**Central Clark Fork Watershed Restoration Plan (CCF WRP)**
Summary of Kick-off stakeholder meeting 11-30-2018 at UM

Samantha Tappenbeck opened the meeting by welcoming the involvement of all in the CCF WRP:

Participants were asked to introduce themselves, their affiliation, and their experience with WRPs.

| NAME | AFFILIATION | EXPERIENCE WITH WRPs OR RELATED PLANS |
|---|---|---|
| Dagger, Steve | E. Sanders County Conservation District | Worked on Thompson River WRP |
| DeArment, John | Clark Fork Coalition staff scientist | Assisted with WRPs while working at DEQ |
| Hayes, Bob | City of Missoula storm water utility | No experience with WRPs; works on reducing storm water pollution |
| Hendrickson, Shane | USFS fisheries biologist, Lolo Forest's Ninemile & Seeley Lake ranger district | has worked on TMDLs in several basins |
| Knotek, Ladd | MT FWP fisheries biologist (Mineral & Missoula Counties) | Worked on TMDLs & planning; Works with Missoula and Mineral County Conservation Districts |
| Mace, Ethan | DRNC hydrologist | Works in water rights, has provided flow info for TMDLs |
| Neville, Meghan | Graduate student, UM | Working on CCF WRP |
| Parson, Paul | Trout Unlimited; Missoula Conservation District | Worked on Ninemile WRP, working on ST. Regis WRP |
| Paul, Kylie | Missoula County Community Planning Services (Parks Trails Open Lands) | No WRP experience |
| Price, Mary | Scientist for CSKT - fisheries, water restoration; liaison to this WRP process | No experience with WRPs |
| Richardson, Kris | USFS hydrologist, Lolo Forest | Worked on Thompson River WRP |
| Ross, Travis | Missoula Water Quality District & Clark Fork Kootenai River Basins Council | Worked on Miller Creek WRP |
| Seymour, Holly | Graduate student, UM | Working on CCF WRP |
| Shively, Dave | UM Geography prof, ExCom of CFKRBC | No experience with WRPs |
| Stanley, Andrea | DNRC hydrologist (serves on Msl WQAC) | Has referenced WRPs and TMDLs |
| Strohmaier, Dave | Missoula County Commissioner | Involved in 9mile restoration work |
| Tappenbeck, Samantha | Soil and Water Conservation Districts of MT | Worked on multiple WRPs |
| Trum, Eric | Montana DEQ (administers 319 funds) | Has assisted groups working on WRPs |
| Valliant, Morgan | Missoula Parks and Rec; open lands | Working on damaged urban stream banks |
| Walters, Dustin | USFS hydrologist, Lolo Forest | Worked on 9 mile & Lolo WRPs; working on St. Regis WRP |
| Watson, Vicki | UM Professor Emeritus, works with CFKRBC & other watershed groups, | Working on CCF WRP; no WRP experience;<br>35 years studying the Clark Fork River |
| West, Heidi | Missoula City Council | Has never worked on WRP - has worked on storm water plans |
| Whitely, Jed | Clark Fork Coalition project manager | Worked on Bitterroot, Miller, Lolo creek WRPs |

Samantha showed a powerpoint (available on request) that explained the purpose of WRP's, WRP elements required by EPA, & definitions of some key terms (impairment, TMDL, WRP). Goals of the CCF WRP include: engage stakeholders & incorporate diverse perspectives; Meet EPA/DEQ requirements, and make it possible to apply for 319 funds for the Central Clark Fork area. Progress to date – Clark Fork Coalition is hosting a web site for the CCF WRP which explains the need for a WRP, provides summaries of key background documents and has a survey to collect input from stakeholders.

Showed Map of the Central Clark Fork and those tributaries that do not already have a WRP. This area runs from the river's confluence with Flint Creek to its confluence with the Flathead River.
In that area, 13 tributaries and the mainstem are listed as impaired by pollutants and have completed TMDLs.
Streams impaired by non-pollutants (so no TMDL) are: Tamarack, Cedar, Fish, Rattlesnake, Mill, 6 Mile Creeks.
Streams listed as fully supporting: Oregon Gulch, south fork of Fish Creek, and Rock, Lost & Cache Creeks.

Eric Trum of DEQ administers the 319 funding program and explained how DEQ prioritizes streams for assessment and how streams are categorized based on type of impairment and whether that has been addressed by a plan.
DEQ prioritizes assessing streams that are 3rd order or higher. Many 2nd order streams have been assessed and can be considered sources of impairments lower in the watershed.

Waterbodies are said to be impaired if they do not meet water quality standards or cannot fully support one of their designated beneficial uses. Waterbodies may be impaired by an excessive load of pollutants (sediments, metals, nutrients, temperature) and/or they may be impaired by non-pollutants (altered flows, altered habitat). Pollutant impairments require that a Total Maximum Daily Load analysis be performed, and all the pollutant-impaired water bodies in the CCF do have TMDLs (which propose actions needed to reduce pollutant loads enough for water quality standards to be met). So a WRP is needed now to guide implementation of the TMDLs and to propose actions to address non-pollutants, and to protect water quality from the effects of climate change and development. Once a WRP is accepted for a basin, all waterbodies in the basin are eligible to receive 319 funds; however, pollutant impaired waterbodies tend to have the highest priority. EPA has allowed up to 10% of funds to go to protective actions on non-impaired streams. Restoration actions can apply to streams contributing to impairments of waterbodies downstream.

Several attendees pointed out that essentially all the streams in the CCF basin are damaged to some degree, including those listed on the 'fully supporting list. They also pointed out that the central Clark Fork has many active restoration projects, even without a WRP. But it would be good to be able to access 319 funding. Eric noted that based on issues raised during the WRP process, streams can be reassessed and their impairment status changed.

Eric demonstrated use of DEQ's Clean Water Act Information Center (CWAIC) an online tool available to the public. (Note: CWAIC is online here and instructions on using CWAIC are online here)
Using the CWAIC you can see whether a waterbody has a TMDL, check on impairment causes and sources, and search by location, planning areas, impairment source, and impairment cause. The interactive map will zoom in to show all of the impaired streams and gives listing history and background, habitat data, chemistry data, which streams have been assessed for at least one parameter. If you click on water quality monitoring data, you can see all the monitoring sites,
DEQ has all of the accepted WRPs & TMDLs on the DEQ website, linked through CWAIC.
More info on the 319 program here.
DEQ is focusing 319 efforts geographically; the Bitterroot Basin will be a high priority area for 319 funds.
Note that there are 3 priority levels for 319 funding – level 1) has a WRP, lots of stakeholder interest & momentum, multiple entities rank the projects high, DEQ will be able to track & show progress. Level 2) has a WRP or developing one; level 3) no WRP.
319 was zeroed out in the past 2 presidential budgets, but Congress has maintained funding in the budgets they passed. This highlights the need to show demonstrable improvement in water quality.
(Eric's presentation is included in Samantha's powerpoint).

**Presentation by Paul Parson of TU on stream restoration projects TU has done in the CCF.**

Paul: Even though there isn't a WRP for the CCF, it is one of the state's most active regions for restoration with over 100 projects over the last 20 years (projects led by TU, FWP, USFS, and others).
Ninemile Creek has a WRP, has received some 319 funding (along with many other sources of funding). Ninemile had placer mining and a channelized stream with lots of runoff and excessive sediment loads. Channel reconstruction,

floodplain reconnection and wetland restoration have resulted in more aquifer storage of high flows, and increased stream recharge during low flows. Note the Ninemile project is also described on the TU web site here.
TU is working on many creeks in the CCF basin that do not have WRPs, so would be covered under a Central CF WRP. Some are impaired by pollutants and some by non-pollutants.
Cedar creek was straightened by road building. TU relocated the road, reactivated the floodplain, added wood, reseeded the floodplain, built in-stream log structures where beavers are now building dams . Fish density has increased 5-7-fold as a result.
Fish Creek is not listed as impaired for sediment. But it washes out every year. TU moved the road and rebuilt channel.
Petty creek has multiple problems: dewatering, erosion, sedimentation (listed as impaired for sediment & temperature). TU rebuilt channels, planted vegetation.
Flat Creek (at Superior) is an abandoned mine superfund site with water quality impaired for lead, zinc, arsenic, copper, cadmium. Big piles of mine waste dumped on or near the stream (occupying much of floodplain).
DEQ manages the upper two miles of stream and last year removed 120 thousand yards of tailings/mine waste.
TU is working downstream on FS land, and has focused on rebuilding the floodplain first; tailings removal will come soon.
Rattlesnake Creek – coming in the next year or so, dam removal and wetland/floodplain restoration.

Paul's talk was followed by a discussion of funding sources, 319 funds, Northwest Energy, Future Fisheries, abandoned mines funds, Bonneville Environmental Foundation, Bonneville Power Administration, NRDP funds. Many projects use multiple sources of funds. Citizens can support stream restoration thus: : join TU; buy a fishing license; on your income tax return, check boxes for non-game wildlife support.

**To wrap up the meeting – attendees were asked to speak to: how best to engage stakeholders they work with; what are their priorities for restoration; how can they help with the WRP; what time line is reasonable.**

Engaging Stakeholders – Many recommended using conservation districts to reach out to landowners; a wider range of citizens could be reached through watershed groups and Missoula Water Quality District. Stay in contact with this technical resource group by emailing updates on milestones. Possibly a couple of meetings a year (late March or early April and November). Sam will focus on keeping the conservation districts informed and engaged.

Helping with WRP – All felt that a WRP would be worthwhile as long as it is kept: Simple, short, strategic, but flexible and focused on already identified projects. Seeking other projects could wait for the next iteration of the WRP.
Watson offered to take the lead on gathering information and assembling the WRP. She proposes to keep the main body of the WRP short (summaries of TMDL conclusions & recommendations, info on non-pollutant impairment actions, sources of funding, how to evaluate results, etc) and put a project priority list in an appendix, and descriptions of any projects in appendices so that the priority list can be easily updated, and new projects added or old ones modified, without need to rework the whole document.
The priority list would focus on identified projects that have high potential for 319 funds.

Many attendees offered to supply information when given a specific request. Some offered to review draft sections.
Watson requested that everyone send her their list of projects: completed, ongoing, planned, and wish list.
And that everyone provides their thoughts on streams that are not listed as impaired, but that they have evidence are impaired.

Time Line -- Most attendees thought the Time Line below presented by Samantha was manageable.
Now through February -- build up a technical advisory group. Request project info (completed, ongoing, planned, wish list), identify existing water resource data, determine info gaps, continue to refine info on stream impairment.
Spring 2019 –develop WRP outline; hold stakeholder meetings in 3 counties (invite: conservation districts & landowners & land managers, watershed groups).
Summer 2019 – develop a draft WRP
Fall 2019, circulate draft WRP to technical stakeholders, with proposed priorities & implementation schedule, measurable goals & monitoring plan, and an education and outreach plan. Revise based on their input.
Winter 2019-20: circulate a review draft of the WRP to other stakeholders (more meetings for them),
Spring 2020 Revise WRP based on their feedback and submit WRP to DEQ; finalize WRP with DEQ comments.

**Restoration Priorities identified by some attendees (& if they can help gather info or write on that):**

Shane Hendrickson: Lolo Forest is now focused 100% on fire & timber management for the next 5 years. We will finish restoration projects we have started, but not initiating or planning any new restoration projects. We will furnish data on request

Ladd Knotek: As for high priority stream -- Fish Creek. Landowners, native fish value, huge prior investment.

Mary Price (CSKT): The Clark Fork is a tribal trust resource, so we will be engaged in this WRP project. On the Central Clark Fork, the tribe's number one priority is cleanup of the Smurfit pulp mill site, followed by upper Clark Fork remediation.

John DeArment. Travis Ross and Vicki Watson: All emphasized cleaning up and restoring contaminated floodplains (like that beside the closed pulp mill). And of protecting remaining floodplains & wetlands in the face of climate change and development.

Dave Shively (CRKRBC): The Council is interested in helping with outreach by publicizing restoration success stories.

Paul Parson (TU): My priority is 9 mile and Flat Creeks and cleaning up the mine waste. Will provide data, input, ideas.

Ethan Mace (DNRC water rights): I can contribute info on water rights or irrigation or streamflow.

Andrea Stanley: (DNRC trust land) – Greatest concern is chronic sediment producing roads. Well-designed roads ruined by graders – need to educate county road departments. I can provide road monitoring data and specific objectives for BMPs.

Morgan Valliant (Missoula Parks & Rec): Missoula has $ 4 million of restoration going on the Clark Fork & Rattlesnake creek. Open space bond funds could leverage 319 funds. We hope to reduce recreation impacts in the urban river corridor (stabilize stream banks with soft methods). We have lots of road & bridge projects that need a restoration component.

Kylie Paul (Missoula Planning): Missoula County involved in 9mile work. Habitat & floodplain restoration are greatest interest.

Heidi West (Missoula Council member): Missoula is trying to get the Army Corps NOT to remove all the riparian vegetation on the levies as part of maintenance. Missoula also may use some open space bond money for strategic acquisition in the floodplain.