Hinkson Creek CAM Science Team
DRAFT Notes of the March 18, 2014 meeting

Team Members Present: Paul Blanchard, Joe Engeln, John Holmes, Jason Hubbart, Robb Jacobson, Dave Michaelson, Dan Obrecht, Barry Poulton

Bill Florea, Catherine Beatty, Erin Keys, Tom Wellman and Steve Hunt from the Action Team were also present.

The Team went through the three science proposals to finalize their thoughts and to discuss how to move forward. Among the comments:

1. We should note the effort and costs already invested in the flow and sediment study to mimic that section of the fish study.
2. While one could envision completing the flow and sediment study in three years by having two post-docs hired one year apart, the proposed 4-year plan was more likely to be successful.
3. We discussed funding certainly vs. risk at some length given the budgeting process and the reliance on three different local funding agencies. After fairly extensive discussion, the Action Team members helped create a very good understanding of the risks and some potential ways to mitigate the funding risks.
4. Al three proposals were deemed to have merit and to contribute to a greater understanding of Hinkson Creek and that the flow and sediment study was more directly aimed at questions within the TMDL and would more directly address potential sources of impairment. The fish study would provide data complementary to the invertebrate data and provide greater spatial power.

Comments on each proposal:

1. Flow and sediment – These data are already in hand and cover multiple years with a good variation in flows conditions, providing a strong basis for analysis. This study builds upon and supplements the GIS and Physical Habitat study. It provides an examination of the most direct pathway in our conceptual model that ties to the TMDL. This provides a context for the invertebrate data when combined with the physical habitat results.
2. Fish – Builds upon and compliments the flow study. It would be informed by the previous study. Quantification via biological metrics is an inherent part of this study. Can help better define the factors that could be leading to impairment. Multi-year study in years with invertebrate sampling would greatly improve the strength of both samples. If delayed a year, this might be changed to a more targeted sampling approach to address specific questions arising out of the flow and sediment study.
3. Symposium – Great potential value for the cost. Engage a broader range of the public and raise awareness of both the science and the actions underway in the watershed. This is an effective way to build support for both the need for action and the approach being taken in the Hinkson watershed.

The action team will meet on Friday, March 21. At that meeting, they will discuss these proposals and a path forward.

Known and potential stakeholder meetings
March 27 – Lynn (with Jason) will present preliminary results from the physical habitat assessment focusing on what they are doing and why. 4 PM in room194B of the General Services Building
April TBD – Possible presentation of the three science proposals
May TBD – Possible discussion of some of the actions underway or science proposal discussion
June TBD – Possible meeting with Karl Brooks and Sara Pauley to note the 2nd anniversary of the start of the CAM process.

The notes from the previous meeting were approved.