Draft Bull Trout Workshop Notes

April 12, 2017 Missoula, Montana

In room:

Dawn Anderson – MFWP

Lee Nelson – MFWP

Nancy Leonard - NPCC

Mike Schwartz – USFS Genomics Lab

Chris Wheaton - PSMFC StreamNet

Jed Whitely – Clark Fork Coalition

Paul Klein - IDFG

Leslie Bach - NPCC

Fred Goetz – USACE

Greg Hoffman – USACE

Matt Boyer – MFWP

Dan Brewer – USFWS

Wade Fredenburg – USFWS

Ben Conard - USFWS

On Phone:

Dan Rawding - WDFW

Bob Austin - USRT

Stacy Horton - NPCC

Stephanie Gunkel - ODFW

Tom Iverson - YN

Joe Maroney - Kalispell

Makary Hutson - BPA

Andrew Murdoch - WDFW

Joe Benjamin - USGS

Kristopher Crowley - BPT

Mike Banach - PSMFC StreamNet

Steven Thiesfield – Bonneville Power Administration

Doug Threloff - USFWS, Regional Office

Alex Conley - Yakima Recovery Board

Sue Ireland or staff - Kootenai Tribe of Idaho

Overview of workshop purpose Dawn & Nancy

- To identify existing Bull Trout objectives to inform the Council's 2014 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program's task for refining program goals and objectives (see presentation for details).
- To discuss existing reporting needs and data availability related to Bull Trout (see presentation for details and below meeting notes).
- To explore opportunities to facilitate data sharing across jurisdictions / entities (see presentation and meeting notes below).

Each Organization gave a 5 minute overview about their bull trout related reporting;

Wade USFWS - Draft recovery plan in 2002 with objectives; final plan in 2015 but the objectives are no longer in the recovery plan/strategy. The draft had the numeric objectives. New plan focus on addressing threats, not on targets. Park service and USFS documents that are not on the list that could help.

Dan R. -WA objectives mostly qualitative

Wade – Montana has three core areas that are related to what is happening in in Canada. Flathead, Kootenai and Skagit need to incorporate what goes in in Canada. Species in not listed in Canada.

MFWP – In process of building centralized fisheries database; survey and inventory data, counts, trends, tagging, distribution – working on a more robust tool for biologists so they can enter/edit their own distribution info; genetic info – would like a new module – scoping that out right now; rebuilding the public portal for fisheries info; Mfish scientific data – need to be rebuilt; every 3-5 years basinwide redd counts; section 6 reporting; data from collector permit process.

USFWS (Wade) – Working closely with MFWP; limited capability on field sampling; Mike Young and RM research station on eDNA – RMRS has about 1/3 of bull trout areas; ½ by summer. Bull trout core areas; would be good to stick with that structure; went from a DPS to state by state structure; but want seamless across states. Get core area list from recovery plan.

Phone:

Kris (BPT) provide their information to the Bonneville web site.

Rick from BOR – bull trout work is result of biop with USFWS; implementing terms; Yakama, Boise offices. Can get BA/BO on reclamation's web site. Dimitre Vitigar coordinating with RM research station, TU; NorWeST database, USGS streamflow, snotel, hydromet. Report to services in annual report. For data: Id'ing minimum pool and how often reach min pool; going to see if can post annual reports.

Dan WDFW – bull trout abundance estimates annually, available on website – longest time series – ok for trend info, but not status – mostly index counts; don't have centralized database for BT like they do for anadromous. Salmonscape has some info. Screw trap catch for adfluvial populations; just catch data. Goals are qualitative

Stephanie ODFW – OR is updating bull trout distribution layers – pairing with USFWS info. No centralized database for BT; most data is housed locally in central locations for each core area. Each area has different levels of surveying info therefore limited and piecemeal data. But statewide strategy for bull trout recovery using a model-based monitoring program; using rangewide data for flow, temp to project persistence of BT (ODFW and USFWS); implementing threats assessment tool in recovery plan to

evaluate threats and track recovery. Eventually all accessible via web page. Late-summer, early fall for initial snapshot.

Doug – USFWS Portland – R1 – ID, WA, OR; GIS data, genetics data, species distribution data, population data – Elicker is interested in sharing data with partners. But around region, concern about time for data requests, so need to be clear about what data we need.

Alex – Yakima basin fish and wildlife recovery board – use WDFW's data which is pretty good for Yakima; only real objective 21 old recovery plan. Yakima basin plan – has good info; creating web library for BT; data, but no objectives.

Mike – USFS – Plan is to create an eDNA atlas for multiple species.

Discuss opportunities and interest to share data

Brief discussion of opportunity (example of CA with salmon & steelhead) and need for data sharing

Discussion of potential sharing across jurisdictional lines to address regional or common reporting needs by the Program, state agencies and Tribes, federal agencies, and others (i.e. Program HLIs, Fish Information site, reporting on objectives, status reviews, BiOps, etc.)

(See PowerPoint)

Presented example of Coordinated Assessments Project for Salmon and Steelhead data necessary for regional assessments and management decisions. Project identified specific actions and activities for sharing Viable Salmonid Population (VSP) indicators in the Columbia River Basin. Important to note that sharing data was for a common goal: to provide data to NOAA for their 5 year status review.

Discussed lessons from Coordinated Assessments (CA);

- Investment of time worth it if staff is repeatedly tasked with data requests
- Investment in data structure and database management eases access
- Standardizes data sets and avoids "conflicting" information
- Focuses managers on information and resource gaps when available data is all shared in one place
- Reduced time needed to provide data for NOAA ESA 5-yr status review, BPA BiOp reporting, and data for Council indicators
- It takes a lot of coordination to get data reported in the same way across agency and state boundaries
- There needs to be a data need "pull" to incentivize working across organizational boundaries. If each organization's data needs are already met internally – why do extra work?

- There needs to be structured data that is similar across Geographic and agency boundaries
- Key participants are the biologists/data experts in each organization that collect data – they need to work together on the DES team to agree on the data exchange standards if this is going to work
- It can be difficult to "automate" calculation of indicators, due to changing conditions and high level of analysis that goes into estimating parameters at the population scale

Discussion

Wade: Tracker mapping tool – contacts Tim Whitesal and David Hines. David: How would population metrics inform threats assessment?? Wade – still need demographic info even though focusing on threats. So still need how many, status, trend. Some think threats are related to population size, so if we can put those together, that would be useful.

Mike – want to use database to contextualize info.

Dawn – have one person on StreamNet funding, also have a subcontract for application development.. Could share data in a spatial context. Matt has info.

Wade: passage through dams – how does this come in. FERC licenses will have some info.

USACE: Columbia counts on line – Cougar dam, also middle Columbia, Pend d'Orielle; could use as a connectivity measure. Also some consultation reports.

Next Steps

1. **Please provide missing documents that can inform the task of compiling existing bull trout qualitative and quantitative objectives to Nancy by June 30th, 2017.**
2. **As relevant also provide input on documents on the draft list that are superseded by newer documents, indicating the relationship between these documents.**
3. **Bull trout managers discuss the needs and benefits of data sharing as appropriate. If managers determine that data sharing is warranted, communicate any need through Dawn and MFWP. StreamNet will assist if data sharing priorities are identified, now or in the future.**