UCFWG FIELD WORKSHOP AUGUST 18, 2021 Recap

Upper Clark Fork Working Group Integrating U Information, Ideas, C and Actions for the F Upper Clark Fork River G



With support from:





UCFWG STRATEGIC PLAN

The Upper Clark Fork Working Group's <u>Mission</u> is to facilitate, produce, analyze and share sciencebased knowledge among key participants involved in the remediation, restoration, research, and monitoring of the Upper Clark Fork River and its tributaries.

FIELD WORKSHOP AGENDA

- Provided background information about history and status of remediation and restoration work
- Described field assignment—visit two sites with your group and fill out your "Ecological Components" form documenting what is present and lacking from your perspective and expertise
- Reconvened and shared our findings
- Summarized and discuss where we go from here
- Shared food and good company
- Hosted by Clark Fork Coalition at their Dry Cottonwood Field Center
- Supported by University of Montana and Natural Resource Damage Program

UPPER CLARK FORK RIVER FIELD WORKSHOP

Site Assessment, August 18th 2021

| Site Name: | Remediated | □ Non-Remediated |
|---|--|--------------------|
| Participant Name: | Affiliation: | |
| Check all that apply in each section below: | | |
| Role: □ Natural Resource Manager □ Researcher □ Educato □ Tribal Representative □ NGO Professional □ Consu □ Other | r □ Student □ Citize Itant □ Policy Maker | n Scientist |
| Expertise: Animal Biology Plant Biology Soils Hydrolog Engineering Social / Cultural Recreation Re Other | gy 🛛 Environmental Ch egulatory 🗖 Funding | 1emistry 🛛 Ecology |
| What approaches do you usually use for site investigations in your field | of expertise? | |
| □ Sampling for research □ Sampling for management □ Limiting fac | ctors for restoration pote | ntial |
| □ Functional assessment for wetlands □ Habitat suitability for biologic | cal components | |
| Exploration for design conceptualization Exploration for design conceptualization Exploration provide the second se | gn engineering | |
| □ Proposed action scope for cultural resource conservation □ Propose □ Other | ed action scope for public | access |
| | | |

From the unique lens of your expertise, please consider ecological components either present or lacking at this site.

Think of component functions across both time and space. As examples, you may consider ecological processes such as flow and sediment transport; biological components such as habitat niches, species, and life stages; physical components such as water quality, structure, and complexity; or holistic processes such as ecosystem services.

| Components Present | Components Lacking | |
|--------------------|--------------------|--|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Field Form

| Components Present (cont.) | Components Lacking (cont.) |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| se this space to write down any ecological, technical, or lo | ogistical questions that occurred to you at this site. |
| | |

Field Form









#1 Brian Bartkowiak Greg Clark Karen Knudsen Gary Swant Rob Thomas Claire Utzman





#2 Beau Downing Kris Boyd Ken Champlain Andy Fisher Caleb Lashway Robert Pal Jose Sanchez Ruis





Downstream



TEAMS

#3 Mike Hatten Brian Balmer Erick Greene Alex Leone Marco Maneta Doug Martin Joe Naughton





#4 Tom Parker Joel Chavez Lisa Eby Megan Fyling Bill Snoddy Will Mcdowell





#5 Amy Sacry Matt Daniels Ben Colman Rafa Fejio Joe Griffin Casey Hackathorn Colton Kyro



Phase 5, Upstream Right Bank

Upstream

RIVER MILE
 PHASE BREAK
 NON-REMEDIATED LOCATION
 REMEDIATED/RESTORED LOCATION
 ALTERNATIVE LOCATION
 ALTERNATIVE LOCATION
 O.25
 O.5
 Miles
 AERIAL IMAGERY: ESRI Basemap

TEAMS

#6 Karin Boyd Wyatt Cross Nathan Kohler Taylor Gold Quiros Maury Valett Vicki Watson





#7 Marisa Sowles Brian Chaffin Nathan Cook Mike DeGrandpre Robert Payn Travis Schmidt



ONLINE MAP HIGHLIGHTING FIELD LOCATIONS FROM AUGUST 18

https://geumserver.com/gdm/public_html/go.php?m=6a93d7df81be12470375576d84fbc4 034a19f754f9

FLOODPLAIN WORKSHOP COMMON THEMES (GROUP REPORTS)

- Decadent willows and water birch present in unremediated Phases, not in remediated phases
- Willow regeneration present in remediated phases within a 10-20 ft band from river, not present in unremediated phases except where local sediment from avulsion or other disturbance
- Stream morphology was generally noted as better in remediated reaches (pools, riffles, etc.)
- High grass cover in remediated reaches
- Bird diversity noted in both remediated and unremediated reaches
- Contaminated sediments and slickens present in unremediated reaches, but noted as a risk to Phase 5 which is below non-remediated reaches
- Biological soil crust developing in Phases 2 and 5
- Redtop becoming dominant grass in both remediated and non-remediated reaches
- Trees lacking in both remediated and non-remediated reaches
- Floodplain connectivity lacking in all but Phase 1
- Noxious weeds scarce in remediated reaches

FLOODPLAIN WORKSHOP SPECIFIC OBSERVATIONS (EXAMPLES FROM FIELD FORMS)

- Bare substrate lacking in areas of remediated reaches
- Soil organic matter lacking in areas with sandy borrow
- Land stewardship noted as lacking in one private, unremediated Phase
- Cattail wetlands described as artificial
- Two types of benthic habitat: Algae forming on gravel, macrophytes growing in sand
- In the same Phase, one observer noted continuous glide habitat while another noted riffle/pool sequences.
- Lack of riparian vegetation for habitat may be limiting aquatic-terrestrial linkages among food webs.
- Observers noted surprising number of native plants and high bird diversity in Phases
 5 and 6.
- Public signage noted as being present by participant with more of a social science background

EXAMPLE QUESTIONS NOTED DURING THE WORKSHOP

- How to address unique habitats such as peatlands where they overlap with contaminated sediments?
- Are there ways to increase hydrologic connection between the Clark Fork River and its floodplain?
- Are there ways to preserve or engineer standing wood for cavity nesting, raptor perching?
- Can we guide management practices on private land after remediation/restoration?
- A How much does sediment starvation and flow moderation from Warm Springs Ponds affect geomorphic potential?

UNIQUE HABITATS

PEATLANDS



UNIQUE HABITATS

PEATLANDS



UCFWG STRATEGIC PLAN

The Upper Clark Fork Working Group's <u>Mission</u> is to facilitate, produce, analyze and share sciencebased knowledge among key participants involved in the remediation, restoration, research, and monitoring of the Upper Clark Fork River and its tributaries.

UCFWG STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

- Understand sources, sinks, and spatial/temporal patterns of metals in the UCFR main channel and relevant tributaries.
- Improve knowledge of water quality and biogeochemistry effects on aquatic species diversity and food web productivity along the UCFR.
- Characterize hydrologic changes longitudinally (upstream to downstream) over the UCFR with focus on Reach A.
- Improve knowledge of UCFR habitat, populations, and biological productivity.
- Improve information management and sharing among the UCFWG and other entities doing research, restoration and remediation in the UCFR basin.