

TRT Meeting – September 26-27, 2006

Members in attendance: Fred Utter, Rich Carmichael, Michelle McClure, Tom Cooney, Charlie Petrosky, Pete Hassemmer, Casey Baldwin, Phil Howell

Non-members in attendance: Damon Holzer, Don Matheson

GRUMA-ch change viability table productivity value from 0.33 to 0.32

MCFIF modify to reflect new size category (**moves down under core areas)

1. Reschedule next meeting to October 16th-17th (check pdx rooms for availability)
2. Steelhead population size categories
 - a. Decision to put DRCRO and JDLMT into the very large category
 - b. Begin Large category at JDNFJ
 - c. Begin Intermediate category at WWTOU (Joseph becomes basic)
3. Prioritizing actions
4. Mid Columbia viability scenario
 - a. Must have Fifteenmile, Eastside & Westside Deschutes, and Klickitat (maintain Rock Creek)
5. Limiting Factors
 - a. Consider attaching a cover letter
 - b. Hydropower effect
 - i. No dams=0; 1-3 dams = 1; >4 dams=2
 - c. Rating: 2=Primary (large effect); 1=Secondary (present effect); 0=N/A (not present)
6. Viability Document Update
 - a. Attachment A
 - i. Viability curves and data
 - b. Attachment B
 - i. Contains description of size category methods
 - c. Switched MPG and ESU level criteria to the front of the document (with population criteria to follow)
 - d. Increased rational for multiple MPGs
 - i. Refer to extirpated MPG memo (keep description of rules)
 - ii. Bulk up “two or half rational”
 - e. Population sizes
 - i. Change numbers for new breaks
 - f. Updated tables to match current assessments
 - g. Workgroup language regarding hatchery origin fish
 - i. Add language expanding on natural origin
 - h. Uncertainty language
 - i. Blended in language from December draft (with examples)
 - i. Spatial Structure and Diversity
 - i. Incorporated December draft and workgroup language
 - ii. Page 33 (Table 5) – B.2.a. (1, 2, 3, 4 metrics order need to be flipped)
 - iii. Table 6 (Factor A.1.a)

1. Middle case in Moderate risk – clear up language (1 MaSA plus enough additional weighted branch area to meet at least 75% of MaSA)
2. Second case in Very Low risk = “3 MSAs in a non-linear configuration plus the sum of branched stream area (IP) outside of MSAs with 75% capacity of an MSA”
3. Change all “MSA” to “MaSA”
- iv. Table 8 (Factor A.1.c) – Change “MSA” to “MaSA”
- v. Table 12 – change left column to “Goal/Mechanism” and A or B to each cell (or “Goal A” and “Goal B”)
- vi. Updated integration graphic (Table 13)
 1. Differentiate between shaded cells that do not meet “Maintained” status (darker shading?)
- vii. Maintained language (added in this draft)
 1. To “As a rule of thumb” paragraph, consider changing supplementation language to be more generic (with regard to case-by-case “maintained” flexibility)
 - a. Remove sentence for now
 2. Circulate copy of maintained language for TRT comment
- viii. Fall Chinook language
 1. currently at the end of the document
 2. consider integrating into the document (viability curve section—move to appropriate section), some may move into the status review (run reconstruction)
 3. move MaSA/MiSA language out of the viability document (since this subject is not addressed for the other populations)
- ix. Sockeye
 1. Mimic Fall Chinook approach
 2. Focus on Redfish Lake
 3. Construct viability curve
 - a. Threshold—in the absence of other information, use TRT basic size (500)
 - x. Comments on the viability document to Tom by the 10th
7. Claire – designs for monitoring – work with Chris Jordan
 - a. Starting work with the Snake River basin (Spring/Summer Chinook)
 - b. Use TRT viability criteria
 - i. Build model using criteria – translate criteria into code
 - ii. Need to develop realistic error structure for SSD ratings
 - c. Present work and questions at October meeting
8. Upper Columbia recovery plan
 - a. Large number of objectives (from existing documents)
 - b. Build check in M&E plan to evaluate previously modeled achievements
 - c. Need to be more explicit about how goals will be reached
 - d. Does the plan address a clear habitat recovery strategy?
 - i. No link back to species response

- e. Write new comments
 - i. Habitat – Casey, Phil, Rich, Pete
 - 1. Same concerns as previous comments
 - 2. Suggest ways to bulk up section
 - 3. Consider illustrating the problem by giving example with an assessment unit
 - a. link back to goals and limiting factors
 - 4. Get comments to Casey by next week
 - ii. Integration – Tom, Michelle, Charlie
 - 1. Meet on the 10th
 - iii. Using M&E to attain recovery – Tom
- f. Tom to email appendices out

Table 1. Rating of limiting factors for steelhead and chinook populations.

Steelhead														
Limiting Factor	Touchet	Walla Walla	Satus	Toppinsh	Naches	Upper Yakima	Asotin	Tucannon	Wenatchee	Entiat	Methow	Okanogan	Crab Ck	
Estuary	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Floodplain	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1
channel complexity	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1
Riparian condition	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Substrate	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	1
Flow	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	2
WQ	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Passage	0	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2
Hydropower	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Hatchery	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
Harvest	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Predation/Comp	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

Spring Chinook							
Limiting Factor	Asotin	Tucannon	Wenatchee	Entiat	Methow	Okanogan	
Estuary	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Floodplain	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
channel complexity	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
Riparian condition	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Substrate	2	1	1	2	1	1	1
Flow	2	2	1	1	2	2	2
WQ	1	2	1	1	1	2	2
Passage	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
Hydropower	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Hatchery	1	1	2	2	2	2	2
Harvest	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Predation/Comp	1	1	1	1	1	1	1