



**EBTJV Conservation Strategy and Science & Data Committee Joint Meeting  
February 19, 2016  
Meeting Room A  
Wheeling, WV**

**Meeting Agenda**

- 8:00 a.m. Welcome and Introductions (22 attendees)**
- 8:15 a.m. Subwatershed Priority Scores – is there continued value in using these scores at the HUC 12 scale? Attendees indicated there seemed to be limited value in using the subwatershed priority scores in their Brook Trout conservation work. However, there may still be some utility in using these priority scores as a surrogate for Brook Trout habitat quality at the subwatershed scale since the scores were estimated using 5 important landscape variables (road density, percent of agricultural use, percent of total forest, combined sulfate and nitrate deposition, and percent of mixed forest in the stream corridor). There was also interest expressed in running the CART model at the catchment scale to see if priority scores at this finer scale would be useful.**
- 9:00 a.m. Priority Brook Trout Conservation Focal Areas – what factors should be used to identify priority areas? Should a tiered approach be considered, e.g. priority level 1, priority level 2, etc.? There was interest in identifying a common set of criteria that would serve the purpose of sorting patches/catchments into different priority bins (i.e. a tiered approach) but determining priority focal areas should also include more localized criteria that managers could add in if pertinent.**
- 10:10 a.m. Break**
- 10:30 a.m. Brook Trout Catchments and Patches – how should these be used to quantify Brook Trout conservation successes (i.e. development of habitat objectives)? Once the catchment data has been summarized range-wide, there was interest in not only looking at the Brook Trout catchments (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4) when developing new habitat objectives but also wild trout catchments that don't currently contain Brook Trout (0.2, 0.3, and 0.4). Also, the concept of zero net loss for Brook Trout was suggested as a more realistic**

range-wide objective, while recognizing that “holding the line” may present issues when it comes to Brook Trout conservation calls for action.

- 12:00 p.m. Lunch**
- 1:00 p.m. Identifying primary threats to Brook Trout catchments/patches**
- 1:40 p.m. Long-term monitoring of Brook Trout populations – how should this be approached across the EBTJV range? Mark Hudy presented a draft survey questionnaire that would be distributed to State Brook Trout managers that get at identifying key threats to Brook Trout patches and what type of Brook Trout fishery is present within the patch, as well as asking each of the States to describe their current methodology for monitoring Brook Trout populations.**
- 2:40 p.m. Break**
- 3:00 p.m. Validating Brook Trout patches - There seemed to be consensus that we should use the patch data as it currently exists and work towards verifying these patches using better culvert data in the 2020 assessment.**
- 3:30 p.m. Update on TU’s Eastern Brook Trout Conservation Portfolio Analysis**
- 4:00 p.m. Update on outcome of Brook Trout Modeling Workshop**
- 4:30 p.m. Meeting Wrap-up**