Below are the main points/action items I noted from the August 6, 2013 Model Work Session:

Upcoming Model Work Session Schedule

- Next weekly meeting August 13, 2013 10 a.m. @ DEQ
- Tentatively no meeting on August 20 due to other schedule conflicts

<u>Decision Points</u> (all of these decisions are "final" pending need to further reevaluate)

No new decisions made during the meeting.

Upcoming Items

• DEQ contract to fund Jonathan Clough and Dick Park for approximately 60 total hours to consult on the AQUATOX modeling effort...nearly in place.

Action Item Updates

- All
- A. Review the model documentation, Dick Park's previous memo, and substrate data collected by DEQ to better understand how input/output should best be interpreted and/or normalized to represent actual conditions.
- B. Please identify if you have been tasked with an item or if there are items you can help to complete on the <u>"LBR Atx 2013Updating Outstandingitems 080613."</u> This is the "to-do" list for the model set-up and calibration.
- Troy
 - A. Troy and Darcy to collect run/riffle/pool, substrate, and other data for Diversion to Star.
 - B. AQUATOX file naming convention identified (see attachment).
 - C. Check with Alex to resolve questions pertaining to elevated sediment levels in Segment 12 relative to Segments 11 and 13 during the August synoptic event (where and how collected, how observations can be explained real event, anomaly, focused sampling...?).
 - D. Check with Alex about the elevated periphyton biomass observed during the March synoptic event (where and how collected, how observations can be explained real event, anomaly, focused sampling...?).

Michael/Tom

- A. Continuing to update Caldwell and Indian Creek data and repost input files on the ftp site for evaluation when ready.
- B. Rerunning the existing condition scenarios to compare output to observed data, based on updated information provided by Dick Park (e.g. adjusting f-crit and other parameters).
- Darcy
 - A. Continuing to work on the morphometry and looking more closely at the velocity components of the model. Currently, trying to rectify modeled flows vs. data.
- Kate
 - A. To provide additional shade information to help group make determination about shade values used in model: Current options include, 0 for all segments, the direct use of

Freshwater Trust Data (lacking for Segments 3-6), Mark Shumar's professional opinion, Troy's hybrid,...

- 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 and 8/9 and 8/12.
 - 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