Wells, Rocky Reach, and Rock Island HCP Tributary Committees Notes 13 January 2022

Members Present: Jeremy Cram (WDFW), Chris Fisher (Colville Tribes), Tom Kahler (Douglas PUD), Brandon Rogers (Yakama Nation), Kate Terrell (USFWS), Catherine Willard (Chelan PUD), Justin Yeager (NOAA Fisheries)[1], and Tracy Hillman (Committees' Chair).

Others Present: Becky Gallaher (Tributary Project Coordinator). Chris Johnson (MSRF), Tara Gregg (MSRF), Jessica Goldberg (MSRF), Michael Rafferty (Inter-Fluve), Luke Swan (Inter-Fluve), Mackenzie Butler (Inter-Fluve), and Steve Kolk (BOR) joined the meeting for the Eagle Rocks Presentation. Scott Bailey (CCNRD), Mike Kane (CCNRD contractor), and Michael Rafferty (Inter-Fluve) joined the meeting for the Peshastin RM 4.3 presentation and discussion. Jason Lundgren (CF), Mickey Fleming (CDLT), Dave Duvall (Grant PUD), Deanne Pavlik-Kunkel (Grant PUD), and Erin Harris (Grant PUD) joined the meeting for the Peshastin Creek RM 2.5 presentation and discussion.

The Wells, Rocky Reach, and Rock Island Hydroelectric Projects Habitat Conservation Plans Tributary Committees held a conference call on Thursday, 13 January 2022 from 9:00 am to 12:15 pm.

I. Review and Adopt November Agenda

Tracy Hillman welcomed everyone to the meeting and the Committees adopted the proposed agenda with the addition of the Salmon Recovery Funding Board schedule.

II. Review and Approval of the November Meeting Minutes

The draft 18 November 2021 meeting notes were reviewed and approved by the Tributary Committees via email on 9 December 2021.

III. Monthly Update on Ongoing Projects

Becky Gallaher gave an update on funded projects. Most are progressing well or had no salient activity in the past month.

- Barkley Irrigation – Under Pressure Project – The sponsor (Trout Unlimited; TU) reported that the project team continued to work through the Little Barkley removal permitting process. The 7460-1 application with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has been approved along with the Section 106 compliance letter. The Construction Safety and Phasing Plan (CSPP), which will allow the contractor to work within the Department of Transportation (DOT) airport boundaries, has been drafted and sent to the contractor, Jviation, who specializes in airport planning. The contractor will complete the final review of the CSPP. A few small cleanup details

[1] Justin joined the meeting at 10:00 am.

along the BIC/MVID pipeline easement will be addressed this spring. The team continues to work through the individual well and DOT/FAA easements along with cleanup at Meredith Gap.

- Beaver Fever Project – This project is complete. The sponsor (TU) provided a final report, which was uploaded to the Extranet site.
- Chiwawa Nutrient Enhancement Project – The sponsor (Cascade Fisheries; CF) reported there was no new activity on this project.
- Johnson Creek Habitat Restoration Project – The sponsor (TU) reported that they completed the transition to a new design consultant, they held a design-team kickoff meeting, and resumed design work. On 2 December, they held a meeting with WDFW, DOT, TU, and the design engineer to discuss technical feedback received from WDFW and DOT, to inform or prioritize design updates, and to identify necessary changes. Based on this meeting, they were able to complete Forsgren's design scope and move on to contracting.
- Lower Wenatchee Instream Flow Enhancement Project – The sponsor (TU) reported there was no new activity on this project.
- Upper Burns and Angle Point Project – This project is complete. The sponsor (Yakama Nation; YN) is preparing the final report.
- Peshastin RM 3.4 Side Channel Project – The sponsor (Chelan County Natural Resources Department; CCNRD) reported they continue to collect, manage, and evaluate groundwater elevation and temperature data to assist with design development. They also completed the 60% design package. For additional information, see discussion below.
- Napeequa Side Channel Connection Project – The sponsor (CF) reported there was no new activity on this project.
- Monitor Side Channel Project – This project is complete. The sponsor (CCNRD) provided a final report, which was uploaded to the Extranet site.
- Restore Chiwaukum Creek Project – The sponsor (CF) did not provide an update this month.
- Nason Ridge Acquisition – The sponsor (CCNRD) did not provide an update this month.
- Beaver Creek Barrier #40016 Correction Project – The sponsor (CCNRD) reported that they continue to work on the Joint Aquatic Resource Permit Application.
- Goodwin Side Channel Assessment Project – The sponsor (CF) reported there was no new activity on this project.
- Chumstick Baseflow and Riparian Enhancement Project – The sponsor (Cascadia Conservation District; CCD) did not provide an update this month.
- Upper Beaver Creek Final Design and Restoration Project – This project is complete. The sponsor (Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation; MSRF) provided a final report, which was uploaded to the Extranet site.
- Nason Kahler Instream Complexity Project – The sponsor (CCNRD) did not provide an update this month.
- Big Meadow Creek Fish Passage Project – The sponsor (CF) reported they continue to work on the design and intend to implement the project in summer 2023.
- Lower Chiwawa River Floodplain Reconnection and Instream Enhancement Project – The sponsor (CCNRD) reported that Inter-Fluve is developing the hydraulic model to evaluate existing conditions.

- Methow Thermal Refugia Restoration Assessment Project – The sponsor (MSRF) reported there was no new activity on this project.
- Alder Creek Floodplain Restoration Project – The sponsor (YN) reported there was no new activity on this project.
- Chewuch RM 4.2 Fish Enhancement Project – This project is complete. The sponsor (YN) is preparing the final report.
- Mission Wood Amendment Project – The sponsor (CF) reported that they are close to finalizing a work agreement with the Forest Service and are on track for implementation in 2022.
- Methow 3R Floodplain Restoration Feasibility Study Project – The sponsor (MSRF) did not provide an update this month.

IV. Decisions Made in December

For the record, Tracy Hillman reviewed the following decisions that were made by the Committees in December.

Nason Kahler Instream Complexity Project (Time Extension)

In December, the Rocky Reach Tributary Committee received a time extension request from Chelan County Natural Resources Department on the *Nason Kahler Instream Complexity Project*. Because of changes in the FEMA no-rise policy and the fact that the project will occur in a regulated floodway, the sponsor will need to prepare a Letter of Map Revision with FEMA. This will require additional time to complete modelling and analyses. In addition, because of the short in-water work window in 2022 (30 days), construction may need to extend into the 2023 in-water work window. Therefore, the sponsor requested a time extension from 31 December 2021 to 31 December 2023. The Rocky Reach Tributary Committee agreed to extend the contract period to 31 December 2023.

Chumstick Baseflow and Riparian Enhancement Project (Time Extension and Budget Amendment)

In December, the Rocky Reach Tributary Committee reviewed a time extension and budget amendment from Cascadia Conservation District on the *Chumstick Baseflow and Riparian Enhancement Project*. Because of staff shortages and FEMA issues, the sponsor requested a time extension from 31 December 2021 to 31 December 2022. In addition, to account for new permitting requirements, the sponsor asked to move funds from Salaries and Benefits and Indirect/Overhead/Admin to a new line item (Professional Services). After review, the Rocky Reach Tributary Committee approved the time extension and budget amendment. The total budget for the project will not change as a result of this amendment.

Methow 3R Floodplain Restoration Feasibility Study Project (Small Projects Application)

In December, the Committees received a Small Projects Program application from the Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation titled, *Methow 3R Floodplain Restoration Feasibility Study Project*. The purpose of the project is to complete a feasibility study to evaluate potential restoration opportunities along the Methow River between river miles 46.0-47.3. This reach of the Methow River has multiple opportunities to reconnect side channels and floodplains, increase thermal refugia, and enhance instream complexity while working with engaged landowners. The sponsor proposes to work closely with the Tributary Committees to identify feasible alternatives. The total cost of the project was $59,238. The sponsor requested $54,238 from HCP Plan Species Account Funds. The Wells Tributary Committee elected to contribute $54,238 to the feasibility study.

V. Review of Draft Wells HCP Tributary Committee Action Plan

Douglas PUD provided the Wells Tributary Committee with the Draft Wells HCP Tributary Committee Action Plan for 2022 (see Attachment 1). Members reviewed and unanimously approved the plan.

VI. Review of Tributary Committees' Policies and Procedures

Tributary Committee Operating Procedures

The Committees reviewed their operating procedures and made no changes to the document.

Policies and Procedures for Funding Projects

The Committees began reviewing their Policies and Procedures document. Tracy Hillman pointed out that the Policies and Procedures document contains a section titled "Review Procedures." That section (Section 5) describes the general and specific criteria the Committees use to evaluate proposals. Although the review procedures explain in detail the criteria for evaluating the biological and technical merits, feasibility, durability, and cost-effectiveness of proposed projects, they do not preclude the use of other criteria in making funding decisions. For example, in 2019, the Colville Confederated Tribes (CCT) voted "no" on a Yakama Nation (YN) proposal seeking funding to purchase land in the Methow River sub-basin. The CCT based their vote on not wanting the YN to own lands in CCT territories. In response to the CCT "no" vote, the YN has voted "no" on all CCT applications that propose protection or enhancement actions outside the CCT reservation; the YN will abstain from voting on CCT projects proposed within the CCT reservation. These decisions were based on policy-level input and are not described in Section 5 of the Policy and Procedures document. Tracy asked Committee members whether there is a need to revise Section 5 to specifically state what criteria can and cannot be used to evaluate applications. Some members present offered initial thoughts but said they need time to think about this.

Below are initial thoughts from some members on the decision-making process.

- The inclusion of criteria that can and cannot be used to make funding decisions may be important to include in the Policies and Procedures document. Funding decisions based on YN ownership in the Methow River sub-basin should not be allowable criteria. Members will need to discuss this internally within their respective agencies.
- The CCT (and likely others) will not surrender their right to make funding decisions based on policy-level input. The CCT will not agree to allowing HCP Plan Species Account Funds to be used by the YN to purchase lands in CCT territories. Importantly, the CCT has supported YN enhancement projects within the Methow River sub-basin and in other sub-basins. Thus, the decision by the YN to vote no on <u>all</u> CCT proposals (except actions proposed on the CCT reservation) is not consistent with the former policy of the CCT to vote no only on YN acquisitions projects in CCT territories.
- The differences in tribal policies and politics are well beyond the purview of the Tributary Committees and therefore cannot be resolved at this level. This issue needs to be resolved by the tribes at the tribal government level. Elevating this issue to the Coordinating and/or Policy Committees will not resolve the problem and will likely waste their time.
- It is unfortunate that tribal policies and politics are holding the HCPs' Plan Species Accounts hostage. Plan Species Account Funds are intended to help offset unavoidable losses due to hydroelectric project operations. The issues between the two tribes are precluding the Tributary Committees from funding good proposals that will or could benefit Plan Species.

The Committees will continue this discussion in February when all members are present (Justin Yeager was not available for this discussion).

VII. Eagle Rocks Presentation

Chris Johnson (MSRF), Tara Gregg (MSRF), Jessica Goldberg (MSRF), Michael Rafferty (Inter-Fluve), Luke Swan (Inter-Fluve), Mackenzie Butler (Inter-Fluve), and Steve Kolk (BOR) joined the meeting for the Eagle Rocks Presentation. Tara and representatives from Inter-Fluve gave a presentation (see Attachment 2) to inform the Committees on recent updates to the Eagle Rocks Project, which is part of the larger Sugar Project. The purpose of the presentation was to review recent monitoring results and discuss design alternatives with the Committees.

Tara began the presentation by reminding the Committees of the preferred 10% concept alternative, which is large wood placement and groundwater channel and alcove construction. Since the last presentation to the Committees, MSRF has conducted lateral migration analysis, recreation risk analysis, continued landowner outreach, and evaluated groundwater yield. Tara summarized the groundwater and alcove work and noted that the pump test for groundwater yield resulted in a relatively low estimated yield of about 3 cfs for the conceptual 2,000-foot-long channel. In addition, their analyses indicated that impacts to the wetland would require significant mitigation and 10 years of monitoring. Thus, floodplain work is likely not feasible at this site. She then stated that they intend to maintain the large wood design in the main channel. Existing conditions in the main channel are a function of historical channel wood removal and riparian forest clearing. The main channel now has limited pool habitat and cover and limited margin habitat. Tara noted that the goal of the project is now to increase instream structural complexity. This should benefit Chinook and steelhead summer and winter rearing.

Tara identified the geomorphic characteristics and treatment opportunities within the site. She showed 1945 and 2021 aerial photos of the site and pointed out changes in channel form as a result of sediment dynamics. She then showed the proposed placement of large wood in the main channel. The wood will serve two objectives: (1) help create scour pools (geomorphic wood) and (2) force water to banks with riparian vegetation. The latter has a habitat focus. Tara showed modeling results that compared water velocities in the site before and after treatment at 1,520 cfs and 3,200 cfs. She then showed how preferred habitat for juvenile Chinook increases with placement of large wood structures. Lastly, Tara explained the next steps for the project. She said that during the 30% design phase, they will refine large wood locations and structure types to maximize benefits, update the hydraulic model, evaluate large wood structure performance, conduct risk assessments (e.g., recreational users and flood risks), and develop 30% engineering plans and analyses.

Chris Fisher asked why the site is void of natural wood accumulations. Michael Rafferty responded that the site is within a transport reach and there is currently no channel roughness to retain wood recruited to the channel. Tom Kahler asked about the placement of large wood near the RV park and whether the landowner is okay with the proposed project. Chris Johnson said they are looking to reposition and rescale the wood placements near the RV park. They are also discussing this work with the landowner.

The Committees thanked MSRF and their consultants for the presentation and for seeking feedback from the Committees on the development of the Eagle Rocks project.

VIII. Peshastin RM 4.3 Project Presentation

Scott Bailey (CCNRD), Mike Kane (CCNRD contractor), and Michael Rafferty (Inter-Fluve) joined the meeting for the Peshastin RM 4.3 presentation. Scott and Michael gave a presentation (see Attachment 3) in which they described the updated restoration designs for the project site. The purpose of the presentation was to seek feedback from the Committees on the updated preliminary designs.

Scott began the presentation by showing the location of the project, identifying the ecological concerns (limiting factors) that the project intends to address, and identifying the goals of the project, which include adding complexity and reducing stream power, improving off-channel habitat complexity, enhancing floodplain riparian community, and avoid raising the 100-year base-flood elevation. Scott

reviewed the comments they received on the earlier preliminary designs. Previous comments focused on riffle/instream structure and side channels/split flow channels. To a large degree, comments focused on avoiding impacts to existing spawning habitat, temperature effects, and possible stranding and entrapment of fish. These effects are largely determined by the timing and amount of flow diverted into side channels.

Michael talked about engineering analyses. He presented a figure that showed daily discharge, exceedances, and the target flows needed to activate the side channels. He showed the typical spawning and incubation period for steelhead on the flow curves. He then showed results from their groundwater monitoring and noted that groundwater depth fluctuates between 3.5-7.0 feet below the proposed bed. He said the selections of 45 cfs to activate side channels and 550 cfs to activate high-flow channels were based on a balance among several factors including potential benefits to steelhead while trying to avoid stranding/entrapment, high temperature effects, and not raising the 100-year base-flood elevation. He reminded the Committees that the project site is located upstream from the Peshastin Irrigation Diversion.

Michael provided an overview of the design alternatives and noted that several design elements have changed based on comments received (from the Committees and regulators). For the mainstem, they eliminated constructed riffles, increased boulder clusters, and removed perennial split flow channels. For the off-channel habitat, they adjusted the connection frequency of seasonal side channels, realigned channels to limit tree impacts, modified channel geometry, added riffles and pools, reduced large wood loading, and selected a different inlet structure. Michael showed the site overview for the 60% plans and walked through the detailed plans for the lower, middle, and upper sections of the project site. He also described changes to the side-channel geometry including bankfull widths and depths. He then described the inlet structure, which includes the use of boulders and some large wood. Michael described the side-channel large-wood structures and boulder clusters. Lastly, Michael compared modeled results for water depths at 45 cfs, 200 cfs, 1,024 cfs (Q2), 2,639 (Q25), and 3,791 cfs (Q100) and water velocities at 200 cfs, 1,024 cfs (Q2), and 3,791 cfs (Q100) for existing and proposed conditions.

Chris Fisher found the groundwater monitoring results encouraging and commented that the groundwater elevation was higher than he expected, especially given that monitoring occurred during a drought year. Chris asked about water temperatures during rearing. He commented that the boulders placed in the side channels can absorb thermal radiation and reradiate thermal energy to the water. This can reduce rearing potential for juvenile steelhead in the side channels. Michael responded that there is a cold-water source upstream from the project that will help keep water temperatures cool in the side channels. Scott added that establishment of riparian vegetation will shade the side channels and boulders, and this should also help maintain suitable rearing temperatures for salmonids. Michael said they worked hard to find a balance among suitable rearing flows, suitable temperatures, and reduced stranding/entrapment.

Scott reported that they intend to submit a proposal through the Salmon Recovery Funding Board process, but there is currently a gap between current designs and developing final (construction-ready) designs. To that end, he would like to request funding from the Tributary Committees to complete the final designs. This will allow them to implement the project without any delays. Scott said they have Bureau of Reclamation support, which will serve as a cost share. When asked about the cost to construct the project, Scott responded that they estimate the cost of construction to be about $500,000. He noted they would need about $70,000 to $90,000 to prepare final designs, which he would like completed by this fall. The Committees recommended the sponsor submit a budget amendment (rather than a separate proposal) to the existing contract. The budget amendment would request funding to prepare final designs. Scott and Michael thanked the Committees and Scott said as part of their contract with the Rock Island Tributary Committee, the Committee must review and approve restoration scenarios and designs. Therefore, he asked the Committees to please review the 60% design plans and preliminary design report and provide written comments back to him (Tracy Hillman provided the two documents to the Committees on 5 January 2022). The Committees will provide written comments to the sponsor by the end of January.

Following the presentation and discussion with the project sponsor, Becky Gallaher reported that their contract expires on 31 January 2022. Thus, without a time extension, the Rock Island Tributary Committee will not be able to review a budget amendment in February. To avoid making the sponsor prepare a new project application, the Rock Island Tributary Committee agreed to extend the contract period from 31 January 2022 to 31 January 2023. This does not change the existing budget but does allow the sponsor the opportunity to submit a budget amendment for review in February.

IX. Peshastin Creek RM 2.5 Presentation (with the PRCC Habitat Subcommittee)

Jason Lundgren (CF), Mickey Fleming (CDLT), Dave Duvall (Grant PUD), Deanne Pavlik-Kunkel (Grant PUD), and Erin Harris (Grant PUD) joined the meeting for the Peshastin Creek RM 2.5 presentation and discussion. Jason gave a presentation (see Attachment 4) in which he described protection and restoration opportunities at RM 2.5 on Peshastin Creek. The purpose of the presentation was to determine the Committees interest in funding protection and restoration work at this site.

Jason began the presentation by stating that Cascade Fisheries and the Chelan-Douglas Land Trust were approached by landowners who recently purchased a 163-acre property along lower Peshastin Creek. The property spans about 0.58 miles along lower Peshastin Creek (RM 2.5-3.0) and contains a large piece of floodplain (20.5 acres). The landowners are interested in conservation and stream restoration work on the property and asked CF and CDLT to develop protection (easement) and restoration alternatives. Jason showed 1949, 1997, and 2017 aerial photos of the project site. He identified the 20.5-acre floodplain and showed a LIDAR image of the floodplain, which indicated channel scars across the floodplain. Using the Upper Columbia Regional Technical Team prioritization tool, Jason noted that the project occurs within a Tier 2 assessment unit for spring Chinook and steelhead restoration. He also identified the factors that currently limit salmonids and the limiting life stages in the assessment unit. Jason noted the locations of steelhead redds within the project reach and commented on the importance of Peshastin Creek as a cold-water stream for salmonids. He also talked about climate change susceptibility risk at this site.

Jason said they would like funding to appraise the value of the 20.5-acre floodplain and to develop conceptual restoration designs. The appraisal would provide an estimated cost to acquire the floodplain and the cost of an easement, which is what the landowners have requested. The purpose of the easement is to remove all development rights on the floodplain. Jason also showed very preliminary design concepts that were prepared by Natural Systems Design. He said potential restoration challenges at this site include the risk to Highway 97 and the private road, a high and cleared terrace that provides little opportunity for enhancement, and possible landowner constraints below RM 2.75 and the Peshastin Irrigation Diversion near the downstream end of the site. Jason concluded by stating this is a unique opportunity to protect and restore important habitat in lower Peshastin Creek.

Justin Yeager asked why the landowners want an easement rather than an acquisition. Mickey said they requested an easement, but the appraisal will provide both the cost to acquire the floodplain and the cost of an easement. She will discuss this with the landowners. Chris Fisher asked what the landowners intend to do with the uplands. Mickey responded the uplands will be used for cabins. Jeremy Cram noted that he is not a fan of conservation easements and would prefer this be an acquisition. He reminded Mickey and Jason that an easement purchased with Plan Species Account Funds requires public access. This is something to discuss with the landowners. Jeremy asked about the effects of the Peshastin Irrigation Diversion on the project. Jason responded it will have no effect on the easement but could have an effect on restoration opportunities. However, the geomorphology of the site appears to limit restoration opportunities at the downstream end of the property. Brandon asked about the height of the terrace. Jason indicated that it is about 7 feet above the wetted surface.

In addition to the presentation, Cascade Fisheries submitted a General Salmon Habitat Program Application titled, *Peshastin Creek RM 2.5 Project*. As noted during the presentation, the purpose of the project is to conduct an appraisal of the 20.5-acre floodplain and develop conceptual restoration designs.

The total cost of the project was $132,825.20. The sponsor requested the full amount from HCP Plan Species Account Funds. The Committees declined the opportunity to fund the project at this time for the following reasons:

- Because the landowners are conservation minded and appear to want to restore habitat conditions for Plan Species on their property, the Committees question why an acquisition or conservation easement is necessary. Perhaps a more cost-effective approach would be to simply enhance the habitat without purchasing the property or an easement. In addition, the Committees are cold to the idea of purchasing an easement, and even if they warmed to the idea, an easement purchased with Plan Species Account funds would require public access, which may not be desirable to the landowners. A possible alternative is the landowners donate the floodplain to CDLT. This would reduce the total cost of the proposed project and allow habitat enhancement work on the property.
- Although this project targets some of the factors limiting salmonid production within Peshastin Creek, an important factor not addressed by this project is stream flow. The Committees question what the landowners intend to do with their senior water right (if they have one). If they intend to exercise their right to withdraw water from Peshastin Creek, it is not clear what affect water withdrawal will have on enhancement opportunities on the property or on salmonid productivity.
- The Committees would like to better understand the landowners' desires and potential constraints on the property. The Committees would like responses to the following questions.
    - What do the landowners intend to do with the uplands?
    - If the landowners require the property be protected before initiating enhancement work, would they agree to an acquisition rather than an easement?
    - What is the size of the landowners' water right and do they intend to use it?
    - How does the senior water right relate to the Peshastin Irrigation Diversion (PID), where the diversion can remove all but about 3 cfs from Peshastin Creek during summer (i.e., if the landowners elect not to use their water right, would PID take the water, or would it remain in the stream)?
    - What are the potential enhancement constraints given the location of the Peshastin Irrigation Diversion at the downstream end of the property?

The Committees directed Tracy Hillman to draft a letter explaining the Committees concerns and questions associated with the proposed project. After the Committees review the draft letter, Tracy will send the letter to the project sponsor.

X. Information Updates

The following information updates were provided during the meeting.

1. Approved Payment Requests received in December 2021 and January 2022:

    Rock Island Plan Species Account:

    - $57.75 to Clifton Larson Allen for Rock Island financial administration in November 2021.
    - $78.75 to Clifton Larson Allen for Rock Island financial administration in December 2021.
    - $1,756.56 to Chelan County Treasurer for work on the Lower Chiwawa River Floodplain Reconnection Project in November.

- $4,059.20 to Chelan County Treasurer for work on the Lower Chiwawa River Floodplain Reconnection Project in December.
- $18,940.55 to Cascade Fisheries for work on the Chiwawa Nutrient Enhancement Project in November.
- $779.74 to Cascade Fisheries for work on the Chiwawa Nutrient Enhancement Project in December.
- $195.47 to Cascade Fisheries for work on the Big Meadow Creek Fish Passage Project in November and December.
- $291.93 to Cascade Fisheries for work on the Goodwin Side Channel Project.
- $7,403.31 to Trout Unlimited for work on the Beaver Fever – Restoring Ecosystem Function Project.

Rocky Reach Plan Species Account:

- $57.75 to Clifton Larson Allen for Rocky Reach financial administration in November 2021.
- $78.75 to Clifton Larson Allen for Rocky Reach financial administration in December 2021.
- $2,640.40 to Chelan County Treasurer for work on the Beaver Creek Barrier Correction Project in October and November.
- $1,167.19 to Chelan County Treasurer for work on the Beaver Creek Barrier Correction Project in December.
- $9,004.58 to Cascade Fisheries for work on the Chumstick Baseflow and Riparian Enhancement Project.
- $423.45 to Cascade Fisheries for work on the Napeequa Side Channel Project.

Wells Species Account:

- $8,948.03 to the Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation for work on the Methow Thermal Refugia Restoration Project.
- $10,409.32 to the Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation for work on the Upper Beaver Creek Design and Restoration Project.
- $303.73 to Cascade Fisheries for work on the Mission Wood Amendment Project.

2. Tracy Hillman reported that he and Becky Gallaher completed Section 2.3 (Tributary Committees and Plan Species Accounts) for the Annual Report of Activities under the Anadromous Fish Agreement and Habitat Conservation Plan for each hydroelectric project. Tracy said he sent the draft reports to Anchor QEA, who is compiling the draft annual reports. The draft reports will be sent to the HCP Coordinating Committees for review. The PUDs will submit the final reports to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in May.
3. Tracy Hillman reviewed the 2021 Wells Plan Species Account Financial Activity report with the Wells Committee (see Attachment 5). This report identifies the beginning account balance ($2,394,264.62), deposits and interest receipts ($299,599.43), expenses and uses ($137,511.89), and ending balance ($2,556,352.16). The 2021 Rocky Reach and Rock Island financial reports will be shared with the Committees as soon as they are available.

4. Tracy Hillman reported that the PUDs will deposit funds into each of the Plan Species Accounts by the end of January 2022. Tom Kahler reported that on 12 January, Douglas PUD deposited $310,501.91 into the Wells Plan Species Account. Following the meeting, Becky Gallaher reported that Chelan PUD deposited $855,132 into the Rock Island Plan Species Account and $405,007 into the Rocky Reach Plan Species Account. Thus, across all accounts, a total of $1,570,641 was deposited into Plan Species Accounts.
5. Tom Kahler provided the Committees with a request to help sponsor the Fish Passage 2022 – International Conference on River Connectivity that will be held on 13-16 June 2022 at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory in Richland, WA. The purpose of the conference is to discuss fish passage issues related to engineering, biology, and fisheries management. Although members see value in the conference, they concluded that the conference is not within the boundaries or scope of the HCPs and therefore Tom pulled the request from further review.
6. Tracy Hillman reviewed the Salmon Recovery Funding Board/Tributary Committees proposed schedule for 2022 (see Attachment 6). Important dates are noted below:
    - Pre-Applications Due: 28 February 2022
    - Presentations by Project Sponsors: 9-10 March 2022
    - Completed Draft Applications Due: 20 April 2022
    - Site Visits: 9-11 May 2022
    - Committees Review Draft Applications: 12 May 2022
    - Final Application Due: 19 May 2022
    - Committees Review Final Applications: 9 June 2022

    Tracy noted that because of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, presentations and site visits will likely be virtual.

XI. Next Steps

The next meeting of the Tributary Committees will be on 10 February 2022.

Meeting notes submitted by Tracy Hillman (tracy.hillman@bioanalysts.net).