Attendees

- Dave Bastian, Utah Conservation Corps
- Nick Behe, Grand Staircase-Escalante Partners
- Matthew Betenson, Grand Staircase-Escalante Monument / BLM
- Ken Bradshaw, Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument
- Steve Cox, Boulder Town / Grand Staircase-Escalante Partners
- Terry DeLay, Forest Service / Dixie National Forest
- Myrl Duncan, University of Utah College of Law
- Alex Engel, Grand Staircase-Escalante Partners
- Sue Fearon, Grand Staircase-Escalante Partners
- Mike Golden, Dixie National Forest
- Karen Gravelyn, REI Adventures
- Stan Gurley, UT Div. Wildlife Resources / NRCS
- Tom Hoyt, Grand Staircase-Escalante Partners
- Amber Hughes, Grand Staircase-Escalante Monument / BLM
- Justin Jimenez, BLM
- Grant Johnson, Escalante Canyon Outfitters
- Hannah Karlsson, Grand Staircase-Escalante Partners
- Steve Kasper, REI Adventures
- Tabitha Kelly, Grand Staircase-Escalante Partners
- Chuck Lambert, Utah Conservation Corps
- Brian Laub, Utah State University
- Robert McElaney, Escalante resident
- Wally Macfarlane, Utah State University
- Stephanie Minnaert, Community member
- Kelly O'Neill, Utah Conservation Corps
- Noel Poe, Grand Staircase-Escalante Partners
- Nancy Sears, The Nature Conservancy
- Brooke Shakespeare, Dixie National Forest
- Peter Skidmore, Walton Family Foundation
- John Spence, National Park Service / Glen Canyon
- Joel Tuhy, The Nature Conservancy
- Linda Whitham, The Nature Conservancy
- Erik Woodhouse, UT Div. Wildlife Resources
- Joe Zelman, Utah Conservation Corps

- Michele Straube, University of Utah EDR Program (facilitator)
- Kim Kernan, University of Utah EDR Program (note taker)
Coordinating Committee Update (Linda Whitham)
PowerPoint slides are available from the facilitator.

- **Coordinating Committee Outcomes for 2016.**
  - Decided to hold partnership meetings in different places across watershed.
  - Created Outreach & Fundraising Subcommittees.
  - Updated Charter.
  - Obtained signatures on 5-year extension for Partnership Agreement.
  
  - **Action Item:** Post Updated Action Plan on ERWP website.

- **Outreach Subcommittee.** The Outreach Subcommittee is working on ideas to broaden the donor base and initiated the following:
  - Newsletter – 1st edition coming out next month to be distributed within the Escalante Watershed and available electronically.
  - Spring meeting with Chamber of Commerce – presentation.
  - November: Noel and Linda meeting with 3 Federal Agencies.
  - TNC developing a brochure “3 Good Reasons” targeting TNC donors and supporters; it will include an article on the Escalante.
  
  - **Action Item:** Share final newsletter with all ERWP partners and participants; encourage them to post it on their websites.

- **Fundraising Subcommittee**
  - **Restore our Rivers (ROR) Update:**
    - ROR is coordinated by the Tamarisk Coalition to help broaden the private donor base for riparian restoration work across the Southwest.
    - ROR intends to raise $2 million in non-public funding by March, 2018.
    - ERWP joined ROR and will be one of nine partnerships eligible for a $155,000 grant in March 2018.
    - To qualify for the ROR grant, ERWP must raise matching funds of $46,000 from non-state/non-federal sources by March 2018.
    - To date: $28,000 has been raised towards the ROR match.
    - Fundraising subcommittee is working on ROR-related tasks:
      - ERWP fundraising brochure
      - Building up private foundation/donor relations
      - Developing plan for use of ROR funds.
  
  - **Question:** How can ROR funds come into ERWP?
    - **Answer:** Make an ERWP-specific donation to any partner organization. Easiest organizations to go through are GSEP and The Nature Conservancy.
  
  - **Question:** What can private funds raised be used for?
    - **Answer:** Whatever the donor requests.
  
  - **Question:** What does it mean to be an “ERWP ambassador”?
    - **Answer:** Be willing to contact potential supporters/donors and tell the ERWP story.
Overview of 2016 Fundraising
- $1,829,701 to date
  - 40% Walton Family Foundation
  - 36% State and Federal Funding
  - 20% In-Kind
  - 4% Private donations
- Committee breakdown:
  - Woody Invasives: 86%
  - Conservation Targets/Science: 7%
  - Capacity/Education and Outreach: 7%

ERWP 2017 Budget projections:
- WICR: $1.5M projected expenses; ~90% gap
- Conservation Targets/Science: $40,000 projected expenses; 50% gap
- Capacity: $88,500 projected expenses; ~25% gap

Action Item: Become an ERWP Ambassador. Anyone who has an idea or a contact for fundraising should contact Nancy Sears at TNC.

The Coordinating Committee year ahead
- Fundraising
  - Continue to fundraise for project work.
  - Continue to raise non-state/non-federal dollars for ROR.
  - Identify how best to spend incoming ROR money.
  - Other ideas for fundraising:
    - Hemingway grant. $60,000 available over 3 years. Very interested in fish & woody invasives.
    - Backcountry.com has potential for this project with $200,000 available; demographic includes millennials who like causes like ERWP.
    - Conservancy Voices luncheon in Fall 2017 in Salt Lake.
- Capacity
  - GSEP looking for a new Executive Director; GSEP personnel actively involved in ERWP may change.
  - ERWP hire a Watershed Partnership Coordinator?
  - Other ERWP capacity needs for 2017
- Coordinating Committee annual retreat – December 6, 2016.

Partnership Agreement
- Original partnership agreement expired on June 23, 2016.
- Partnership Extension Agreement (adding 5 years) was offered to all of the 19 original signatories.
  - Signed: 13 of the original 19 signatories.
  - Dennis Bramble, Dixie NF/USFS, Grand Staircase-Escalante Monument/BLM, Grand Staircase-Escalante Partners, The Nature Conservancy, Escalante Canyon Outfitters, Four Corners School/Canyon Country Youth Corps, Glen Canyon NRA/NPS,
Grand Canyon Trust, Rim to Rim Restoration, Tamarisk Coalition, UT Division of Water Quality, UT Division of Wildlife Resources.

- Not yet signed:
  - Boulder Community Alliance, Grand Canyon Wildlands Council, Great Old Broads for Wilderness, Wild Utah Project.
- Do not plan to sign:

New partners this round:

- Signed: 8 new partners.
- Awaiting signature:
  - UT Forestry, Fire, and State Lands.

**ERWP Capacity** (Noel Poe)

- Noel will be resigning as Executive Director of GSEP at the end of 2016.
  - An offer has been made to a new E.D., but it has not finalized.
  - The new E.D.‘s role will focus more on fundraising for all GSEP programs.
  - Noel’s role with ERWP will remain “involved at some level.”
- Watershed Partnership Coordinator.
  - The level of funding and position description for a Coordinator will be fleshed out at December retreat.
- Other ERWP capacity needs for 2017 to be discussed at December retreat.

**Action Item:** Noel to send out information on new E.D. when agreement is final.

---

**Woody Invasives Control and Restoration Committee Update**

PowerPoint slides are available from the facilitator and on the TNC website.
Photos available: TNC Facebook, Flickr.

**Public Lands** (Nick Behe)

- Great Old Broads: 8 volunteers.
  - Spent 1 week in Phipps Wash removing Russian olive.
  - Great backcountry experience, several were returning volunteers.
- Wilderness Volunteers: 10 volunteers.
  - Extensive backcountry experience and familiarity with Utah landscape
  - 1 week removing Russian olive from HarrisWash - second group from WV this year.
- Russian olive removal progress:
  - New areas treated so far:
    - GSENM: 44.8+ acres / 1.65+ miles
    - GLCA: 36+ acres / 1.5+ miles
  - Retreatment:
    - 993 acres so far this season.
Upcoming Events
- Continuing Corps member field season.
- ACE Crew assisting with backcountry R.O. removal next week.

**Conversation Corps (Nick Behe)**
- Conservation crews received training in:
  - Wilderness first aid
  - Sec. 212 wildland fire chainsaw equivalency
  - Russian olive cutting instruction
  - Herbicide application/applicator certification
  - Helicopter evacuation zone safety
  - Backcountry lifestyle, safety and communications
  - Native plant ID
  - And more!
- Great group, very happy with project.
- Escalante Outfitters provides pack horses for provisions for working groups
  - 650 miles outfitting last year
- Before and after photos / video – available on Facebook, Flickr and ERWP website
  - Headwaters demo project
  - Upper River, just below Death Hollow
  - Sand Creek confluence
  - Boulder Creek
  - Below Harris Wash

**Private Lands (Sue Fearon)**
- Conservation Corps does their training on private lands. This year, training was done as a demonstration project for a land owner in Alvey Wash.
  - 80-90 acres of R.O. & Tamarisk as firebreak on windward side.
  - Corps did a great job and private landowner is now interested in developing partnerships with Partners for Fish & Wildlife and Div. of Wildlife Resources.
- Cutting on private land: October 1st, 2016 through April, 2017.
  - In 2015, started September 1st through May.
  - Worked exclusively with local contractor. Full time employment for 8 local Escalante residents, part-time employment for 1 local resident. Good local work force available during the off-season.
- This fall, first time efforts at 3-way partnerships (ERWP, NRCS and USFW partnering with private landowners).
  - NRCS is technical and financial anchor for conservation plans.
  - USFW & Sue provide technical and financial assistance.
- Retreated 200 acres, and cut 40 acres so far this year.
- Western Forestry Leadership Coalition grant (landscape scale restoration)
  - Request has been made for $300,000 FY2017 on non-federal lands (FFSL).
Question: Under NRCS conservation plans, what is the level of commitment to maintain conditions after the project work is completed?
   - Answer: The tie to providing funding for restoration in the Escalante is SWFFL habitat. Restoration requirements are very site-specific (e.g., several years rest, rehabilitation, retreatment), and includes 10 years of monitoring. The restoration and monitoring commitment is tied to the property, and remains valid with changing landownership.

Question: Are there local youth involved with the Conservation Corps?
   - Answer: Yes, 1 young woman, also the youngest Corps member this year (18 years old).
   - Suggestion: ERWP should talk to High School again.

Question: Does NRCS monitor for conditions beyond SWFFL habitat?
   - Answer: Yes, they incorporate other bird species. SWFFL is considered an indicator species. But, the focus of treatment and monitoring is not exclusively on bird species; the treatment and monitoring has to be certified by a NRCS conservation planner.

Question: Are NRCS payments to private landowners taxable?
   - Answer: The private landowner has to pay the contractor 100% upfront; NRCS reimburses the landowner. This possibly serves as a disincentive for landowners to participate.

Action item: Dave Bastian to revisit recruiting for Conservation Corps from local schools.

Packrafting the Lower Escalante (Peter Skidmore)
Videos and photos available on ERWP website.

- Beginning at the Egypt Trailhead, rafted from mile 36 to mile 90, and hiked out to Willow Gulch Trailhead
  - Total 50+ miles in 12 days. May 1-12, 2016.

- Observations -- Fence Canyon to Moody:
  - Only evidence of Russian olive was active treatment
  - Only 1 jam from debris on this section; floated over it.
  - Lots of individual stumps, but never in a big jam.

- Observations -- Moody to Scorpion:
  - Saw more Russian olive that needed retreatment.
    - Some >10 years, some flowering
    - Every quarter mile = 1-3 trees
  - Anyone floating the river can take pictures with Iphone (automatically GPS’es pics).

- Observations -- Scorpion to Ford Canyon.
  - More Russian olive re-treatment necessary. (“fair bit” of regrowth)
  - Tamarisk dead on higher surfaces. (beetle and geomorphic processes)
  - Incredible cottonwood and willow recruitment. (6’ width / 3-4 years?)
    - Saw lots of cottonwood and willow seeding (time seeding with high flows / snowmelt off mountains).
    - Natural hydrograph → continued flooding → regrowth
• Newer flood plain surfaces as lake crops = new population almost exclusively natives (willow and cottonwood).
  - Almost no Russian olive beyond Coyote.
  - *Except* highlands – cheat grass very thick.
• Very end, very muddy, then to Lake Powell.

• **Observations summary:**
  - River is resilient.
    - Good grazing conditions.
    - Good flow regime
  - Native vegetation is pervasive.
    - Strong recruitment in all ages classes.
    - Passive reseeding with natives.
  - Saw R.O. present throughout, some maturing.
    - Red flag that some areas are slipping through the cracks and deserve re-treatment.
  - R.O. debris is largely distributed or absent.
    - Well below treatment areas.
    - Did not have a problem, but evidence of treated R.O.
  - No obvious vegetative or geomorphic distinction by treatment year.
    - 10 years vs. 3 years, could not tell a difference meaningfully from a geomorphology perspective.
    - Natural flow regime helps river rebound quickly.
  - Little tamarisk above Coyote Canyon, and where it was, it was very incidental.
    - Below Coyote, all tamarisk dying as the lake drops.
    - New systems getting re-vegetated with native species.
  - Recreational use above Coyote.
    - Saw packrafters every single day.
    - Lot more recreational use.

• **Recommendations:**
  - Urgent need for retreatment down to Coyote. (flowering R.O.)
  - Retreatment less important below Coyote. (shifting lake level and dynamic system)
  - Formalize maintenance and monitoring plan.
  - Citizen engagement idea to help with monitoring.
    - Anyone rafting the river should be encouraged to take pictures with GPS placement and report back.
  - **Action item:** WI CR to follow up on citizen monitoring idea (taking photos of RO regrowth with GPS location).

• Question: We are seeing variable rates of tamarisk regrowth in Moab (with no sign of the beetle). Now seeing tamarisk in Escalante again, after several years of death.
  - Answer: There is no spring flooding in entrenched stream banks, so the seedlings are not washed out. In the Neon area, we are getting over-bank flooding. Challenge is slow-changing geomorphology. Entrenchment is being locked into place with willows. Debris jams could fix this.
• Question: What are the projections for re-flooding of the lower river? Is this the “new stable”?
  o Answer: We need back-to-back El Niño years. Floodplains will get bigger and bigger; this is semi-permanent.

Science / Conservation Targets Committee Update
PowerPoint slides are available from the facilitator.

• Watershed Resources Database Prioritization Meeting (Mike Golden)
  o Two main outcomes:
    ▪ ERWP partners and agencies still have a lot of data that needs to be provided to Phoebe.
    ▪ Sub-group is building a list of what is still needed.
    ▪ Looked at data in database and discussed how to use it to prioritize subwatersheds to work in and treatment areas.
  o The database and prioritization work will support the work that BLM/USU is doing (later presentation)
  o Action item: Phoebe to provide BLM with more specifics regarding what data is needed from them for the watershed resource database.

• Long term temperature monitoring probes (Mike Golden)
  o Working on putting data together.

• Fish update (Mike Golden)
  o Mike did very little fish work in the Escalante basin this year.
  o East Fork Boulder Creek update
    ▪ DWR is in process of putting together treatment plan to use as starting point for discussions with County and local communities.
    ▪ No plan to treat Boulder Creek this year.
    ▪ DWR will begin having small individual meetings with interested community members about the treatment plan.
    ▪ DWR and FS are committed to CRCT reintroduction.

• Water Level Recording (Brooke Shakespeare)
  o NRCS SNOTEL precipitation data as of September 30, 2016
    ▪ Percent average of total: 105% for 10/1/2015 – 9/30/16.
    ▪ 124% of 30-year average.
  o Different streams react differently to snow melt and/or precipitation events.
    ▪ Some – small precipitation = high water.
    ▪ Others -- high precipitation = low flow.
    ▪ Cannot make assumptions about amount of precipitation → water quantity or flow.
  o Question: Are there any monitors / gauges on the main stem of the Escalante?
    ▪ Answer: No, not USGS quality gauges.
    ▪ We are only measuring discharge.
Question: Are there any water level recording locations at the forest boundary?
  - Answer: No, they are usually higher, in areas where the forest is looking to do vegetation treatment.

Question: Will the gauges on Boulder Creek and Deer Creek be reopened?
  - Answer: Not unless USGS funding becomes available. Equipment and tech time is expensive.

- **DWR update on “Three Species” Fish (Erik Woodhouse)**
  - Three Species Monitoring for species protected under interstate conservation agreement: Flannelmouth Sucker, Bluehead Sucker, and Roundtail Chub.
  - **Progress:**
    - Sampling is increasing.
    - Changing / standardizing sampling to provide more and better information.
      - Changes in occupancy.
      - Long-term habitancy trends.
  - **Methodology:**
    - Spot Seining -- Three-pass depletion seining – 20 sites within each station. Move downstream.
    - Hoop Netting – Additional sampling effort for Three Species and to collect Roundtail Chub fin clips for genetic analysis.
    - In Escalante, sample each site 3 times per year, 13 reaches.
  - **Species-specific results:**
    - Flannelmouth Sucker
      - High abundance in deeper pools.
      - High numbers of fry in some reaches.
      - Recruitment from 2015 class was unconfirmed.
    - Bluehead Sucker
      - Abundance relatively low.
      - Only unidentifiably fry captured in select reaches.
      - Recruitment from 2015 class was unconfirmed.
    - Roundtail Chub
      - None observed, none captured.
      - Need to assess genetics on roundtail chub in Escalante.
    - Specked Dace
      - Multiple age classes captured.
      - Reproduction confirmed.
    - Non-native fish
      - Brown Trout captured (18), likely from Calf Creek inflow.
  - **Conclusions:**
    - Native sucker reproduction confirmed.
    - Recruitment from 2015 year class was unconfirmed.
    - Large, older adult native sucker population is robust.
    - No roundtail chub present in sampling reaches.
    - The results are alarming …
Question: Were the Sept. 2014 huge flood, then no flood in 2015, possible causes for no recruitment?
  - No. The lack of recruitment was from 2015, when we had a large number of suckers.

Question: Is DWR still interested in doing a barrier project at the confluence of Calf Creek?
  - Answer: DWR sports fish staff are doing it.

Question: Why is 2015 different? Were you using the same sampling approach?
  - Answer: In 2015, we used seining; in 2016, we used hoop nets. In 2015, we had rains the week before we sampled, with elevated flows.

Question: Were any other geographic areas sampled this year?
  - Answer: We did not sample other drainages in the Escalante. We did see recruitment in the Fremont.

Question: What does the conservation agreement say if one of the protected species “disappears”?
  - Answer: This may be cyclical; there are good and bad habitats. Are they going extinct? This is a high priority for BLM Conservation Team; they hired an expert to do a more in-depth study of Utah fisheries, especially roundtail chub. A standardized methodology is now being used.

Question: Are these numbers reflected in other watersheds?
  - Answer: I don’t know. The conservation team is looking across regions. Erik will be sampling the Escalante more frequently from now.

Question: Given that you found no chub, that means there were no fins to clip for genetics and propagation?
  - Answer: We need 50 fish for good genetic analysis.

Question: What does “removing non-native fish” mean?
  - Answer: There are usually a low level of non-natives in the Escalante.

Question: The barrier project at the bottom of Calf Creek, why is it not moving faster?
  - Answer: It is a joint BLM-DWR project, involving a series of fish barriers from Escalante upriver to help CRCT suckers and chub. DWR has had changeover in staff; they are re-looking at it right now.

Question: How can a barrier protect one species?
  - Answer: We salvage / release natives first, then treat the reach and restock.

Springs (John Spence)
  - No work has been done in the lower basin (no time)
  - Putting on a workshop in Flagstaff with the Springs Institute -- spring 2017

Long-Term Monitoring (John Spence)
  - Finalized 10 sites in place for R.O. monitoring.
    - Many are hard to get into.
    - They are not necessarily representative of the entire corridor.
o Headwaters Site monitoring results -- 2010 – 2016:
  § Not much has changed since R.O. was removed.
  § Still some woody invasives.
  § Natives are not coming up and filling in as expected.
  § Native and exotic herbaceous plants have increased.
  § Upland species have increased.

o Highway 12 Bridge monitoring results -- 2010 – 2016:
  § Zero exotics.
  § Natives have increased.
  § Native herbaceous plants are essentially the same.
  § Exotic herbaceous plants are slightly increased.
  § Upland species are down.

o Cross-channel transects monitoring results:
  § Dynamic stream channels.
    • Island has shifted.
    • Channel has shifted 15-20’ toward the wetland.
    • Not a lot of change in the channel itself.
    • Eroding on right side of channel.
    • Sedimentation on north side.
  § Overall: not a ton of change, but is moving southward.

o Fort Collins post-doc to evaluate data, which will be ready by next spring.

o Submitting $300,000 proposal to USGS
  § Increase more data collection and modeling.
  § Model flood discharge downriver.
  § Will be awarded by Christmas.

o Question: Are bends in the river moving?
  § Answer: The transect was in the straight stretch. River is naturally sinuous without R.O. The headwaters site is not representative of river sinuosity.

o Question: Why are we seeing the differences in vegetation?
  § Answer: Grazing impact over longer period of time. Mostly it’s a response to the removal of R.O.

o Question: Is there any comparable data from elsewhere?
  § Answer: No.

Making Landscape Assessments More Useable for Local Aquatic Resource Management
(Ken Bradshaw, BLM, Jeremy Jamecke, BLM, Justin Jimenez, BLM, Wally Macfarlane, USU; Brain Laub, USU)
PowerPoint slides are available from the facilitator.

- Overview: BLM is working with a team from Utah State University to develop methods and tools to improve the accessibility and useability of the BLM landscape products for resource and conservation managers.
  o BLM/State of Utah/USU project: Riparian Assessment Tool
  o Improve useability and get tools into the rights hands.
ERWP Full Partnership Meeting Summary – October 13, 2016

- Coordinate and get feedback from local resource specialists.
- Combining BLM landscape products with other aquatic condition assessments will make them more useable for local managers.
- Specifically, evaluate how to use these tools in ERWP’s work.

- **Project Timeline:**
  - This is the kick-off meeting.
  - Winter – REA/AIM/ other landscape analyses
  - Early Spring – meetings to summarize and get feedback from BLM/Partnership
  - Spring/Early Summer
    - Incorporate feedback
    - Compare/contrast landscape analyses
    - Develop conceptual models/useable products
  - Early Summer – Presentation of preliminary final recommendation
    - Feedback from BLM/Partnership
  - Late Summer/Early Fall – Final reports and presentations.

- The BLM’s landscape tools:
  - **REA - COPL** Rapid Eco-region Assessment
  - **REA - COPL REA** aquatic intactness model & step-down analysis at sub-watershed scale.
  - **AIM** - Assessment, Inventory, and Monitoring framework. A national strategy used to promote integrated, cross-program resource inventory, assessment and monitoring at multiple scales and measure chemical, biological and physical parameters.
  - **Beaver Restoration Assessment Tool.** [http://brat.joewheaton.org](http://brat.joewheaton.org)

- **BLM’s Landscape Approach**
  - Uses broad ecological assessments to discern values, patterns of change, management opportunities.
  - REA’s will aid in broad-level management strategies and land-use planning.
  - Compare and contrast REA & AIM results and REA with RCAT data
    - Are conditions and stressors consistent
    - Understand limits of REA step-down products.
  - Compile everything that is known about the Escalante Monument.
  - Interrogate the data.
  - Utah-wide Riparian Vegetation Conversion Type.
  - **WEBSITE:** [https://bitbucket.org/](https://bitbucket.org/)

- **Discussion:**
  - Question: Does the data portal allow access to different layers?
    - Answer: Yes. (slides show input data for model)
o Question: Who did the weighting for the “fuzzy thinking” model?
  • Answer: Conservation Biology Institute, a team of experts to create weighting using delphi approach.
  • We look forward to ERWP’s review / ground-truthing of the weighting assumptions.

o Question: What will this be used for? Are you using the weighting for a pre-desired end?
  • Answer: We want to identify areas of high and low intactness, to inform preservation or restoration decisions. We don’t know if it can be used more site-specifically.

o Question: Did you use habitat quality as an indicator? Where did the data come from?
  • Answer: We looked for areawide data sets. Intactness and road information.
  • AIM can inform adaptive management decisions (terrestrial and aquatic). Aquatic AIM is based on measurements on the ground in randomly selected streams.

o Question: Does ERWP have comparable data collection?
  • Answer: No. USGS project will gather channel width/sinuosity/braiding.
  • We would love for ERWP to interrogate this data.

o Question: Can we bring site data together with this large scale data to make it something that regional managers can use
  • Answer: Site data ---- network summary
  • This could be done with AIM data because of the probability-based design (GRT).

o Question: The scale crux: how can we better predict site level summary from network level output?
  • Answer: Run assessments with higher resolution data.
  • Example: San Rafael River. ½.meter scale date GOI donated to BLM.

• Discussion: ERWP Database
  o Question: Could we verify water quality with standing fish population; temps, etc.? A lot of verification of data comes from bottom up.
  • Answer: ERWP wants to get data to that level and flag areas.
  • Answer: ERWP has some multi-level data of vegetation, a lot of spring data.
  • Answer: BLM is almost ready to use, but would like to have great confidence in the data which could be accomplished by bottom up verification.

o Question: How to you match up those who need the data with the access to the data?
  • Answer: Everyone’s desire is to get the information into the hands of the local land managers. Met with local Monument staff, personal meetings, liaisons in place, this is a TEST CASE.
  • Answer: the ERWP data gathering meant to fill the very holes this project is talking about.
Process / Next Steps:
- Have BLM/USU groups be more involved with the ERWP Science Committee.
- BLM/USU group to come back to make follow-up presentation to ERWP, perhaps at next partnership meeting.
  - **Action Item:** Send handout to Phoebe.
  - **Action Item:** Add Ken Miller to ERWP Science Committee.
  - **Action Item:** Plan for follow-up presentation from BLM/USU group.
  - **Action Item:** ERWP to review weighting assumptions.

Cross-Watershed Network (XWN) Update

- XWN is a tool to make peer-to-peer cross-watershed networking and learning easier.

  Cross Visit Incentive Program
  - $2,000 matching funds, planning assistance.
  - Visit other watersheds.
  - Next round applications accepted this winter.

- Gila Watershed hosting next XWN Annual Workshop in Stafford AZ
  - Sharing between watershed practitioners
  - Hoping to have ERWP attendees

Other Updates or Events

- Nov 9-11 -- Society for Ecological Restoration Conference, Las Vegas

- Nov 15 -- Short course on river restoration
  - Jack Schmidt/Mark Briggs, presenters
  - Walton FF funded.
  - Nominal fee.
  - Provide own transportation.

- Feb 7-9 – Tamarisk Coalition annual workshop – Fort Collins, CO
  - [http://tamariskcoalition.org/events/2017-tc-conference](http://tamariskcoalition.org/events/2017-tc-conference)

- Mar 21-22 – Cross-Watershed Network (XWN) annual workshop – Stafford, AZ
  - Gila Watershed hosting
  - [http://crosswatershed.net/xwnprograms/workshops/](http://crosswatershed.net/xwnprograms/workshops/)

- March 2017 – exact date TBD – ERWP full partnership meeting
Escalante River Watershed Partnership
October 13, 2016 – Full Partnership Meeting
Escalante, UT

Meeting Schedule – NOTE new location -- all events are taking place at Escalante Showhouse, 50 N. Main Street, Escalante (unless otherwise indicated)

Thu 10/13
- 8-9:30 am – Coordinating Committee F2F meeting (Escalante Showhouse)
- 10-5 – ERWP full partnership meeting (NOTE new location, Escalante Showhouse)
  o RSVPs for lunch to Angela Turnbow (angela.turnbow@law.utah.edu) by Fri 10/7 (estimated cost for lunch: $10-12)
- 5 (or immediately after partnership meeting) (1-1.5 hours) – WICR Committee F2F meeting (Escalante Showhouse)
- 7 pm -- Alan Titus, GSENM paleontologist; “Paleontology on the Grand Staircase-Escalante Monument” (Escalante Showhouse)

Fri 10/14 – Sat 10/15
- Bio-blitz in Deer Creek

October 13 Full Partnership Meeting Agenda* (10-5)

- Introductions
- Housekeeping
- Coordinating Committee update
- Woody Invasives Control and Restoration Committee update
- Packrafting the Lower Escalante – Adventures and Observations (Peter Skidmore, WFF)
- Science / Conservation Targets Committee update
- 12:30-1:30 -- LUNCH
- 1:30 pm – BLM science update – Analysis/synthesis from Rapid Ecological Assessments and other assessments (Ken Bradshaw, BLM; Jeremy Jarnecke, BLM; Wally Macfarlane, USU; Brian Laub, USU; Scott Miller, BLM; Phaedra Budy, USU; Justin Jimenez, BLM)
- Science / Conservation Targets Committee update – cont’d.
- 3:00 pm -- XWN update (Lindsay Murdoch, XWN – via Skype)
- Other Partnership Updates
- Upcoming Events
- Additional Agenda Items (if any)
- Schedule Next ERWP Meeting

* Breaks will be taken at appropriate times in agenda