IC-TRT Meeting 1/18/2006
Members in attendance: Michelle McClure, Howard Schaller, Charlie Petrosky, Fred Utter, Phil Howell, Pete Hassemer, Tom Cooney
Non-members in attendance

1. Meeting dates
   a. March—14th-15th in Boise (changed from 15th-16th)
2. Workgroups for this meeting
   a. Modeling
   b. Gaps—standardize descriptions (describe ESU level and population level gaps)
      i. Review existing summaries
3. Gaps group
   a. Need an ESU level gap
   b. Need to clarify population level gap
   c. Pete's population requirement spreadsheet
      i. Uses numbers and colors to highlight required populations to achieve viability
      ii. Shows possible combinations that achieve viability within an MPG
   d. Historic vs. current life history expression
      i. how does the population get counted?
      ii. use current description (add notation)
   e. 5 large or very large populations in the Upper Salmon
      i. must have 4 (Pahsimeroi—due to life history, plus 3 additional)
         1. bumped up to 4 because of Panther Cr. (substitute for a large)
         2. able to substitute a larger for a smaller, not vice-versa
   f. South Fork Salmon
      i. 4 existing populations, must have two
      ii. must have the Little Salmon – life history
         1. ignore this criteria for restoration purposes
            a. use SF mainstem and East Fork-- big production areas
            b. maintain populations
   g. Grande Ronde Imnaha
      i. 4 intermediates, must have 1 or 2
         1. lay out different options
   h. Clearwater River (Steelhead)
      i. First option
         1. Must have Lolo (A&B type)
         2. Must have lower mainstem (A type only)
         3. Must have south fork (only intermediate)
         4. This leaves maintain Selway/Lochsa
      ii. Second option
         1. Intent of size category proportions shouldn't emphasize intermediate populations

2. Prioritize number of populations needed, then diversity requirements, then distribution across size categories

i. Future tasks
   i. Develop a menu for each ESU—use as an intro to the status assessment atlas
   ii. show the shortest path (or suite of paths) to viability
   iii. highlight recommended options
   iv. descriptive paragraph explaining overall changes needed for SSD and AP

j. Grande Ronde / Imnaha River MPG
   i. Given the potential for this MPG to remain isolated, the TRT recommends 5 populations (both Imnaha populations, and three from the Grande Ronde)
   ii. Legacy best represented by Wenaha or Minam
   iii. Choose Catherine or Lostine

k. South Fork Salmon MPG
   i. Little Salmon is not a primary production area, currently dominated by Rapid River
   ii. Two populations in the south fork drainage (south fork and secesh)
      1. secesh is genetically different from other populations
      2. east fork has hatchery considerations

l. Lower Snake
   i. **Tucannon** is a must-have
   ii. Asotin, functionally extirpated. TRT recommends restoring currently occupied areas first

m. Middle fork
   i. **Chamberlain** is genetically unique
   ii. **Big** Creek
   iii. **Marsh** vs. Sulphur Creek
      1. Marsh Creek is less isolated and a larger production area than Sulphur Creek
   iv. **Bear Valley** vs. Middle Fork
      1. Bear Valley is more likely to serve as a core area, Middle Fork tribs will be restored as other areas improve
   v. **Loon** vs. Camas
      1. both have challenges, but Loon Creek has a smaller AP gap, and a larger diversity bonus
   vi. Either Big or Bear Valley must be highly viable
      1. Big Creek has more life-history diversity

n. Upper Salmon
   i. 4 of 5 must be large or very large
      1. Lemhi—large producer, legacy population. Also the extant downstream populations
      2. Pahsimeroi
      3. Upper Mainstem
      4. East Fork

5. **Valley** Creek vs Yankee Fork or North Fork
                        a. Lemhi can cover downstream instead of North Fork
                        b. Yankee Fork—SSD considerations
                        c. Choose **valley** creek—more data rich
                    6. at least one must be highly viable
            o. ESU level
                i. Need 18 populations at viable or highly viable
                ii. Use a "unit less" scalar
                iii. Average quantitative gap (with min and max)
                iv. State common impairments to SSD
                v. Show integration graphic of current status of populations within MPG. Bold populations that must be highly viable (TRT recommended). Color code populations by MPG and parenthetical notation.
4. Upper Columbia Steelhead
    a. Although Okanogan is an intermediate, recognize that it may be treated as a basic for recovery (consider Washington portion)
    b. Require 4 populations for recovery (driven by single MPG)
        i. TRT recommends Wenatchee, Methow, Entiat, Okanogan
        ii. MUST have Wenatchee and Methow (highly viable)
        iii. Okanogan includes territory within US and Canada
            1. should meet requirements for a basic population (US portions), or intermediate (status within Canada and US considered)
5. Upper Columbia Chinook
    a. Need three populations
    b. Okanogan not required, but recognize a lower risk with the Okanogan
    c. Wenatchee and Methow must be highly viable
6. Easiest path for the ESU -- considerations
    a. Political, biological, ease of monitoring, presence/absence of life-histories
7. Upper Columbia
    a. Why is 3 out of 4 populations ok, but not 3 out of 5?
    b. Requiring a higher number of populations in an ESU with one MPG and so few extant populations ensures a lower risk scenario.
8. Sockeye
    a. Alturas, Redfish, Stanley required (large gap)
    b. Continue work
9. Snake River Fall Chinook
    a. Describe gaps
    b. Need 2 above dam
        i. Describe gap for extant population
        ii. Discussion of 2/3 issue (UC)
10. Snake River Steelhead
    a. Grande Ronde MPG
        i. Need upper mainstem

  ii. Lower mainstem or Joseph (maximizes geographic coverage), or Wallowa (has multiple core areas
    1. TRT recommends lower mainstem and wallowa
 b. Clearwater MPG
  i. Need Lower Mainstem and Lolo
  ii. 2 of the following: South Fork, Selway, Lochsa

11. Other issues
 a. Current Status Assessments
  i. Finish reviews
 b. Extirpation memo
 c. Viability memo
 d. Maintenance language
  i. Use boxes adjacent viable boxes in integration graphic
  ii. Moderate AP and High SSD would NOT meet the maintenance definition
  iii. Add language concerning maintenance at high SSD

12. gaps
 a. January document
  i. Add more detail about computations
 b. Next steps
  i. Tom, Charlie, Howard to get outlined information for gaps and modeling sensitivity (summarize and send to Michelle and Rich)
  ii. Review Tom's gap 1 paper
  iii. Viability update – send comments on extirpated areas memo (to Tom)
    1. 2/3 rule and maintenance language for inclusion (Michelle)
    2. Remove "not viable" language, instead use Not Meeting Criteria
  iv. Finish comments on status reviews
    1. deadline by the 10th of Feb
    2. send out review assignments
    3. post comments to docushare review folder
  v. Tom, Charlie, Howard to set up Steelhead and Fall Chinook models