

Final Minutes  
**TRINITY ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP**  
 Tuesday, September 9, 2014  
 Weaverville Fire Hall, 125 Bremer St, Weaverville, CA

**Tuesday September 9, 2014 9:00 AM**

**Attending Members**

Member	Representative Seat:
Elizabeth Hadley	Chair, City of Redding Electric Utility Department
Tom Stokely	Vice-chair, California Water Impact Network
Gil Saliba	Redwood Regional Audubon Society
Ed Duggan	Willow Cr. Comm. Serv. Dist., E. Humboldt Co. and small businesses
Richard Lorenz	Trinity County Resident
Joe McCarthy	Commercial Fishing Guide
David Steinhauser	Six Rivers Outfitters and Guides Association
Liam Gogan <sup>1</sup>	Trinity River Fishing Guides
Emelia Berol <sup>2</sup>	Northcoast Environmental Center

1) Arrived following discussion of item 7; 2) arrived following item 10.

**Members that did not attend**

Member:	Representative Seat:
Kelli Gant	Trinity Lake Revitalization Alliance
Paul Hauser	Trinity Public Utilities District
Tiffany Hayes	Natural Resource Conservation Service
Sandy Denn	Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District
Jeffrey Sutton	Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority

Designated Federal Officer: Joe Polos, Fish and Wildlife Service, Arcata, CA.

**Other attendees:** Justin Day (City of Redding Electric Utility Department); Dave Wellock, Kristin Brevard, Julie Cantonese (members of the public); Vina Frye (USFWS); Robin Schrock, D.J. Bandrowski, and Ernie Clarke (TRRP); Andreas Krause (Yurok Tribe); George Kautsky (Hoopa Valley Tribe); Wade Sinnen (Ca Fish and Wildlife); Teresa Connor (Department of Water Resources); Brian Person (Bureau of Reclamation).

Notes: Kim Mattson (ENW).

**List of Motions Made during the Meeting**

**Rich Lorenz made a motion to approve the agenda.**

**Gil Saliba seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Tom Stokely made a motion to accept the June 2014 TAMWG minutes.**

**Gil Saliba seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Richard Lorenz made a motion to make the Phase I Workshop on October 30 and 31, 2014, an official meeting.**

**Ed Duggan seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Gil Saliba made a motion that the TAMWG approve the TRRP Communication Processes, as presented, and that the TMC approve the processes, as well.**

**Liam Gogan seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Gil Saliba made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC support the Program's efforts to stream-line the watershed grants application program.**

**Tom Stokely seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Rich Lorenz abstained.**

**Rich Lorenz made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC undertake for restoration in 2016 Evans Bar, Soldier Creek, Chapman Ranch, and Oregon gulch, as recommended by the new quantitative prioritization process referred to as 2D hydrodynamic-based logic modeling framework.**

**Ed Duggan seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed with 8 votes.**

**Tom Stokely voted no.**

**Liam Gogan made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC accept the No Action Alternative (Option 4); that is, defer all channel rehabilitation and gravel augmentation in the Lewiston area until further review or coordination with hatchery practices.**

**Tom Stokely seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Gil Saliba and Joe McCarthy abstained.**

## **Action Items Designated during the Meeting**

There were no action items assigned during the meeting.

## **Meeting Minutes by Agenda Item**

### **1. Welcome, Introductions, Approve Agenda and Minutes**

Elizabeth Hadley opened the meeting for the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG). As they lacked a quorum of 8 members, she deferred approval of the agenda and the June meeting minutes until a quorum was established. She asked if those present were satisfied with the agenda. The discussion moved on to the next item. A quorum was achieved once Liam Gogan arrived and the TAMWG took action on the agenda and minutes.

**Rich Lorenz made a motion to approve the agenda.**

**Gil Saliba seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

### **Approve Minutes**

**Tom Stokely made a motion to accept the June 2014 TAMWG minutes.**

**Gil Saliba seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

### **2. Public Comment**

Wade Sinnen commented on a recent die-off of kokanee in the Lewiston Reservoir. These fish had been drawn into the release tunnel of Trinity Reservoir and suffered pressure trauma. Otherwise Sinnen reported that there has not been a fish die-off downstream.

Dave Wellock commented on the fishing holes in the Trinity River that are being filled in. He suggested that the deeper holes had helped fish survive droughts in the past. He also suggested that Mark Lancaster do more to monitor water use by pot growers.

Ed Duggan asked about getting additional members to sit on the Trinity Management Council (TMC). Joe Polos noted that the TAMWG can suggest this and that the TMC has consider this twice in the past. Elizabeth Hadley said that this issue would need to be agendized.

Krista Brevard asked if she could get a full budget printed out.

### **3. Designated Federal Officer Items**

Joe Polos, designated Federal Officer, thanked those for getting their application packages in, and said that the charter renewal and membership application packages have been sent to the FWS Regional Office in Sacramento for forwarding to FWS and Department of the Interior in Washington, DC. Currently there are 14 primary members and 4 alternates on the TAMWG. Nominations were received for 14 primary members (not all the same individuals currently on the TAMWG) and 10 alternates. Rich Lorenz asked about changes in membership. Polos said that there will be some turnover, but he could not be specific.

Ed Duggan asked about the speed of getting the members and charter renewed. He also expressed his appreciation to Vina Fry for her help she has given to members in preparing their application packages. Gil Saliba asked about the policy for members that fail to attend. Polos

explained that three consecutive unexcused absences can lead to removal from the TAMWG. There was discussion about members that do not attend and causing issues in establishing a quorum.

#### **4. Trinity Management Council Update**

Elizabeth Hadley noted that Brian Person would be presenting later this afternoon. Person made his presentation between Items 7 and 8. He acknowledged the desire to finalize the TMC minutes before the following TAMWG meetings. He is working to accomplish this, but it has been a challenge to get final minutes approved in time for the TAMWG meetings.

Person summarized the flow conditions and the low levels of the reservoirs. He provided several series of numbers describing levels in the Shasta and Trinity Reservoirs. In summary, Shasta Reservoir is headed toward 1.2 million acre-feet by the end of the water year and will have to start bypassing power to meet temperature targets downstream. The drawdown in Shasta will be the 2nd or 3rd lowest since 1977. Trinity Dam is getting a new generator. Trinity Reservoir is also dropping in level and has dropped 18 feet in last 30 days and is headed toward 600 thousand acre-feet by the end of the water year. He noted that this year, exports from Trinity and Lewiston will total about 600,000 acre-feet and this is about 61% of the annual water budget. He explained that they have calculated that the long-term average exports out of the Trinity basin should be about 53% but this varies from year to year. Lastly, he commented that the emergency releases for fish health downriver of 25,000 acre-feet are only 2.5% of the annual water budget.

Regarding the emergency water releases for the Klamath, Person reported that on July 29, the fish health triggers were generated by reports of lethargic fish and recommendations by KFAT of an impending fish kill. They increased flows from the reservoirs so as to increase flows on the Lower Klamath to 2,500 cfs. This was then pulsed to 4,000 cfs for a 24-hour period. These emergency flows seemed to help fish health. They are planning to maintain 2,300 cfs on the 14th for the Yurok Boat Dance.

On August 5 they received their first reports of dead kokanee. Total dead according to DFW ranged from several hundred to 2,000. They are thought to have suffered hyperbaric shock when they inadvertently passed through the dam intake while seeking cooler waters.

El Nino is shaping up in the Pacific and this, combined with the Winemum Wintu predictions based on the acorn crop, portends a big winter. It may be that the El Nino will trend more south this year leaving the north with less rain.

#### **5. Executive Director Update**

Robin Schrock handed out a copy of her memo to the TMC and TAMWG that constituted her report (Attachment 1). She noted they are continually updating the TRRP website to include more information. She encouraged members to visit the Lower Junction City restoration site as it is functioning well. She noted that 2014 is a Critically Dry water year and is the first since restoration flows began in 2004. The 2015 budget has not changed. A new physical scientist, Robert Stewart is coming on as a replacement for Andreas Krause. Rod Wittler has returned from his detail. The Trinity River Restoration fisheries biologist is being re-advertised. TRRP staff volunteered on snorkel surveys this summer. Schrock noted the list of new publications and reports in her report. The 2013 annual report is well done and available online.

## **6. TRRP Workgroups Updates**

Ernie Clarke passed out a Workgroup Update (Attachment 2) that outlined progress by workgroups. The Flow Workgroup held a Webex meeting in June and has built new hydrographs for their portfolio. Next meeting is also Webex and will be October 15 and they will consider other hydrographs. The Fish Workgroup last met in July. They are working on hatchery reach restoration, screw trap synthesis report, and salmonid restoration goals from historical documents. A new coordinator is being sought. The Gravel Workgroup provided advice and input on gravel for the permit renewal and for a long-range strategy.

The topic of gravel stimulated some discussion. Rich Lorenz asked if the long-range strategy is considering the holes that are being filled in. Andreas Krause pointed out the analysis on hole filling has already been done by Dave Gaeuman. Ernie Clarke said that this report is being finalized now. Ed Duggan asked about a policy about adding gravel during Dry or Critically Dry years. Krause noted their strategy considers how to distribute gravels over all years. He noted they balance out additions in Dry years in anticipation of higher flows in subsequent years (e.g., Normal or higher flows). Robin Schrock noted that the restoration site designs are incorporating hydraulic modelling to predict sediment movement.

Clarke continued his report by noting the next Gravel Workgroup meeting will be in November. The Wildlife and Riparian meeting did not meet last quarter but will be focusing on riparian plantation maintenance and compliance reporting. Ed Duggan asked how to dial into Webex meetings. Clarke said this can be arranged or that they can come to the TRRP office to sit in on a meeting.

Clarke continued his report by noting the Interdisciplinary Team meets on the last Thursday of each month and the last meeting was August. They are discussing an upcoming workshop and refinement to the decision support system. He noted that Design will be covered by D.J. Bandrowski. The Watershed Workgroup met in June and participated in the SSS workshop on tributaries and is recommending projects to the TMC.

The issue of watersheds prompted discussion. Tom Stokely asked about the prohibition on “brick and mortar” projects in the tributaries. Robin Schrock said, in her opinion, that it means no construction projects, but the Watershed Workgroup can recommend projects and if the TMC approves them, then they can be performed. Stokely clarified that the Lee Fong project is an example that cannot be funded. Ed Duggan asked if they can perform mouth-opening projects. Clarke said it is best to identify the types of projects they want to fund and work with the solicitor in advance. Stokely asked if road projects are prohibited. Schrock said road decommissioning has been done.

## **7. Implementation Update**

Andreas Krause referred to a memo in the TAMWG members meeting packet (Attachment 3) regarding the Design Team discussions about restoration at the hatchery. Krause reviewed the issue. He explained that during the discussion of the design of restoration at the hatchery reach, the issue of hatchery fish interbreeding with natural fish came up. The design element of the project was put on hold as the interbreeding issue was considered. From Lewiston Dam to the old Lewiston Bridge there is a likelihood of 50% interbreeding with hatchery fish with natural fish. Experts from within and without the Program have mixed views on what to do about this. A primary solution would be an exclusion weir to reduce hatchery fish mixing with natural fish. But for the interim of 3 to 5 years, the question is, “Should we modify restoration actions in the

hatchery area?” Options range from doing all restoration to doing none. They are seeking guidance on how to proceed.

George Kautsky clarified that the memo also suggested that the TRRP better coordinate with the hatchery. Tom Stokely asked if the Hoopa Valley Tribe does not support restoration. Kautsky said the Hoopa Valley Tribe is seeking more integration of the TRRP work with the management of the hatchery. Wade Sinnen said the DFW has differing opinions on this issue but the main concern is to find a way to prevent hatchery fish from spawning in the restored reach. Should we put great habitat where we already have hatchery fish spawning? The restored habitat may draw more fish to spawn there instead of going into the hatchery. Joe Polos said the FWS has not made a formal recommendation but their thinking on this issue is consistent with the State's. They are supportive of the gravel augmentation but less so of building a site at this time. Action was postponed until after Item 12 and a quorum was present. Tom Stokely summarized the gravel and restoration options at the hatchery reach as four options:

- Option 1: Place gravel and go forward with restoration.
- Option 2: Place gravel, but perform no restoration actions.
- Option 3: Place limited gravel augmentation at the Weir and Cableway sites but none at hatchery and perform no restoration activities.
- Option 4: Place no gravel at hatchery and perform no restoration until further review or coordination of hatchery practices occurs.

**Liam Gogan made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC accept the No Action Alternative (Option 4); that is, defer all channel rehabilitation and gravel augmentation in the Lewiston area until further review or coordination with hatchery practices.**

**Tom Stokely seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Gil Saliba and Mike McCarthy abstained.**

The discussion moved on to Phase II Channel Rehabilitation and D.J. Bandrowski gave a summary report on Phase II progress. He noted that Lower Junction City hard features have been completed and re-vegetation is taking place. The Yurok Tribe construction team built this site and did a great job and finished ahead of schedule. Upper Douglas City has been postponed until next summer but will use FY 2014 funds. Other projects in design phase that should be ready for 2015 are Dutch Creek, Limekiln Gulch, and the Bucktail site. The Bucktail site will be coupled with the bridge. If they can find the resources for the bridge, it will be ready for implementation. He noted the need to start design in November 2014 for projects that are expected to be ready for construction by summer 2016.

Ed Duggan asked about the splitting of water in side channels and if this reduced the ability to move gravel. He also asked at what point he might add input to the design. Bandrowski said input can be made at any point. He went on to explain how side channels are designed for rearing habitat and this is balanced with sediment mobility. They are using sophisticated hydraulic that use velocities vectors that should be able to predict sediment mobility.

Bandrowski next gave a more formal PowerPoint presentation on how they are proposing use of a model to guide choices of project development. He explained how they are attempting to integrate

all sources of information to help guide where the next projects should be. They have adopted a 2D hydrodynamic-based logic modeling framework to help in this process. Bandrowski explained the use of digital terrain mapping of the bottom of the river along with airborne LiDAR to provide a physical description of the river. A 2D hydraulic model is then run through the physical description. He noted that a single run of the model at a single flow takes 2 weeks for the computers to find the solutions but they use multiple servers to shorten model run times. Most of the model predictions of river elevations are within 0.5 feet of actual observations and he felt this was quite good vindication of the model. The model also provides stream power, shear stress, velocities, and other useful output. Using modeled depth, velocity, and cover, they are able to project rearing habitat quality. Bandrowski felt that the correlation between the model, and observations of velocity, depth and cover and observations of juveniles are good.

Bandrowski next described how they divided the river into 200-meter panels and ran their model to find good clustered areas for restoration. They also searched for areas that also supporting spawning as a criterion for choosing restoration sites. In summary, the best places for restoration would be areas with poor habitat, available spawning, and good flow dynamics. The results were projected over the entire 40-mile restoration reach of the Trinity. The areas that were the most ideal for restoration were Dutch Creek, the canyon below Lorenz Gulch, Chapman Ranch, Pear Creek, Indian Creek, Vitzum Gulch, Soldier Creek, Oregon Gulch, Sky Ranch and Tom Lang Gulch (Poker Bar area). The Design Team recommends for 2016 restoration sites, Evans Bar, Chapman Ranch, Soldier Creek, and Oregon Gulch.

Tom Stokely asked how Limekiln Gulch came out in this analysis. Bandrowski said it came out as already having pretty good habitat and that is why they are proposing only minimal amounts of work in that project for 2015.

Action was postponed until after Item 12 and a quorum was present.

**Rich Lorenz made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC undertake for restoration in 2016 Evans Bar, Soldier Creek, Chapman Ranch and Oregon gulch, as recommended by the new quantitative prioritization process referred to as 2D hydrodynamic-based logic modeling framework.**

**Ed Duggan seconded the motion**

**The motion passed with 8 votes.**

**Tom Stokely voted no.**

## **8. Presentation-TMC Phase I Review Workshop**

Ernie Clarke passed out a synopsis for a proposed workshop to be held October 30 and 31 (Attachment 4). The workshop would review broad-scale scientific findings to build a common understanding about current conditions and to help with decision making. They would focus on the Record of Decision (ROD), Phase I, and SAB Phase I Report. The TAMWG was supportive of a workshop and wanted to hold an official meeting for that time.

**Richard Lorenz made a motion to make Phase I Workshop on October 30 and 31, 2014, an official TAMWG meeting.**

**Ed Duggan seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

## **Lunch**

### **9. Discussion-TRRP Program Goals (Objectives Refinement)**

Ernie Clarke made a PowerPoint presentation on TRRP program goals and efforts to refine them. Before his presentation he commented on permits and to answer an earlier question by Tom Stokely. Clarke reported that the plan is to continue to use the same gravel augmentation sites. Based on Dave Gaeuman's report on gravel augmentation, the State Water Resources Control Board thought the existing permits would not need to be renewed and the activities would be covered by the 2009 EIR. The State expressed interest in receiving annual updates in the activities and plans.

Clarke then switched to his presentation on objective refinement. He gave an overview of the steps taken so far on objective refinement. This process started in 2009 with the IAP version 1. He reviewed the goal statement from the IAP and the six objectives. The goal was basically to restore fisheries below the dams to pre-dam levels. The objectives touched on the specifics of fish, production, and harvests. He showed there were multiple sub-objectives and these can be reviewed in the appendices of the IAP. The second milestone was the Science Symposium where Jim Peterson made a presentation on decision support systems. This approach recommended ways to use objectives. He distinguished between fundamental objective (end) and a means objective (way). To this was added an over-arching goal defined to be a final desired condition regardless of the means to arrive at the condition. Clarke presented an over-arching goal and two fundamental objectives for the TRRP based on language of past documents. He went on to show how many of the objectives in the IAP were redundant or did not link well to activities. He showed how he modified the objectives of the IAP and was able to distill the program down to a more simple flow so that anyone could explain the program on a single page. He wanted to know if there were other objectives that still need to be included here.

Gil Saliba liked what Clarke had presented. He thought Clarke could simplify some of the objectives still more and leave out some detail. He thought the word "restore" was a catch word that goes back to a condition that cannot be achieved. Elizabeth Hadley suggested that the membership take this on as a homework assignment and give it some study for the next workshop/meeting in October.

This was the end of Tuesday agenda items. As the meeting was ahead of schedule, items scheduled for Wednesday were discussed during the remainder of Tuesday.

### **10. Discussion-Follow-up from May 15 Joint TMC/TAMWG Meeting**

Elizabeth Hadley, Ed Duggan, and Liam Gogan noted that the joint meeting was very good. There seemed to be no additional need to discuss it.

Justin Day presented on TRRP Communication Processes (Attachment 5). He showed a series of charts on the action steps and the flow of information for a number of key processes of the TRRP. He covered administrative calls, establishing the TMC agenda, the TMC meeting and delivery of minutes, establishing the TAMWG agenda, the TAMWG meeting and delivery of minutes, TAMWG recommendations to TMC, and Technical Workgroups and reports.

Rich Lorenz noted a problem in that the TAMWG must have its agenda prepared 4 weeks before its meeting but the TMC only provides their agenda to TAMWG 2 weeks before the TAMWG meeting. The TAMWG discussed a way to agendaize a placeholder for TMC issues that do not make the TAMWG agenda deadline. Joe McCarthy suggested a standing agenda item for review

for TMC issues. Joe Polos said this is a good idea and he would check with the FACA regulations.

**Gil Saliba made a motion that the TAMWG approve the TRRP Communication Processes, as presented, and that the TMC approve the processes, as well.**

**Liam Gogan seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

#### **11. Discussion/Presentation-Watershed Work including Trinity South Fork**

Ernie Clarke gave a PowerPoint presentation on watershed work. He suggested they solicit applications for watershed work through Grants.gov. This would streamline the process and would help to clarify the program. He proposed to model it following another federal grant program for watershed work that includes application information, award information, eligibility, application information, selection process, and award administration. It would also give wider exposure.

**Gil Saliba made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC support the Program's efforts to steam-line the watershed grants application program.**

**Tom Stokely seconded the motion**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Rich Lorenz abstained.**

Clarke next gave a presentation on watershed work including the South Fork Trinity River in response to a request made at the last TAMWG meeting. He listed two targets, summary of work and a map of the work. He reviewed that in 2008, the RCD was asked to coordinate watershed work. In 2012, a watershed assessment was proposed but not acted on. Clarke projected a list of watershed projects that the TRRP have contributed to, but he was not yet able to synthesize the information into the summaries as requested. He listed the six various programs and offices that have contributed information for watershed work. Most programs do not track the information in a similar way. The results so far include a GIS layer showing TRRP watershed projects since 2008. NOAA is working on a similar layer. The Resource Advisory Committee has a map for projects implemented between 2002 and 2006. There is broad support for synthesizing watershed work, but it is a bigger effort than originally realized.

This prompted a discussion of efficacy and how much work it would be to summarize and who is responsible for it. Gil Saliba asked how important it would be to spend resources on a summary of things that have already been done. It may be more important for future projects or enforcement of illegal activities. Emelia Berol thought that this effort is important. She suggested going to Redwood Sciences Lab to look for a graduate student. Liam Gogan commented it sounds like a lot of work. He thought we are losing millions of gallons of water a year due to marijuana growing operations. He asked how to get some of that water back in the creek. Who looks at the creeks and checks on this? Ed Duggan said it was important to find out what has been done in the watershed earlier to help with future planning. Brian Person said the TMC wants this information on watersheds so they can address the request for more watershed work. He expressed surprise that it is so difficult to summarize. Clarke said they have the handouts and lists of projects; it is more of a job of sorting through it to separate repetitively listed projects, but he thought it may not be as hard as originally thought.

**12. Discussion of Reduction to CVPIA Restoration Fund**

Joe Polos started this discussion by explaining that Central Valley Project (CVP) water and power users were contributing funds for TRRP restoration of between \$1 million and \$3 million annually. Tom Stokely said TRRP is not being represented at meetings about the distribution of Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) funds. He said the CVP power customers think they are paying too much into the restoration fund. He noted the CVPIA was set up to pay for impacts of construction and operation of the CVP. Recently litigation has stopped meetings for the time being. Elizabeth Hadley said the restoration fund of the CVPIA is paid by both the water users and power users. The water users' payments are capped but not the power users. With drought and lower water deliveries to the water users, they pay less and power users make up the difference. The power users feel they are paying more than what is identified in the law and have filed a claim in Federal Claims Court. She passed out a graph of the CVPIA restoration fund and the CVP repayment allocation (Attachment 7).

At this point, and before adjourning Elizabeth Hadley noted the TAMWG did have a quorum since Item 8. She asked if the TAMWG wanted to take any action on the hatchery reach restoration as presented by Andreas Krause or action on the four sites for 2016 restoration as presented by D.J. Bandrowski. These items were briefly discussed and two motions were made (see Item 7).

**13. Set Next Meeting: Date and Location, Brainstorming Possible Agenda Items**

Next meeting was tentatively scheduled for Dec 11-12. They will try to assemble the agenda items at the October meeting held with the workshop.

**Adjourn 3:40 PM**

## **LIST OF ATTACHMENTS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS**

Attachment 1: Executive Director's Report, September 9, 2014, handed out by Robin Schrock.

Attachment 2: Technical Workgroup Summary, September, 2014, handed out by Ernie Clarke.

Attachment 3: Design team memo Hatchery Reach Restoration handed out by Andreas Krause.

Attachment 4: TRRP Workshop Synopsis handed out by Ernie Clarke.

Attachment 5: TRRP Communication Processes handed out by Justin Day.

Attachment 6: Possible future implementation of the TRRP watershed program handout from Ernie Clarke.

Attachment 7: Graph of CVPIA Restoration fund payments handed out by Elizabeth Hadley.

### **Other Documents**

1. Letter to TMC from TAMWG June 16, 2014
2. Action Tracker
3. Watershed work Including South Fork Trinity River
4. Objectives Refinement—Ernie Clarke
5. Letter to TAMWG from TMC September 5, 2014
6. Letter to BLM from TMC
7. 2 D Hydrodynamic Based Logic Modeling Tool for River Restoration Decision Analysis a Quantitative approach to project Prioritization
8. 2 D HBLM Cluster
9. TRRP Logic Model Results
10. Project Management Plan CVPIA Finance Plan Draft
11. Draft Revenue Options Technical Memorandum
12. Draft Program Component Options Technical Memorandum
13. Revenue Options at 2014 Levels CVPIA

## Trinity River Adaptive Management Working Group

### AGENDA

Meeting of September 9-10, 2014

NOTE: Times Subject to Change

In-Person ONLY Location: Weaverville Fire Hall (2051 Main Street, Weaverville, CA 96093)

#### Tuesday September 9, 2014

Time	Agenda Item	Presenter
9:00 AM	Welcome, Introductions, Approve Agenda & Minutes	TAMWG
9:15 AM	Public Comment	
	<i>Note: In accordance with traditional meeting practices, TAMWG will not act on any public comment item during its current business meeting</i>	
9:30 AM	Designated Federal Officer Items (including Action Tracker Update)	Joe Polos
10:00 AM	TMC Chair Update (including Drought and Flows Update)	Brian Person
10:30 AM	Executive Director Update	Robin Schrock
11:00 AM	TRRP Workgroups Update	Ernie Clarke
<b>12:00 PM</b>	<b>Lunch</b>	
1:00 PM	Implementation Update (Including Phase II Channel Rehab, Hatchery Reach Site and SRH2D-Logic Model)	DJ Bandrowski
2:00 PM	Presentation-TMC Phase 1 Review Workshop	Robin Schrock/ Ernie Clarke
3:00 PM	Discussion-TRRP Program Goals (Objectives Refinement)	Ernie Clarke
<b>4:00 PM</b>	<b>Adjourn</b>	

#### Wednesday September 10, 2014

Time	Agenda Item	Presenter
9:00 AM	Discussion-Follow-Up From May 15 Joint TMC/TAMWG Meeting	TAMWG
10:00 AM	Discussion/Presentation-Watershed Work Including Trinity South Fork	Alex Cousins/ Ernie Clarke
11:00 PM	Discussion of Reduction to CVPIA Restoration Fund	TBD
12:00 PM	Set Next Meeting: Date & Location; Brainstorm Possible Agenda Items	TAMWG
<b>12:30 PM</b>	<b>Adjourn</b>	

*\*Discussion Postponed-Vision of a Restored River to Help Guide Restoration*