



# Final Notes

Kootenai River Habitat Restoration Program  
Project Management Team Annual Planning Meeting

February 17, 2016 – 9 AM to 4 PM Pacific  
Oxford Suites, Spokane, WA

---

## Meeting participants

Ron Abraham, Matt Daniels, Alan Flory, Sue Ireland, Norm Merz, Tom Parker, Patty Perry, Jason Shappart, Lane Shinnick, Scott Soult, Doug Smith, Alison Squier, Dan Warren, and Scott Wright.

## Item 1: Review lessons learned in 2015 by project area

### *Construction, materials acquisition and staging*

- Weekly safety and construction meetings. In 2015 held weekly safety meetings on Mondays and weekly construction meetings on Thursdays. Both were really important to the success of the project. In 2016 would like to have Alan Flory and Thomas Mackey participate in the construction meetings when possible.

For the weekly construction meetings developed a simple agenda with standing items so that nothing was overlooked. Kept simple notes from each meeting. Used the meetings to address any problems, make sure everyone on the same page etc. Sue noted that the construction meetings gave her a much better understanding of the project as it unfolded.

In addition, to the weekly Monday safety meetings, they talked about safety all the time on the job. Everyone has been on top of the various safety guidance and the result is another year with an excellent safety record.

- Site security and high visibility of construction activities. This was the first year we dealt with security issues at a KRHRP construction site, it went well. Will need to continue to stay on top of all the details related to both security and the high visibility of the project in 2016.
- Best Management Practices. The four years of prior experience implementing projects were really helpful implementing and refining BMPs. Everything worked really well this year (see additional notes under environmental compliance and permitting).
- Complacency. Complacency can be a problem with a multi-year project, especially since things have been going very well. Need to always treat each project as a new project and carefully review every component. Need to carefully review all of the specs, any design changes, etc. We missed and/or had some communication breakdowns around some project components, particularly the vegetation and fencing changes (see following).
- Vegetation. There were changes in 2015 in vegetation design, materials and installation as a result of the learning curve from previous projects. We also learned we need to do earlier coordination with the revegetation subcontractor to make sure everyone is on the same page and not working from erroneous or outdated assumptions. For example, the fascine brush designs were a new component that we didn't fully explain to everyone, it worked out in the

end but there was some confusion. Need to make sure everyone understands the sequence, approach, materials, purpose, timing, etc. In addition, we need to have better coordination of the revegetation components with the overall construction process.

Had a meeting with key vegetation and construction contractors in January to discuss specific issues related to vegetation. One outcome is that in March 2016 with Geum, NW Tree and Alan will get together to go through the 2016 specs, make sure they make sense to everyone, and prepare for the 2016 projects.

- Materials acquisition and staging. Each year the staging is different. Alan would like to know as soon as possible when they can start delivering materials and to know what's coming up. Want to make sure that we confirm the staging location as soon as possible in 2016.

Last year was extremely dry, that can shut down wood acquisition. In 2016 would like to be 80-90% staged at Duarte's by July in case we can't get into the woods later. We're using more brush in the new designs, that dries out and becomes brittle more quickly so we had to water that material throughout the construction season in 2015.

- Fencing. The fence specs changed in 2015 and then the fence wasn't available. Need to determine what were using and coordinate as early as possible to make sure that doesn't happen in 2016.
- Weather and river conditions. The weather conditions in 2015 allowed Goodfellow Brothers to get into the river two weeks prior to what we'd planned. This changed everyone's schedule. It worked but coordination was critical. We won't know what the 2016 water year looks like until closer to the construction season.
- Drone heliport. A designated heliport for the drone is important to safety.

#### ***Environmental compliance and permitting***

- Permits and permit binder. The permit binder continues to be really helpful on the construction site; however, it did not include a protocol for the inadvertent discovery procedure. That protocol was added.

Everyone figured out how to do the ENOI to file the SWIPP. The construction manager, engineer and project all manager all have to file, and then you have to wait 2 weeks before beginning construction.

- **ACTION: Sue to send inadvertent discovery procedure to Jason S.**

- Communication. There was an incident in 2015 when a body was found on an island while subcontractors were securing the willows. The subcontractor notified the sheriff but did not notify the Tribal project manager and construction team. For 2016 need to identify a procedure to improve communication and deal better with unexpected events like this during the field season. Everyone on the project needs to understand the chain of communication.
- Compliance. Seemed like everything went very well. Jason S. suggested summarizing the monitoring results each year for our internal project records. Sue suggested giving the various regulators a simple end of season report to let them know how well the various BMPs work. The regulatory agencies are trying to learn what works well and what doesn't and the results in the field are important to their understanding. Jason also noted that he would like to see periodic updates of the compliance monitoring during the season just to understand how things are working.

There were no visits from regulatory folks even though they were invited. The construction

team and Tribe have developed a good working relationship with the environmental compliance people, there's a good foundation of trust and confidence. Want to continue to build on that.

- Environmental Assessment and associated. NEPA scoping isn't outreach to educate the public, it is a scoping to find out if there are any significant issues that arise in the process of scoping. In reality, almost by design, it results in no significant public comments.

Having to do the EA locked in the design earlier than with previous KRHRP projects. It also created some additional challenges in terms of timing of landowner outreach. Providing support to BPA to complete the EA took a lot of time and effort. Where possible, we would like to avoid projects that require an EA in the future.

#### ***Coordination and communication with landowners***

- Ongoing effort. Communication with landowners is a constant day-to-day exercise during the construction season and it takes time and consistent commitment. You have to deal with multiple personalities, and you have to be prepared to invest the time and effort in ongoing communication.
- Uncertainty. You can never predict what's going to happen. In 2016 we may be in another situation where we have to make last minute adjustments. We have a landowner whose land is in probate and we may or may not be able to get timely agreements relative to use of that land for staging. There are also the unknown unknowns.
- Don't make assumptions. We learned in 2015 that some landowners have very different values in terms of the short and long term uses of their properties. In the past we've worked primarily with agricultural producers who are concerned about reducing land loss and see the projects as largely consistent with their own goals and interests.

In 2015 we had a landowner who was more concerned about retaining the development and resale value of this property. That landowner didn't see the project as a visual asset and was concerned about the potential impacts from the project construction and staging while his house was on the market. It took a while to find a mutually agreeable approach and that approach included making some modifications to the project design.

#### ***Outreach and communication (community, KVRI, web site)***

- Pre-project community outreach. The outreach that was completed in 2014 in advance of the 2015 project made a big difference. It answered a lot of the public's questions.
- Internal Tribal program manager and Tribal outreach and communication. The Kootenai Tribe Fish and Wildlife Department employees were asked questions about the project by members of the community, etc. but weren't all familiar with the projects. In 2016 it would be good to brief everyone about the project before we start construction so they all understand what we're doing.

The frequent briefings to Tribal Council were helpful. Also, having Ron A. participate in the weekly construction meetings, meet people who came for tours, connect with landowners, etc. was really valuable so that he could provide and maintain a direct link with Tribal Council.

Alan F. noted that he would like to meet with Tribal Council to discuss how to best represent the project. He said that sometimes landowners bring up questions that make him feel uncomfortable and he would like to make sure he's representing the Tribe accurately.

- Weekly construction updates. Sue compiled weekly construction updates after each construction meeting. These were based on a simple template and included information about

that week's construction activities and photos. Those were posted in prominent places, shared with the County and City, etc.

Consider paying for an ad in the newspaper next year so that they're available in the newspaper as well.

- Everyone plays a role in outreach and communication. With Goodfellow Brothers employees and other subcontractors in town, it doesn't take long for people to know they're the contractors working on the project. The weekly meetings that educate everyone on the overall project, specific construction activities, etc. help to inform everyone and also help to slow the rumor mill. This increases our ability to provide accurate information about the project.
- Community outreach (KVRI, Soil Conservation District, County Commissioners, City Council). In 2015 Sue and Patty briefed KVRI and used their mailing list to get construction notices out. Ron A. also chairs the KVRI and both he and Gary were able to provide updates on the KRHRP as well. We also shared the weekly updates with the Soil and Conservation District which meets regularly.

Patty noted that Sue does a great job of briefing the County Commissioners but they don't always do a great job of sharing that briefing externally. She suggested asking them to invite Bob Graham to the briefings in 2016. Also, focus more in 2016 on deliberately reaching out to key resource people e.g., county planner or others and ask them to help share information.

- Open house. Hosted a successful open house in 2015 which was well-attended and received.
- Web site, press coverage, flyers, and signs. We got very good coverage from the online newspaper. Recommend informing them more frequently during construction season and on an ongoing basis. If we want to get the message out in the print media we may need to take out a paid ad or do an insert. Paid advertising is preferable since most people just throw out the inserts. The print papers are also a challenge because they have a lot of turnover, as soon as you get someone up to speed on the project, they move on. Sue suggested in 2016 doing a few press releases through the construction season with photos and also placing a more in depth ad or multiple ads.

The web site updates always fall to the bottom of the to do list. Updating the web site is a priority for 2016. In 2015 we got a good free review of the web site by the Bonners Ferry News folks via their list of questions and things from the web site that were confusing. Dan noted there are newer technologies that make it easier to update your web site.

In terms of outreach materials keep the message as simple as possible. Alison suggested a one-pager with key talking points (e.g., goals and objectives of project, where to look for more info, what's going on this year, frequently asked questions) might be helpful for all of the contractors and subs to have to hand out to people who ask about the project. Alan suggested figuring out how to reach the younger generation e.g., Kyle and Rob.

#### ***Data collection, modeling, and USGS coordination***

- Modeling. 2015 was the first time we implemented a project that spans multiple construction seasons. The modeling and analysis all focused on evaluating the project as a whole and did not include analysis of the interim conditions when the projects are half built. There have been some localized effects that were not anticipated. At the scale the we're working on (i.e., materials removed for pools and construction of islands) we increased the local gradient in that area and through the summer saw some bank erosion. Rock was placed at the upper end of the site to address this. However, the lesson is that when we move forward in the Lower Meander

and any other projects that span multiple years, we need to take a closer look at interim effects as part of the modeling.

- USGS coordination and data collection. The five-year SOW has helped to make the process more efficient and has helped prioritize and plan for data collection, clarify deliverables, etc. Ryan F. has been really proactive in terms of coordination in the field and RDG is getting information from USGS when they need it. Molly Wood who has been doing the real time suspended sediment stations and gages, published her scientific investigations report this year. Mitch and Sue were reviewers on that report. Sue noted that the sediment surrogate turned out to be a valuable tool for looking at impacts of a big wind and rain event.

### ***Design and engineering***

- General. Matt said the modeling exercise is the biggest lesson. The designs are evolving based on what we've been able to do on other KRHRP projects and what we've learned from that. At this point we have a pretty good set of treatments. Dan noted that it's been important to keep track of the design milestones and minimize changes to the designs.

### ***Technical review and coordination (PRAT, CMART, Modeling Subgroup)***

- PRAT and CMART. Being able to continue to work with our technical advisors has been really helpful, particularly getting timely review of the designs. In the past we used the PRAT to evaluate alternatives in detail. A lesson is that sometimes we've given them too detailed design alternatives and that's not the best use of their expertise or the design team's time. Dan added that, from his perspective, providing designs for review that are already to more refined stages is not the point where designers should be considering and/or incorporating biological, ecological, broader considerations for engineering and other input needs to be obtained. It can be costly to redo designs that may be beyond the 50% stage. Dan suggested that it is potentially expensive at even less refined stages. Dan suggested that development of design alternatives based on expert input and review should be considered only at stages below 30% design completion.

There are also other ways to have the PRAT provide feedback on different design stages that are more valuable. The last PRAT and CMART meeting provided a lot of valuable feedback in terms of specific questions (e.g., feasibility questions, success criteria, biological hypotheses, etc.)

- Add additional follow-up with the PRAT and CMART between the meetings to keep them informed about project progress, construction, etc. Is it important to continue to utilize expert input from individual PRAT members through formal reviews during the design process technical memos from these reviews should be produced as part of documenting the basis of the design and to capture input from members whether they are attending the group reviews or not, or might be less likely to actively participate in the larger PRAT meetings. This type of individual review has in the technical review budgets.

In 2014 we skipped the PRAT/CMART meeting and in 2015 we regretted that, we didn't get feedback that would have been useful and it took longer to get everyone back up to speed and understanding the project again.

Having the Kootenai Tribe's wildlife department participate in the CMART this year was valuable on all sides.

- Modeling subgroup. This group has been really helpful. We started with questions about what models were needed. Now the models are up and running and we're asking what questions can we answer with those. Also using the modeling meeting to help interpret what we're seeing in

the monitoring data. We design a project, we model it, then after its built we survey the as-built conditions, then the USGS goes back out and looks at changes in depth and size, then we go back into the model and tweak the parameters. Eventually that will lead to another paper looking at prediction, what happened, and how we tweaked the model.

Sue noted the value of having Stanford Gibson, who developed the HEC-RAS model as part of the modeling group.

- Other technical coordination. Coordination with Kootenai Tribe program managers is valuable and necessary. Getting out into the field to look at Ball Creek was important in 2015 and continued coordination will be critical as we move into the meander reach. Information sharing between the various Kootenai programs is helpful to all of the programs.

### ***Monitoring and evaluation***

- BPA and NPCC review of monitoring and evaluation. BPA and NPCC will be looking at the monitoring and evaluation associated with all of the projects and whether that monitoring and evaluation work is effective, is justified, and how it is being used. What we are doing on the KRHRP is consistent with that emphasis. We can show how we're using the monitoring data we're collecting, why we're collecting it, our review process for making sure we're not just collecting data for the sake of it.
- KRHRP Monitoring Reports. Last year, Geum and RDG produced a big data report with lots of charts, graphs, etc. Input from the PRAT, PMT and CMART was that it would be valuable to have a shorty summary interpretation of that information. Tom and Sarah distributed a copy of the 2015 summary report that was a result of that input.

Based on PMT discussions in 2015, the KRHRP monitoring will be presented in three reports that will be posted on the web site: Part 1 is an overview of the KRHRP program and links it to the Master Plan, Part 2 is the summary interpretive report that shows snapshots of how each project is doing relative to addressing limiting factors, and Part 3 is the larger data report with columns that can be added each year as new data is collected. In the past we also considered separating the geomorphology and revegetation reports, but decided to keep them together consistent with the interdisciplinary project approach.

- Monitoring, interpretation of monitoring results, and use of data and information gathered. We're at a point in the project where we have seven years of data collected. It is a big collection of information. We now have an opportunity to pause and look at all of that information and what it means. For instance, can begin to understand exceedance percentages? Doing that analysis is an important part of adaptive management, and of telling the story of our project. Further discussion of how to best evaluate this data is a topic for 2016.

Jason noted that for lessons learned relative to monitoring and evaluation, there are two components: 1) what have we learned from doing the monitoring and, 2) what we have learned about how we're actually doing the monitoring and if our methods are working for us. Tom agreed and explained that is identified as a next step in the current summary interpretive report.

Sarah reviewed the table of progress against success criteria and noted that while we're doing very well on most of the criteria, browse is a continued challenge. However, we did get initial feedback at the June 2015 PRAT and CMART workshop that some of our survival metrics are overly optimistic.



Sue commented that at the recent River Restoration Northwest Conference Janine Castro talked about success versus succession criteria. Matt explained that river restoration practitioners have set success criteria set, but those success criteria aren't always a good measure of the actual "success" of the project over the longer term. For instance, if you're measuring cross sections of a channel and a beaver goes in one year and builds a dam across those transects, which alters your ability to meet the predefined success criteria – that's not necessarily a bad thing.

Alison noted that the recently completed 2014-2015 KRHRP project report includes specific examples of how data, modeling and monitoring information was used to guide selection, design, refinement of designs, implementation and maintenance of KRHRP projects. The monitoring and evaluation report summary also illustrates the adaptive management process being used and how specific data collected through the monitoring efforts is supporting that adaptive management.

- Substrate Enhancement Pilot Project monitoring. The substrate project was built in the fall of 2014. We have video of after winter operations before spawning and then again after spawning. There may be some algae on the newer images. It would be useful to reach out to biologist or others for interpretation. The Myrtle Creek site appears more effected by sediment at this point.
- Upper Meander and Middle Meander projects monitoring. The pools are being sustained, there have been slight changes in terms of bed evolution. The Middle Meander pool doubled in volume, and the maximum depth increased by eight feet the first year following construction. This year that pool continued to adjust and maximum depth increased by four feet. At low flow it is a 30-foot-deep pool, and at high flow it is over 40 feet deep.

#### ***Maintenance of 2011-2014 projects***

- Vegetation. The earlier we can get vegetation maintenance scheduled and contracted the better. It is always a little difficult because you have to wait for flows to drop to identify what that year's maintenance needs are. This last year did an earlier walk through and so did the subs.

Trying to figure out how to retrofit the previous soil lift vegetation structures. The soil lifts are starting to decompose as they were designed to do, but the vegetation hasn't taken hold as expected due to browse pressure from beaver, etc. Trying to figure out how to salvage those structures (Phase 1A, Phase 1B and Upper Meander projects).

Learned the importance of pre-project weed control and are incorporating that into the project planning. Another lesson is that sometimes getting the bio-vegetation materials is difficult.

- Structures. In general, the structures are creating stable bank conditions.
- Fencing and livestock. The North Side Channels project is hard to manage due to the complexity of fencing the area and ongoing livestock management issues. Sometimes it really depends on the landowners. Probably isn't possible to address that through landowner agreements since there is no way to enforce those.
- Contracting. Current contracting approach is working in terms of how we respond to maintenance needs.

#### ***Project Management Team coordination***

- Video/calls and frequency. Video conferencing works well and cuts down on amount of multi-tasking thus improving efficiency and focus of coordination. Advantage of meeting more

frequently (i.e., similar to 2015) is that it keeps the calls quick and to the point. You don't have to spend time getting everyone up to speed.

- **ACTION: Add Ron A. to the PMT list for regular video/calls**
- Construction progress updates. It would be of interest to team members not directly involved in the construction process to receive the weekly construction meeting notes and/or the updates that are posted to the public.
- Annual PMT in-person meeting. Keep doing it, it is helpful to get together and celebrate what we've accomplished, reflect on what we've learned, and plan together for the next year. Having the construction meeting debrief as a separate meeting ahead of the PMT meeting worked well this year and allowed participants to get into more depth on specific issues there wouldn't have been time, or comfort level, with addressing in the larger PMT coordination meeting.

### ***Documentation, information management, information sharing***

- Project documentation. No additional documentation is needed for the Bonners Ferry Islands or Straight Reach project since the design document and EA cover both 2015 and 2016 activities. Will need to develop documentation for the Lower Meander and out-year projects. RDG will be developing a design document for the Lower Meander.
- Information management (i.e., data collected for project design and monitoring). Tom built a spreadsheet with all of the data that's been collected to date and turned that into an online database with the ability to upload and download information. It is built in Python.

Sue noted that BPA has certain requirements in terms of public access to data. An important focus for BPA and the NPCC is also showing how data is being used to inform project design, maintenance, selection, etc.

- **ACTIONS:**
  - **Tom to send link data database to PMT.**
  - **Sue to confirm what specific BPA requirements are in terms of public access to data.**
  - **Alison to schedule future discussion with full PMT and/or subgroup next steps relative to information sharing.**
- PISCES. BPA looks to PISCES as the place where they store all the information about the project. However, you're really limited in terms of what you can post, for instance, you can't upload the designs because the files are too big. The Tribe's approach has been to upload the minimum to support BPA's requirements.
- Publication and information sharing. There are a lot of people in the basin looking at the KRHRP. Sue would like to see a concerted effort to develop published papers on different aspects of the project.

### ***Contracting and budgets***

- Contracting process. The subcontractor coordination review process and timeline to develop SOWs and budgets worked really well in 2015. Plan to do the same thing in 2016.

Note that as of October 1, 2016 there will be new government procurement processes activated that will affect all of the Tribe's programs.



- Budgeting process. It is critical to ensure a zero-based budgeting process on an annual basis. Each contractor should ask questions as to whether something being done can be modified, reduced, or eliminated as project has matured into an implementation stage.
- Invoicing. Sue appreciates the budget tracking that everyone is doing on their invoices. Keep it up.
  - **ACTION:**
    - **Ask Billy to give an update on the new requirements on a future PMT video/call.**

## **Item 2: 2016 and out-year project overview**

### Bonnars Ferry Island Site 3 (2016)

- Didn't review the project in any detail except to discuss potential implications associated with landowner whose land is currently in probate.

### Straight Reach (2016)

- Didn't review the project.

### Lower Meander (2017-2018 tentative)

- The Lower Meander project is upstream from the Bonnars Ferry Islands project and downstream from the Middle Meander project. The project is the last identified project in this section of the braided reach of the Kootenai River. The project concepts were reviewed by the PRAT and CMART at a June 2015 workshop and both groups provided input which will be addressed and/or incorporated into the next iteration of the designs. There are three project sites: the north site, south site and the Day property (car bodies). The project would be implemented over two years tentatively with the Lower Meander south work in year one and the Lower Meander north and Day bank in year two.

The north side staging area would be on Bill M's property. Staging on the south side would be with another landowner. The project includes two timber pile structures, two pools (about 50,000 cubic yards). Material excavated from the pools would be used to enhance existing island features. Currently the side channels are really wide. The Day property has a 20-25-foot-high bank, it is currently stabilized with car bodies. The plan would be to slope the bank back and create a bench. Due to the steepness of the existing bank it wouldn't be possible to reach down from the top to do work below so we would have to step the bank back. The excavated material from the bank would have to go somewhere. Access to this site would be from the Dirks/Snow Family Farm property. Matt expressed concerns about the restoration value of the Day/car body portion of the project relative to the cost. Sue noted that stewardship is one of the objectives of the project.

### Myrtle/Refuge (TBD)

- At the PRAT and CMART workshop in June we presented a range of alternatives to illustrate the range of possibilities. These are not yet actual projects, just alternatives. One of the top ranking possibilities from that workshop was the Myrtle/Refuge project at the USFWS' Kootenai Wildlife Management Area.

The USFWS has gone through the initial steps to figure out if they can do a project with us. The

local refuge representative, Diane, talked with the regional director of refuges in Seattle about doing a project and got the green light to move forward to next steps to explore it. On our end the next steps are understanding the USFWS process and stakeholders. Tom suggested that we'll need to shift to thinking about the USFWS stakeholders as we think about this project. Also will want to continue to engage with the Tribe via Sue, Patty and Scott. It is likely that the project will require an EA since it is on federal land. Jason suggested documenting all the meetings because that may be able to serve as the scoping process.

#### Ball Creek (TBD)

- At the June PRAT and CMART workshop the group also reviewed a range of different alternatives for Ball Creek. The consensus recommendation from that workshop was to look at enhancing Ball Creek in place. There is close connectivity to Kootenai River at this site and the potential to deliver gravel and substrate to the Kootenai. You can see a gravel plume at the mouth of the creek under certain conditions. We had an initial meeting with the landowner, who seemed interested. The next step is to refine the concept. As we refine the concept objectives work may be more focused in the gravel deposit area. It is a relatively simple, small project that could potentially be implemented in 2017 or 2018.

### **Item 3: Planning exercise for 2016-2018 (SPLAT!)**

#### **February 2016**

- Bonners Ferry Islands and Straight Reach projects
  - Sue to contact probate lawyer about Wruck property ASAP and determine feasibility/possibility of using the property
  - Identify alternate staging and access route within existing APE
  - If not possible to work within existing APE, identify staging and access route outside APE
    - Schedule cultural survey
    - Wetland assessment/delineation
  - Coordinate with Jason Flory to clarify exact barge work window for Straight Reach substrate placement
  - Coordinate with IDFG and USGS on monitoring and USGS actions during spawning season; also to discuss possibility of pre-project monitoring in straight reach associated with additional substrate placement (Alison to schedule call).
- Lower Meander project
  - Set up call with Sue, Matt, Doug, possibly Jason S. (and others if requested by Sue) to discuss options regarding the Day bank work, soil removal, and/or other approaches.
  - Identify design options and summary of considerations to share with Mr. Day (considerations include: relative cost and complexity of project versus value, possibly have to move soil and where to put it/costs, possible contaminants in soil, if do soil test soil Mr. Day could be responsible for dealing implications even if the project doesn't move forward)

#### **March 2016**

- Bonners Ferry Islands and Straight Reach projects
  - Tribal Council briefings/updates (regular continuing updates into rest of season)
  - Review permit binder conditions
  - Identify any changes upfront and review with permits for consistency
  - SOR for August - November flows
  - Pre-bid meeting with revegetation and construction contractors

- Continue 2016 landowner coordination
- Coordination with BNFS
- If need to have new access and staging site update ESA and JPA
- Coordinate with Mr. Day to discuss potential design options and implications
- Lower Meander project
  - Confirm ESA process for Lower Meander with Jason Flory. Assume we're using the KRHRP programmatic BiOp
  - Outreach to BPA about NEPA process for Lower Meander
  - Cost out Ball Creek and Lower Meander Stage 1
  - Day bank soil sampling (if decide to move forward)
- Other
  - Coordinate in-season monitoring/data collection call with RDG, USGS and IDFG
  - Sue (and others as identified by Sue) to meet with David Rockwell about website update
  - Alison send table out to identify potential KRHRP papers, authors, journals, and target dates for development/publication of papers (discuss at following months PMT video/call)
  - Nimz Ranch central quad coordination (for coordination purposes)

### ***April 2016***

- Bonners Ferry Islands and Straight Reach projects
  - Tribal Council briefings/updates (regular continuing updates into rest of season)
  - Outreach to 2015 landowners to close out any loose ends
  - Signed landowner agreements for 2016 project by April 30
  - NW Tree maintenance contract in place
  - Pre-project weed control
  - Tribal Council approval to submit RFP to GBI
  - Issue RFP for construction
  - Complete as-built documentation for re-vegetation
- Lower Meander project
  - Start EA (if needed for project) in early April
  - Decision on when Ball Creek will be implemented (i.e., 2017 or 2018 or 2019)
  - Clarify documentation needs for Lower Meander if no EA
- Ball Creek project
  - Coordination with Kootenai Tribe wildlife department on Ball Creek
  - Decision on whether to move forward with Ball Creek in 2017 or 2018 or 2019
  - Clarify and confirm Ball Creek documentation needs (i.e., design document, other?)
- Other
  - Coordinate in-season monitoring/data collection call with RDG, USGS and IDFG
  - Coordinate with IDFG, U of I and Tribal biologists on fish monitoring for Bonners Ferry Islands, Straight Reach and other project locations
  - Maintenance documentation
  - PMT call multiple discussion including identification of initial papers and authors for 2016 and/or 2017.

### ***May 2016***

- Bonners Ferry Islands and Straight Reach projects
  - Tribal Council briefings/updates (regular continuing updates into rest of season)
  - KVRI, County/City, news, etc. briefings/updates (regular continuing updates into rest of season)

- “Serious” wood acquisition (May/June)
- Lower Meander project
  - One-on-one landowner coordination
  - Order plants for 2017 project(s)
  - Technical coordination with PRAT (one-on-one)
  - Review Lower Meander and Ball Creek project designs with Tribal program leads (wildlife, nutrients, aquaculture)
- Ball Creek project
  - Technical coordination with PRAT (one-on-one)
- Out year projects
  - Coordination with KTOI wildlife and other KTOI program leads on design, monitoring, etc. for out-year opportunities and concepts, prioritization of meander reach work, and effective integration
- Other
  - PMT call (tentative)
  - Coordinate in-season monitoring/data collection call with RDG, USGS and IDFG
  - Complete 2015 monitoring report
  - PMT subgroup coordination on monitoring and evaluation (identify new priorities, gaps, changes, etc.), prep for coordination with University of Idaho, IDFG and others.
  - Coordination with University of Idaho and IDFG on monitoring and evaluation (possible discussion topic includes use by sturgeon of floodplain and/or off channel habitat and ways to test)
  - Modeling team meeting May 18
  - Modeling/biological M&E/hypothesis testing meeting May 19

### ***June 2016***

- Bonners Ferry Islands and Straight Reach projects
  - Tribal Council briefings/updates (regular continuing updates into rest of season)
  - KVRI, County/City, news, etc. briefings/updates (regular continuing updates into rest of season)
  - “Serious” wood acquisition (continue if needed)
  - Construction contract in place
  - Coordinate with County Road supervisor and city administration. Provide road safety plan (GBI)
  - ENOI filed 15 days before start of work
- Other
  - PMT call (tentative)
  - Coordinate in-season monitoring/data collection call with RDG, USGS and IDFG (tentative)
  - Maintenance walk through (2011 through 2015 projects)
  - 2016 baseline photos
  - RDG refine groundwater monitoring sites for middle meander (coordinate with wildlife program for Nimz Ranch, use of information and input on sites)

### ***July 2016***

- Bonners Ferry Islands and Straight Reach projects
  - Tribal Council briefings/updates (regular continuing updates into rest of season)
  - County/City, news, etc. briefings/updates (regular continuing updates into rest of season)

- Staging area ready for materials/wood delivery
- Lower Meander project
  - 50% design complete
  - Wetland delineation and updates as needed for 2017 project
- Ball Creek project
  - 50% design
  - Wetland delineation for 2017 implementation if a go
- Myrtle/Refuge project
  - Continued coordination
- Other
  - PMT call (tentative)
  - PRAT and CMART workshop(s) July or August plus possible site visit
  - Monitoring of revegetation
  - South Quad Nimz construction implementation (tracking for coordination purposes)

### **August 2016**

- Bonners Ferry Islands and Straight Reach projects
  - Tribal Council briefings/updates (regular continuing updates into rest of season)
  - County/City, news, etc. briefings/updates (regular continuing updates into rest of season)
  - Invite agency permitting entities to site prior to construction
  - Construction implementation
- Lower Meander project
  - Continued coordination as needed
  - Follow-ups from PRAT and CMART workshop(s)
- Ball Creek project
  - Ball Creek ESA work, BA and/or SLOPES
  - Coordinate with NRCS on Ball Creek (if scheduled for 2017 implementation)
- Myrtle/Refuge project
  - Continued coordination
- Other
  - Budget development memo/schedule for FY 2017 and coordination document to team for kickoff conference call
  - Kick-off USGS 5-year SOW update

### **September 2016**

- Bonners Ferry Islands and Straight Reach projects
  - Tribal Council briefings/updates (regular continuing updates into rest of season)
  - KVRI, County/City, news, etc. briefings/updates (regular continuing updates into rest of season)
  - Construction implementation
- Lower Meander project
  - Continued coordination as needed
- Ball Creek project
  - Continued coordination as needed
- Myrtle/Refuge project
  - Continued coordination as needed
- Other

- Budget FY2017, coordination document due and call with PMT
- USGS 5-year SOW and budget due and call with USGS and RDG
- Identify Creston Wildlife Refuge (CA) contacts, set up time for coordination
- Creston reconnaissance visit

### **October 2016**

- Bonners Ferry Islands and Straight Reach projects
  - Tribal Council briefings/updates (regular continuing updates into rest of season)
  - County/City, news, etc. briefings/updates (regular continuing updates into rest of season)
  - Construction implementation
- Lower Meander project
  - Continued coordination as needed
- Ball Creek project
  - Continued coordination as needed
- Myrtle/Refuge project
  - Continued coordination as needed
- Other
  - Budget FY2017, Budget and SOW to KTOI October 1
  - USGS updated 5-year SOW and budget to KTOI by October 1

### **November 2016**

- Bonners Ferry Islands and Straight Reach projects
  - Tribal Council briefings/updates (regular continuing updates into rest of season)
  - County/City, news, etc. briefings/updates (regular continuing updates into rest of season)
  - Construction implementation
  - As-built monitoring/mapping
- Lower Meander project
  - 90% bid design complete
  - BiOp amendment to Jason Flory for Lower Meander
- Ball Creek project
  - Continued coordination as needed
- Myrtle/Refuge project
  - Continued coordination as needed
- Other
  - Herbicide use reporting for 2016
  - Budget FY2017 to BPA November 1 (meet 90-day requirement)

### **December 2016**

- Bonners Ferry Islands and Straight Reach projects
  - Notice of completion to USACE and close NPDES
- Other
  - Nimz permit submittal and BA, etc. for central quad (tracking for coordination purposes)

### **January 2017**

- Lower Meander project
  - JPA pre-application meeting for Lower Meander (and Ball Creek in constructing in 2017)
  - JPA submittal



- Have a good grasp on wood quantities and types
- Final design RFP Lower Meander (and Ball Creek in constructing in 2017)
- Complete herbicide reporting
- As-built documentation (revegetation)
- Ball Creek project
  - JPA pre-application and submittal if constructing in 2017
- Myrtle/Refuge project
  - Ongoing coordination
- Other
  - BPA contract and subcontract renewals by 1/31/17

#### ***February to December 2017***

- February PMT annual in-person lessons learned/planning meeting
- Confirm Myrtle/Refuge NEPA process and begin in 2017
- Assuming EA required, finish Myrtle/Refuge EA process by April 2017
- Complete Myrtle/Refuge 50% design
- Develop and prioritize near-term and longer-term out year designs
- Begin Lower Meander project (and Ball Creek if constructing in 2017) community outreach in May
- Complete permit binder and NPDES/ENOI for Lower Meander Stage 1 construction (and Ball Creek if constructing in 2017) by June
- Lower Meander Stage 1 construction implementation
- As-built mapping of Lower Meander Stage 1 construction
- Tentative Ball Creek construction implementation

#### ***2018***

- Lower Meander Stage 2 construction implementation
- As-built mapping of Lower Meander Stage 2 construction
- Out year project design and identification of new out-year projects
- If Ball Creek is delayed to 2018 implementation, complete Ball creek permitting later part of 2018

#### ***2019***

- Tentative Myrtle/Refuge project construction

#### **Item 4: Identify additional planning/coordination needs and next steps**

- Participants discussed areas requiring additional planning and/or coordination and identified placeholders within the previous month-to-month schedule to address the following:
  - Monitoring and evaluation program refinements (internal discussion, PRAT and CMART input, etc.)
  - Meander reach data collection requirements (scheduled coordination with KTOI program leads, USGS coordination, PRAT and CMART input, further development of out-year project opportunities and concepts)
  - Lower Meander project and Ball Creek documentation approach (scheduled deadline for decision/discussion).

- Publication of papers about various elements of KRHRP (scheduled time and process to identify authors and papers). Participants identified the following brainstorm list of potential papers.
  - *USGS*
    - *Sediment*
    - *Hydraulic modeling*
    - *Others per USGS SOW*
  - *U of Idaho*
    - *Microhabitat*
    - *Side channel*
  - *Other ideas*
    - *Adaptive management approach to riparian vegetation response*
    - *Overview Tribal led project – size, scope, etc. for Fisheries Magazine or similar*
    - *Building and testing pile structures*
    - *Wetlands journal (maybe collaborate with Stewart Rood)*
    - *Consider asking some of the peer reviewers to help with and/or suggest papers*
    - *Substrate pilot project case study*
    - *Social aspect of project e.g., commitment to coordination, work on private land, win/win, \$ to local economy*
- In addition, Sue indicated she would like to have all news stories about the project cataloged (e.g., local news, Indian Country Today, NPCC, etcetera). Patty said Denise is doing that, Sue (or others) just need to send the stories or links to the stories to her so she can include them.

## Item 5: Closing thoughts

- Doug – Dennis is a big help and an asset to this group. We have continued to meet the schedule requirements.
- Jason – We started this program in 2011. Now we're at the point where we've exhausted all the known projects, that's impressive. After 2017 we will need to think about building a structure that encourages BPA to continue this program since we've just barely gotten started if you want to implement the objectives of the Master Plan.
- Norm – This is a really good opportunity to dovetail the Tribe's Fish and Wildlife Program and look at things from an ecosystem approach instead of separating out what happens above and below the water line. Also an opportunity to learn from what we've each done.
- Matt – We didn't talk today about the River Restoration Northwest conference we went to. Our KRHRP session was the first session following the opening keynote speaker Janine Castro. The themes that came up in our session were repeated by people who knew about our project as well as people who didn't know that much, including the technical, tribal and people components. It put this project on the map for a lot of people who may or may not have known what was happening in this huge tributary to the Columbia.
- Ron – Looking back where we started and now what we've accomplished. And that we are only just beginning. Whether some of us are here for the end product or not, it is a heck of a road trying to get there.

- Sue – I'm so honored to be able to work for the Tribe, and the Tribe's goals, and the grounding in the thinking of seven generations and out. Also, it is so awesome to work with all of you who are so committed to those goals.
- Scott – I like to pay attention to what creates success. To learn you don't look at it in the same market you are in. A good friend of mine is a head coach in women's basketball. Stanford dominated for years and Oregon state was at the bottom about five years ago. They were considering scrapping the program. But a new coach came and rebuilt it from the ground up and now they have dethroned Stanford. What are the keys for success for your team? It always comes back to chemistry and how good the chemistry is. My point is when you look at our team, and we all get a chance to be on project teams, but it comes down to who's willing to lay down their pride, or their own agenda and produce something as a team. The chemistry has been really good on this group; I think that's why you're seeing such a high degree of success.
- Dan – We work on a lot of projects. Sometimes it is very hard to be able to do what you're good at. This project has matured and allowed engineers and ecologists to do what they're good at. It is somewhat unusual in the Columbia Basin. Opportunities came up that were biological, or related to construction, or other things that are considered. Now it is starting to gel to take the next step into the future.
- Sarah – Hearing the feedback on the public outreach was really neat to hear and I'm impressed with the huge efforts you made to get the information out to people. One of my favorite things was when the high school kids came out and put out their 2016 sign on the island.
- Alan – I appreciate the Tribe's effort at continuing the public outreach. I would really like to meet with Ron and Gary and make sure I present the Tribe's program in the right way. And I look forward to continuing that part of it.
- Patty – The effort of all this group and the accountability you have makes it easy to tell a good story to the community. From putting the Master Plan together, to listing the projects, to implementing them, it all took a long time, but it also was just a flash of the eye. We need to start some serious mentoring because we're all getting older. The effort that's gone forward to allow these projects to happen has been really important. I don't want to see some of us retire and move on and no one to come along and take it up. That won't happen within the Tribe but we maybe don't do as good a job of mentoring along the way. I consider it a privilege to work for the Tribe every day. And I appreciate the fact that I can fit in with this group and bring what I have to bring to the table.
- Tom – From this meeting I am taking away how important it is to reflect on what we've done and turn the data into knowledge that can be passed on.
- Scott – I'm impressed with all of Sue's work, and also kudos to Alison for organizing so much stuff so well. What we're looking at is just starting the operational loss mitigation. We're talking about many years of implementation, but at a smaller scale than this. It will be a lot of wildlife restoration and mitigation. This process gives us an idea of what has been accomplished and what can be. I'm anticipating going to that next level. Hoping that we can build on this effort.
- The group watched the trailer for Kyle and Rob productions documentary on the KRHRP and were wowed! The consensus response was that we all can't wait to see the finished product.

## Adjourn

