

IEP Tidal Wetlands Monitoring Project Work Team
September 23, 2015
9:00 – 12:00
DWR – West Sacramento – Room 119
Call-in Line: (916) 657-4108 (No passcode needed)

Phone: Dave Osti (34 North), AJ Keith (Stillwater Sciences)

CDFW: Alice Low, Stacy Sherman, Alison Furler, Dave Contreras, Rosemary Hartman

DWR: Erik Loboschefskey, Pascale Goertler, Randy Mager, Kris Jones, Ted Sommer, Louise Conrad, Anitra Pawley, Gardner Jones, Joy Khamphanh, Chris Geach

USFWS: Heather Swinney, Lori Smith

DSP: Maggie Christman, Karen Kayfetz

DSC: Daniel Huang

ESA: Ramona Swenson

SFCWA: Kelsey Cowin

UCD: Jim Hobbs

MWD – Shawn Acuna (phone)

Bruce Herbold

Updates from Subteam Meetings

Contaminants

- Updated CM and text have been sent the contaminants team
 - Some comments have been received
- Comments welcome

Data Management and Reporting

- The team discussed recommendations project level data management
- The team discussed how to share data across agencies and to the public
 - Kris Jones presented the Portal to the team and it seems a promising platform to display data
 - Kris Jones will send a template over to us

Results of Decision Tool

- Response was low and the survey will be open until Monday, October 5th Take the survey here: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/PLY3XYH>
- For the survey a question should be added stating what type of job the person does to separate out who's a field practitioner vs permitting

Preliminary Results of FRP 2015 Pilot Work/Discussion of upcoming FRP 2016 pilot work

Invertebrate Sampling Comments

Surface/Terrestrial bug section

- Yolo Bypass does invertebrate work and may be comparable to the pilot study
- Some people thought ESA take should probably be a "neutral" factor rather than "negative", since take is expected to be minimal. However, other people pointed out that permits are hard to get even if the take is minimal.
- Twitchell Island may be a good location to test gears, since ESA permits would not be required

Passive method section

- Hester Dendys and mesh scrubbers should be left out for at least 3 months, or be pre-conditioned to acquire a biofilm
- For leaf packs should tules be taken from the site or just the same species?

Does sample number look reasonable?

- It depends on variability, should look at the current samples to get an idea
- Perhaps try to do 4 samples at each site
- Perhaps do work in non-restored sites (ie historic rip rap channel areas)
 - Tule packs are artificial and placing them in channels could be compared to vegetated samples
- Several of the invertebrate methods listed in the study are passive. It will be difficult to scale these up to calculate a total invertebrate biomass for the area.
 - Our group is looking to do relative biomass, not absolute biomass

Other Comments

- We should think of comparing gears to open water sampling to get at the question "Did restoring tidal wetland habitat increase food web production in comparison to the channels?"
- Once a tidal wetland is restored, how do you know organisms are leaving one area and coming into yours?
 - Our program plans to look at other sampling program data

Larval Fish Comments

- What purpose would light traps serve?
 - Presence/absence

Juvenile Fish Comments

Fyke Net

- The fyke net has a dewater bias vs the electrofishing that makes comparing these two gear types difficult unless the channel completely drains

Kodiak Trawl

- A plus for kodiak trawl is the amount of efficiency studies already done
- A negative for kodiak trawl is it needs a relatively large area for deployment

Sampling Scheme

- Spatial sampling may confound sampling results and it may be best to do multiple sampling in one site
 - If this is done, perhaps do 3 to 5 samples spaced 30 minutes apart
- If ESA take is not granted, the PWT team discussed sampling in other locations where Delta Smelt take shouldn't be an issue
 - Upper Petaluma, South Bay, Suisun Marsh, and Delta Meadows were all suggested
- Jim Hobbs would like smelt preserved in 95% ETOH
- The FRP team is requesting comments for the upcoming phase II sampling plan by Sept. 30

Update on Conceptual Model Text

- Most of the conceptual model text has been completed
- A good set of drafts has been completed and FRP would like to put them up on the website
- The team discussed which should be peer reviewed - the entire conceptual model text or a whittled down version for publication?
- Publishing the entire texts as IEP technical reports may be best way to make the conceptual models available for citation quickly
 - The PWT team decided to pursue a whittled down version for peer-reviewed publication
 - Need to touch base with SFEWS again for parameters
 - The FRP will lead the charge in whittling down text for each model
 - It was suggested that each model have three reviewers
 - It may take 6-10 months to address comments