Below are the main points/action items I noted from the July 16, 2013 Model Work Session:

Upcoming Model Work Session Schedule

- Next weekly meeting July 23, 2013 10 a.m. @ DEQ.
- No meeting on July 30 – this is the LBR 319 Tour

Decision Points

- No decision points made during meeting.

Upcoming Items

- DEQ contract to fund Jonathan Clough and Dick Park for approximately 60 total hours to consult on the AQUATOX modeling effort, getting closer to complete.

Action Item Updates

- All
    A. Please identify if you have been tasked with an item or if there are items you can help to complete on the *"LBR_Atx_2013Updating_Outstandingitems_0716913."* This is the "to-do" list for the model set-up and calibration.

- Troy
    A. Will send Darcy (Ooops!!) the data sheets for the LBR data collection float on 6/20 and 6/21 in order to compile water depth, clarity, substrate, periphyton, etc.
    B. Will distribute riffle/run/pool, substrate, water depth, periphyton data, etc. once data has been entered/analyzed and the question of segment breaks has been clarified.
        - We will also look at the Mullins report to see if riffle/run/pool data are applicable to this model set-up and calibration.
    C. Continue to update post-meeting materials to ftp site, DEQ's LBR webpage, and directly to group

- Michael
    A. Continue updating and reposting input files on the ftp site when ready. Input files and figures provided (attached) and posted on ftp.
    B. 15-mile memo complete (attached)

- Darcy
    A. Continuing to work on the morphometry and looking more closely at the velocity components of the model.

- Tom
    A. Will share notes relating to the modeling/target development on the Yellowstone River (email attached)
    B. Jonathan Clough's response to questions about the TSS "driver" variables (email attached):
        1. "The user needs to input all driver variables externally. TSS is not modeled in any way shape or form in the LBR simulation as it currently stands, but drives the model based on external modifications.

My recollection is that we used TSS data where available and interpolated between stations where required. There was not a whole lot of data at the time that we were doing the original analysis.

We do have some additional sediment capabilities in the model, but modeling sediment deposition and suspended concentrations with a cell-size of 5-10km reaches may have limited utility."

- Jack ~~(although he was unable to attend the meeting, his items from the 6/11 meeting were kept on the agenda so that they could be fully addressed)~~ – These items will be placed aside pending the results and use of the LBR data collected on 6/20 and 6/21.
    - ~~A. Frame/outline 3 questions related to the interpretation of pebble count and periphyton data, model results, and targets (roughly paraphrased below):~~
        1. ~~How to best characterize riffles/runs/pools on the LBR for use in the model?~~
            - ~~Some methods discussed by the group included algorithm review, sensitivity analyses, field documentation, remote sensing, etc.~~
        2. ~~How to apply the USGS periphyton data collection to riffles vs. runs in the model and interpret results?~~
            - ~~Alex's and Dick's professional opinions were interpreted as believing periphyton growth would likely be similar in riffles and runs, given the appropriate substrate. However, it was also identified that other factors could come into play such as turbidity, water velocity, water depth, etc.~~
        3. ~~Ensuring that the target and data transformation procedures are clear, aligned, and appropriate.~~
            - ~~It was suggested to deal with questions 1 and 2 first, which may help formulate how question 3 is addressed.~~

As always, please let me know what I missed or misinterpreted and thanks for your participation today! Cheers,
-Troy

Troy G. Smith
Watershed Coordinator
DEQ Boise Regional Office
1445 N. Orchard St.
Boise, Idaho 83706
208-373-0434
Troy.Smith@deq.idaho.gov