

Meeting Notes 9 June 2010

Location: Entiat Fire Station (3 miles up Entiat River Rd)

For more info contact: Casey Baldwin 509-664-3148 casey.baldwin@dfw.wa.gov

RTT members attending: Casey Baldwin, Tracy Hillman, Chuck Peven, Keely Murdoch, Russell Langshaw, Joe Lange, Cameron Thomas, Karl Polivka, John Arterburn.

Others attending: Mike Ward, Derek Van Marter, James White, Julie Morgan, Barb Carrillo, Mike Rickel, Roy Beaty, Joe Conner.

Casey reviewed the agenda and noted one major change that needed to occur. The site visit to Tyee Ranch had to be postponed to a later date. After some discussion with Mike Rickel, it was determined that the preferred alternative would be to visit the site on the afternoon of June 24th, following the other Entiat site tours for the SRFB/Trib funding cycle. Mike said he would be on a conference call with the Trustees later this week and will work to achieve access on June 24th, in the afternoon.

1) Updates

- **Tyee discussion continued:** The group continued the Entiat Tyee Ranch discussion, to clarify the process and timelines for this potential targeted solicitation project. Casey was concerned that delays could impede the implementation target of 2011 if everyone was not working on the same timeline. Mike said the Trustees want agreement from entire trust on the channel migration barrier location before a site tour occurs, and that his plan was to get that agreement by July 1. Mike asked about working with a few RTT members to further the project during the end of June and into July, and bring back to the full RTT later. Casey did not think that would work due to the other RTT commitments during the summer and that it is better to involve the whole group throughout the process. Mike wanted to have landowner agreement on the preferred alternatives by August 30th. Casey laid out a timeline starting with August 2011 implementation and worked backwards to see if having agreement that soon was necessary. It appeared that the October to December timeframe would be feasible and give time for the RTT and others to provide feedback on the alternatives as they are developed. Assuming that a site visit occurs on June 24th, Mike should be able to work that feedback into a set of alternatives for presentation to the RTT in September. A second feedback loop to landowners could then occur and a final design selected by October or November.
- **MaDMC:** Keely gave an update on the recent activities of the MaDMC, which met on May 14th. Activities included:
 - Established a timeline for finalizing appendix B (Entiat) of the Monitoring Strategy (review starts in June)

- The MaDMC received a presentation on YN STAR report, comments and feedback will be sent to YN (Bob Rose).
 - Finalize the data gaps document (should happen tomorrow)
 - Between last meeting and this meeting, small workgroup met to discuss the data gaps section of the synthesis paper. Have a draft that the MaDMC will look at tomorrow.
- **2010 Project Review:** Casey noted that 22 pre-proposals has been submitted so it will be a busy year for project reviews. We will need all four days for site visits on June 21-24. Stay tuned for logistics and an itinerary. Casey also reminded folks that Joe Conner (BPA) would be joining us on activities related to projects that would/might be funded by BPA.

2) UCRTT Analysis Workshop Results / Synthesis Paper

Casey provided an overview of the purpose and objectives for this agenda item as well as the list of accomplishments from the 12 May 2009 meeting. The purpose was to provide Mike Ward with edits and feedback on the material in the draft synthesis paper, focusing on the Habitat Status and Trend Section and the newly added presentation summaries.

Julie offered an update to the logistics and timeline related to the synthesis paper. We are currently on version 2 and there will be 5 versions before finalized. The RTT will have chances to wordsmith and edit on version 4, which will come back to the RTT on September 8. Between now and then, Derek and Casey will go to each of the WAT, perhaps with other RTT members as well, in order to present the key points and begin soliciting feedback from the WATs. The WATs will have an opportunity to review the actual document later, probably the August version (4). On Sept 22-23 the Board wants to receive a presentation on the RTTAW/Synthesis Paper. Julie hopes to involve as many session moderators as possible in teaming up on that presentation. The November RTT meeting (10 Nov 2010) will likely be the Adaptive Management Science Conference.

Mike Ward described the status of the report and discussed the sideboards for today's conversations. The plan was to cover a lot of material without getting too bogged down in the detail and wordsmithing. The version circulated for today's meeting does not include all the edits and comments from May 12th. Mike focused on adding the remaining new material that included the presentation material and write-ups by Cooney et al., Connolly et al., Baldwin and White, Van Marter, O'Neal, and the introduction.

Data Gaps Session: On May 12th we decided to let the MaDMC handle the data gaps session. Keely gave an update on that process and product. They decided to change the summary boxes to cover "current" and "next steps" rather than deliberations and recommendations. The top data gaps were moved out of the write-up and into one of the boxes so we can report on which of the previously identified data gaps are being addressed with new funding. This move opening up some space to increase the

methods and procedures section to capture what the MaDMC did when they identified and prioritized the data gaps.

Karl recommended going through the synthesis paper and look at the studies, and discuss how they address, or not, data gaps from the list. To better integrate with the rest of the list. The discussion lead to a potential recommendation that we need to use the Analysis Workshop and other current processes to update the list of data gaps. Mike offered to look for a few opportunities to circle back and make the link, perhaps setting up the next task with real examples, such as: 1) after seeing the study we realize that there are things that we don't know OR 2) the studies address a part of x data gap but now there is y data gap.

Habitat Status and Trend

Mike Ward said the layout of this section is a little but different because the questions are a little bit redundant, and the answers are redundant, and we aren't there yet as far as analyzing and synthesizing the data. He could see the intro paragraphs being expanded just a little (not too much) to call out specific recommendations for the WATS, etc. Mike also suggested we should discuss data collected by OBMEP and also the new program in the Methow.

- Karl recommended that when it says that changes have been detected at small scales, might make reference to who/what, so the lay reader can flip to the study with the results. Also, in Methow, suggestion for PIBO to consider variance partitioning from Jordan study.
- Arterburn – also have a huge scale issue in PIBO that we hope have been fixed in the other monitoring that we have going – hope to be able to see trends better at the populations scale than at the whole NW Forest scale. Didn't like how the sentence ends – that PIBO couldn't find a trend so we won't be able to.
- The need for a glossary with definitions and a list of acronyms was suggested.
- Derek – it would be helpful to go a little further in the summary, it is OK to say that we need more time, but that should not be all we say. Can you make any recommendations based on the data that is available?
- Casey – the information is there to start to look at it but the reporting is not there. ISEMP has completed 5 year panel, but all that data is not being reported. That should be a key message for this section.
- John – Last sentence – it does not necessarily need to be simplified, but needs to be more clearly specified in terms of the specific metrics that will be used. Once we know the metrics and analysis there is adequate data to answer the questions. Wasn't a matter of not having data, but not having agreement on how to report it.

The group discussed Jordan's point that the plan was asking wrong questions. It was not that they were the wrong questions it is just that Chris's questions need answered first, then we will know which KMQ are good, which ones need modified, and which ones need to be dropped. ISEMP analysis needs to feed back through the RTT so we can filter it up to policy levels.

The details regarding Chris's figure with all the embeddedness data were discussed. A better figure caption is needed to understand what is being presented. Y-axis and sample size need to be added.

Mike W. gave an overview of the main point and the group liked it and thought it should go into a box as part of the RTT deliberations. Main point: there can be different significant independent trends at site, watershed, and subbasin scales. We need to evaluate it at all 3 spatial scales and some metrics might only be appropriate at certain scales.

Tracy – a recommendation from this is that we want to monitor and report at all three scales for habitat and fish. We want to be able to roll up to the subbasin scale, but fish responses are at the site and watershed scales. But we want to be able to show that conditions are getting better or staying the same. Need to monitor at the site scale because you can roll up, but if sample at the subbasin scale then you are not able to roll down to the site.

Julie: A recommendation that could be made – the monitoring is specific enough that with some tweaking, should be able to report at the reach and watershed scale, and not just the subbasin.

Chuck asked what are the mechanisms for reporting all of this? Cameron thought that ISEMP has to report annually to BPA – but the bigger question is how often do they do data analysis and is the reporting format useful for other purposes (besides a contract deliverable). Mike pointed out that ISEMP is about to start publishing manuscripts, but those will not be useful for adaptive management. They will be about how to do better monitoring. ISEMP was never set up to do status and trend monitoring for the long term or to provide answers to the Recovery Plan KMQ. Julie has started to engage Chris talking about how to use the ISEMP data to do S&T. He is not opposed to that.

Tracy added some history: when they developed ISEMP the program for the Wenatchee was not necessarily a S&T program that would be carried on into the future. There were two basic questions: 1) which metrics are the most precise, and 2) which ones are associated with fish. What we were hoping to see in this were the answers to both of those, but what we heard was that there were different trends at different scales. The RTT (or someone) should ask ISEMP (the data) those questions. Tracy thought Chris Jordan has started to do this, in that there will be a change in the protocols for S&T monitoring that the action agencies will be proposing.

Several aspects of the Introduction Section (pp 2-3) were discussed.

- How to cite it— Title as: Adaptive Management Science Synthesis Report; also need to get RTT in the title if we are not going to be the authors.
- where changes have been made to the presentation write-ups,
- The group was not comfortable with some of the introductory text on page 4. Particularly regarding the harvest related statement and the “disastrous repercussions statement. Mike offered to work with Chuck P on those edits.

Population Status and Trend

Several edits and critiques of various figures and formatting were offered. Casey needs to work with Mike to fix some of the specific language. Casey questioned the need to show A&P for every population for both species. The group thought it was a good idea but recognized the inconsistency with how the section handled SS&D. Casey suggested a partial remedy was to include the population status on the integrated risk level matrix (lower right, pg 8)

Other sections not dealt with today:

- Van Marter presentation – contents of this will change
- Modified O’Neal presentation– a workgroup including Karl, Casey, and Julie will look at this to combine what was talked about at the workshop and the contents of the modified write-up
- Juvenile productivity section– an e-mail exchange provided deliberations for Mike – others are encouraged to contribute by e-mail if they want to comment.

Casey asked if there were any other topics before ending the meeting.

Dale asked about the RTT's role in providing technical feedback on the specific details of targeted solicitation projects. Derek said the RTT had a role in selecting the preferred alternative as well as several steps before that in contributing to the development of the alternatives. Most of those interactions occur when the project is still somewhat vague, but there could also be important contributions after a final design is selected. For example, the timing of implementation could affect existing conditions for fish that are spawning in or around the work window. Although often left up to the permitting agencies, there is no reason why the RTT could not add this level of detail to our review or review comments. People agreed to keep it in mind as we move through the process and Casey would be sure that project sponsors were aware of it.

Casey thanked everyone for coming and adjourned the meeting at 1300.

Upcoming meetings: June 21-24 site visits
July 7th RTT meeting(pre-proposal workshop)
August 4th (RTT meeting / final proposal review and ranking)