

Interior Columbia Technical Recovery Team Meeting #8

July 22nd and 23rd, 2002, Seattle, WA

Members present: Cooney, Johnson, Hassemer, Petrosky, Schaller, Spruell, Carmichael, Utter, Roper, McCullough

Non-members present: Carson, Giorgi, Holzer, Waples, Foster, Winans

I. Summary of Snake River Spring/Summer Chinook Workgroups' progress

A) Grande Ronde / Imnaha – Rich Carmichael

B) South Fork Salmon – Pete Hassemer / Charlie Petrosky

C) Middle and Upper Salmon – Pete Hassemer / Charlie Petrosky

D) General Conclusions:

- Sub basin documents should be clear about the relative importance given to data types when making decisions
- Comparisons of historic population estimates between streams need to be standardized. Median population size from available data between 1950 and 1970?
- Team must decide if there is enough evidence to separate Spring vs. Summer run fish into separate populations

II. Review of Puget Sound and Willamette TRT Population ID methods

- Discussion of methods to use in uncertainty
- Presentation by Jim Myers from WLC TRT about calculation of basin area
- Consensus: Interior Columbia TRT will calculate basins starting at lower extent of core spawning area, including all upstream area

III. Grande Ronde / Imnaha Populations

Uncertain areas:

1) **Indian Creek**- data poor, probable low historic productivity

Options: a) Create a category for streams such as Indian Creek which are not considered independent but cannot be easily linked to a nearby independent population

b) Link Indian Creek to Catherine Creek, its nearest upstream independent population

c) Link Indian Creek to Lookingglass Creek, its nearest neighbor

Decision: Indian Creek will be linked to Catherine Creek until further information can be collected. Putting streams in an unknown category could unintentionally reduce their importance, and linking Indian Creek to Lookingglass Creek is not favorable because the Lookingglass wild population is believed extinct due to hatchery influence. Catherine Creek, in its position upstream, is a more probable source of strays into Indian Creek.

2) **Wallowa River, Lostine River, Hurricane Creek and Bear Creek** – data poor, close proximity to each other

Decision: These four streams should be lumped into one population until more information can be collected.

3) **Imnaha River and Big Sheep Creek** – Lack of data on Big Sheep Creek

Decision: From available information, including the large distance between core spawning areas, Big Sheep Creek and the Imnaha River will be considered two separate independent populations.

Draft Population areas:

1.) Wenaha River

2.) Lookingglass Creek – Extinct

- 3.) Minam River
- 4.) Wallowa River, Lostine River, Hurricane Creek, and Bear Creek
- 5.) Catherine Creek and Indian Creek
- 6.) Upper Grande Ronde River and Sheep Creek
- 7.) Imnaha River
- 8.) Big Sheep Creek

IV. Lower Snake Tributary Populations

- 1) **Tucannon River** – Independent Population
- 2) **Asotin Creek** – discussion tabled to a later date

V. South Fork Salmon River Populations

Uncertain areas:

- 1.) **Upper South Fork**- contains two separate core spawning areas
Options: a) Lump Stolle Meadows and Poverty Flat spawning areas into one population
b) List them as two separate populations
Decision: Not enough information exists to differentiate between the two spawning areas; they will be considered one.
- 2.) **Upper East Fork South Fork** – had capacity to support independent population historically, but has current low productivity partially due to the effects of Stibnite mine
Options: a) Lump with Johnson Creek, tributary to the East Fork South Fork
b) Consider separate but extinct
Decision: consider separate for now, final determination tabled to a later date

Draft Population Areas:

- 1.) Secesh River, Lake Creek, and Lick Creek
- 2.) Johnson Creek
- 3.) Upper East Fork South Fork – Extinct
- 4.) Upper South Fork

VI. Upper Salmon Tributary Populations

Uncertain Areas:

- 1.) **Big Creek** – contains two core spawning areas
Options: a) Divide into upper and lower populations
b) Lump two spawning areas together into one population
Decisions: Despite possible differences in spawn timing, there is insufficient evidence to separate the two populations.
- 2.) **Sulphur Creek** – data poor
Options: a) Consider separate population
b) Lump with nearby conglomerate of Marble, Indian, Pistol, and Rapid
Decision: Despite a lack of genetic data, the Sulphur Creek population is sufficiently large and isolated to be considered separate.
- 3.) **East Fork Salmon** – three core spawning areas
Options: a) Lump Upper East Fork, Lower East Fork, and Herd Creek into one population
b) List them separately
Decision: Despite close proximity, these populations appear to be distinct. Until further information can be obtained they will be considered separate.

4.) **Alturas Lake Creek** – close proximity to upper salmon spawning areas
Options: a) Lump Alturas Lake Creek with the nearby conglomerate of Upper Salmon tributaries

b) List as separate

Decision: Despite close proximity, the Alturas Lake Creek population is very distinct genetically, perhaps due to migration through Alturas Lake. It will be considered separate.

5.) **Lower Salmon tributaries:** White Bird, Slate, Crooked, Wind, Bargamin, Horse, etc. – data poor and low potential productivity

Options: a) Leave alone in “Gray” or “Unknown” area

b) Lump together into Lower Salmon dependent population

c) Attach to nearest upstream core spawning area (i.e. White Bird and Slate link with Little Salmon River)

Decision: Linking to nearest upstream independent population would be difficult because nearest populations are often far up the south fork or middle fork. The Streams will be lumped together due to their similarity, and labeled “dependent”.

6.) **Mainstem Spawners** in the Upper Salmon and Middle Fork Salmon – adjacent to and similar to fish in lower reaches of tributaries

Options: a) Separate summer run fish into one population including the mainstem and lower reaches of adjacent tributaries. Leave upper (spring) spawning areas in tributaries separate and independent.

b) Join tributaries and mainstem populations into one population due to low geographic separation, high connectivity, and lack of genetic evidence to divide them.

c) List mainstem spawners as a separate population, and leave all areas of tributaries as separate populations.

Decision: Because of little (mainly anecdotal) evidence to separate spring (upper) and summer (lower) spawners in the tributaries, these regions cannot be separated from each other. Because the tributaries are different enough to be separated, they cannot be lumped together despite connectivity via the mainstem. Therefore, the tributaries will remain separate and the mainstem spawners will be listed as independent.

Draft Population Areas:

- 1.) Lower Salmon dependent population (White Bird, Slate, Crooked, Wind, Bargamin, Horse)
- 2.) Little Salmon River and Rapid River
- 3.) Chamberlain Creek
- 4.) Lower Mainstem Middle Fork Salmon (below Indian Creek)
- 5.) Big Creek
- 6.) Camas Creek
- 7.) Loon Creek
- 8.) Marble Creek, Indian Creek, Pistol Creek, and Rapid River
- 9.) Upper Mainstem Middle Fork Salmon (above Indian Creek)
- 10.) Sulphur Creek
- 11.) Bear Valley Creek and Elk Creek
- 12.) Marsh Creek, Cape Horn Creek, Knapp Creek and Beaver Creek
- 13.) Panther Creek – Extinct
- 14.) North Fork Salmon River
- 15.) Lemhi River and Hayden Creek
- 16.) Pahsimeroi River
- 17.) Lower East Fork Salmon River

- 18.) Upper East Fork Salmon River
- 19.) Herd Creek
- 20.) Upper Salmon Mainstem below Redfish Lake Creek
- 21.) Yankee Fork and West Fork Yankee Fork
- 22.) Valley Creek
- 23.) Upper Salmon Mainstem above Redfish Lake Creek, Beaver Creek, Pole Creek, Frenchman Creek, Smiley Creek
- 24.) Alturas Lake Creek

VII. Steelhead Population Identification

Review of previous studies / available data on Columbia Basin Steelhead genetics – Robin Waples and Gary Winans

VIII. Population Identification Draft

Ideas: 1) Create a basic, summary matrix comparing key data types between streams such as genetic and geographic distance
2) Add a section to the analysis of each stream titled “data needs and remaining uncertainties” per the Puget Sound TRT document
3) Add a section to the conclusion outlining population identification alternatives not chosen and justification
4) Designate the Middle Fork Salmon and Little Salmon areas as major subgroups on the same level as the Grange Ronde / Imnaha, South Fork, and Upper Salmon groups. Although the genetic data do not clearly separate these areas, other data, especially distance and isolation, warrant separating.

IX. Interior Columbia TRT liaisons to 4H papers

The following members will act as representatives to the group writing 4H papers on the Interior Columbia:

Hatchery: Carmichael, Utter
Harvest: Schaller
Habitat: Roper, Johnson

X. Future Meetings

August 26th – 28th, Boise and Stanley, ID
September 30th – October 2nd, Portland, OR
November 4th – 6th, Tri-Cities, WA

XI. Tasks (Suggested deadlines added to minutes by Tom C.)

Michelle M./Tom C. – Finish compiling/edits of Introduction sections, post by Aug. 14th.

Paul S./Fred U. – Draft section summarizing spr/sum Major Groupings results from genetics analyses. Target - post by Aug 21

Rich C.-Expand draft Grande Ronde pop results summary using outline (target –Aug 21)

Charlie P./Pete H.– Draft Salmon R. pop results using general outline (target – Aug 21)
Look for early analyses/field reports re summer vs spring runs for discussion at Aug. TRT session.

Tom C./Charlie P. – Explore access to Idaho Power technical documents re populations/production above Hells Canyon for discussion at Aug. TRT meeting.

Damon H. – Provide subsets of steelhead spawning distribution maps to TRT members – Rich C. lead for Oregon areas (Grande Ronde/Imnaha, John Day, Deschutes, etc) Charlie/Pete for Idaho, David J. and Tom C. for Washington (Upper C, Yakima, Klickitat, Walla Walla, Tucannon, Asotin) Distribute by Aug 2nd??

Rich C. (lead for Oregon)/Charlie/Pete (Idaho)/David J/Tom C. (Washington) – Review steelhead spawning distribution maps to be provided by Damon H./Henry C., special attention to ‘breaks’ in spawning in lower mainstems. Provide Damon with map edits by Aug. 22nd.

Dale M./Phil H. – Begin exploration of habitat rules based analytical tool for application to historical population areas. Rept to next TRT session.

Tom C./Michelle M./Henry C. – Explore possible simple matrix summaries of key info used in pop. Definitions for inclusion in results sections. Initiate compilation of draft detailed information appendices. By the Aug. TRT meeting.

David J/Tom C. - Review info for Upper Col. Spr chinook (including QAR analyses and results and develop draft upper C section for TRT pop report. Meeting in Olympia during Aug 6-8 including Fred U (and other TRTers??), draft by Aug 22.