

**Big Creek Collaborative
Combined Aquatics Working Group**

February 9, 2005

Meeting Notes

Time:	10:00 AM to 4:00 PM	Facilitator:	Bill Pistor
Teleconference No.:	1-800-556-4976	Recorder:	Ryan Bricker
Access Code:	271911		
Participants:	Wayne Allen Ryan Bricker Joanna Clines Deborah Giglio Rick Hopson Mitch Katzel Wayne Lifton Julie Means Bill Pistor Geoff Rabone Roger Robb Katie Ross-Smith Phil Strand Wayne Thompson Woody Trihey Julie Tupper Cindy Whelan Larry Wise	SCE Kearns & West U.S. Forest Service U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service USFS ENTRIX ENTRIX CDFG Kearns & West SCE Friant Water Users ENTRIX USFS Fly Fishers for Conservation, Inc ENTRIX U.S. Forest Service U.S. Forest Service ENTRIX	
Phone Participants:	Ken Voos	ENTRIX	

Introductions and Agenda

Bill Pistor asked the group to introduce themselves and reviewed the agenda.

Review Outstanding Action Items

The group then reviewed the January action items.

Wayne Allen gave a brief update on the results of the February 2nd snow survey. He told the group that water levels are currently at 190% of the annual expectancy for a normal water year, and if there was no more precipitation for the remainder of the year the level would end at approximately 120%.

Review and Approve Meeting Notes

The group then reviewed the January CAWG meeting summary. Roger Rob referred to page two of the summary, where it notes Ken Voos reporting over-predicting temperature modeling by about 0.4°C, and asked if a reference to that measurement could be added to all relevant tables as a sub-note. Ken said this was doable. Geoff Rabone asked if the 0.4°C was a mean or a maximum. It was answered that the number represented a maximum, which Geoff requested be clarified in the sub-note as well (see AI #1 below). There were no additional comments and the January meeting summary was approved.

CAWG 5 Temperature Modeling Memo Comments

Wayne Lifton (ENTRIX) told the group that the CAWG 5 Temperature Modeling Memo was sent out shortly after the last CAWG meeting along with a request for comments. Wayne informed the group that no comments had been received and asked if anyone had any they would like to discuss.

Wayne then told the group that the next steps would be to get the temperature modeling report out to the group with changes based on recalibrations, and he hoped to do this in February. He added that the near-term schedule for the CAWG was to get through the PRIM in February and then revisit the temperature modeling in March.

Rick Hopson said that he and Phil Strand had been looking at the unimpaired hydrology data for below Mono Diversion and were observing some large changes that did not seem realistic. It was determined that Rick and Phil did not have the latest version of the data, in which some corrections were made to the Mono Creek and Bear Creek data. Wayne explained that the suspect data used the Flow Balance method in the first version and this was repaired and changed to use an Area-Based measurement. Wayne agreed to send a new version of the file to the USFS and Geoff Rabone (see AI #3 below).

Discuss Potential Resource Issue Criteria and Potential Resource Issue Matrix (PRIM) and Resource Information Matrix (RIM) for Geomorphology

Mitch Katzel explained to the group the contents and categories of the Geomorphology RIM. Mitch informed the group that one of the parameters in the Geomorphology RIM used Montgomery Buffington classifications and it was requested that Montgomery Buffington codes be added for reference (see AI #4 below). It was decided that a Rosgen Code table for use with the Geomorphology RIM would also be useful (see AI #5 below).

Mitch continued to walk the group through the contents of the RIM. He explained that some reaches had two measurements for slope. This was because sometimes, with long reaches, the slope determined from localized measurements for the floodplain modeling were different from reach scale slope measurements derived from the topographic map, so both were included. Julie Tupper requested that a column for the length of the reaches be added to the RIM. Mitch said that it could be added.

Mitch continued to explain the contents of the Geomorphology RIM. When discussing Bank Erodibility, Mitch told the group that streams were classified as either erodible or non-erodible. Julie Tupper told the group that it can be frustrating to work with unclear definitions, such as erodible, and thought that it would be a good idea to create a glossary with definitions from reports as well as references to reports where information can be found (see AI #6 below).

Mitch continued to explain the contents of the RIM including erodibility classification methods, Floodplain, Spawning Gravel, Fine Sediment, Fine Sediment content of spawning gravels from bulk samples, and Large Woody Debris.

Rick asked if information on geomorphic significant discharges or flows would be included somewhere. Mitch replied that a RIM would be created for hydrology, which would include pre and post-project flood frequencies. Rick then also requested that a floodplain definition be included in the next version of the Geomorphology RIM.

Julie Tupper, referring to Bankfull Width measurements, asked if it would be made clearer if the bankfull width measurements are based on present-day or historic bankfull indicators. Mitch answered that the bankfull indicators were identified in the field and represent the present-day rather than historic bankfull indicators. Julie stated that it was often difficult to identify and distinguish present-day from historic bankfull indicators and that it might not be possible to even pick out a present-day bankfull indicator, which is often confused with the most recent high flow on a stream. Mitch stated that we were aware of the problems with identifying a bankfull

discharge at the time that we conducted the field studies. He further stated that it is not uncommon that true bankfull indicators are not renewed on a regular schedule on regulated streams, and that bankfull indicators might not even occur at all. Regardless of these challenges, Entrix did their best to identify bankfull indicators that represented the present-day bankfull flow. All of these issues regarding the challenges of identifying bankfull discharges were raised and discussed in the 2004 CAWG-2 Geomorphology.

Roger Robb requested that fine sediment criteria also be clarified in the next versions of the RIM and Rick added that there seemed to simply be a general request to put all the relevant information in one place that would be helpful for interpreting the chart.

Wayne told the group that the next CAWG meeting was scheduled for February 22, when the group would be dealing with comments to the PRIM. In order to give Mitch sufficient time to respond to comments, Wayne requested that stakeholders submit their comments to the Geomorphology PRIM by February 16th (see AI #7 below). He also told the group that they would try to provide the populated Geomorphology PRIM at the next meeting, but warned that they would probably not be able to get it out prior to the meeting. He also told the group that the unpopulated Hydrology PRIM would probably go out by February 16th (see AI #8 below).

The group then reviewed the comments submitted on the criteria for the Geomorphology PRIM as well as Mitch's prepared responses to those comments. The group discussed the concern with measuring changes in bankfull width in places where there are very few cross-sections to use on which to base comparative results. Mitch told the group that they noted the changes to bankfull width by visual field observations, which were all changes believed to be a change of at least 50% or more. It was suggested that visual measurements could potentially misleading or could show recent changes that were obvious, but might not show changes that occurred years ago. Geoff then pointed out that there were only three instances in the PRIM that were affected by these measurements and suggested the group just agree that it is ok. Julie Tupper said that the bankfull width based on hydrology data is by definition a 1.5 year flow, so you need to see the historic flow data. Rick then told the group that right now he is fine with the bankfull width data, but thought that it needed to be very clear what the data is showing.

Regarding bed particle size criteria, Rick felt there was a need to capture instances where change occurred, but were not substantial enough to make it on the table. Wayne suggested that a possible solution might be to use multi-phased criteria that would capture a larger range of particle sizes. After discussing the matter, it was decided that Mitch would propose a different indicator for determining change in bed particle size. Wayne asked Mitch to develop some criteria by the middle of the following week to be discussed on the 22nd. If Mitch's new proposal is adequate, then he will bring a populated table to the meeting on the 22nd (see AI #9 below).

The group then discussed some comments and responses to Spawning gravel. Mitch explained a new, more robust, set of criteria developed using more of the data collected from spawning inventory studies and bulk sampling of reservoir sediments obtained from spoils material excavated for sediment maintenance. Rick voiced concern with the V^* value being used frequently, but not always being based on the literature. Woody Trihey replied that he felt that a lot of fine data for V^* existed and he would like to use it.

The group quickly reviewed the remainder of the Geomorphology comments and responses and moved on to discuss roads.

Mitch told the group that roads are not geomorphic attributes and therefore the road ratings alone should not define a major resource issue. Mitch suggested that the geomorphic effects of roads are captured in the "Sedimentation" column of the PRIM. Wayne suggested that Mitch insert a new column showing where there are roads adjacent to reaches, and also include the road ratings. Bill suggested that the CAWG could deal with road sedimentation, and a note could be sent to the Land Management Working Group telling them that they need to add a column to their

RIM to deal with road maintenance and other road-related issues (see AI #10 below).

Mitch then reviewed the contents of the Geomorphology PRIM with the group.

Bill explained that the PRIM will be used as a tool to help the CAWG focus on a manageable list of issues to develop a list of PM&Es to send to the Plenary where they will decide what PM&Es will be included in the final package.

Discuss PRIM and RIM for Riparian

Katie Ross-Smith explained to the group the categories and contents of the Riparian RIM.

Rick asked if the floodplain connectivity and bar inundations could be two separate columns since they are two separate measurements. Katie said that it would be done, but the information for each is specifically detailed in the RIM and comments in the PRIM.

It was asked what the absence of a comment for Proper Functioning Condition (PFC) meant and Katie replied that it meant that they did not conduct a study there. She then told the group that she would grey-out these boxes in future versions of the RIM.

The group moved on to discuss the Riparian Comment and Response Table. The Forest Service asked if timber harvest data had been provided to ENTRIX. Katie indicated that it had not (see AI #11 below).

The group discussed the PFC attribute. Wayne Thompson asked if there was a reference for PFC. Katie told the group that there is a document that describes and provides the PFC datasheet, which includes hydrologic, geomorphic, and vegetation characteristics. Julie Tupper suggested that it might be helpful to include a reference to the report. Katie replied that this reference would be included. PFC will also be included in the glossary with a reference to where the information is available in the riparian report, in addition to being included in the comments of the PRIM.

Katie continued to review the comments and responses with the group. The group discussed the need for additional clarification to be included in the Riparian Criteria on the riparian coverage from aerial photography and the criteria for the presence of upland species were determined. Katie said that she would include that the riparian coverages were determined by comparing 1944 and 2001 aerial photography. The 1944 set is the earliest and most complete set. This would be included in the text for that criteria. Katie said she would include information on the rationale for the upland species criteria (in reference to Joanna Cline's comment of 'only one plant') in a footnote. Katie also suggested that she could include a graph or table that would show the frequency distribution of evaluated resources with the range of reaches with impacts that might occur depending on the criteria level, as appropriate.

Katie continued to review the comments and responses with the group. When discussing the comment that addressed the symbols in the PRIM, it was suggested that different letters and symbols could be used rather than bolds and colors. ENTRIX said that they would meet internally and decide on a consistent symbol key (see AI #12 below).

Katie then provided the group with an overview of the categories and contents of the Riparian PRIM.

Julie Tupper voiced a concern with having a lack of flow regime data for riparian communities along the main stem of the San Joaquin and thus not knowing what types of flows would enhance the area. Katie said that there is a possibility that data might be available from the geomorphology and aquatics transects, depending on if the locations of the transects are across bars and if the width of the surveyed transects in relation to flows for bar inundation. Larry Wise said that he would work with Katie to determine if their transects would be useful for the purposes

of evaluating flows for riparian communities on the bars (see AI #13 below).

Wayne asked the group to provide comments to the Riparian RIM and PRIM by February 16th (see AI #14 below).

Discuss Potential Resource Issue Criteria, PRIM and RIM for Fisheries (Including Temperature and Habitat)

Larry then led the group in a brief overview of the Aquatics PRIM and RIM. Geoff asked Larry if he could include in the PRIM a comment in the 2000-2001 Monthly Mean Range column that would indicate the months when it was a dry. Wayne answered that they could include a comment that would lay out a month by month description of conditions (see AI #15 below).

Upcoming CAWG February Schedule

Bill reminded the group of the upcoming CAWG meetings on the 22-24th of February at the Piccadilly Inn Airport location (see AI #16 below) (see AI #17 below).

Cindy Whelan (USFS) asked if it would be possible to discuss the hydrology model at the meeting scheduled for the 23rd. Wayne Allen responded that model would be rolled-out by the second set of CAWG meetings in March and could be discussed then.

February 9, 2005 Action Items

- AI #1:** Wayne Lifton (ENTRIX) to provide copies of the Temperature Input on CD to Phil Strand (USFS) and Geoff Rabone (SCE). Information provided on USB drive to USFS during meeting.
- AI #2:** Kearns & West to provide Rick Hopson (USFS) with a copy of Big Creek Relicensing Initial Information Package.
- AI #3:** Wayne Lifton (ENTRIX) to re-check the Bear Creek data and provide the USFS a revised CD containing the hydrology data.
- AI #4:** ENTRIX to add Montgomery Buffington classification codes to the Geomorphology RIM.
- AI #5:** ENTRIX to distribute a Rosgen Code table for use with the Geomorphology RIM.
- AI #6:** ENTRIX to prepare a glossary of definitions from each report, with references to occurrences in report, for both Geomorphology and Riparian RIMs.
- AI #7:** CAWG members to provide Kearns & West with comments on the Geomorphology RIM by 2/16/05.
- AI #8:** ENTRIX to distribute the Unpopulated Hydrology PRIM to the CAWG by 2/16/05.
- AI #9:** Mitchell to propose an alternative criteria for determining change in bed particle size.
- AI #10:** ENTRIX to coordinate with the Land Management Working Group to add a column regarding road ratings in the road section of the Land Management PRIM.
- AI #11:** USFS to provide timber harvest information to Katie Ross-Smith for inclusion in the Riparian RIM.
- AI #12:** Per the 2/9 comment and response discussion, additional resource criteria explanation to be added to the RIM.
- AI #13:** Larry Wise and Katie Ross-Smith Cross-reference reaches with only qualitative data with reaches where PHABSIM was conducted to determine if other riparian information is available to use.
- AI #14:** CAWG members to provide ENTRIX/Kearns & West with comments on the Riparian RIM and PRIM by 2/16/05.
- AI #15:** CAWG members to provide ENTRIX/Kearns & West with preliminary comments on the Aquatics RIM and PRIM.
- AI #16:** Kearns & West to contact Carla Anthony (SCE) to obtain the 2005 Meeting Location Calendar/Table for distribution to the CAWG.
- AI #17:** Kearns & West to ensure that additional seating capacity is provided at future meetings of the CAWG.