

TRRP Fish Workgroup Meeting Summary
TRRP Office, Weaverville, CA
Tuesday, January 5, 2016

Participants

Core members: Aaron Martin (YT), Todd Buxton (FWS), George Kautsky (HVT), Seth Naman (NOAA), Steve Cannata (CDFW)

Others in attendance: Shane Quinn (YT), Joe Polos (FWS), Phil Phishella (USFS), Kyle DeJulio (YT)

Note taker: Todd Buxton

New Actions Items

- Next FWG meeting will be in Arcata on February 3, 2016.
- Steve Cannata will provide an outline for a presentation comparing Fall Chinook salmon escapement estimates for Trinity River to other rivers in the region by January 19th.

Work Group recommendations/decisions

- None

Notes

Discussion on the outline for fish synthesis analysis and reporting resulted in no suggested changes, but recognition that the outline should only be viewed as broad suggestions for directions to take in this effort. Preferable to strictly following the report outline, Buxton emphasized that scientists should focus on creativity in analysis and interpretation of results when forming and testing hypotheses in this effort. The group agreed the full report is too large to undertake at once, and should instead be broken into component parts. In this direction, Polos and Martin agreed to form and lead subgroups that will conduct synthesis analysis of adult Chinook salmon production metrics and juvenile salmon habitat information, respectively. Updates on progress made by these subgroups will be given by Polos and a YT representative individuals at the next FWG meeting. Martin will miss the next FWG meeting because he will be attending a conference.

Cannata presented preliminary results of comparisons of Fall Chinook salmon escapement between the Trinity, Eel, Klamath, and Rogue Rivers. The point was made that data used in the comparisons needs to be evaluated for consistency between rivers to ensure the same metrics are being compared. Cannata said data were comparable such as escapement of adults vs adults and hatchery and natural area spawner comparisons and it is the relative trends that are important, but he will review data. There was also some question regarding the applicability of correlation and regression tests used to evaluate the statistical significance of differences between annual escapement estimates in the comparisons. Despite these concerns, preliminary data indicate Trinity escapements generally track in direction (increasing or decreasing) with escapements to other rivers. Kautsky asked that the return of hatchery and natural origin adults be overlain in a

figure so that TRRP managers can best appraise the relative change in the natural origin population which is most directly influenced by TRRP actions. This work is largely complete in the existing performance metrics paper on this topic, it may simply need to be updated. Cannata agreed to present his revised presentation at the February 3 FWG meeting for practice and possible refinement before presenting this information at the TMC and TAMWG meetings mid-February.

Eric Peterson shared a list of upcoming fisheries and other reports that are due and reports that are past due to the group. Peterson also explained several aspects of the TRRP data management plan (DMP), which includes instructions for TRRP partners to submit reports and data packages to him and others (TRRP Executive Director, Science coordinator, ect.) for posting on the TRRPs online data portal (ODP). Kautsky pointed out that reports produced by the HVT are provided to contracting personnel in BOR, and Peterson explained the reports also need to be submitted to the TRRP, as outlined in the DMP. Kautsky reasoned that dual submission is unnecessary since reports are already being submitted to BOR, and Peterson responded the TRRP is not the BOR, but a partnership that is only partly composed of BOR personnel, so separate submissions are needed to ensure that all work that comes from the partnership is available to all partners and the public. Peterson went on to explain the importance of submitting reports to the ODP in terms of ensuring full public access to insensitive data that is US government property. Buxton noted that 3 months after emails were sent to principal investigators informing them of past due reports, most have yet to be submitted. Martin and Quinn responded they will attempt to provide YT reports that are past due. Kautsky stated willingness to provide Buxton fisheries reports previously provided to COTR from the HVT that are missing from the ODP.

The group reviewed a memorandum addressing criteria for evaluating fine sediment impacts to biologic processes and populations in the Trinity River that Buxton is composing. Buxton recognized that by including nutrient retention and ammocoete rearing in the memo that he went beyond the FWG's recommendation to only identify fine sediment criteria for salmon spawning habitat and egg incubation, lamprey spawning habitat, and invertebrate production. The group was asked if it opposed inclusion of fine sediment criteria for these additional elements, and no opposition was announced. Several FWG members made helpful suggestions for refining the memo. Steve Cannata recommended to include a percent of sediment size of 6mm in the evaluation of bulk sediment samples based on literature reviews and discussions with Andreas. He had previously provided this in comments on the draft memo. The criteria proposed in the memo were then agreed on by the FWG. Buxton will now analyze sediment transport and bulk sediment data collected by the program to evaluate whether fine sediment criteria is being met for nutrient retention, ammocoete rearing, salmon spawning habitat and egg incubation, lamprey spawning habitat, and invertebrate production.

The FWG worked to address comments by Bradford and Hankin (2013) and the SAB regarding adult salmon studies on the Trinity River. The bulk of comments addressed in the meeting were fielded by Kautsky, who questioned the appropriateness of all PI's not being present during this exercise. If one partner agency is held to the scrutiny of FWG with regard to responding to the BH review, then why would not all partner agencies be subject to same standard?