

Meeting Summary
FISH WORK GROUP
Wednesday, July 16, 2014, 9:00 – 2:30
USFWS/NOAA Office, Arcata, CA and via Webex

Participants

Seth Naman (NOAA), Ernie Clarke (TRRP), Andreas Krause (HVT), Joe Polos (FWS), Billy Matilton (HVT), George Kautsky and Steve Cannata (CDFW), Tim Hayden (YT)

Notes (via Webex): Jeanne McSloy (TRRP)

Action Items Derived during the Meeting

- Seth to finalize and send out hatchery memo. Remove word reform. Add in recommendations for hatchery changes (COB 7/18/14)
- Tim to talk with Aaron for list of pre and post construction reports (7/25/14)
- Seth and Ernie to develop framework or outline or choose existing for rapid assessment of pre restoration conditions (??)
- Joe to calculate spawning habitat area (by 8/1/14)
- Seth to look into amount of redds/m² that constitutes imposition (COB 7/18/14)
- Seth to send out channel rehab priorities (COB 7/18/14). Group to fill in and return by (COB 7/25/14).

Meeting Notes:

9:00 Agenda Review

Seth reviewed the agenda and introduced participants. It was agreed that the Rehab effectiveness monitoring discussion could be pushed forward in time or shortened in length to allow more time for the Hatchery memo discussion.

9:15 Hatchery memo – fill in table, finalize comments.

Document (20140630.hatchery.reach.memo.docx). Seth discussed the geographic scope over which the PNI should be calculated, with input from a recent discussion with Hankin; a concern is that the population is not a randomly mixed, so it is not appropriate to calculate it as such. Hankin supports restoration in that reach if it is possible but strongly advocates a sorting weir to get hatchery fish out of the system, and increasing natural origin broodstock prior to pursuing more restoration in this area. Hankin was also in favor of coordinating the restoration program and the hatchery. The workgroup discussed spawning timing and how spawners might be sorted.

The group reviewed the Hatchery memo and filled in the biological information in Table 1 (the table on the last two pages). Options A through E were reduced to options A through D, and the group refined the language of the descriptions, added effects to salmonid production for each category, and eliminated the “Genetics” category from the sidebar.

Option A – Full suite of restoration actions

Option B – Full range of gravel augmentation at any or all of the 3 sites

Option C – Gravel augmentation only at Weir and Cableway or Cableway only

Option D – Do nothing

Each of the options was considered, discussed, and the document amended where appropriate. The group discussed the characteristics of rearing habitat and how different methods of gravel augmentation might impact habitat formation. Discussion of whether or not to suspend restoration actions in the Hatchery Reach pending changes at the hatchery. Discussion of how to order the decision process and how to divide the projects into categories. Discussion of the degree of impact on spawning likely to be produced by each of the options. Discussion of life stage survival for each option. Seth added a breakdown of impact on life stage (egg, fry, juvenile, adult) to each of the options. Discussion of hatchery expert opinions on whether or not it is a good thing to increase the amount of second generation hatchery fish without changes at the hatchery.

11:30 Rehab effectiveness monitoring memo

Document (Channel Rehab Priorities and Questions Science Workplan - FY15.docx). Seth went over the list of potential questions from RIG (questions that could be assessed: in general; at a minimum of one year pre-construction; pre-construction compared to post-construction), with attention to items 2 and 3. The group was asked to consider whether or not the timeline is reasonable, or what a reasonable timeline might be. For example: Can you know in a couple of years, without a certain sequence of flow events, if a design was successful? Suggestion that the response be measured at sites over a range of water year types. Suggestion that this is an opportunity to use objectives to bridge any gaps in the program and to improve communication between engineers and biologists. Suggestion to use this list to guide work planning in the future. Seth created an Excel spreadsheet for the questions and color coded them according to projected timeframe, matching up the question from RIG with Fish WG response and project description. Seth noted which projects already were or could help answer the questions and agreed to send the document out. Seth agreed to develop a framework or outline (or choose an existing one) for rapid assessment of pre- and post-restoration conditions with Ernie.

12:00 LUNCH

12:45 Metrics for TRRP Fish Objectives

Document (20140630_Fish related means objective and management action linkages.xlsx), the Objectives workbook from the Objectives exercise. Ernie gave a brief update on what has been happening with objectives and his discussions with other workgroup leads. Sean Ledwin will add language related to basin and watershed to existing documents and distribute it to all. Wildlife-Riparian objectives will remain as they are for now. The Design Team will work within the existing framework. Suggestion that representatives on the Design Team be aware of the objectives and how they are being used to evaluate potential rehab designs. Suggestion that the means and objectives for the Fish Workgroup be streamlined or simplified. Language changed in items #10, 13 and 14 to refine metrics.

Adjourn 2:30.

[The Phase I/II transition workshop was held after the meeting was adjourned; no notes taken]

Fish Work Group

Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, July 16th

09:00 am to 3:00pm

Arcata USFWS/NOAA office
or Teleconference - WebEx

Coordinator/Facilitator: Seth Naman

Desired Outcomes:

1. Fill in table of biological responses to alternatives for hatchery memo
2. Provide input Rehab site effectiveness monitoring for FY 2015 Memo sent out by DJ
3. Assign tasks to FWG members for outstanding metrics that need refining for Objectives refinement.

Background/Audience

1. A draft memo on the hatchery restoration site to be sent to the TMC by beginning of August. We need to fill in the biological information in the table on the last 2 pages with the effects to fish in the 4 different alternatives. Please think about ways we can describe quantitatively or qualitatively the effects to fish production or genetics.
2. Memo from DJ on channel rehab priorities for FY 15. We need to look at items 2 and 3 (mainly 3) and step through the list and discuss the questions in the memo that our current list of projects is already answering, or could be answering. Or if we agree on whether or not the questions are important to be answered, and think about ways we can help get the information to DJ.
3. The objectives workbook from our objectives exercise. We need to finalize this and move on. Please go to the last tab where I have highlighted some outstanding objectives that have metrics that need refining. Please put some thought into how we can come up with metrics for those that are highlighted in orange before the next meeting.

Agenda Items

WebEx Call-in/Log-in Details

Topic: Fish wg

Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Time: 9:00 am, Pacific Daylight Time (San Francisco, GMT-07:00)

Meeting Number: 573 085 286

Meeting Password: Abc123!

1. Go to <https://trrp.webex.com/trrp/j.php?MTID=m2687a986de650362ed95158d7e7237bb>

2. If requested, enter your name and email address.

3. If a password is required, enter the meeting password: Abc123!

4. Click "Join".

To join the audio conference only

Call-in toll number (US/Canada): [1-408-792-6300](tel:1-408-792-6300)

Time	Topic	Presenter
09:00	Hatchery memo-fill in table, finalize comments	Seth/Group
10:30	Rehab effectiveness monitoring memo	Seth/Group
12:00	Lunch	Seth/Group
12:45	Metrics for TRRP fish objectives	Seth/Group
2:15	Phase I/II transition workshop	Joe/Tim/Geo.
3:30	Adjourn	Group