

JARBIDGE RIVER BULL TROUT RECOVERY TEAM

Draft Meeting Summary

Dates and Time: March 28-29, 2006; Starting at 8:00 a.m. on 3/28 (Pacific), ending at ~1:00 p.m. on 3/29.

Location: Café X Social Room, Great Basin College, Elko, Nevada

Team Members Present: Sonny Buhidar (IDEQ; via conf. call for 30 minutes on morning of 3/28), Tim Burton (BLM-Boise), John Elliott (NDOW-Elko), Rich Haskins (NDOW-Reno; 3/28 only), Gary Johnson (NDOW-Elko), Maija Meneks (USFS-Elko), Chris Reighn (FWS-Boise), Laurie Sada (FWS-Reno), Selena Werdon (FWS-Reno)

Team Members Absent: Tim Dykstra (DVSPT), Jim Harvey (USFS-Sparks), Rob Ryan (IDFG-Jerome), Dennis Walker (NDF)

AGENDA and DISCUSSION NOTES

1) **Discuss agenda and timelines.**

Done

2) **IDEQ Involvement/Discussion – Conference in Sonny Buhidar via telephone.**

3/2006 – IDEQ’s Twin Falls office has responsibility for water quality in Bruneau River subbasin. Performing a beneficial use evaluation of receiving streams. Interested in streams that cross into Reservation. Coordinateing with Mike McIntyre, Water Quality Program Administrator in the State Office (Boise) – Barry Burnell - Nate Fisher with Governor’s Office of Species Conservation is also involved from the State of Idaho. IDEQ has not worked with Nevada Department of Environmental Protection (NDEP) yet. Either Sonny or someone else from IDEQ in Twin Falls will participate on Recovery Team (RT).

Gary Johnson - NDEP contact for Jarbidge River is Randy Paul. NDEP is doing a TMDL evaluation. They are gathering temperature data for sites with more than 1 year of data. Assignment to see if NDEP is interested in participating on RT.

3) **BLM – Tim Burton – Summary/Compilation of BLM 2005 stream survey data.**

3/2006 – R1R4 habitat inventory method. Spent ~3 weeks in Jarbidge/Bruneau reaches. Higher fines in Bruneau River downstream of the Jarbidge River mouth. Channel/gradient change near Indian Hot Springs. Fines are very low – looking at pool tails. Large woody debris (LWD) was lower than Natural Conditions Database standards (developed for central Idaho streams; sorted by geology, channel type, stream size) except for two small stream points. Pool frequency is higher than standards – quality? Indications that LWD and quality pools are lacking, however, limited reach surveys. GAWS method also had similar results.

2006 Surveys:

What info needs are there? Limiting factors? Factors associated w/bull trout presence/absence?

What is the potential habitat condition and relate this to population in terms of abundance/density (RP criteria)?

Quantify availability of spawning substrates?

Are 100 stations of 100m feasible in 1 year?

Suggestions:

Work with researchers to determine what habitat data to collect, number of sites, and site locations.

Tim B. - Reduce number of variables measured (n = 57) and send draft out to team – differentiate between habitat use by fish (*i.e.*, spawning and rearing, FMO)

Work with Twin Falls BLM – manpower and priority.

Duplicate electrofishing sites. Subsample occupied habitats, potential habitats?

This is dependent on if contractor for 2006 survey work includes habitat inventory or not.

4) Follow up on Assignments.

Assignment follow-through will cover the following topics.

a) Field survey methodology, objectives – Rob/Chris

- FWS research involved in review of Request for Proposals/Scope of Work (RFP/SOW)

- Rob – (via email) provided recommendations from Kevin Meyer, IDFG. EMAP and site selection information.

- Gary to initiate contacts between NDEP and IDEQ

b) RFP/SOW update on status w/ potential contractors – Selena

Selena contacted TU, Biowest, USGS – Seattle, Entrix, Parametrix, BSU, USFWS – Vancouver FRO. No word from BSU, others showed great interest.

TU and Biowest came back together with a proposal. Everyone says they can do it. BUT, all say not enough \$\$ for everything we wanted. Also, more than 1 year of work needed to get info we want. Selena provided overviews of each potential contractor's aspects.

USFWS – Part of range wide Research Monitoring and Evaluation Group (RMEG). RMEG group started to help identify methods to address recovery criteria (distribution, abundance, and trend) with multiple agencies, but was suspended in 2004 due to suspension of FWS bull trout recovery planning work.

How to proceed with determining who does the work?:

- Subcommittee?:

- Govt vs. private?

Timing is an issue along w/ Selena's time - 30 day contract advertisement, need high capital investments, ordering equipment, etc. Internal contract (Gov.) = ease of administration. If outside, then we need 3 bids; administrative difficulties and timelines. Requires more time from team member as COTR, etc.

BLM – supplemental crew available to collect habitat info – they would need to know whether we want them (Twin Falls BLM) in 6 weeks.

- USGS likely has some remote PIT tag receivers we could use - would not cost us as much.

DECISION:

- USGS/USFWS meeting in Reno:

- o Matt Mesa and Pat Connelly – USGS – feedback on draft SOW, 2006 field activities on contract, what they can provide.
- o Tim Cummings et al. (USFWS) – criteria, monitoring, RMEG, etc.
- o Dates (tentative): 1:00 p.m. on Monday April 17 to mid-pm Tuesday April 18
- o Agenda to be developed by Selena
- o Attendees: Gary, John, Chris, Tim B.?, Selena, Laurie, Jim (2nd Maija), IDFG.

Chris – IDFG RT participation. Reminder/update on Reno meeting and May meeting.

- c) *Review proposed changes to threats table - Maija/Chris*
3/2006 – Done. Chris sent out new version – 3/31/06.
- d) *Update on field season 2006 activities.* -NOTE: to include discussion of otolith/mortality collection
3/2006 – Field season 2006 activities were discussed by default through assignments update. Otolith/mort collection will be discussed at May meeting.
- e) *Stakeholder – late June meeting in Jarbidge.*
3/2006 – postpone discussion until May meeting
- f) *Recovery plan sections and assignments – review RP, identify needs/changes, desired sections to work on.*
3/2006 – Done. See “Recovery Plan notes and assignments”
- g) *Discuss on-the-ground implementation projects w/ updates, and establish list of projects to be done in 2006 or funds obligated for future.*
3/2006 – Projects were discussed (see this document and “Mar 06 progress on assignments from Feb 06 mtg”). Funding for projects in 2006 was not discussed.
- h) *BLM involvement in RT.*
3/2006 – Kate Forster will become involved in mid-May. Tim will slowly transition workload/involvement over to Kate.
- i) *DVSPT involvement in RT*
3/2006 – Council interest in \$\$ for Marys survey.
Interested in recovery process, still determining priority.

5) Assess meeting.

3/2006 – Not done.

6) Next meeting logistics.

Tentatively May 2-3 – dependent on contractor information.

Meeting w/USGS/USFWS in Reno re: survey methodology/design, logistics, etc. –
Mid/late April.