

Pend Oreille Salmonid Recovery Team Technical Advisory Group Meeting

POSRT Strategy Revision Workshop

Draft Meeting Minutes

April 18, 2011

Scheduled 8:00 am - 4:00 pm Kalispel Wellness Center, Usk

Facilitator: Nick Bean, Lead Entity Coordinator, Kalispel Tribe of Indians

Present: Nick Bean (KNRD), Sandy Dotts (WDFW), Jeff Lawlor (WDFW), Todd McLaughlin (PO County), Rob Lawler (USFS), Jill Cobb (IPNF), Todd Andersen (KNRD), Tom Shuhda (CNF), Wade Pierce (Stimson), Sean Stash (IPNF)

Meeting: Called to order by the Coordinator Nick Bean at 8:15 am.

Introductions: Given by each attendee at 8:20 am.

Announcements:

- The 2-10-2011 TAG meeting minute's approval was shifted to the next TAG meeting based on a lack of a quorum.
- The agenda was approved as is understanding that the duration and content of the meeting is subject to change.
- A workplan created for the 2011 SRFB process was presented to the members. This is based on the original schedule sent out earlier in the year and contains meeting dates and content, deadlines, and sponsor requirements.
- Klündt Hosmer is being contracted by the Tribe to develop a website for the Lead Entity and educational/outreach materials for the POSRT and local salmonid recovery. This is being paid for through the Lead Entity operational grant with RCO.
- Project update: the engineered plans for Mill Creek Fish Passage Design project will be complete June 30th; plans for the CCA Culvert Replacement Design project are complete and awaiting approval from Stimson; the FS will be sending out the RFP for MB LeClerc Restoration (Phase I) this week; the Kapelke Diversion Screening project has been surveyed and Bruce Heiner is designing the project but the screen may be a different type than expected to reduce the maintenance responsibility for the landowner; there is a NEPA meeting next week for the Granite LWD Replenishment project.
- The PUD is submitted JARPA and SEPA for the MB LeClerc LWD project.
- Phase I of the Greggs Addition demo site is going to be this Friday and will be focused on planting riparian vegetation. Two sites (Nosbom [spelling?] and Greggs Addition) are being used as a demonstration site to evaluate the success of planting cuttings to shade out reed canary grass.
- Sandy mentioned that Nick should contact George Luft with the County to assist him with the PRISM database.

Cost Share Road Presentation and Discussion

- Wade Pierce presented a slideshow on USFS/SLC Cost Share Roads.
- Of the original 11 agreement areas in NE WA, one now exists which includes the LeClerc/Harvey Creek and Chewelah/Calispell Creek areas.
- Proposed changes within a management area must be accomplished through a Supplement to the Agreement. This involved a fairly lengthy process that starts with the proposed changes, then layout and design, NEPA, appraisal and fact sheet then the supplement. The initiating (proposing) party has to submit the proposal to the cost share partners from which the cooperators have 20 days to act on the proposal. Once completed, the supplement becomes a legal document and an obligation to perform the work. As a cost sharing method the cooperators may elect to perform the improvements.
- To date some of the SRFB projects have circumvented the cost-share process. The issue is the SRFB projects not being conducive to cost-share timelines. Legally the Supplements need to be signed prior to commencing work and Stimson is now backlogged with many of these Supplements. To date some of the SRFB projects have not properly considered the cost-share process timeline in their implementation schedules. Legally, supplements to the existing cost share agreement between the Forest Service and Stimson Lumber Company need to be agreed to and signed prior to commencing implementation work. Stimson is now backlogged with supplements relating to SRFB projects.

- It was mentioned that this should be integrated into the POSRT Strategy. Also there was some hesitation from members to allow cost-share proposals in the future though this was met with some opposition. [It was also clarified that supplements to cost share agreements cannot be started until detailed information is obtained through the completion of survey and design projects. Therefore, the issue of the timing of project proposals and the cost share agreement process refers only to SRFB implementation project proposals and not to SRFB survey and design project proposals.](#)

POSRT Strategy Revision (Sessions 1-3)

- The group reviewed the changes made by the coordinator to the POSRT Strategy. Of these revisions the majority focused on grammatical and structural edits to the document content.
- The species distribution and habitat maps will be changed to reflect the current bull trout (BT) critical habitat, any recent sightings, new information on westslope cutthroat trout (WCT) distribution through the Kalispel Tribe, USFS, WDFW and any other data holders, and non-native (brook trout) overlap with WCT. Sandy will send Nick the list of documented sightings she keeps. She will also provide any GIS data she has so we don't have to recreate the maps. Table 1 will now include BT individual sightings and BT populations (via ongoing successful reproduction).
- Northern pike information should be added to the strategy.
- We will add information on the assessments that have been conducted (Granite and NetMap) in section VI.
- We discussed how to divide priorities based on restoration versus protection and if the priorities still reflect what we want to see. The coordinator discussed how habitat suitability and access for westslope cutthroat trout may serve as a proxy for determining priority watersheds since the single sighting rule seems to be creating some disparity amongst the watersheds. Using successfully reproducing WCT populations, biological competition and extent of suitable habitat may be factors useful in weighing watersheds based on WCT. Another idea discussed was to look at prioritizing watersheds partially on restoration needs. We could give priority to watersheds that need a minimal amount of work to close the book on these areas. The discussed priorities also included separate BT "protection" criteria. The group determined that this exercise was not warranted and decided to hold on to the criteria from the last revision.
- There was extensive discussion on the "historic" BT sightings and documentations. The group determined that historic should be any time frame in the past and the Strategy should describe this as such. We will leave the 1980 occurrence as such since the date of this somewhat irrelevant (section VII). Current criteria are based on recent documentation of the activities (life stages) occurring (group discussion).
- The group discussed the existing scores for each category within the subbasin priority tables and evaluated each based on new knowledge and the criteria used for each segment. No changes occurred in the water temperature, public vs. private, or restoration potential categories in the subbasin ranking. Sightings within the last 10 years, current or historic use, current habitat, migration barriers and total score/rank changed in the high and medium priority subbasins as follows (Changes in **BOLD**):

HIGH PRIORITY SUBBASINS

Subbasin	Current or historic use	Sightings last 10 yrs	Water temp	Public vs. Private	Current habitat	Migration barriers	Restoration potential	Total Score	Rank
Granite	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	33	1
South Fork Salmo	5	5	5	5	5	5	0 ¹	30	2
Hughes Fork	5	5	4	5	4	2 ¹	4	29	3
Cedar	3	2	5	5	4	5	4	28	4
Slate	2	2	5	5	4	5	2	25	5 (tie)
LeClerc	5	5	3	3	3	2	2	23	6
Sullivan	3	2	4	5	2	5	3	22	7
Indian	3	2	5	3	4	4	4	25	5 (tie)
Upper West Branch	2	0	3	5	3	4	2	19	9
Mill	2	0	3 ²	2	2	4	2	15	10
Kalispell	2	0	3	5	4	5	2	21	8

¹ There are no restoration activities currently required in this subbasin so a value of "0" is assigned.

² Current water temperature data is incomplete. Value will be reevaluated when new data becomes available.

MEDIUM PRIORITY SUBBASINS

Subbasin	Current or historic use	Sightings last 10 yrs	Water temp	Public vs. Private	Current habitat	Migration barriers	Restoration potential	Total Score	Rank
Cee Cee Ah	1	0	4	3	4	4	3	19	1
Tacoma	1	0	3	3	3	5	2	17	3
Calispell	1	0	3	3	2	4	1	14	4
Ruby	3	2	2	5	1	4	1	18	2(or high)

- It was determined that based on scores in the medium and high priority subbasins, we may need to reprioritize certain subbasins from high to medium (UWB, Mill Kalispell?) and upgrade one to high from medium (Ruby?). This will be clarified and discussed again prior to formalizing these changes.
- The areas and actions table in the Strategy was reviewed. Minor changes occurred within certain subbasins. Changes included updating the status of projects, revising the actions needed, eliminating erroneous information and adding new information. We will reflect work likely to be conducted through FERC relicensing projects if it currently exists as a priority within the Strategy. Nick will continue to rework the table to reflect a change in subbasin priority (structural). Details on this information and all edits will be presented upon completion of the current Strategy revision. The map (figures F-T) depicting priority actions will be updated by Nick with Sandy's assistance.
- Appendix A will become a list of SRFB projects to date, with a link to Habitat Work Schedule instead of the extensive individual project summaries.
- A prioritized list of surface water diversions (WDFW) will be added as an appendix to the Strategy.
- The barrier prioritization table in Appendix E will be reevaluated and updated based on new information. If the latest barrier assessment proposal is funded the information from CNF land will be added and the whole list of barriers for WRIA 62 will be prioritized and housed in a database with the top barriers added to the Strategy.
- The group did not discuss the last agenda item involving the implementation strategy due to time constraints.

Meeting Wrap-up Discussion; Upcoming Meetings/Items:

- The next meeting is May 11th from 9am -12pm. The meeting will be focused on project presentations and discussions for 2011. We may also discuss the implementation schedule since we didn't get to discuss it today.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:50 pm