IC-TRT Meeting
September 8-9, 2004
Kooskia, ID

TRT Members Attending: Hassemer, Petrosky, Carmichael, McCullough, Cooney, Howell, McClure, Spruell
Other Attendees: Andonegui, Baldwin, Carrell, Seminet, Matheson, Morita

I. Hatchery Programs – history, issues, etc
- A. Briefings on experiments
  1. 70% mitigation, 20% fisheries stock, 10% supplementation
- B. Questions to be answered
  1. Should hatcheries be included in ESU recovery numbers?
     a. Ecological functioning vs. demographics
- C. Next RSRP meeting
  1. Nov 30 – Dec 2, 2004 in Santa Cruz, CA

II. BiOp Remand
- A. New draft is out – please review

III. Historical areas above Hells Canyon Dam
- A. Information compiled comparing ecoregion, distance between spawning areas, temperature, precipitation, elevation.
  1. This information can be compared to the population stats available for the currently described populations
  2. Given this info – can another ESU be designated?
     a. What more data is needed?
     b. Can MPGs also be identified?
- B. Pratt reports and the intrinsic potential model
  1. Do they both match?
  2. What levels of spawning potential can used from the model (1, 2, 3)
- C. Can information from other species inform decisions on historical chinook populations?
  1. Might differences in resident populations in the region be due to factors that would have affected anadromous spp?
  2. Bull trout
     a. Break in genetics around Malheur river
  3. O. mykiss
     a. Genetic data suggests separation between Malheur and Bruneau
        i. Get this data by 9/24, send by email
- D. Clearwater Chinook are the next step
- E. Data to compile for SRSS Chinook
  1. Ecoregion – basin area upstream of lowest moderate intrinsic potential (I.P.)
  2. Distances – moderate to moderate intrinsic potential
  3. Temp., elev., precip.
     a. Basin stats upstream of lowest moderate I.P.
     b. Add averages for each factor
     c. Whole basin stats above lowest moderate I.P., also stats on stream intersections
- F. IC-BMP data

1. Look at data if easy and useful
2. vegetation analysis

G. SRSS ESU limits
1. Rather than forming new ESUs, determine upstream limit of SRSS ESU

H. PCA on attributes to help with ESU and MPG designations

I. MPG designation
1. Decision – leave Imnaha river within the Grande Ronde/Imnaha MPG
    a. Do not remove to Pine/Powder/Burnt grouping

J. Upper Snake populations
1. Wildhorse with Powder population
    a. Look closer at data, but appears too small to support independent population.
2. Pine creek is its own population
3. Powder River
    a. Eagle a population (including spawning downstream to mouth of powder)
    b. Remainder of Powder another population
4. Burnt Creek a population
    a. Spawning contiguous
5. Weiser (decided on distance)
    a. Monroe/Mann & Crane
    b. Grays/Little & Pine
    c. Upper Weiser
6. Payette (on distance)
    a. Willow
    b. Squaw
    c. North Fork
    d. South and Middle forks
7. Malheur
    a. Willow
    b. North Fork
        i. Incl. Mainstem down to Cottonseed
    c. Upper Malheur and South Fork

IV. SRSS Chapter Draft

A. Current spawning not matching with I.P. in Marsh creek, other sites in Idaho.
1. Check IDFG data so only spawning, not rearing, is included
2. Check against redd density data
3. in each population, state how current counts are obtained
4. index of relative amt of habitat 9/9/04 – TFW (Timber Fish Wildlife)

V. Catastrophic risk

A. By next meeting, new round should be completed

B. Watershed level catastrophic risk

C. Frequency data at population level and subpopulation
1. ESU
2. MPG
3. Populations
    a. Homogenous unit
    b. Population structure – watershed

D. Considerations in risk modelling
    1. Identifying risk factors and frequencies
    2. What proportion of watershed is affected
    3. Duration of catastrophe
    4. Effect of catastrophe
E. Pick a representative population
    1. branched

VI. Metapopulation analysis
A. Scales to work at
B. Catastrophic rates, correlation
C. Non-viability
D. Variance, autocorrelation
E. Dispersal between populations
F. Values for lambda other than 1

VII. Upper Columbia
A. Update & handout from Baldwin, Andonegui

VIII. Patch Definition
A. What does it mean? In terms of contiguity and branching?
B. Physical characteristics (elev & temp)
C. Panmictic is a patch? Genetically
D. Is population or habitat defined as the patch?
E. Patch is a unit that supports a population

IX. Status assessment
A. Marsh creek handout from Petrosky, Hassemer
    1. Within basin factors
B. Current potential
    1. subcategories for sources and if the habitat is capable of supporting them
C. Rating Processes
    1. To get to low risk, must get near historic levels of risk
        a. But pops have different levels of inherent risk
        b. Rate historical risk, include note on amountof change
D. High risk historic populations
    1. Can there be a population that is “High Risk”?
        a. Compared to other populations, yes
        b. A population can be in a higher risk situation inherently
    2. Must still be 100 years viable
    3. Highest historical risk cannot be worse currently for recovery
E. Tom Cooney’s List of questions regarding the table
    1. How do we use this table to further develop viability draft? How should it be used in a current assessment
    2. Occupied versus suitable
        a. 5 mention one or the other
    3. Metrics to rate each question
        a. 6 of 13 have a clear metric
    4. Change vs. absolute measures
        a. 8 of 13

5. Potential vs. occupied
    a. 2 ratings? Availabitily vs. actual use
6. Numeric vs. “hi, med, lo” rating
7. Definition of Patch vs. Branch
8. Define “Source areas”
9. Connectivity: risk departure from historical
10. Out-of-basin vs. in-basin
    a. Keep separate
11. will this be summarized across a population?

F. Rating based upon capacity of performance
1. Rate based upon performance, not capacity – and explain why

G. How detailed should the viability report be?
1. extend conceptual draft
2. include narrative for each MPG
3. Build off what Petrosky & Baldwin have done

H. Focus on MPGs
1. after populations are done, then show range of low & high risk MPGs

I. Keep current status assessment separate from viability report

X. How should the table be used

A. Categorize historical risk, then compare to current change

B. Attempt to tell peolple risk levels for each population
1. Criteria, not an actual evaluation

C. Table that puts populations into a historical risk category
1. Define a continuum, 5 categories
    a. % area rated high intrinsic potential

D. Branching in HUC 5s
1. decide what a branch is, then determine which ones have sufficient habitat

E. Define viability criteria

F. Identify current and historical conditions and status

G. Identify gaps

H. Keep separate current status assessment and viability report

XI. Future Tasks

A. Conference call to define patches, branches, and cores before next meeting

B. Update diversity metric

C. Discussion on branching

D. Progress on catastrophe