

White River Partnership Meeting
November 18, 1:00-2:45

Meeting Minutes

Objectives:

- Updates on implementation funding proposals
- Restoration plan timeline
- Agreement on restoration plan's Prioritization Criteria for active and passive restoration

1:00 Welcome and agenda

In attendance: Callie Hendrickson, Matthew Jennings, Tildon Jones, Jessica Sanow, Pat Rainbolt, Casey Pennock, Jordon Detlor, Matt Breen, Jojo La, David Graf, Ross with Uintah County, Deirdre Macnab, Tory Mathis, Ian Emmons, Brook Watts, Luke Smith
REW staff: John Leary, Rusty Lloyd, Shannon Wadas

Meeting started at 1:02

Introduction and overview of White River Partnership for first time callers.

Update to MOU: Still some partners making some final edits so not quite ready for signatures.

- For those who have already send in signatures, the new MOU will be sent out as well a bulleted list with the updates
- Signatures from Utah Conservation Corps, WCCC, UDWR, few others
- Deirdre: Send the alliance the MOU and will get a signature when ready
- David Graf: Timeline for MOU being final? – mid to late December. CPW still looking at whether we can or should sign.
- Deirdre: Would like to know what feedback people are providing and what the issues are

1:10 Applications recently submitted for implementation

Conservation Districts applied for funding on Yellow Creek

- Callie: Coordinated Resource Management Plan grant submitted to Restore includes tamarisk removal on Yellow Creek.

REW applied to a CWCB Watershed Restoration Grant and a Bureau of Reclamation funding opportunity in partnership with the Conservation Districts, BLM, conservation corps

- BLM on the main stem of the river closer to the Utah state line
- If these are accepted it will be a great start in Colorado and help with leveraging funds in the future
- Deirdre: Concern with drought and adequate river water- has there been any research there in CO? Also with writing the basin implementation plan- seem to be two other restoration plans

- Science is still developing about control of TRO and availability of water, hard to calculate, still studies being done
- What is not clear is how mother nature reintegrates water back into the system, the 1:1 math problem
- Basin Implementation Plan: follow up on details of 3 different White River plans. Callie submitted a grant for the Integrated Water Initiative for a coordinator to continue with the process of gathering information and putting together a 3 year work plan, also complete riparian health and diversion assessments.
 - TU, CD, REW have separate projects that are related and will hopefully complement each other in the future. Check with TU on their project

1:20 Restoration plan

- Introduction (purpose) – important to set the context – creating a framework that communicates our common goals, guide and set of tools for restoration plans
 - Trying to complement other projects when we can
- Sections
 - Accessible summary
 - Appendices provides a lot of background information; the body is staying relevant and concise.
 - Establishes common goals and understanding of riparian restoration and communicates those goals with the public
- Timeline
 - Already worked through a lot of the plan and are now at site prioritization
 - John will make the draft plan available to everyone to comment on- use a December meeting to further this conversation and then start to talk about 2-year goals and methods for achieving the goals.
 - Partnership and implementation goals
 - For now, work on site prioritization and then wrap up the nuts and bolts of the document

Deirdre: Isn't a lot of this boiler plate? Would like to get this moving, learn from Utah

- John- a lot is boiler plate and exists, There is a lot that needs to be White River-specific such as the private lands approach and incorporating fish and geomorphology

David: There is a lot of BLM in Utah that assists with getting projects done quicker, is this boiler plate for grants or specific to the White River?

- John- it's a little bit of both. It needs to be unique to the White River but also apply to funding opportunities
- Rusty- we have learned a lot of things that we have learned from other partnerships, definitely more complex on the CO side. We are already moving forward on trying to get some implementation done right now, have to start small.

Callie: Are we focusing on the first set of priorities and looking more instream?

- John- we are looking at how riparian restoration impacts instream, how is climate change going to affect flows in the future and what does that mean for implementation
- Rusty- some of the appendices will be citations and references, still focusing on restoration
- David- Example of fish prioritization in relation to habitat- same with riparian restoration- some areas better suited for work and prioritization = not much with site prioritization right now in the list which should be a higher priority

1:45 Site Prioritization and Feasibility Criteria for active and passive restoration

Applied to the entire watershed across CO and UT

Passive vs. active restoration

Land owners and land managers will be making the choice on what is done on their lands

Feasibility:

Dierdre: Concern with the feasibility characteristics and funding: does funding have to be available in order to prioritize

- John: 3 standard conditions- we will not physically start unless we do have funding, cooperation and it is economically feasible to get to the site
- Rusty: Funding does not mean the landowner has to have funding, just means we have collaborated and have secured funding in one way or another, doesn't preclude private landowners

Deirdre: Concerned with beetle releases being impacted by the mosquito spray on the west side of the county

- Rusty: We have the same issue in the Grand Valley- contradiction
- John- Will touch base with Deirdre on beetles and the insectary offline

Callie: How do you decide where funding is going, factoring in time and planning with the process

Criteria:

Callie: Keep in mind a lot of work has been done in the past and questions have come up with maintaining areas where work was done in the past

- John- add in "legacy site maintenance"
- David – good return on stewardship and maintaining legacy sites or sites that are in good shape, longitudinal connectivity
- Casey – Using maintenance of existing sites and expanding out from the existing plot, increasing the area is the main goal which leads to connectivity
- Callie- is it a priority to start at the top and work your way down?

- David- if working in a small watershed that is a valid approach, when getting into a bigger area you might want to be opportunistic
- John- comes down to the scale of the issue that you are dealing with

The above comments were included in Criteria F section

Criteria A:

No comments

Criteria B:

Note that channel complexity might not be a goal to private landowners in relation to erosion, not an easy sell to private landowners but try and maintain areas that naturally promote channel dynamics where appropriate

Follow up with Callie on comments here

Erosion is a loaded term but there might be some landowners looking for a project – balance between soil transport needs and protecting property – keep channel complexity and floodplain connectivity

Criteria C:

Still figure out where to put cottonwood statement – hydrologic connectivity (C) or native vegetation (A)

Would there be reduced water consumption by riparian vegetation if woody invasives were removed from higher up in 1st order streams where native riparian vegetation doesn't usually consist of woody species?

Criteria D.

No comments

Criteria E.

Change the word “supported” in last objective

Criteria F.

See above for comments.

WRP partners should make sure that past treatments are mapped and stored for reference and future monitoring/treatment

Biological Control Criteria:

Criteria A:

No comments

Criteria B:

No comments

Criteria C:

No comments

Criteria D:

BMP's that are emerging could be applied to pilot projects

E.

Iain: Emerging wetlands could be another landscape component criteria under active criteria

2:35 Additional comments

No additional comments

2:45 Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 2:42