



REGIONAL TECHNICAL TEAM PROJECT WORKING GROUP MEETING MEETING SUMMARY

Date: December 22, 2020

Time: 9:00 AM – 1:00 PM

Location: Remote

Present: Ryan Niemeyer – UCSRB, Greer Maier – UCSRB, Jeremy Cram – WDFW, Hans Smith – Yakama Nation, John Crandall – MSRF, Justin Yeager- NOAA, and Tracy Hillman- BioAnalysts.

Overview of Meeting Agenda

Greer began the meeting by reviewing the agenda. She said the group will also review draft Protection results and the meeting notes from the Bull Trout Prioritization Work Group meeting.

The team briefly discussed the mapping information. Tracy mentioned it would be useful to have a link to interactive AU maps that contain information on AU conditions. John Crandall mentioned that it would make it a lot easier for the sponsors to have the limiting factors for each reach in an interactive map. Greer shared a version of this map but says the current version of the map is temporary until they complete the final version. John also mentioned that the EDT user interface has “help” buttons that explain the meaning of different aspects of the online tool. This would be a useful feature in the prioritization tool.

Decisions:

- The group agreed to construct an interactive map with AU priorities, reaches, reach break points, and priority reaches.
- Interactive maps will include limiting factors by reach. The group also agreed to include information helping sponsors understand the meaning of each indicator (e.g., what is a Limiting Factor), which is similar to the EDT interface.

Action Items:

- Greer will finish the web-map (based on criteria above) and will provide a link to the map.
-

Protection

The group discussed the issue of not having data for all reaches. This information is needed to prioritize reaches for protection. The group discussed using a subset of the data.

Greer mentioned rather than focusing only on high priority life stages, the analysis could look at a comparison across all life stages in each reach.

Unfortunately, because there are no data for several reaches within high priority AUs, those reaches are not evaluated within the tool. For example, the White River is a high priority AU for protection, but because there are no reach-scale data for the White River, reaches within the White River are not considered within the prioritization tool. The group decided to use the network-based Step 1 data to help prioritize reaches within AUs lacking data. Where reach-scale data exist, those data will be used in prioritization. Thus, Step 1 data will be used to fill in missing data.

Decisions:

- Remove adult migration from life stage priorities.
- Group decided for reaches in high priority AUs with no reach-scale habitat data to use network-based Step 1 data and downscale the network-based data to the reach scale and generate a new HQ Pct score based on those data.

Action Items:

- Ryan will verify that confinement was not included in protection.
 - Ryan will add species to the protection output (and insert the updated results in the MASTER tool).
 - Greer will identify a subset of reaches where the most data are present, and some not, and apply a function that calculates HQ Pct based on the subset of data.
 - Ryan will update protection output to list if and when HQ pathway is being called.
 - Greer will generate the new HQ Pct data based on network-based Step 1 data.
 - Ryan will update the python code to generate HQ Pathway in two ways: (1) if there are reach assessment data, generate HQ Pct as before; (2) if there is no reach assessment, generate data based on network-based Step 1 data (with a new HQ Pct).
-

Bull Trout

Greer indicated that the bull trout spawning reach layer is still under construction.

Decisions:

- The group agreed that Greer should work with the Bull Trout group to update the Spawning reach layer.

Action Items:

- Greer will work with Bull Trout working group to finalize the Spawning reach layer.
-

Okanogan Steelhead

Greer discussed some of the issues associated with compiling EDT information for the prioritization tool. She said results will be available in January or February. Greer has been working with Eric Doyle and John Arterburn on integrating EDT results. The hope is the results will be integrated into the prioritization tool. EDT results will be used to generate priority reaches and actions.

Decisions:

- Sponsors will rely on Step 1 priority AUs and EDT results when developing projects in the Okanogan subbasin.
-

Follow-up Items on Step 2

The group discussed the issue of the tool generating a large number of restoration actions and reaches for enhancement. As a result, most reaches in all high priority Step 1 AUs are identified as priorities for restoration. The group discussed several options to make the filter “less leaky” (i.e. stricter), such as tiering the reaches based on species (give Spring Chinook a high priority) or going back to the “goldilocks” scoring instead of accepting all reaches with Habitat Quality pathway score lower than 90%. Highest priority reaches could be Spring Chinook reaches in a certain limited Habitat Quality window. The group discussed having three ratings (5, 3, 1) for ranking reaches for restoration. These additional criteria could be used to further filter reaches or to weight the reaches

There was some trepidation about adjusting filters because it may preclude important projects from being implemented.

Decisions:

- Create a new output tab that adds additional criteria, and use those additional criteria to rank reaches for restoration.

Action Items:

- *Ryan/Greer will re-organize the “Action” tabs so that each row is a reach (make it so all the actions are in one cell), and fill out additional columns of HQ Unacceptable attribute, core habitat attribute (is unacceptable), Spring Chinook reach, all three species, HQ or LF Pathway, and number of action categories.*