

**Rickel, Mike - Wenatchee, WA**

---

**From:** Todd Reeve [treeve@b-e-f.org]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 27, 2009 11:12 AM  
**To:** Rickel, Mike - Wenatchee, WA  
**Subject:** BEF follow up

Mike,

I am looking forward to catching up with you today. To help frame our conversation, I thought yesterday about what is fundamentally at stake here from the BEF perspective. I came up with the following four points that represent what BEF expects to occur in the Entiat to continue funding:

1. Entiat watershed stakeholders set and institutionalize specific and measurable restoration objectives and benchmarks for desired restoration progress
  2. Entiat watershed stakeholders set and institutionalize the monitoring systems and timelines necessary to judge progress towards reaching the stated objectives and benchmarks.
  3. Entiat watershed stakeholders set up, implement, and institutionalize a process to transfer knowledge of results and measured progress to a wide body of stakeholders in the Entiat and (as appropriate) upper Columbia.
  4. Entiat Watershed stakeholders incorporate and institutionalize an adaptive management and discussion loop into ongoing restoration planning and management
- Regarding item #1: I believe this is done already in the matrix.
  - Regarding item #2: I believe this is already underway through existing monitoring work—the timelines of existing monitoring strategies need to be configured into (and synched up with) the existing matrix.
  - Regarding Item #3: I believe this is beginning with the annual report, but you and I have discussed the more deliberate and strategic ways to transfer this information to select groups.
  - Regarding item #4: I am not sure this is occurring, but an annual review of collective results at the EWPU level could provide a means to move this forward.

Best,

Todd