

**Draft Minutes**  
**Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group**  
**Victorian Inn, 1709 Main Street, Weaverville, CA**

**Tuesday, December 12, 2006**

**The meeting was open to the public.**

**8:30 AM**

Attending members:

| Member:                     | Representative Seat:                          |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Arnold Whitridge (Chairman) | Safe Alternatives for Forest Environment      |
| Ed Duggan                   | Willow Creek Community Service District       |
| Richard Lorenz              | Trinity County Resident                       |
| Serge Birk                  | Central Valley Project Water Association      |
| Pat Frost                   | Trinity County Resource Conservation District |
| Byron Leydecker             | Friends of the Trinity River                  |
| James Feider                | City of Redding Electric Utility Department   |
| Tom Weseloh                 | California Trout, Inc                         |
| Dana Hord                   | Big Bar Community Development Group           |
| Steve Anderson **           | Bureau of Land Management                     |
| James Spear                 | Natural Resources Conservation Service        |
| David Steinhauser *         | Six Rivers Outfitter and Guide Association    |

\* Arrived during discussion of Item 4. \*\* Left after discussion of Item 4.

Members that did not attend:

| Member:              | Representative Seat:       |
|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Elizabeth Soderstrom | Natural Heritage Institute |
| Spreck Rosekrans     | Environmental Defense      |
| Dan Haycox           | Miners Alliance            |
| Joan Hartmann        | Local Landowner            |

Designated Federal Officer: Randy Brown, Fish and Wildlife Service, Arcata, CA.

## **1. Adopt Agenda Approval of Minutes**

Arnold Whitridge, chairman of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG), opened the meeting and asked the members to introduce themselves.

### **Changes to Agenda**

No changes were made at this time.

### **Changes to September 2006 minutes**

Arnold made two edits to the minutes.

Serge Birk asked that when members leave before some items are discussed, it should be pointed out in the minutes. For example, the CVPIA discussion (Item 6) last meeting took place after Serge Birk and Jim Feider had left to attend another meeting. They both felt the discussion that took place was not a fair characterization of the topic. This note was added to the September minutes.

**Ed Duggan made motion to accept the minutes as edited.**

**The motion was seconded by Jim Spear.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

## **2. Open forum; public comment**

No comments were made by the public at this time.

## **3. Integrated Assessment Plan**

Rod Wittler of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) gave a Power Point presentation entitled "Integrated Assessment Plan: update TAMWG & TMC, Fall 2006" (**Attachment 1**). Wittler emphasized the two major objectives of the Integrated Assessment Plan (IAP): 1) evaluate program progress and 2) provide feedback. Most of the remaining presentation was an explanation of the schedule and the strategies to achieve the two stated goals.

Wittler noted that the Science Advisory Board has scheduled a meeting for tomorrow to "write the experiment." A draft of the experiment was presented as:

"A combination of mechanical alterations and vegetation removal in addition to managed high-flow releases in the spring will promote geo-fluvial processes leading to a new channel form that is expected to provide significantly increased spawning and rearing habitat for anadromous salmonids."

Wittler listed three hypotheses from the experiment that addressed improvement of habitat types and increased smolt survival.

Wittler noted that the explicit statement of the experiment helps to prioritize objectives during the budget process. He also noted that, to bring people together on the same page, they needed to develop a glossary that states agreed upon definition of the words such as "prioritization" and "integration."

Wittler noted that the TRRP isn't a research program, but is a program that uses science to assess whether the strategies work. Along this line, he presented a flow diagram that outlined a stepwise procedure to determine whether a question is worthy of testing for action effectiveness or magnitude of cause-effects links (i.e., whether or not it helps to evaluate TRRP objectives).

Several of the TAMWG suggested Wittler simplify the description of these procedural steps. For example, Serge Birk suggested Wittler drop the qualifier "significant" from uncertainty. Others suggested that the diagram seemed to utilize "double negatives" or "reverse Polish" to communicate a rather simple concept. It really seemed that the various diagrams of explicit decision-making or strategies were unnecessary.

Serge Birk asked if they might restate their conceptual model with about four steps or graphs: flow leads to habitat, which leads to increased smolts, which finally leads to adult returns. Wittler presented a diagram called Integration that showed how five "managed actions" (flow, channel shape, gravel additions, fine sediment reductions, and vegetation removal) lead to improvements in four "valued ecosystem components" (fish, riparian vegetation, birds, and reptiles/amphibians).

Unresolved issues included assignment of responsibilities among stakeholders, peer review, and competitive versus non-competitive contracting.

Curtis Anderson, chairman of the steering committee, responded to a question why there still are questions regarding roles and responsibilities. He said that individuals have opinions about how things should go, but the group of all stakeholders (members of the TMC) does not agree as a group on the roles of responsibilities. There may be a continued "absence of consensus" for some time to come. Arnold Whitridge suggested that if this is acknowledged, some guidance to the TRRP might be provided as to how to proceed.

Anderson also commented on the difficulty in producing the IAP in time for the SAB review. He noted that the steering committee is composed of members with other full time jobs. The time requirements for the IAP are in addition to the needs of considering the flow scheduling, budgeting, contracting. Tom Weseloh, who has been partially involved in the IAP process, commented on the large effort for the IAP process. For example, he noted that he has more emails on the IAP than all other TRRP items combined. He noted the recent progress that is now being made. Weseloh also emphasized the need to provide input now and not at the end of the process.

Rich Lorenz noted that this phase of the IAP is a vast improvement over the past. He wondered whether they could use the IAP as part of the budget process. Douglas Schluesner said they want to use it, but it may not be ready for the 2008 budget process.

Tom Weseloh noted that the TAMWG should also look at several other handouts regarding the IAP process. These included the comments of the SAB (Attachment 1a) and comments by the TMC (Attachment 1b). Other handouts included the SAB meeting agenda to review the IAP (Attachment 1c) and a set of notes from a telephone conference call (Attachment 1d).

Jim Feider commended the hard work put into the IAP and was pleased with the effort to prioritize activities and identify policy issues; however, he also expressed concern about

the "bureaucratic way" of the IAP and that the presentation gives the impression of a more "research and development" (by using words like "experiment") than a "restoration" program. He also expressed concern over the apparent amounts of uncertainty still associated with the program and the potential for paralysis by analysis.

Tom Weseloh suggested that the TAMWG recommend to TMC: that TAMWG provide them with recommendation that IAP is still high priority that needs completion and that the TAMWG supports the schedule. TAMWG should look at the policy during the March meeting.

Tom Weseloh said he would prepare a motion and would submit it to the group at the end of the day.

#### **4. Non-TRRP restoration activity in Trinity basin**

Tom Stokely of Trinity County Planning started a series of presentations on the watershed components of the Trinity. He passed out a copy of several pages of the ROD that emphasized the need for watershed focus (Attachment 2). Stokely gave a Power Point presentation on the background of watershed activities. He noted that early work started with Grass Valley and sediment sources. He described the evolution of the EIR process and noted that the TMDL listing of the mainstem occurred after the ROD was signed in 2000. Stokely presented his hypothesis that the mainstem restoration experiment may fail without addressing the tributary sediment contributions.

Sandra Perez of Trinity County Planning described their program to monitor and restore excessive sediment from roads. She noted that the TMDL reported that 31 % of total sediment delivered to the river is management-related and that the remaining 69 % is of natural origins. Of this 31 %, 29 % is road-related. They estimate that completed projects prevented over 20,000 cubic yards of sediment inputs at a cost of \$720,000. TRRP has provided \$40,000 toward this cost. They are currently working on Indian Creek and Browns Mountain Road, Trinity Dam Blvd, Roundy Road, Viola Lane. They are also working on fish barriers and other road designs.

Questions were raised about whether dealing with only 10 % of the entire sediment load (29 % of 31 % of the total sediment inputs) may not be enough.

Dan Westermeyer, Project Implementation Coordinator with the Resource Conservation District (RCD), gave a Power Point on the Trinity River TMDL and gave a handout (Attachment 2a). Trinity River was 303(d) listed in 1992 for sediment impairment. The EPA identified the sub-watersheds as sources and that managing mainstem flows alone will not recover the river. He described some of the RCD's work and promoted the value of more watershed work. He noted the formation of the Trinity River Watershed Council. Using seed money from TRRP, the RCD received \$2.9 million in grant money for 2007 and most is earmarked for restoration involving roads and watersheds in the South Fork and tributaries of the mainstem of the Trinity River.

Bill Brock of the Shasta-Trinity National Forest gave a power point presentation about forest service roads. He noted that most were built between 1945 and 1965. A typical FS road has four culverted stream crossings per mile. The Shasta Trinity has 3,500 miles of system roads and 1,000 miles of non-system roads. There may be 18,000 culverted

crossings in the Trinity basin. 200 miles of roads have had stream crossings upgraded at a cost of \$4.3 million. Much of this funding came from non-Forest Service sources (Attachment 2b).

He stressed the value of performing preventative work of pulling culverts as a cheaper way than having to restore failures and debris flows and mass wastes after failures.

Steve Anderson of the BLM handed out a map showing public lands in the Grass Valley watershed (Attachment 2c), and a manuscript that described their work in the Grass Valley (Attachment 2d). He noted the BLM has completed the fuel break and is planning thinning projects to reduce fire risk along highway 299.

Jim Spear of the Natural Resource Conservation Service noted that they provide technical and financial services to the agriculture community, including tree farmers, in Trinity County. They can address a host of resource issues. They spend 50 to 75 % to improve health and vigor of tree growth. They are funded through the Farm Bill, which is re-authorized about every five years. They have spent \$2 million in Trinity County. \$1 million to irrigation projects efficiencies. A variety of water users takes water out of anadromous streams; improvements in efficiencies reduce these withdrawals. All projects are cost-share so their \$2 million was matched by additional dollars or matched with in-kind effort.

Tom Stokely noted that a lot is going on. They are looking at multi-year agreements. Steve mentioned that more could be spend on watersheds. He noted that the usable lifetime of Buckhorn Reservoir could be extended with more spending.

Break for lunch.

## **5. Integrated Information Management System (IIMS)**

Andreas Krause of the TRRP presented a Power Point show on the strategies for their centralized database. The database would handle new and historical data, maps, field notes, photos, and raw data. It would allow visualizations and analysis tools and would be publicly accessible. The TRRP has secured funding from other Bureau of Reclamation nearby offices. They have existing data sets on river and stream flows, temperatures, and some fish migration data. Expected funding is just under \$1 million over a four-year period. It should be operational by FY 2009.

Andreas contrasted this data set with KRIS by describing this effort having a greater degree of quality control. He reported that they are just now figuring out their security protocols to allow various users direct access to the data. The dataset will be linked to GIS and will access the Terrain Database. All of the legal aspects for public access have not yet been worked out. They plan to have public access via the TRRP website.

## 6. 2006 construction activity

Joe Riess of the TRRP summarized what the summer accomplishments in the construction program: gravel introductions at Lewiston and completion of four restoration projects.

Gravel introductions at the hatchery at Lewiston will total 6,000 cubic yards or 9,000 tons; 2,500 tons were introduced in August 2006. They had to truck gravel from Junction City. They broke through riffle crests, deepened pools and redistributed pre-existing boulder clusters. They distributed gravels with an excavator driving it right into the stream. Their permit did not allow creation of turbidity levels of 20 % over background levels. They plan to add the remaining 6,500 tons next year. The source should be the nearby Indian Creek project. Overall, the caused little disturbance and they observed increased spawning the first year.

Four restoration sites were completed: Conner Creek, Valdor Gulch, Elkhorn, and Pear Tree Gulch. These four projects were started in October 3, 2006 and finished by November 17, 2006. They generally consisted of clearing vegetation, re-contouring the slopes, placing trees into the river as large woody debris, and creating alcove pools. At Valdor Gulch, the floodplain will now be inundated at 6,000 cfs of river flow where before it was not inundated until 10,000 cfs. At the Elkhorn site, they did floodplain work and restored an old side channel. At the Conner Creek site, they removed a hard berm. They also attempted to work around the existing cottonwood at Conner Creek. At the Pear Tree Gulch site, they created high-flow channels and an alcove pools.

Diana Clifton, the realty specialist of the TRRP, provided a Power Point presentation on the floodplain infrastructure program (Attachment 3). She mentioned moving the yellow house and they have moved 34 small structures such as pump houses. They provided help to those having damage to water systems due to high flows. As part of participation in these financial aid programs, the TRRP requires the landowners to sign a waiver that releases the TRRP of future liability. The maximum payment is \$10,000. They have had 48 applications for help so far.

## 7. Juvenile Fish Health

Nina Hemphill of the TRRP provided a summary of fish health studies. Several studies have been conducted on infection rates by *C. Shasta* and *Parvicapsula* of chinook smolts in the Klamath River. In 2002, Trinity smolts from the Lewiston hatchery had 19 % infection rate. The mean for all other smolts was a 60 % infection rate. The mortality rates of smolts in the estuary are thought to be an incredible 60 %; this suggests that infection results in 100 % mortality. There is a one-month delay in the development of the disease this past year. There should be more details and information presented at the upcoming Science Symposium. There was a request to get a full report on fish runs at the next meeting.

## 8. Klamath Basin Initiatives

Arnold Whitridge provided a few comments on the Klamath Basin Initiatives.

## **9. Reports from TRRP work groups**

Arnold Whitridge, Ed Duggan and Tom Weseloh commented on their work groups. Whitridge noted that it is difficult to participate in all meetings due to time constraints and the TAMWG may want to reconsider their participation. There will be fewer meetings as time is taken up by issues such as the IAP. Whitridge noted that anyone from TAMWG is invited to any of the workgroup meetings.

## **10. Executive Director's report**

Doug Schlesner of the TRRP passed out a handout that provided update on activities of the TRRP (Attachment 4). Schlesner noted that the Congress is operating on "continuing resolution" through February and likely for the entire fiscal year. This means the TRRP has a \$9.2 million program of work and the \$2 million add-on work is apparently not likely to happen. This reduction in funds means no funds for some new channel construction projects.

## **11. Designated Federal Officer topics**

Randy Brown noted that everyone should have received the new charter. It has now been signed. Brown also noted that updated travel guidelines have been sent out. He noted that it is getting close to the time to re-nominate members to the TAMWG.

## **12. Open forum; public comment**

Sid Mickelson, a resident at Indian Creek, commented that he has seen the final Indian Creek designs and does not like them. He noted that bank erosion is occurring and that 74 tons of gravel comes down Indian Creek in a typical year. An island has formed at the mouth of Indian Creek. He asked whether a caterpillar could be allowed to enter the river and "mush down" the island. He noted that there have been studies that are filed and never seen again. He would like TAMWG to inquire about the design.

Douglas Schlesner commented that a final decision has not been made on the design. The final EIR document is coming out and Mickelson's comments will be considered before Schlesner signs off on it. Arnold Whitridge made a commitment to making inquiries regarding Mickelson's concerns.

Jim Feider asked whether the SAB process streamlines or creates a bureaucratic process. Byron Leydecker noted that the SAB offers totally independent scientific expertise and has no financial interest in or conflict with the Restoration Program.

It was also noted that regarding the memo from Curtis Anderson to the TMC regarding policy questions (Attachment 2b) be put on the March TAMWG agenda and that the TAMWG members be ready to make recommendations at the March meeting. Perhaps some of the business could be handled by emails before the meeting.

Douglas Schlesner also noted the need to approve the budget and the IAP itself.

As the meeting was nearing its end, Tom Weseloh made a three-part motion regarding the discussion of the IAP.

**Tom Weseloh made the following motion for TAMWG actions:**

- 1. The TAMWG endorses the proposed schedule for the IAP in the handout received.**
- 2. Relay the importance of IAP as a TRRP top priority.**
- 3. TAMWG generally endorses the SAB process for reviewing the IAP and recommends moving forward with SAB recommendations regarding the IAP.**

**The motion was seconded by Rich Lorenz.**

**The motion passed unanimously with 11 members present. Steve Anderson had left.**

**13. Tentative date and agenda topics for next meeting**

Next meeting is tentatively scheduled for a day and a half with a start in the afternoon on the first day. Possible days include March 19 and 20.

Arnold Whitridge had noted several topics for discussion; these included fish report, membership renewal, and flow.

Ed Duggan suggested the TRRP put out notices about flow management in a more positive manner to not negatively affect businesses.

Adjourn

## **LIST OF MOTIONS**

**Tom Weseloh made the following motion for TAMWG actions:**

- 1. The TAMWG endorses the proposed schedule for the IAP in the handout received.**
- 2. Relay the importance of IAP as a TRRP top priority.**
- 3. TAMWG generally endorses the SAB process for reviewing the IAP and recommends moving forward with SAB recommendations regarding the IAP.**

**The motion was seconded by Rich Lorenz.**

**The motion passed unanimously with 11 members present. Steve Anderson had left.**

## LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Integrated Assessment Plan: Update TAMWG & TMC, Fall, 2006. Printout of Power Point presentation by Rod Wittler.

Attachment 1a: Draft Review Comments on: Trinity River Restoration Program Integrated Assessment Plan, Version 0.9—November 1, 2006. Prepared by Science Advisory Board, Dec. 1, 2006.

Attachment 1b: Copy of memo “Subject: Submission of High Level Policy Issues from the IAP for TMC Resolution.” From Curtis Anderson to Trinity Management Council, Nov. 21, 2006.

Attachment 1c: Trinity River Restoration Program Science Advisory Board (SAB) Review Part 1 of the Draft Integrated Assessment Plan (IAP). Meeting agenda.

Attachment 1d: November 29, 2006 Meeting IAP Steering Committee Notes {Updated based on Dec. 7<sup>th</sup> conference call}.

Attachment 2: Watershed Components of the ROD. Selected pages from the Record of Decision relating to watershed issues. Copied by Tom Stokely.

Attachment 2a: Summary of Trinity TMDL. Hard copy of Power Point presentation by Dan Westermeyer.

Attachment 2b: South Fork Trinity River (USFS, SFMU): Projects Funded through TCRCDD for implementation in South Fork Trinity River (194-2007). Sheet provided by Bill Brock.

Attachment 2c: Map of Public Lands and Granitic Soils in the Grass Valley Creek Area. Provided by Steve Anderson.

Attachment 2d: Watershed Thinning & Prescribed Fire: a Healthy Forest Initiative and National Fire Plan Wildland Urban Interface Project for the Grass Valley Creek Watershed, Trinity County, California. BLM Redding Office. Report provided by Steve Anderson.

Attachment 3: Floodplain Infrastructure Program. Hard copy of Power Point presentation by Diana Clifton.

Attachment 4: Copy of memo “Subject: Director’s Report; September 22, 2006—December 14, 2006. From Douglas Schluesner, to TMC and TAMWG. December 8, 2006.