

MEETING NOTES

TRRP IDT meeting in Weaverville; 10/1/2015, 9am-3:30pm

Participants

Joe Polos, Science Coordinator (Acting), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Robert Franklin, Hoopa Valley Tribe
George Kautsky, Hoopa Valley Tribe
James Lee, Hoopa Valley Tribe/TRRP – Riparian/Wildlife and Flow WG coordinator
Brant Gutermuth, Trinity River Restoration Program
Robert Stewart, Trinity River Restoration Program – Gravel WG coordinator
Dave Gaeuman, Trinity River Restoration Program
Eric Peterson, Trinity River Restoration Program
Aaron Martin, Yurok Tribe Fisheries
Andreas Krause, Yurok Tribe Fisheries
Conor Shea, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – Design Team Coordinator
Todd Buxton, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – Fish WG coordinator
Wes Smith, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service

1. Workgroup Updates –

a. IDT – Joe Polos:

- i. Joe reviewed guidelines to promote work group effectiveness, WG rules and the agenda for the meeting.
- ii. **WG Coordinators** - coordinators were reminded that it is time for the WGs to select a coordinator with the new fiscal year approaching.
- iii. **FY17 Work planning** – there may be an accelerated schedule for developing work plans for FY17, with the due date for approval by the TMC in late January. Their typical target date for TMC approval is mid-June. The TMC will discuss this at their October 15 conference call. Depending on the outcome of the TMC discussion workgroups may need to develop a FY17 work plan for their discipline very soon if the late January target date is necessary.
- iv. **Reports/Deliverables** – Eric Peterson discussed that final reports are not being submitted to the data steward for proper filing and electronic retrieval. Eric and Todd have been developing a list to account for the project products/deliverables that the TRRP has funded over the past 4-5 years and have found that not all of the submitted reports have been provided to the TRRP office. Some reports were provided to contracting staff and never made it to the TRRP office. It is important that technical reports/data are provided to the TRRP staff also. Joe directed partners to submit documents for technical review to the Science Coordinator or Implementation Branch Chief as appropriate with Eric cc'ed. Draft reports will still go through the TRRP peer review process.
- v. **Performance Measures** – WGs need to review the Performance Measures documents (located on the ODP at: <http://www.trrp.net/restore/performance->

measures/) and update them as appropriate. These were last updated in 2012. Development of new Performance Measure documents is encouraged. The TMC is interested in getting information such as this and maybe be requesting a more extensive reporting on that status of the system that would integrate information such as that found in the Performance Measures documents. At the TMC meeting there was some discussion about developing a “State of the River Report”. Joe will follow up with Bruce Bingham to get clarification as to what he would expect to see this type of document. The deadline for getting the Performance Measures documents updated and reviewed by WGs is November 13 so they can be provided to the TAMWG and TMC at their December meetings.

- vi. **Funding to Assist with DSS and/or River Corridor Planning:** The TMC has set aside approximately \$120,000 for the IDT to identify how to use to help move the River Corridor and/or DSS efforts forward. Some of the ideas mentioned at the TMC were to hire a consultant or somebody from another agency that has the right expertise to help the Program. This will be discussed in more detail at the next IDT meeting.

- b. Fish WG – Todd Buxton.** The Fish WG met on September 24. Todd Buxton was selected as the new WG coordinator. Todd has compiled recommendations from the TRRP adult monitoring review (Bradford and Hankin), SAB and NMFS-Santa Cruz lab and the status of addressing or implementing the recommendations. The WG review and discussed items that needed WG input but did not get into specifics on many projects due to time constraints. Todd will continue to develop this product as information is provided by partners. At the Sediment Lessons Learned WG a comment was made that the Program did not have any targets for fine sediment composition. A general discussion occurred on what was needed at this time and the WG decided to write a memo that would focus on fine sediment composition of spawning habitats, areas for invertebrate production, and lamprey spawning habitat. This memo will be provided to the IDT. Authors of the Performance Measure documents will be asked to update them. The WG reviewed the draft synthesis report outline and will provide comments and suggest priority order for sections to Joe. Two scenarios were drafted to be used to demonstrate the potential use of the Fish Production Model, one addressing flow management and one addressing large scale channel rehabilitation actions.
- c. Gravel WG – Robert Stewart.** Workgroup is working in finalizing reporting of workshop and reviewing internal comments.
- d. Riparian/Wildlife WG – James Lee.** TRRP riparian experts met with Blair Griman from BOR-Denver to discuss the development of the SRH1D/2D- VEG model will be part of the TRRP DSS.
- e. Watershed WG – Sean Ledwin.** WG coordinator did not participate in meeting. Working on addressing review comments on Causal Linkage whitepaper
- f. Flow WG – James Lee.** Nothing to report.

g. **Design Team – Conor Shea.** Design team will meet on October 28. There will be a presentation of the results of the habitat and fish use studies that have been conducted on the Trinity River.

2. **River Corridor Planning:** Dave Gaeuman and Robert Stewart presented a summary of their work on development of components of the River Corridor Management Plan and Tools (Attachment 1-3). Dave provided a description of their approach as consisting of: (1) Preparing multiple scale assessment of ecological conditions, (2) Identifying Target Conditions, and (3) Developing strategies to achieve Target Conditions. Scales consist of Valley-scale, Geomorphic Unit (multiple reaches), and Reach (riffle crest to riffle crest) scales. Dave described methodology used to identify reaches. Dave and Robert described investigations used to evaluate channel complexity, rugosity, and small-scale and large-scale contributions to channel complexity. These metrics may be used to assemble contiguous reaches with similar characteristics into Geomorphic Units. Dave indicated that he felt that the next steps were to link complexity metrics to habitat. Group held discussion about the nature of the evaluation, utility of metrics, and next steps. Andreas Krause stated the need for inclusion of assessment of channel dynamics. They were asked what happened to the “map” that Eric Peterson was developing as part of this project. Dave did not think that was necessary while Conor added that the map was intended to identify constraints that would need to be considered as this effort moves forward. Andreas suggested that this effort needed to incorporate floodplain connectivity. “Group member?” said that this effort had drifted from what the Gravel WG was looking for and that it needed to look at desired future conditions and future opportunities. Joe Polos closed the session and directed that a pilot-project should be completed by the end of the year, that the project should incorporate characterization of dynamic processes, and should identify future steps in development of the planning tools.

3. **Big Questions, Objectives, DSS:**

Big Questions: The Big Questions document was shared with the group as a refresher of some of the efforts that have been taken to help guide some of the objectives/monitoring/ etc. (Attachment 4a-b). It was suggested that these need to be reviewed and revised or added to if necessary. One suggestion was that a questions addressing ecosystem/biology/physiology was needed. **WG leads need to have their groups review the Big Questions and provide comments, revisions, or new questions.**

Objectives: Next a summary of the objectives refinement exercise was presented and it was noted that the WGs had gone through the IAP objectives and sub-objectives to refine/clarify some of the objectives and clean up some of the redundancies (Attachments 5a-d). It was noted that the Program has agreed to two fundamental objectives (increased anadromous fish production and a healthy alluvial river) with six means objectives (5d). One of the critiques from the SAB concerning the objectives exercise/refinement was that the Program needed to develop metrics associated with each objective. Until this was done it would be impossible to evaluate that effectiveness in Program actions in meeting the objectives. Joe proposed that the WGs review the objectives exercises to refresh everybody’s memory and to start developing metrics

for the objectives. He stated that this is where we all seem to hit a road block and if we are going to try and move the program forward in implementing adaptive management and a DSS we need to focus on this task. George thought that focusing on the metrics may be out of sequence because the DSS may help us focus on specific objectives and then the WGs can develop metrics for the critical objectives. Nobody had a strong opinion on way or the other on the sequencing but waiting for the metric development seemed to be appropriate given the significant workload that it would entail and waiting until the some more clarification of the basic structure of the DSS seemed appropriate. WG leads need to have their group review the current Objectives documents and provide comments, updates or revisions. If metrics have been developed or are under development this information should be provided also.

DSS: The status of the development of the TRRP DSS was discussed with little development since the last DSS meeting. Joe showed the DSS diagram from Appendix H of the Phase I review that primarily addresses the fish production fundamental objective. The River Health Evaluation form developed by the HVT, a proposed method to evaluate the fundamental objective of a healthy alluvial river system, was also shared with the group. Robert Franklin pointed out that some of the models that would support the fish production component of the DSS would also support the evaluation of the healthy river fundamental objective. Andreas and Robert noted that an individual, a Science Lead, needed to be tasked with coordinating and implementing the development of the DSS. Joe relayed that the TMC had directed the IDT to function in this roll but that has been a challenge. Robert Franklin also stated that the DSS or Science Coordinator needs the authority to direct what science is being conducted so that the program can implement adaptive management. Joe stated that this has been a challenge due to the limited flexibility of partnerships in what monitoring occurs on an annual basis. Joe showed a few slides (Attachment 7) that had the steps in moving forward with the DSS (below). He also told the group that Tyrell DeWebber, the Post-doc that is working with Jim Peterson, developed a similar document. The IDT DSS subgroup will have a conference call before the end of the month and work on developing a document that outlines the steps that we need to develop and implement the TRRP DSS.

Integration of Big Questions and Objectives with DSS Process

1. Integration of Big Questions, Objectives, Metrics/Targets and Models
 - a. WGs need to develop and/or refine metrics
 - b. Description of models – needed inputs and resulting outputs
 - c. Need to assign to individuals to write-up
2. Science Symposium – Late March/Early April
 - a. WGs need to develop scenarios to be evaluated for demonstration of model utility in informing TRRP management actions

TRRP next steps for DSS

1. Work through the DSS question in Appendix H of the Phase I review.
2. Incorporation of Big Questions?
3. Incorporation of objectives exercise?

- a. Define/refine metrics associated with objectives
- 4. What models does the TRRP have?
 - a. How important are these in informing the TRRP through the DSS?
 - b. Description of models – needed inputs and resulting outputs
 - i. Need to assign to individuals to write-up
 - c. What is missing?
 - d. How important are these in informing the TRRP through the DSS?
- 5. How will the DSS guide TRRP management actions – define procedures
- 6. How will the DSS guide the TRRP monitoring and assessment programs (TMAG and RIG information needs).- define procedures
- 7. Science Symposium – Late March/Early April
 - a. WGs need to develop scenarios to be evaluated for demonstration of model utility in informing TRRP management actions

The IDT DSS subgroup will have a conference call before the end of the month and work on developing a document that outlines the steps.

- 4. Next meeting: The next IDT meeting will be on November 17. Location TBD but likely Willow Creek or Arcata.

IDT MEETING AGENDA

October 1, 2015
9:00 am – 3:30 pm

DRAFT AGENDA –

Weaverville TRRP Office

TECHNICAL ROUNDTABLE MEETING

Coordinators: **Joe Polos**
 Brandt Gutermuth

Desired Outcomes:

- Chart out a path forward for DSS development
- Update on Corridor Planning Effort and Input from partners
- Sediment Lessons Learned summary document plan

Time	Topic	Presenter
9:00	Introductions/Agenda Review/Goals and Objectives	Joe Polos
9:15	TRRP Work Group <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Coordinator Reports- FY17 Workplan process- Performance Metrics	WG coordinators
10:00	Corridor Planning Effort – presentation of analyses to date and discussion	Dave Gauman
12:00	Lunch	
1:15	Review of Sediment Lessons Learned Workshop – summary document	Robert Stewart
1:45	Trinity DSS update – plan on path forward	Group Discussion
2:45	Big Questions, Objectives, IAP – Updates? Review by WGs?	Group Discussion
3:15	Next Steps / Action Items / Set Date for Next Meeting	Joe Polos
3:30	ADJOURN	

Buffington, J., C. Jordan, M. Merigliano, J. Peterson, and C. Stalnaker. 2014. Review of the Trinity River Restoration Program following Phase 1, with emphasis on the Program's channel rehabilitation strategy. Prepared by the Trinity River Restoration Program's Science Advisory Board for the Trinity River Restoration Program with assistance from Anchor QEA, LLC, Stillwater Sciences, BioAnalysts, Inc., and Hinrichsen Environmental Services.

http://odp.trrp.net/FileDatabase/Documents/Buffington_et_al_2014_Phase_1_Review_with_appendices1.pdf

TRRP (Trinity River Restoration Program) and ESSA Technologies Ltd. (2009) Integrated assessment plan. TRRP, Weaverville, California.

<http://odp.trrp.net/Data/Documents/Details.aspx?document=400>

TRRP (2009) Conceptual models and hypotheses for the Trinity River Restoration Program. Final report prepared for the Trinity River Restoration Program, Weaverville, CA. 130 pp.

http://odp.trrp.net/FileDatabase/Documents/Conceptual%20Models%20and%20Hypotheses%20for%20the%20TRRP_FINAL1.pdf