

CHaMP Considerations for Reporting Back to the ISRP

Sarah M. Walker

A decorative graphic consisting of several horizontal lines of varying lengths and colors (teal, white, and light blue) extending from the right side of the slide towards the center.

Reporting back to the ISRP

ISRP 2013-11 Geographic Review Final Report August 15, 2013

- By March 2014, the Council requested that these projects (CHaMP, ISEMP, AEM) submit a progress report for ISRP and Council review addressing comments from the ISRP's recent review ([ISRP 2013-2](#)).

BPA questions to ISRP for their review of CHaMP

- Has CHaMP identified and addressed the right questions with regard to tributary habitat status and trends?
- Has CHaMP provided satisfactory answers to the ISRP's and Council's questions and concerns (see attachment)?
- Does the CHaMP synthesis report adequately address the lessons learned from pilot studies? In particular, has CHaMP provided useful information about what worked and what did not work in implementing the habitat surveys?
- Has the CHaMP team adequately described how they will analyze the data collected?
- What suggestions does the ISRP have for CHaMP as the project goes forward?

ISRP Executive Recommendations: CHaMP

- CHaMP should continue its efforts to consolidate and streamline habitat measurements, as well as eliminate metrics that do not provide useful information.
- We recommend that CHaMP be open to inclusion of metrics that go beyond the characterization of physical habitat, such as additional measures of food webs and the condition of watersheds outside the boundaries of streams and their immediate riparian areas.
- The ISRP suggests that CHaMP look for opportunities to improve collaboration with other habitat monitoring efforts to improve sampling efficiencies and promote coordination with organizations having similar interests (e.g., PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinion Effectiveness Monitoring Program [PIBO] and the Aquatic and Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring Plan [AREMP]; water quality monitoring programs).

- The process being used to cull metrics and indicators that are found to be difficult to measure consistently or are not closely associated with fish response should make the monitoring process more efficient in the future; however, increased transparency in how those decisions will be made is needed.
 - It does seem that this culling process could proceed more rapidly.

- [In the 2011 report] CHaMP staff gives their rationale for excluding non-standard metrics.
- The ISRP remains reluctant to give up on the need to monitor non-standard variables at some sites, especially where these factors have the potential to obscure the benefits of habitat restoration.
- The ISRP strongly urges that ISEMP and CHaMP seriously consider including additional sampling of pesticides, metals, and aquatic invertebrates at those sites where the potential for contamination is obvious.
 - If addition of these measurements is believed to be cost-prohibitive, perhaps agreements can be reached with partnering organizations to obtain the measurements while the crews are on site, e.g., water quality agencies could sample for contaminants or arrange for the CHaMP crew to collect water samples.
 - If arrangements could be made for water quality agencies to collect and analyze samples ... this sampling should be conducted in a manner compatible with the data being collected in the ISEMP and CHaMP programs.

- One concern with the use of the NREI approach is that CHaMP habitat metrics may not adequately reflect food availability, as stated above.
 - Directing some effort towards identifying metrics that provide a better indication of food production and are compatible with CHaMP data collection procedure would be valuable. The IMWs, where both habitat and detailed information on fish responses are available, would be good locations at which to conduct such an evaluation.
- The ISRP suggests that the ecosystem functions influencing upslope processes, such as wood and sediment delivery, should be more carefully examined as well as factors affecting the longitudinal and lateral connectivity of the stream network

- The 2011 report indicates that progress on Theoretical Interpretations of the CHaMP data was expected by April 2012. Was this work completed?
- The report also indicates a roll-up of the habitat data to the subbasin scale was to be completed by spring 2012. Was this task accomplished?
- A management question by analysis method matrix is needed to give the reader or future user of the system a guide to what methods can be used to answer what types of questions. That is, which questions are amenable to regression-type analyses, which to structural equation modeling, etc?

- There is a provision to incorporate probabilistically chosen sites from other studies, but for some restoration work, i.e. AEM, control sites are much more deliberately chosen and certainly not in a probabilistic fashion compatible with the GRTS approach.
 - We encourage CHaMP to examine the difficulties and potential benefits in incorporating *ad hoc* data when trying to extrapolate to other areas.
 - Perhaps two versions of analyses can be programmed where all data are used compared to a probability sample, to see if there is a large difference.

- (re: stick and tape method employed at sites in 2011)
Developing a method that ensures that the data collected at these complex sites is comparable to that collected at other sites would seem a priority.
- It would seem that more streamlining of the sampling protocol would be desirable if it would enable sites to be completed more rapidly or provided some flexibility to incorporate new metrics.
- It was not always clear how decisions were made with regard to acceptance, rejection, or modification of protocols. We strongly encourage CHaMP to be explicit with respect to criteria used to evaluate field and analytical methods for retention and to publish those criteria in subsequent reports.

Improving Coordination

- There would be great value to bringing additional consistency and coordination to the habitat monitoring efforts in the region.
 - The ISRP suggests that CHaMP evaluate additional options for achieving this goal. Perhaps working with PNAMP to hold periodic meetings would be a fruitful approach.
- On occasion CHaMP, PIBO, and other surveys have been conducted in the same drainages without survey teams being aware of each other.
 - We encourage better coordination with other habitat monitoring efforts to provide greater efficiencies when gathering data.
- One possibility mentioned in the report was the establishment of an executive team to interface with policy and management processes in the basin and to help with outreach.
 - Given the complexity and size of the CHaMP effort, the establishment of such a committee should be given serious consideration.