

RAE workgroup meeting 7-25-2019

Participants: Bill Pinnix - USFWS, Bob Sullivan - CDFW, James Lee – HVT, Kyle De Julio - YT, Justin Alvarez - HVT, Eric Peterson - TRRP, Chris Laskodi – YT

Action items:

Eric Peterson will develop demonstration of RAE – 1 target

John Bair will develop demonstration of RAE – 4 target

James Lee will develop demonstration of RAE – 2 Black Cottonwood/tree willow recruitment target

Bob, Bill, Kyle, and Chris will consolidate and justify RAE 1-4 with IAP 5 & 6

James Lee will send out Workgroup Objectives and Targets master spreadsheet to workgroup

Kyle will send annual progress report on BMI drift study to workgroup

Meeting Notes

Review of previously generated objectives from May meeting – These can be found on the living spreadsheet / google docs.

4 new objectives were developed for the RAE workgroup at their previous meeting. There is considerable overlap with the objectives put forward in the IAP and trying to eliminate redundancy is major object of today's meeting. Conversation surrounding the wording and intent of the previously develop objectives lingered for longer than the group was comfortable with and it was decided to move on to the review of the IAP objectives and their overlap with the newly developed sweet of objectives (RAE 1-4). Changes to the 4 new objectives are reflected in the master copy of the workgroups objectives and targets spreadsheet.

IAP objectives – Bob suggested that IAP objective 5.3 was regulatory and should not be included here, and we get rid of IAP objective 6 in (near) its entirety. And simplify others. He provided comments in advance of the meeting of that nature (refer to submitted comments). His concerns include that there is a lack of commitment of resources to accomplish these objectives and that it may not be efficient to dedicate time and resources to their development. He argued that there is a need to reduce and prioritize the current objectives so that monitoring and goals are realistic. Suggested that the group should request an annual level of funding and tailor projects to that amount of funding.

This precipitated vigorous debate of the “chicken or egg” variety. Kyle expressed that in his experience he has not seen generalized requests for funding be successful and that he believed it was the responsibility of this group to prioritize and develop/solicit proposals that were detailed enough and supported enough to compete well during IDT deliberations.

Other members offered various views on both sides of the issue. The group decided to move forward with prioritization and objective and target development, but recognized the need for commitment from the TRRP and TMC to consider these for funding priority. While at the same time the RAE group needed to hold realistic expectations as to the number and type of efforts that funds would be available for.

Further conversation on the redundancy between the IAP and newly developed objectives took place. Kyle suggested that all of IAP 5 was redundant with RAE – 1 (5.1.1, 5.1.2, and 5.1.3) and RAE – 4 (5.2.1) and agreed with Bob that 5.3 was a requirement and not an objective. Kyle also suggested that RAE – 1 covered 6.1 and 6.2. IAP 6.4 is not something that the management action of the program could directly affect and should be removed. RAE – 1 was related to 6.4.2, and RAE – 2 was targeted at major management action that affect 6.4.1 and 6.5. RAE – 3 is redundant with IAP 6.6. The group offered general agreement and found that targets developed under RAE 1-4 could sufficiently cover the 3 levels of objectives in the IAP.

It was suggested that return interval of different efforts should be reviewed and that every target did not need to be assessed annually. A cyclical monitoring effort that was tailored to the expected interval of detectable change for a given response variable would allow for more targets to be monitored with limited resources. It was also suggested that remotely sensed data and predictive modeling tools were cost effective and useful in guiding management actions. Acknowledgement that many of these techniques/analysis have substantial assumptions inherent in them was made and the need to perform validation efforts along the way acknowledged. However, there was substantial conversation about how validation and hypothesis testing has not been equally applied to all efforts and it was often difficult to validate without an experimental action targeted at a hypothesis.

James moved conversation back to reviewing the objectives and targets that were generated during the last meeting. Several comments on the language of the objectives were considered by the group and the results of that are reflected in the current wording on the master spreadsheet for all workgroups. Significant change include the removal of the word “increase” from RAE -3, and the addition of several concepts for targets to RAE-2. It was recognized that RAE – 2 holds the potential to proliferate targets back to the number that previously existed if independent targets are generated for every focal species. Further discussion around RAE -1 was had and the importance to use different bins of relative elevation or discharge were recognized. Eric Peterson volunteered to work on the demonstration of this target for the September TMC meeting. John Bair was amenable to formalizing the existing target for RAE – 4. Brief conversation about the possibility of RAE – 4 actually being a target under RAE – 1 was had, but it was the opinion of sever workgroup members that the history of this target and the specificity of its, merits it being is own objective. There was substantial conversation around aspects of the target that were generalized and did not address the intent of the target to avoid channel simplification due to riparian encroachment. Measured were proposed to change the analysis to reflect the intent of the objective and James added the language “exterior” was added before “channel margins”. James offered to work on the demonstration of the Black Cottonwood target for RAE – 2.

An afternoon meeting was scheduled for August 20th as a place holder in case the group needs to meet prior to the September 11th and 12th TMC meeting. Bob inquired as to what the group should work on between now and then. Kyle suggested that the members who were working on target demonstration should concentrate on that task and the remaining members should be tasked with any other business. Chris Laskodi suggested that the remaining members work on consolidation and justification for the updated RAE objectives and targets with the previous IAP objectives and targets. Bob, Bill, Kyle, and Chris accepted that task.

Meeting adjourned 4:35 pm