

Meeting Summary

TRRP 2014 Project Design Alternatives Stakeholder Workshop

June 04, 2013

Trinity Alps Golf Course, Weaverville, CA

Overview and Process

Jeff Morris opened the workshop and went through introductions and the agenda. DJ Bandrowski reviewed the history of the design process, where we are today and how input from today will be incorporated into the design process.

Review of three objectives and associated metrics

Fish presentation: Rearing habitat calculations - Aaron Martin

Flow presentation: Obstructions in river and width variations - Dave Gaeuman

Flora presentation: Riparian Function Metrics – James Lee

Questions regarding review of objectives and metrics

Fish:

Is all inundated area beneficially the same? At this 5% level, we can't say.

Can you define the difference between base flow habitat area and flood plains? Floodplains are not all habitat. Can't differentiate much at this level.

Flow:

George K. started a discussion on metrics, standard deviations and the calculations. He was requested to take this discussion to future meetings.

Flora:

Why is open water the top score in the metrics? It had to be included and was tough to place. At this 5% level we're looking at big changes – say from human disturbance to the flood plain.

Why are you using the "4 ft. above flow" rule of thumb and where did it come from? It relates to depth of willow/cottonwood root growth in first year and other ground water dynamics that influence it. At 10% design, we use this as rule of thumb.

When did this get figured out? Why are we watering current restoration sites when it is supposed to be a functioning riparian area? The vegetation can still provide many benefits, and over time the processes will increase the probability for natural recruitment. John Baer (sp?) answer - It is better to have some vegetation than completely open. We've found that there is an issue with the days the flood plains are wetted and germination. 80% of all riparian vegetation on river grows within 9 ft of river edge. But those areas are only inundated for short time. But that doesn't mean that we shouldn't try to promote vegetation on the river. Our first estimates of "6 ft. above flow" were too high. Ideal we believe now is about 4' and 4000 cfs. This is an example of adaptive management based on gained knowledge. DJ noted that when the design process moves from the 10% level to 30-40%, the metrics will change and evolve.

Jeff Morris noted that based on mostly agency attendance today, evening meetings will be set up to give more members of the public an opportunity to attend.

Participants completed their ranking sheets and took a break.

mid-range of flows. As the design process moves forward, there will be more analytical tools to use for details like this. Like

Discussion on left bank of design. The original ideas included lowering the left bank, but then decided may not be a good idea, because material out of CC might stall out. But we could add wood structure, but not remove material. Tim – is there opportunity for synergy between this and Hocker Flat? Just looking for more opportunities on left bank. Further discussion on need to increase rearing habitat at this site. Possibility of including wetlands/ponded areas as additional habitat if water temperatures are cold enough. There will be more details available at the next level in design. DJ – By using metrics, we're trying to quantify our decision making process. This discussion is good to examine what is not included in these metrics. Right now we are learning a lot at an early stage and we have so much more to do. Discussion of goals, metrics and balance of design process.

Metric Summary

Discussion on the use and purpose of the metrics. They are designed to get people engaged and to pay attention – especially members of the public. Possibly use the Means Objectives number as a review if numbers are too low. The intent of this meeting is to begin the communications process and involve the public in the decision making process. The metrics have to be repeatable and objective. The intent is to remove subjectivity from the process.

DJ Housekeeping – Metrics and notes will be important and shared. By Friday will need comments back from design groups. On June 13, we will meet internally and discuss comments – need to refine alternatives and choose two alternatives to move to 30%. Lots of steps coming up, and plenty of time to engage. Most important meeting to attend is on June 13.

11:30 – Break for lunch

Bucktail Project design alternatives presented by Fred Meyer

Site Overview / Orientation / Existing Conditions

Questions/Comments:

Where did data come from? TRRP data collection.

What is the status of the new Bucktail Bridge? Design is at 60% design level. Meeting next week. New bridge will likely be built in 2015, not next year.

Presentation of 4 Alternatives

Alt 1 – Focus on mainstem sinuosity, connect flood plains

New bridge will ease flooding that happened at 11,000 cfs.

The outlet of the first meander where it connects back to mainstem is where bedrock comes out part way and wonder if scour is even possible. Trying to use energy in there now, right now is only idea and will discover more with modeling.

Alt 2 – Increase rearing habitat

Alt 3 – “Japanese garden” of fish production. How many side channels can we get?

What problems will this cause for landowners with all that water in there?

If we don't replace the bridge, will that ease pressure on bridge? No, it would still all have to come out under that narrow bridge.

Presenters note that they haven't created much base flow habitat on this one but recognize the need to incorporate some ponds, be more creative.

At what flow level is the back channel engaged? Around 4,000 cfs. Water follows that path currently at higher flows. It is likely too long to be functional as lower flow channel.

Alt 3 – Independent of Alt 1.

Different features from different alternatives, may be mixed together to get bigger bang for buck. Need to get metrics set up for each feature. Add wood for juvenile habitat and possibly an alcove.

Questions/Comments:

Why would a federal agency be insisting on no change to flood elevation when no one lives there? Re: FEMA regulation. Scott – They don't care. We can't lower elevation either. Discussion on FEMA and flood maps. Further explanation of how DWR works with the counties on flood map elevation changes.

You discussed coarse sediment coming into the reach then discussed augmentation – can you discuss this? Scott – The upstream riffle is degrading and we thought gravel would increase riffle height and get water up to floodplain. We have no base flow habitat in there now, may add some. It would be a transient feature. Mark – We're trying to get more water on that floodplain more often and hopefully get more vegetation moving down stream.

Is all information and process standardized across the board with all agencies and groups? Working on a range for information that is coming out of IHAP. The current approach is to work together, with each group bringing their own knowledge and approach. There's coordination, but not consistency, which adds depth to the process.

Chapman – How long will the project last? June (soonest) to September 15, then reveg after that. By December you will stop seeing equipment and people in there.

Discussion on working with property owners. If they are not willing, the design is adjusted to go around their property.

Metric Summary

Still need to work on it. Riparian metric only one completed.

Scoring Summaries and Next Steps - DJ

Explanation of charts and spreadsheet.

Robert – It seems that stakeholders understand what is happening here. DJ – We're providing transparency so everyone knows how we move ideas to reality. Robert – don't understand Dominance Analysis chart and I think we have a ways to go. Discussion on charts.

Review of future meetings / processes including NEPA

June 13 meeting at TRRP office.

July 12, Friday, at 1 pm will hold Value Engineering meeting at Library.

Request made that all work groups get information to DJ and he'll post on ftp site.

4:20 Adjourn