

Meeting Summary
Inter-Disciplinary Team (IDT)
Thursday 26 September 2019
TRRP Office, Weaverville, CA

Participants

In person: Ken Lindke (CDFW), Justin Alvarez (HBT), Conor Shea (USFWS), James Lee (HVT), Eric Peterson (TRRP), Mike Dixon (TRRP), Logan Negherbon (TRRP), Todd Buxton (TRRP), Kyle De Julio (YT), Seth Lawrence (DWR).

By webex: Bill Brock (USFS), Seth Naman (NMFS – for afternoon)

Note taker: Conor Shea

Consensus Items:

- Workgroup coordinators poll workgroups for examples of how the TRRP has changed management aspects of the restoration program and that can be reviewed in context of adaptive management.
- Flow Synthesis Report proposal should be developed following synthesis report request in 2018; will be due Nov 1 along with pre-proposals.
- Additional pre-proposals from James (below) are welcome, will initially be added to bottom of priority list, group recognized that TMC may reorder everything.
 - Geomorphic influence of narrowleaf/dusky willows that become established in the channelbed. Modelled with unconstrained hydrographs.
 - Compare and contrast FYLF recruitment between pre-TRD hydrographs and post-ROD hydrographs at 40-mi scale.

Action Items Derived during the Meeting

- Mike will direct workgroups to develop skeletal workplan for FY 2020 for review by IDT at November meeting and presentation to TMC in December.
- Subcommittee (Ken, Conor, Kyle, Todd) to work on proposal for flow variability topic #2: “Can flow management tailored to meet temperature targets be an effective tool to reduce pre-spawn mortality and induce pool temperature stratification for adult salmon holding habitat?”
- Eric to check if flow variability question #12, “How can flow releases be optimized for wood transport and deposition.(e.g. wood flux)” is being covered by existing wood synthesis report.
- Todd to invite Bill Trush to submit a proposal for answering the question “What is the minimum flow that is required to maintain suitable dissolved oxygen and temperature for juvenile salmonids in fish producing tributaries?”.
- Mike/Eric schedule IDT meeting for November

Recommendations for Future Agenda

- AM loop closure ideas from WGs
- Consolidation of Objectives
- Annual work schedules for workgroups (including IDT itself).

Summary of Meeting by Agenda Items (order as covered)

1 Introductions / Agenda Review and Finalization

2 General Program updates

Mike went over staff changes and vacancies in the Weaverville office

- SC: 1st Round Interviews coming soon - Target In-Place by December
- Implementation Branch Chief at bottom of pile in JAO
- Questions about prioritizing filling geomorphologist and civil engineering tech

NEPA Contractor:

- Kickoff meeting held.
- Contract written with flexible assignments - river design and flow management

Channel Rehab:

- Sky Ranch hung up because of land ownership issues. Not ready for NEPA
- Oregon Gulch - no place identified to place spoils - not ready for impact analysis.
 - Discussion about property that is under foreclosure which is in the foot print for the Oregon Gulch property.
 - Design probably on hold.
- Upper Connor Creek not ready.
- Evans Bar - in preliminary stage
- Dutch Creek - USFS NEPA
 - Bald Eagle Issue
 - Wild and Scenic River Clearance
 - Potential FONSI by November

Kyle asked about if Program is considering smaller projects. Mike: Sawmill could be a small project. TRRP staff does not have capacity to develop. Logan: Sky Ranch and Oregon Gulch have potential for break out into small projects.

Watershed Grants: No approval for FOA yet. Anticipating announcement in November.

LIDAR: USGS flying a large portion of upper basin. TRRP was planning to cover some of the same area, so USGS project will reduce area that TRRP needs to cover. TRRP will cover river and a large portion of Hayfork Creek.

Seth Lawrence recommends getting photography with LIDAR. Discussion followed. Problems with photography at time of year LIDAR is collected and photography cost will reduce area that TRRP can cover.

3 **Objective Target Refinement**

Eric summarized Nick's presentation at TMC.

- Nick tied together the products of workgroup, compared and contrasted the objectives, discussed Flow Workgroup metrics, Riparian Workgroup, Physical Workgroup, and Fish Workgroup
- Nick conveyed burn out on metrics.

Discussion:

- Ken conveyed that he feels burn out on objectives. Asked if others felt similar?
- Kyle: Depends on which targets, some subgroups are able to develop objectives easily, other workgroups struggle.
- Shea: Objectives are important, but detracted workgroups efforts in other areas. Suggested moving forward that workgroups should develop objectives as part of work approach.
- Ken: Performance objectives are important and should have been identified long ago. Current exercise should get to a point where objectives and targets are identified, rather than kicking it down the road.
- Kyle: Workgroups are coming up with overlapping objectives. IDT should coordinate the process. Should IDT review objectives?
- Discussion about multiple workgroup interactions and reviews. Several noted chaos that results from too many people in the room. Problems with workgroups working in isolation.
- Mike: Workgroups need to be working on other things.

Discussion about IDT setting annual workplan for workgroups.

- Mike: Proposes that Workgroups should submit annual workplan to IDT for review.
- Discussion -
 - Kyle proposed annual schedule
 - Todd discusses workgroups not producing work.
 - There is need to implement top-down direction rather than bottom-up.

Action Item: Mike will direct workgroups to develop skeletal workplan for FY 2020 for review by IDT at November meeting.

4 Synthesis Reports

Eric presented progress on Synthesis Reports.

- Completed:
 - Riparian Encroachment
 - Cottonwood Seed Dispersal
 - 1/2 Juvenile Chinook Production – This project was split into two reports, one from Yurok and one from USFWS. Yurok portion is complete.
- Several over-due

5 Peer Review Guidelines

Eric passed out handout. Eric noted Ernie prepared original guidelines. Eric felt that some parts are not clear and some updates to guidelines are needed. Guidelines do not clearly identify review levels for differing types of documents. Eric went through handout which provides an assessment of current guidelines and deficiencies in current guidelines. Asked for comments on current process.

- Shea: Raised concerns about requiring independent internal program reviewers.
- James: Suggested adding investigation plans to review documents so reviewers have an understanding of scope of work.
 - Discussion about the additional work, potential limits on reviewer, introducing bias into review.
- Shea: What are responsibilities of author to respond to comments?
 - Discussion leads to agreement that author expectations should be included in guidelines.
- Lindke: What are OMB obligations? Eric explained relevance of OMB to works with federal employee authors versus not. TRRP will hold up to same standard – relevance is mainly for coordinating with agency peer review teams.
- Eric will not finalize new guidelines, but will present suggestions to next Science Coordinator.

6 Adaptive Management Loop Closure: Template

Under TMC ‘Refinements’, a contractor will be brought on board to coordinate development of adaptive management plan document in two-year period. Staff will develop large components of adaptive management plan. Eric presented thoughts on getting ready for developing. He notes that we have adapted management, but not necessarily made changes in the context of an adaptive management procedures. Eric proposed to document past adaptive management actions. Eric's intentions for this document:

- Start documenting where we have changed management and how well it followed adaptive management measures.
- Start group thinking about how to perform adaptive management.

Discussion about whether program is performing adaptive management. Path forward to be decided after lunch.

[lunch]

Afterward, discussion continued on about how to proceed.

Action Item: Poll workgroups for examples of changes in management actions that imply an adaptive management measure.

7 Preproposal Solicitation on Flow Variability

Began with a presentation by Justin Alvarez on a new Flow Synthesis Proposal

- Flow management is an important program action. Synthesis reports missed Flow Management.
- Proposal development team (Alvarez, De Julio, McBain, Naman)
- Buxton mentions that Flow was not missed; intention was to complete other reports and used those results to support Flow synthesis.
- Discussion about when to schedule work and how to fund. Comments generally agree that a flow report is required.
- Discussion about priority of Flow Synthesis report versus Flow Management Proposal Topics.
- Will flow synthesis report address any of the Flow Management Proposal topics.

Discussion about which groups intend to submit Flow Management Preproposals and which topics will be submitted. Notes that it is important to have proposals on shelf in case funding becomes available.

During discussion, Mike noted that item #2 (temp and flow management to manage adult holding pools) is a high priority. The group did not identify specific projects that are already being developed to address this, as it has multiple sub-topics. Eventually group consensus led to a subcommittee assigned to address this and develop a proposal: Todd, Kyle, Ken, and Conor.

-
- Todd intends to submit for 4 and 11.
-
- Mike indicates that Number 2 (temp and flow management to manage adult holding pools) is priority.
-
- Discussion about how to get preproposals for priority topics

Going through List:

1. “Can variation in the timing of juvenile outmigration from the Trinity explain variation in survival and be influenced by water management?”
 - Ken will take to fish group and attempt to get a team to develop proposal, or may fit with existing S3 Scenarios project.
2. “Can flow management tailored to meet temperature targets be an effective tool to reduce pre-spawn mortality and induce pool temperature stratification for adult salmon holding habitat?”
 - Todd, Kyle, Ken, and Conor will develop proposal for No. 2.
3. “How do flow and flood event timing and duration effect drift food availability and growth of juvenile salmonids?”
 - Waiting on 3 (already being worked on within existing projects)
4. “Development of hydrophone method for monitoring sediment transport on the Trinity River at Douglas City, Limekiln Gulch and Lewiston.”
 - Todd proposing for No.4.
5. “Evaluate how the connectivity timing, controlled by flow management, of intermittently connected off-channel habitats impacts fish use and survival.”
 - Yurok/CFDW team will develop No. 5.
6. “Apply the S3 model in conjunction with observed fish size data to evaluate assumptions regarding percent maximum consumption and food as a limiting factor for Chinook Salmon juveniles.”
 - May fit within existing S3 Scenarios project - Kyle and Justin will follow up with Nick Som
7. “Evaluate the effects of flow event magnitude, duration, and recession on scour (bed, bar, redds), bank collapse, and channel meander.”
 - Yurok planning on submitting for No. 7. Todd will join proposal team
8. “Does flow management influence cottonwood cohort success on targeted floodplain surfaces and prevent willow establishment on channel margins?”
 - No. 8 already being done – to be answered in upcoming Riparian Monitoring Report.
9. “What are the impacts of a variable flow regime on reservoir levels and river recreational access?”
 - No. 9 should not consider at this time – this is likely an EIS evaluation.
10. “Evaluate the impacts of higher discharge winter flows on intergravel water temperatures.”
 - No. 10 addressed in conjunction with Redd study. Kyle to follow up with USFWS or may add to Redd Scour (#7)
11. “Evaluate the impacts of peak flow frequency and seasonal timing on turbidity.”
 - No. 11 will be addressed by Todd in Fine sediment synthesis.
12. “How can flow releases be optimized for wood transport and deposition.(e.g. wood flux)”
 - No. 12 addressed by Large Wood Synthesis. Eric will verify

13. “What is the minimum flow that is required to maintain suitable dissolved oxygen and temperature for juvenile salmonids in fish producing tributaries?”

- Fits with Trush current work on riffle crest depths - maybe best addressed in watershed FOA. Todd will discuss with Trush.

Flow Synthesis Proposal should be fully developed.

James Lee presented three new investigations proposals

- Evaluating narrow leaf willow recruitment in the channel bed with unconstrained summer flow (min flow and temperature management).
- Evaluate Foothill Yellow Legged Frog recruitment with unconstrained summer flow.
- Evaluate what minimum flow regimes are required to support Spring Chinook holding habitat

James and group agreed that the third topic may best come after the first two, and may fit with topic #2 (above). James to prepare preproposal for 1 and 2.

8 Site Visit to Chapman Ranch

Led by Logan Negherbon, attended by Kyle De Juilio, Conor Shea, Ken Lindke, James Lee, Todd Buxton, Eric Peterson