

Modeling humpback chub, adaptive management and LTEMP experiments

Lucas S. Bair, U.S. Geological Survey, Southwest Biological Science Center, Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center Charles B. Yackulic, U.S. Geological Survey, Southwest Biological Science Center, Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center Michael R. Springborn, University of California at Davis Matthew N. Reimer, University of Alaska at Anchorage Pierce Donovan, University of California at Davis Craig A. Bond, Rand Corporation Lewis G. Coggins, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

GCDAMP Annual Reporting Meeting 2018, Flagstaff, Arizona

U. S. Department of Interior U.S. Geological Survey

Applied Decision and Scenario Analysis

 Develop a bioeconomic model to identify the cost-effective management strategy for rainbow trout that achieves humpback chub population goals.





http://www.coloradoriverrecovery.org/general-information/the-fish/humpback-chub.html

Cost-effectiveness Analysis

- Comparing the costs of alternative means to achieve goals set through a political or public process (Sagoff 2009)
- Example: Determine an operation at GCD that limits impact to [or improves] hydropower while meeting recovery and long-term sustainability of downstream resources (Reclamation, 1996).



Sagoff, M. 2009. Regulatory review and cost-benefit analysis. Philosophy & Public Policy Quarterly. 29(3/4):21-26.

U.S. Department of the Interior. 1996. Operation of Glen Canyon Dam, Record of Decision. Upper Colorado Region, Salt Lake City, Utah.



Bioeconomic Model





Humpback Chub (Gila cypha)





Adapted from: Yackulic, C. B., M.D., Yard, J. Korman, and D.R. Van Haverbeke. 2014. A quantitative life history of endangered humpback 6 chub that spawn in the Little Colorado River: variation in movement, growth, and survival. Ecology and Evolution 4(7): 1006-1018.

 τ – proportion of Colorado River fish in Colorado River HBC monitoring site

Bioeconomic Model





Management Component

- Mechanical removal
 - Remove rainbow trout in the vicinity of JCM reach
 - Limit of one trip per month and six trips per year
- Minimize costs
 - Number of trips
 - Period of analysis





Bioeconomic Model Results





LTEMP EIS Objectives

 'Determine the appropriate experimental framework that allows for a range of programs and actions...keeping with the adaptive management process'





LTEMP EIS Objectives

 'Minimize emissions and costs to the greatest extent possible, consistent with improvement and long-term stability of downstream resources.'





GCMRC Research

- Trout management flows
 - Incorporate additional management options and associated costs, such as trout management flows at GCD, into the bioeconomic model
- Humpback chub population parameter uncertainty
 - Identify the importance of parameter uncertainty in the prioritization of monitoring and research



Trout Management Flows



Example implementation of a two-cycle TMF in June and July with resumption of normal fluctuations between cycles and afterward

Adapted from: Glen Canyon Dam Long-Term Experimental and Management Plan December 2015 Draft Environmental Impact Statement http://ltempeis.anl.gov/documents/draft-eis/vol1/Chapter_2-Alternatives.pdf



Bioeconomic Model





Optimal Management Strategy



Optimal Economic Strategy





Adaptive Management

- Reducing parameter uncertainty may improve long-run management (i.e., reduce costs) but it incurs short-run costs
- Incorporate active or passive learning into the model as a state variable
- Dynamic programming is a frequent solution but requires that we further simplify the population model







Dynamic Programming Model



Preliminary data, do not cite

science for a changing world

Dynamic Programming Model







Questions?
<u>Ibair@usgs.gov</u>
928-556-7362

