

**November 29, 2006 Meeting IAP Steering Committee Notes**  
**{Updated based on Dec. 7<sup>th</sup> conference call}**

1. What are some dates we can pencil in for doing prioritization?
  - see below #2
  
2. What is a realistic schedule for completing the IAP?
  - Principles:
    - Need to ensure that no more than 50% of any month is devoted to IAP, so that other responsibilities can be fulfilled
    - Work every other month to complete a chapter of Part 2 of IAP, with draft reports completed beforehand
    - Expect to complete Part 2 by Dec/07 for next several years of budget cycles
    - For 2010 fiscal year, need RFPs by fall 07
    - Need 18-24 month lead time to have SOWs reviewed, RFPs, proposals completed, ERPs peer reviews, budgets, contracts.
  - Today/tomorrow: support SAB
  - Friday: get SAB draft
  - What can we expect from SAB?
    - Comments on IAP
      - Describing the experiment (Chapter 0? Or part of Chapter 2?)
      - What's the sequence and spatial allocation of treatments given different priorities for testing habitat, flow, sediment and temperature action effectiveness hypotheses?
        - Start it with bulldozers, finish it with flows
      - What are the restoration-learning tradeoffs of different experimental designs (e.g. put in all rehab projects as quickly as possible vs. staging them in time and space to learn more)?
        - What are policy limitations to experimental design
        - Good opportunity to rethink next steps (e.g. concentrating rehab projects in reach 1) - Lewiston and Dark Gulch are in the can, but location of next 8 projects are still open
        - More gravel first or more rehab projects? Maybe can't do both
      - What are the implications of this experimental design for prioritization of assessments / integration in IAP? For long term schedule of activities over next 5 years?
      - Habitat Symposium
    - Comments on Science Program
      - Issues to be addressed by TMAG

- Issues to be addressed by TMC (revise Policy Issue document),
  - Issues to be addressed by TMC budget Subcommittee
    - Resolve things at lowest level possible; take assessment issues off of the table wherever we can
    - **Hatchery:** include assessments as part of juvenile production objectives, but not have hatchery management objectives in the IAP
    - **Harvest:** include production assessments in IAP; reference draft harvest goals being developed by other entities, but not necessarily a goal of Program (*this is disputed*)
  - Issues to be addressed by Technical Reps of TMC and TAMWG partners
  - Science Symposium
- **Dec 7, 2006 (1-4 pm) - IAP Steering Committee - conference call**
  - process and parse SAB's comments (see above) - defer until full report received. Key thoughts from group on SAB:
    - Rod: really great week, very constructive contributions to the IAP. We might want to get our calendars out and get 18-24 month lead time to finalize assessments prior to budgeting process.
    - Dave: good to hear some simplification of assessments (e.g. eliminating sediment budgets, focus on 1D), also positive comments
    - Larry: positive feedback from SAB really good to hear
    - Tim: valuable to take a step back, look at grand experiment
    - Curtis/Joe: specific comments will really help w prioritization
    - Joe: nice to hear them acknowledge complexity of both science and institutional aspects
  - decide on changes to TMC Policy document
    - hatchery, harvest issues may be able to be simplified (e.g. we agree on need for assessment);
    - RFP / Peer Review issues simplified; need to add our recommendation on how to handle the 'competition' issue. We seem to be in agreement on the review aspects, but should prepare a written statement that we all can review.
    - other issues may not have changed (e.g. roles of technical reps vs. TMAG, Klamath).
    - Address this on Dec. 19<sup>th</sup>, then resubmit with clearer direction to TMC on what specific decisions we want them to make.

- assign people to tasks in a proposed plan. - defer until full report received
- Send out proposed plan by email to IAP group **{done}**. People should come to Dec. 19<sup>th</sup> meeting with ideas for how to deal with SAB comments.
- Discuss ESSA contract. Terminates on March 31<sup>st</sup>; could either extend to end of April 30 with no change in money; or extend to October 2008 with more funds. But no extra funds are currently available, so would need to defer something else to find the money.
  - Need to indicate that ESSA has met existing requirements, and that requirements have been expanded, get Exec. Dir OK on it.
  - Rod to receive suggestions from other IAP Steering Committee meetings
- Chair person replacement for Curtis after April 1<sup>st</sup>. {this taken care of by changes in logistics outlined elsewhere}
- Do we need any other people involved on Dec. 19 or Jan. 10-12, given the SAB comments?
  - statistician involved with out-migrant program, as suggested by Josh. Do we have capability in house?
  - Joe: may have an agreement with HSU to get statistical advice
  - Tom Weseloh: would be good to find a way to deal with Tom Stokely's critical comments internally, and better engage Trinity County in process rather than having criticisms delivered to the SAB. Better to get comments earlier.
    - Tim H: Have Josh Allen attend IAP meetings?
    - Curtis/Rod: Respond formally to Tom Stokely's comments when we respond to SAB comments
- **TAMWG meeting on Tuesday:** Rod to provide update...
- **Dec. 13, 2006 – Experimental Design group made up primarily of Flow Study authors, TMAG, and a few others, meet in Weitchpec.** Have a subgroup of Flow Study Authors write up straw description of the experiment (Rod, Joe, Tim, Wade, Nina, Tom).
- **December 19, 2006 (8-3 pm) – IAP Writing Group – meet in Weaverville TMAG office (most likely location)**
  - 
  - Subgroups begin to address SAB comments in light of straw description of the experiment:
    - *First part of morning* – review plan and straw experiment together, review IAP goal statement – have we completed what we said we would do? Is the IAP doing what we said it should or should not? How should the goal statement be revised?

- *Second part of morning*: subgroups then work through draft responses to SAB and Tom Stokely's comments, and implications for prioritization (not detailed writing, but outline of thinking);
  - *Afternoon* – meet together to review draft responses; Collate aggregate written response to SAB, including responses to Tom Stokely's comments
  - Revisit high level policy document
- **January 10-12, 2007 – IAP Writing Group - IAP Part 1 Writing Workshop in Arcata**
  - Dave M & Marc P to attend Jan. 11-12 (come down from Portland after USFWS bull trout meeting). Darcy could possibly attend for whole meeting.
  - **Revise Part 1 of IAP:**
    - description of the experiment and logical associated experimental design for at least next 5 years;
    - revision of individual sections of IAP to deal with specific comments;
    - addition of description of other required assessments
    - prioritization or sequencing of: a) assessments and b) integration efforts, for next 3-5 years, given the straw description of the experiment and long term goals / objectives (see Attachment A)
      - describe annual, water-year dependent and state-dependent assessments
      - prepare draft material to B team for their consideration at Jan. 16-19<sup>th</sup> meeting
  - **Revise policy issues for TMC**
- **Jan 15-26, 2007 – IAP Writing Group:**
  - Finalization of material; send to ESSA Jan. 26<sup>th</sup> *{include updates on what monitoring and reports have recently been completed for each section}*
- **Jan 29<sup>th</sup> – Feb. 9<sup>th</sup>**: ESSA does technical edit and sends out draft final version on Feb. 9<sup>th</sup> (sort out controversial stuff with authors)
- **Feb. 7-9<sup>th</sup>**: Science Symposium
- **Feb. 16, 2007 – IAP Lead Authors**
  - Lead authors to circulate their comments on draft final version to group
- **Feb. 20, 2007 – IAP Writing Group**
  - Conference call run by Marc Porter (Dave away) to review any controversial comments
- **Feb. 20-23<sup>rd</sup>**: ESSA to finalize document (Marc)
- **Feb. 23<sup>rd</sup>**: Final Part 1 of IAP sent to Rod Wittler, and forwarded to TMC for approval at their March 28-29<sup>th</sup> meeting
- **March 28-29<sup>th</sup>**: TMC meeting

3. What are some dates we can start penciling in for the next writing workshops dealing with chapters 4-9?
- **April 2<sup>nd</sup> (± one week):** Curtis' 2<sup>nd</sup> child expected  ; Curtis gone in April
  - **April 16– 20, 2007 – IAP Writing Group - Writing Workshop location TBD – Weaverville / Rod to coordinate**
    - Wrap-up Part 1 based on TMC comments; work on Part 2 of IAP.
    - Raw Materials:
      - IMEP 0.5 chapters
      - Conceptual Models document as anchors for Ch. 4-9
    - Alternatives for Chapters 4-9:
      - Blueprint like IMEP 0.5
      - Detailed description of requirements for an RFP process to get alternative ideas
      - Official proposal process
      - Unofficial (through workshop)
4. When do habitat assessment, population assessment, and physical assessment workshop fit into the IAP process?
- **Robert:** increased team work through IAP process has decreased some of Hoopa's original need for habitat assessment symposium, but still a good idea technically, and a commitment was made to TMC
  - **Tim:** SAB is clearly putting higher priority on biological assessments than habitat assessment; may want to use SAB recommendations as a springboard to change direction of meeting to focus more on biological assessments; would need to clear this w TMC
  - Would be good pre-cursor to finalizing Chapter 6 habitat assessments at April 16-20<sup>th</sup>
    - Timing of Tom Hardy's work is very important;
    - ideally should have all of the raw materials before April 16-20<sup>th</sup> meeting: EHM + 1-D + 2-D + Utilization reports.
    - Curtis: Teresa (DWR) could help w application of 1-D HEC-RAS if necessary
    - Rod: John is leading 1-D effort, would be great if Robert could help with this
  - **May 14-18' 2007 - Habitat Workshop. – Weaverville (Robert to lead logistics with TMAG help)**
    - Finalize habitat part of Chapter 6 of IAP. Work on common mapping units for geomorphic and fish habitat components (geofisheries). Determine Requirements for RFPs.

- **July 9-13, 2007 - Adult and Juvenile Population Assessment Workshop. –**
    - Tim Hayden and Bill Pinnix to lead logistics, meeting in either Weitchpec or Arcata; Larry to look into AFRAMP meeting facility in Arcata; Tom Weseloh can utilize Humboldt Area Foundation – halfway between Arcata and Eureka
    - Finalize population part of Chapter 6 of IAP. Have reports on smolt and spawner monitoring completed before this workshop. Determine Requirements for RFPs.
  
  - **Sept. 24-28, 2007 - Physical / Riparian / Wildlife Workshop.**
    - Dave Gaueman and Sherri/Don to coordinate logistics; may need to change date
    - Finalize Chapters 4 (Physical), Chapter 5 (Riparian), Chapter 7-9 (Wildlife). Have reports on physical, riparian and wildlife completed before workshop. Determine Requirements for RFPs.
5. Does the Resolution Roundtable need adjustment as we move to the more detailed chapters?
- No. It's working well.
6. What is the steering committee recommendation for prioritizing completion of the IAP vs. flow scheduling, budgeting, field work, etc?
- Inadequate time left for this discussion.

## Attachment A: Prioritization Process

### A. Material in Chapter 3 of IAP: ✓

- Applied justification criteria for some example assessments
- Specified spatial and temporal resolution
- Listed next steps for improving assessments

### B. Achtung! Beschreiben Sie das Experiment!!

### C. Co-authors focus on assessments for their Chapter 3 subsection:

- Lump assessments into logical hierarchy: major, minor, alternative methods ✓ (partially)
- Describe / reference rationale at major level
- Discuss alternative methods: costs, feasibility and sufficiency
- Rank relative priority of each major and minor assessment category for the 2 major functions, considering state of method development
- Describe how assessments address specific TRFE objectives, what needs to be done first, required frequency of assessment

### C. Rank assessments across objectives, in a larger group

- Which assessments are most important & feasible for the 2 functions?
- Use pair-wise comparisons

### D. Sequencing? Relationship to B? <probably need to change B to be a little more helpful than funny! - rjw>

