

DRAFT TRRP MEETING SUMMARY – FISH WG

Meeting Summary: FWG met to update work group member on the activities of the subgroups and discuss the upcoming adult salmonid monitoring evaluation workshop. Not much work has been conducted by the subgroups, primarily due to workload issues. Subgroups are going to try and devote time to their tasks over the next several months. The adult monitoring review work shop had to be postponed because the primary reviewer, Dr. Mike Bradford, has to provide expert testimony on the dates that were selected. New dates will be identified after conferring with the reviewers.

Date: 8/9/2011
Time: 9:00-3:30
Location: Weaverville, CA
(TRRP office)
Number: N/A
Password:

Coordinator: Joe Polos (FWS)

Note Taker: Joe Polos

Desired Outcome:

1. Learn of the fish information needs of the Flow WG and identify how the FWG can facilitate this information transfer.
2. Update FWG on efforts of the subgroups
3. Update FWG on the adult monitoring review work shop, finalize agenda and presentation template.

Attendees: Seth Naman (NOAA), George Kautsky (HVT), Sam Chilcote (FS), Tim Hayden (YT), Nina Hemphill (BOR), Robin Schrock (BOR), Wade Sinnen (CDFG), Joe Polos (FWS)

Minutes

Agenda item: Misc. info updates provided by WG members

Presenter: Group

Discussion:

1. During agenda review added Fish Production work shop/planning topic to the subgroup discussion item (Attachment 1).
2. Robin - she would like to see symposium report/proceedings published for any symposia that the TRRP hosts. BOR has a technical editor that is available to provide support.
3. Wade – JC weir is in and catching fish the first day in. Collecting some brown trout at the weir for a tissue analysis/toxicology study
4. Sam – summer steelhead/spring Chinook salmon dives have started on the major tributaries.
5. Nina – the Trinity River systems analysis (metrics) document will be ready for internal review by the end of next week (~Aug. 19)
6. Group –
 - a. general discussion of the TRRP external review process which is coordinated through UC Davis. The redd/carcass 2002-2010 report recently went through the process and the authors are now addressing comments. The 2009 IHAP report, 2010 CDFG run size and harvest report, and 2009 outmigrant report are currently being reviewed.
 - b. FY2012 proposal re-writes addressing comments provided through the external review process were due to Ernie on Aug 1.
 - c. TRRP field trip of restoration sites will occur on Aug 16. This is a follow-up to the spring field trip during the 11,000 cfs release. Andreas Krause is coordinating the trip.

Conclusions: N/A

Action items: N/A

Person responsible: N/A

Deadline: N/A

Agenda item: (2) Information needs from the Flow WG

Presenter: Andreas Krause

Discussion: Andreas updated the FWG on the current efforts of the Flow WG to formalize the process of incorporating information into flow scheduling in a more formal AEAM process. The Flow WG is going to be working on three products: (1) annual flow experiment report, (2) current knowledge document, and (3) flow experiments compendium. For the annual flow experiment report there is a subgroup of the Flow WG developing a template for the annual report. One issue that was briefly discussed was the information flow to inform the annual flow scheduling process. There is a subgroup of the IDT that started working on identifying the various programmatic tasks and timelines so that the efforts of the various work groups can be timed to provide the information when needed. A couple flow charts were shared with the groups (Attachment 2 and 3). There was also a brief discussion of what type of data would be appropriate since reports would typically not be completed in time to inform the next year's flow scheduling process. There is the potential to use preliminary data if the various entities are aware of the timing of the information need and exactly what types of analyses are required by the Flow WG so they can focus their efforts. The current knowledge document (synthesis report) will summarize the TRRP information/data concerning flow management. This will be additional work and Robin may seek extra resources/staff/funding to support this effort. The third document, the flow experiments compendium, will be a collection of brief write-ups (4-5 page tech memos) of potential flow experiments that will serve as a repository of experiments that the program may want to consider. Examples that have been suggested in the past include the "build and carve", "diel flow variation", "summer baseflow variation" and "descending limb to minimize frog egg mass desiccation".

Tim informed the group on the status of the fall flow recommendation (Tim is the leader for this subgroup). A proactive fall flow augmentation is not being recommended because the flow at Terwer is projected to be above the 2,500 cfs threshold based on the NOAA river forecast tool and the inriver fall Chinook salmon run is projected to be below the long term mean. Adult disease monitoring conducted by the Yurok Tribe will start within the week and this information will be used to inform the need for a potential reactive release. This subgroup is also working on an implementation plan for the fall flow effort. It was also mentioned that there is the Klamath fish disease monitoring group (KBFA?) that may be useful if conditions become a concern in the lower Klamath.

Robin informed the group that there will be a release for the Hoopa boat dance beginning on August 30 with the peak on that day of ~2,600 cfs.

Conclusions: The Flow WG would like input from the FWG on what we would like to add to the topics addressed in the current knowledge report and what potential flow experiments should be included in that document. Review notes taken from Flow WG meeting concerning this topic/request (Attachment 4).

Action items: FWG members are to provide suggestions to Joe by September 23 and he will compile them and forward to Andreas by Sept 30.

Person responsible: FWG members and Joe to compile.

Deadline: Sept 23 to Joe, then to Andreas by Sept 30.

Agenda item: (3a) FWG Subgroup – cohort reconstruction

Presenter: George Kautsky

Discussion: George updated the efforts of the cohort reconstruction subgroup which is to address the metrics of quantifying to contribution of naturally produced Trinity River fall Chinook salmon to dependent fisheries and natural spawning escapement. This group is initially focusing on fall Chinook because it has the most extensive database. The effort will partition hatchery and naturally produced fall Chinook in the Trinity River and will also partition out the contribution of the Trinity natural and hatchery fish to the mixed stock fisheries in the lower Klamath River (tribal and recreational) and ocean (recreational and commercial). George recently received the CWT recovery data from CDFG-Santa Rosa to move forward with this analysis. George shared a spreadsheet

(Attachment 5) with the data that are currently developed for this effort and would like feedback from the FWG members what information/metrics that they would like to see presented. There was some discussion about the cohort reconstruction methodology but George said that he would provide the details of the methodology at the TRRP adult monitoring review workshop presentation on this project.

Conclusions: Effort is ongoing and, with the newly acquired data, partitioning of the mixed stock fisheries will be initiated.

Action items: FWG members provide George suggestions on what information/metrics they would like to see presented as a product of this analysis.

Person responsible: FWG members

Deadline: **September 30, 2011**

Agenda item: (3b) FWG Subgroup – SF Spring Chinook Limiting Factor Analysis

Presenter: Tim Hayden

Discussion: This effort was initiated following this project being consideration in the FY12 proposal process. The FWG could not reach a consensus recommendation on the project as there was a policy concern expressed that this was outside the scope of the TRRP. A document was provided to the IDT and Science coordinator presenting this information and the Acting Executive director had some conversations with the Solicitors office, but it was still unclear if this effort was permissible. A draft needs assessment RFP document was developed by Tim to get the effort initiated but nothing else has occurred due to other competing activities. There was some discussion as to what exactly was to be done. The group should compile the available information that currently exists and review the Pacific Watershed Associates South Fork Trinity River limiting factor analysis (http://www.krisweb.com/biblio/sft_usbor_pwa_1994_sftplan/pwa1.htm). Josh Smith of the SF Trinity watershed group is very interested in assisting this group. While the Solicitors have stated that watershed restoration efforts in the SF Trinity could not be supported by TRRP funds, this population is part of the overall programs restoration goals and this document may assist other entities in securing funding.

A couple of changes to the group structure were done – Nina will take over as subgroup leader from Tim and Shane Quinn will replace Tim on the subgroup. Tim will work with Nina to pass the torch.

Conclusions: Subgroup will review the SF Limiting Factor Analysis and other pertinent information and refine the draft needs assessment document.

Action items: FWG members to review needs assessment (Attachment 6) and get comments to Tim by Aug 29.

Person responsible: FWG members

Deadline: **Aug 29, 2011**

Agenda item: (3c) FWG Subgroup –Juvenile Salmonid Survival

Presenter: Seth Naman

Discussion: There was a conference between Seth, Nina and Sam to develop a plan for the subgroup to address its task. There was some confusion concerning membership of this group but that has been clarified. During the conference call the group decided to take a step back and develop the information documenting the poor natural recruitment then move forward from there, depending on the outcome of that analysis. There was some discussion of the potential drift of the purpose of this subgroup away from addressing survival and focusing more on a coho salmon stock assessment effort. Depending on the outcome of the stock-recruit analysis, the subgroup may identify potential survival bottlenecks to evaluate. If other factors are believed to be population bottlenecks, then this group

should focus on evaluating juvenile Chinook salmon survival, possibly focusing on flow related survival relationships.

Sam and Wade were added to this subgroup.

Conclusions: The full subgroup will be engaged and move forward with the analysis.

Action items: Move forward with the analyses and recommendations for this subgroup.

Person responsible: Subgroup members

Deadline: TBD

Agenda item: (3d) FWG Subgroup – Potential Habitat

Presenter: Joe Polos

Discussion: Joe updated the FWG that there has been no progress on moving forward with this subgroup's task. There was an indication that there would be no funding for this effort this FY due to the budget short-falls so no effort put into it. Additionally, this effort is going to build upon the potential capacity evaluation being conducted by Tim Beechie and George Pess under a contract with FWS. A presentation of their interim effort was presented at the last science symposium. Due to other obligations that they have (primarily efforts on the Elwha River) they anticipate that their report will not be available until the end of September. FWS is undergoing a staffing reorganization and once that occurs the FWS rep will be identified. A leader from the core membership of the FWG will need to be identified.

Conclusions: Subgroup efforts on hold until Beechie and Pess report is available.

Action items: Distribute and review Beechie and Pess report when available, subgroup should then meet to review its content and make a plan to meet the subgroups objectives. FWG needs to identify a subgroup leader.

Person responsible: TBD

Deadline: TBD

Agenda item: 3(e) Fish Production

Presenter: Joe/Group

Discussion: The status of the fish production modeling effort was discussed. There is an PITA in the IAP recommending that the TRRP should identify the needs/uses of a fish production model and, if it is determined that the TRRP should develop one, host a workshop. At this work shop invited modeling experts can share what fish production models they work on and how these can possible support the TRRP's needs. SALMOD was used as part of the Trinity River Flow Evaluation and an updated version of SALMOD is being used, and currently undergoing another refinement, for the Klamath River. There are also other modeling tools that may be useful to the TRRP (i.e.: Individual Based Models, Smart River GIS). A couple of ideas shared on the potential use of a fish production model as a learning/predictive tool were evaluating different flow schedules and evaluating the potential production gains from different restoration treatments. In the past the TRRP has funded USGS-Fort Collins (the line item was identified as SALMOD) but no update of the model that was used in the Flow Study is believed to have happened. Leanne Hanson and Sam Williamson have developed Smart River GIS (<http://www.fort.usgs.gov/SmartRiverGIS/>) that may be useful to the program and should be considered in this effort. There was a brief discussion that this subgroup could possibly be partnered with the Potential Habitat subgroup but it was decided that these effort should remain separate but will need to be coordinated because the product of the Potential Habitat subgroups could be an input value as the habitat base for the Fish Production model. Notes from a conference call held on March 8, 2011 were shared at the last FWG meeting (Attachment 7) and Nina developed a proposal (Attachment 8). On July 7,

Ernie, Robin, Joe, and Nancy Finley discussed this task during a conference call and Joe was asked to lead this effort.

Conclusions: A formal subgroup of the FWG was formed to address this task/PITA. Joe will lead the group and Nina, Wade and Tim are members.

Action items: Joe will compile the various documents and notes that have been developed on this topic and will summarize the current rationale for the need of a TRRP fish production model.

Person responsible: Joe

Deadline: TBD

Agenda item: (4) Brown Trout

Presenter: Seth Naman

Discussion: Seth presented a catch-effort (catch/day) data for adult (>41cm) brown trout from the Junction City Weir from 1985 to 2010 that was compiled by Wade (Attachment 9). There were some concerns raised about the comparability of data across years due to operational and flow differences and some possible ways to standardize the data were suggested. While there are some possible refinements to the data analysis, there does appear to be a significant increase in C-E following implementation of ROD flows, with the total numbers of brown trout capture substantially greater. Some possible explanations of this observation were: (1) an increase in the population, (2) a redistribution of fish due to the changes in flow/temp, (3) changes in migration activity, (4) a combination of the aforementioned factors, and (4) possibly other factors. Some of the mechanisms that could influence the population and/or the data are: (1) changes in flow triggering migration, (2) more habitat, (3) more habitat due to more favorable thermal regimes, and (4) better spawning gravels. CDFG marks brown trout as part of standard weir operations and has had very few recaptures suggesting that they are not catching the same fish over and over again. CDFG has also recently increased the limit on brown trout to 5/day and 10 in possession to encourage increased harvest pressure on them.

Conclusions: This was an informational topic but something that the program should keep an eye on when considering factors that may be limiting juvenile salmonid production.

Action items: N/A

Person responsible: N/A

Deadline: N/A

Agenda item: (5) TRRP adult salmonid monitoring review work shop.

Presenter: Joe Polos

Discussion: As part of the TRRP's subprogram review process, the adult salmonid monitoring component of the TRRP was selected to undergo an external peer review in FY2011. A draft SOW was circulated among FWG members in December, following incorporation of comments, Nina and Ernie move this effort through contracting and awarding the contract. Dr. Mike Bradford (CDFO) is the primary reviewer and Dr. Dave Hankin (HSU) is working in a supporting role. A draft agenda, and list of topics and presenters (Attachment 10), and presentation template were shared with the group (Attachment 11).

The work shop was planned for September 15-16 in Arcata but due to uncontrollable work commitments, Dr. Bradford will not be able to make it on these dates. Joe and Ernie will coordinate with Mike and Dave and see what other dates, probably in late Oct or early Nov, may work for them. Once some dates are identified a doodle pole will be sent out to the FWG members and presenters to see what dates work best.

It was suggested that an overview of the TRRP adult assessment that is supported by the individual projects be given (Joe or Ernie were identified as potential presenters) at the beginning of the work shop and then a wrap-up of the assessment presentation at the end of the work shop. A rough time for each presentation was suggested: 15 minutes for presentation and 15 for Q&A, although some may not need as much time (i.e.: CWT, marking, tag recovery). The agenda will be updated with presentation times, breaks, and lunch break. Depending on when the work shop occurs and the amount of time necessary for all presentations and Q&A, a field trip may be considered if time permits.

There were some recommendations on the presentation template that Joe will incorporate and send back out to the FWG for a final look. Ideally, we can get all presentations a couple of weeks prior to the work shop so these can be sent out ahead of time and can also be provided as handouts.

Conclusions: Proceed with work shop scheduling.

Action items: Joe and Ernie will coordinate with Drs. Bradford and Hankin on some potential dates then get a doodle poll to see what dates work for most participants. Joe will update the agenda and presentation template and circulate it to FWG members for a final review.

Person responsible: See above

Deadline: TBD

Agenda item: Misc. items/future meetings

1. All information disseminated to subgroups members should also be cc'ed to the core FWG members so that everybody is aware of what is going on. If this becomes too burdensome we may reconsider this.
 2. Tim mentioned that at the recent Physical WG meeting there was a discussion concerning FWG input on a fine sediment modeling/assessment report addressing fine sediment production from Grass Valley Creek. It is unclear exactly what specific input the PWG is seeking. Joe will contact Andrea Davis and get some clarification.
 3. No date for a future meeting was set. FWG members wanted to wait until dates for the FY2013 proposal process and/or IDT support needs were identified and then the FWG would schedule a meeting(s) as needed to support these efforts.
-

Other Information

Observers: None

Resources: None

Special notes: None