptable"
Life Stage Scores

Removed unused and redundant habitat attributes- e.g. edge habitat (redundant)
Deleted floodplain connectivity as an action category for wood and side channels

Decisions Today:

Pick up actions for 1s and 3s in HQ and LF pathways- generate a list for each and then combine

Track down entrainment ratings from WDFW. Consider "at-risk" rating for all salvage sites or sites with management /infrastructure issues (overtopping etc.)

Defer adopting high priority barriers in Methow until after QAQC/RTT approval

Defer to REI indicator value (when available) for pool, wood, substrate

Adopt the rating rules for 305b listings for temp and flow- update the flow scores

Adopt changes to Life Stage Priorities for Entiat

Adopt predation rating for Entiat- no need to evaluate in other watersheds b/c not Tier 1 with High Priority life stages currently

Keep actions for contaminants (noting that some may drop off later due to feasibility of projects to address)

Assign a rating of “unacceptable” to dewatered reaches of mainstem Methow (noted in attribute table)

Look for mis-matches in life stage priorities in Tier 1 watersheds and email Watershed Workgroups

Define harassment- recreation, hatchery broodstock collection, frolicking

Updated life stage requirements

Add filter to LF pathway- >3 life stages

New Data- Large datasets can be incorporated into the tool (either existing metrics can be updated or new datasets added) as needed pending approval of the PWG and RTT, smaller datasets can be incorporated through an over-ride of a reach score and notes referring to the data source

Incorporate WDFW temperature data but not CCNRD thermal refugia data at this time

Defer Barrier (ID 604676) until after QAQC determination of priority level

Habitat Analysis and Draft Actions by Reach will be sent out to full RTT for approval in November

Watershed flow ratings will be split into current and future ratings

Develop the final draft review package for the RTT and consider approval of the tool in October

[RTT Prioritization - Methow Watershed Workshop](#)

Decisions/Recommendations to PWG:

- Delete floodplain connectivity as an action category for wood and side channels

Action Items:

- Run HQ by life stage and look for “mis-matches”
- Update Chewuch reach names and make sure HQ and LF have those (Thirty-mile missing)
- WDFW- entrainment issues
- Need to refine “pool” language and reconcile
- Defer adopting high priority barriers until after QAQC

[RTT Prioritization - Wenatchee Watershed Workshop](#)

Decisions/Recommendations to PWG:

- At-Risk Rating for Food Lower Chiwawa AU
- Add WDFW temperature data to RAW Data
- Changed pool ratings for Lower Chiwawa AU
- Rounded confinement up to 60% in Lower Chiwawa 02
- Rounded confinement up to 60% in Nason Creek 02
- Proposed to change the confinement filter at the end of step 2 to show where in the reach to work (focus on unconfined areas within the reach)
- Proposed to pick up actions for 1s and 3s in HQ assessment- generate a list for each for HQ
- Proposed to default to RA REI values (when available) for Pools and Wood

Action Items:

- Add Nason 15 to LF sheet- DONE
- Add RA data to Nason 14 – DONE
- Lower Chiwawa Temperature ratings- check on DOE listings and WDFW data- follow-up by email
- Check on substrate ratings in Chiwawa- follow-up by email
- Fix Chiwaukum AU- DONE

RTT Prioritization - Entiat Watershed Workshop

Decisions/Recommendations to PWG:

- Update LS use for Entiat Lake AU to all 7 life stages
- PWG- what to do about “at-risk” flow issues – assign action broadly? Makes for a lot of actions without specific solutions
- PWG- should we use side channels and floodplain separately in the HQ
- Upgraded LSP of fry to High in Preston AU and High in Lake AU- due to amount of spawning and habitat impairments associated with Fry for SPCHN
- Upgraded LSP of summer rearing to High in all Tier 1 AUs for SPSCH
- Downgrade LSP of STL spawning in Preston to Moderate
- Upgrade LSP of summer rearing to High in Preston, Potato, and Lower Mad Tier 1 AUs
- Upgraded LSP of winter rearing to High in Preston
- PWG- Upgraded Predation- Juveniles to “1” in Mills 01, do the same for all lower reach?
- Adopt the two Tier 1 barriers as a recommendation to the PWG- discuss the mainstem Entiat barrier before moving forward

Action Items:

- Look into DOE temperature and flow listings for what should be used- DONE

DOE Ratings- <https://ecology.wa.gov/Water-Shorelines/Water-quality/Water-improvement/Assessment-of-state-waters-303d/Assessment-categories>

Category 1: Meets tested standards for clean waters= 5

Category 1 means a water body meets the state water quality standards. Being placed in this category does not necessarily mean that a water body is free of all pollutants.

Most water quality monitoring is designed to detect a specific array of pollutants, so placement in this category means that the water body met standards for all the pollutants for which it was tested. Specific information about the monitoring results may be found in the individual listings.

Category 2: Waters of concern= 3

Waters in this category have some evidence of a water quality problem, but not enough to show persistent impairment. These are waters that we want to continue to test.

There are several reasons why a water body would be placed in this category. A water body might have pollution levels that are not quite high enough to violate the water quality standards. Or there may not have been enough violations to categorize it as impaired according to our listing policy.

Category 3: Insufficient data= 5

There is insufficient data to place these waters in any of the other categories, according to Policy 1-11.

Category 4: Impaired waters that do not require a TMDL= 1

Waters that have impairment problems that are being resolved in one of three ways:

- **Category 4a** — already has an EPA-approved TMDL plan in place and implemented.
- **Category 4b** — has a pollution control program, similar to a TMDL plan, that is expected to solve the pollution problems.
- **Category 4c** — is impaired by causes that cannot be addressed through a TMDL plan. Impairments in these water bodies include low water flow, stream channelization, and dams. These problems, while not pollutants, require complex solutions to help restore water bodies to more natural conditions.

Category 5: Polluted waters that require a [water improvement project= 1](#)

This is the list of impaired water bodies traditionally known as the 303(d) list. Starting with the 2004 Water Quality Assessment, Washington's 303(d) list of polluted waters were placed under category 5 in the approved assessment. TMDLs or other approved water quality improvement projects are required for the water bodies in this category.

If a water body is in this category it means that we have data showing that the water quality standards have been violated for one or more pollutants, and there is no TMDL— or pollution control program — in place.