

**Final Minutes**  
**TRINITY ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP**  
 Friday, December 9, 2011  
 Trinity County Library, Weaverville, CA

**Start of meeting: 9:36 AM**

Attending members:

Member:	Representative Seat:
Arnold Whitridge	Trinity County Resident
Ed Duggan	Willow Creek Community Services District
Gil Saliba	Redwood Regional Audubon Society
Kelli Gant	Trinity Lake Alliance
Dana Hord	Big Bar Community Development Group
Richard Lorenz	Trinity County Resident
Pat Frost	Trinity County Resource Conservation District
Elizabeth Hadley	City of Redding Electric Utility Department
David Steinhauser	Six Rivers Outfitters and Guides Association
Emelia Berol	Northcoast Environmental Center
Joe McCarthy	Commercial Fishing Guide
Sandy Denn	Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District

Members that did not attend:

Member:	Representative Seat:
Jeffrey Sutton	Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority

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

**1. Welcome, Introductions, Adopt Agenda and Approval of April Minutes**

Chair Arnold Whitridge called the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG) meeting to order and noted that Brian Person may not be able to attend. The agenda appeared to be acceptable.

The meeting minutes from September were next addressed; Ed Duggan made a correction regarding the maximum flows (peaking at 12,400 cfs).

**Ed Duggan made a motion to accept the September 2011 minutes.**

**Joe McCarthy seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

## **2. Open Forum and Public Comment**

Tom Stokely of California Water Impact Network (CWIN) commented that they wish to help the program and do not wish to create problems for it. He asked that the TAMWG take a position on their request—that the program take a break from performing Phase II projects until the Programmatic review was completed.

Sandy Denn noted that the ROD stated that the Program “may” take a break for a review and did not say “shall” take a break. Stokely thanked Denn for her clarification.

Travis Michel of the Trinity River Guides Association also stated that they are, like CWIN, not “anti-restoration but supportive.” But he re-emphasized their position in favor of taking a break. He also asked for more public outreach. Whitridge noted that the new Outreach Coordinator is going to make a presentation.

Ed Duggan, speaking as a member of the Guides Association, noted that at their last Guides meeting a citizen complained about “denuding” the trees along the channel. Duggan thought this could be addressed via outreach. Duggan thought it should be put on the record that some of the public is getting “pretty upset” about the Program.

Dave Hillemeier of Yurok noted that the Trinity Management Council (TMC) and the TAMWG had a productive joint meeting. He thought that the public perception is driven by some misinformation and that the two groups should have another joint meeting. Areas of controversy should be worked out, especially given the funding. He hoped they could sort their issues out, not in the media, but in joint meetings and recommended the TMC and TAMWG look to hold another such joint meeting early next year.

Rich Lorenz noted that the failure of the TMC to respond to the guide’s letter is the reason that these stories are coming out in the media. He asked that Hillemeier take that message to the TMC. It was noted that there may have been some misunderstanding of whether the TAMWG or the TMC was the appropriate group to respond to the guides’ letter. Hillemeier noted that though a letter has not been written, there has been some positive communication between the Program and the guides. Whitridge agreed and thought that both are needed. He noted that some agreements made on field trips do not “get translated” into the media stories. Robin Schrock asked that the same standards be used in responding to written requests. She noted difficulty in getting a copy of the letter and once it was obtained, they are intending to respond properly. She asked that the issue be passed on formally in writing. Travis Michel noted that the previous Executive Director was handed a letter during a meeting with the Guides Association. He stated the Guides Association did not see enough response and that prompted the second letter and stories in the media.

Wade Sinnen offered to make a preliminary presentation on good news on the fall Chinook runs in the Trinity and Klamath Rivers. Sinnen reported that the Shasta, Scott, Bogus, and Iron Gate are all reporting large increases in fall Chinook. The Shasta River has increased 10-fold from 1,100 last year to 11,000 as of October 19. Many of the other sites have doubled. The Trinity River is showing increases too, and there appears to be a good percentage of 2-year-old fish. This bodes well for good returns of 3-year-olds next year. He said the Klamath River should not be a constraining factor for ocean fisheries. We should see an increase in fishing opportunities in Tribal, sport and ocean. Things are good and next year should be good.

Ed Duggan noted that the North Coast is catching larger fish this year, many over 40 pounds. This year is the best catch of these large fish he has ever seen in his 20 years of experience of fishing.

### **3. TMC Chair Report**

Brian Person could not attend this meeting, but Whitridge commented that Person had a written a response letter to the last TAMWG letter regarding 1) the 20:30:50 budget breakdown, 2) the recommendation on public outreach, and 3) the consideration of 100 % marking of hatchery fish. Whitridge read Person's letter out loud. In the letter, Person acknowledged the TAMWG requests. He next noted that the budget ratio has varied over the years and the 50 % allocation to in-river projects is rarely exceeded. He commented on the issues surrounding whether the Program should expended funds on watershed. He thanked TAMWG for positive comments on public outreach and stated their support for this. Regarding hatchery marking, he noted the Hatchery review is ongoing. A letter to the Guides has been drafted and is under review.

### **4. Review of Phase 1 Channel Rehabilitation Projects**

DJ Bandrowski, Channel Rehabilitation Branch Chief with the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) introduced this topic by noting that he wanted to explain how they arrived at their position today and that he did not want to debate the pros and cons of specific design projects. He first noted that, over the past year, they have engaged the Guides and he has appreciated their input, and they should have engaged them earlier. During his presentation, he referred to handouts and projected slides that described the process of the review of the Phase 1 channel projects. He referred to his Update on the Implementation Program (Attachment 1a). He described the Science Advisory Board (SAB) as a 5-scientist panel that is currently engaged in the Phase 1 review. He next referred to the SAB's Scope of Work to guide their review dated November 4, 2011 (Attachment 1b). He projected a flowchart describing the steps for the Phase 1 review, noting that the review should be finalized by July, 2012.

Robin Schrock noted that the SAB is being very engaged and is accepting input from partners and will be considering the history of the Program. Kelli Gant expressed the need for the review to be performed as quickly as possible (by March), given the public perceptions and concerns about future funding. Bandrowski agreed but noted that the SAB thinks they should take more than one year to do this properly. Schrock noted the importance of performing the review correctly but that they are pressing for an earliest review as possible.

Pat Frost asked how the review may guide new design work. Schrock said this may be addressed later today. Bandrowski projected an example informational "summary fact sheet" for Hocker Flat that the SAB will be reviewing to see how designs have been implemented (Attachment 1c).

Ed Duggan noted he was one of the original TAMWG members and has been here 10 years. He said the SAB was recognized as very important five years ago. Three years ago it was requested that the SAB was needed to review. He had expected a report by the start of this coming year and now he hears that it will not be out until July and that this is too late. He noted that the public is getting tired of waiting and may begin to ask that funding be stopped. Ernie Clarke noted that the Programmatic review is what Duggan is referring to. This review is a Phase 1 channel work review. Whitridge noted that regardless, that these reviews are being perceived as occurring late. Alex Cousins noted that doing things quick is good but it must be done well. Bandrowski said that the review will be looking at the technical issues of both physical and

biological responses. Robin Schrock defended the timeline and the need to be both responsive and professional. Elizabeth Hadley noted that she is glad that the review is now underway. She said the July date appears to be an acceptable compromise. She recommended that this timeline is presented to the public, and that something is put out by March as a preliminary assessment. Roger Jaegel noted that they should not be discussing about eliminating funding or to take a break, but that they have very important projects such as watershed and temperature assessments. Emelia Berol cautioned that rushed reports have actually resulted in lawsuits and that the SAB should not be rushed. She noted the reason for the Program is not so much for the fish but for the people of the region which were suffering. She stressed that we can't just tell the people to wait. If anyone needs to give, it is this "rush to implement." She noted that she had serious doubts two years ago about the concept of proceeding with Phase 2 along with Phase 1 review. She cited unresolved issues such as temperature, hatchery that justify continued funding.

Bandrowski continued with his presentation. He explained that they have substantially scaled back their planned projects and have focused on two projects that have passed review from Program partners, land owners, and value-engineering teams. Adjustments have been made to incorporate these reviews. He showed an example of adjustment via a map of where designs had been made, but the design review recommended removing all designs along an entire bank. They are modifying the design. He showed how they have changed design concepts for side channels based on reviews. As an example of their review efforts, Bandrowski passed out and projected a summary sheet of discussions that occurred during a river float with the river guides (Attachment 1d).

Travis Michel said that the guides are now backing these new designs. Sand Denn described how mistakes were made by placing too large of boulders in the Sacramento River. As these did move, they became a hazard to navigation. She admitted she does not understand all the nuances of gravel movement but agreed with Hadley that the projects should not be stopped. Rich Lorenz noted the tough spot of the TAMWG to address the guides and CWIN's concerns but that he still supports construction at these two sites. However, he recommended no new gravel augmentation, and no side channels. Gil Saliba noted that it appeared that Lorenz's concerns are being addressed by the staff and that he also supports continuing work. Lorenz said he was bothered by the construction of what appeared to be "World War I wood bunkers." Travis Michel said they are not against gravel being added to the river, but the guides think that the river is adding enough on its own and also adding enough wood. Bandrowski said they brought in consultants that produced a wood budget report and this is on the TRRP website. This report noted that the amount of wood added by the TRRP is small compared to natural additions.

**Elizabeth Hadley made a motion that the TAMWG recommend to the TMC that they direct the TRRP to proceed with the 2012 projects (Lower Steiner Flat, Upper Junction City and Indian Creek) and Phase 1 review as planned, while publicly providing the timeline for the review now, a status update by March, and to be completed in July. This does not include a decision on gravel injections as the TAMWG asks that the results of the gravel analysis be brought before them before any gravel injections are performed.**

**Sandy Denn seconded the motion.**

**The motion failed on five for votes, six opposing votes, and one abstained.**

Before the vote on the above motion, there was considerable discussion. During the discussion the motion was slightly modified and several members declared whether or not they could support the motion. Emelia Berol stated her objection to the motion by stating the Phase 1 review must be completed first. Joe McCarthy and Sandy Denn was pointed out that if the projects do not go forward the money would not be spent and that this could result in Program funds being withdrawn. Tom Stokely said CWIN would not accept this and they will be forced to continue their adversarial position. He asked for independent scientific review. There was discussion of what other projects could be funded instead of the controversial channel projects. Schrock said that the temperature project model is going forward. Roger Jaegel mentioned that temperature modeling is needed. He noted that gravel is not a major cost of these projects and it may be appropriate to not do this. Ed Duggan noted the importance of increasing funding in watersheds since they are so important to coho and steelhead. He suggested they use the gravel injection funding and keep the watershed funding at \$1 million. Darren Mierau of Caltrout said they will stand with CWIN and the guides on their position. He asked why the two projects could not be “stripped back” to just removal of berms and provide access for flows. Kelli Gant said she would not support the projects and they should spend the money elsewhere. Lorenz said he could support the projects as Caltrout suggested and follow the ROD. Bandrowski said if the projects are changed too much they will not achieve their goals and he could not guarantee the suggested changes can be done. Gil Saliba noted that the TAMWG is not supposed to design for the design team and stated he supported the motion. He noted that he was disturbed over the rigid opposition. Whitridge asked whether the TAMWG should obstruct the Program or if they can still go forward. He stated his support for the motion.

After the motion failed, Lorenz suggested they may be able to form a new motion that 1) scales the projects back still further, 2) they hold off on gravel injections and 3) hold off on side channels. He does not want to jeopardize the Program and wanted everyone to think about it over lunch.

### **Break for lunch.**

Upon return from lunch, there was discussion about gravel injections and whether the TAMWG does or does not support performance measures. Graham Matthews is collecting the data as part of a sediment study that will be analyzed by program scientists.

Rich Lorenz made a slightly modified motion to change Elizabeth Hadley’s failed motion by adding language that the design team meets with concerned stakeholders to develop a revised design for the 2012 projects. Elizabeth Hadley said that there has been much effort, time and money spent on the current design and the rescaling back. These 2012 projects were originally designed as part of Phase 1. She did not want to get too involved in the design aspects. Can we reword to meet and confer and address any lack of information? Lorenz did not mind rewording of his motion; he wanted to move forward and not jeopardize funding and still keep the public satisfied.

**Rich Lorenz made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC to direct the TRRP to proceed with the 2012 projects (Lower Steiner Flat, Upper Junction City and Indian Creek) after consultation with concerned stakeholders. The TRRP should continue with Phase 1 review as planned, while publicly providing the timeline for the review now, a status update by March, and to be completed in July. This does not include a decision on gravel injections as the TAMWG asks that the**

**results of the gravel analysis be brought before them before any gravel injections are performed.**

**Elizabeth Hadley seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

Discussion included the notion that this motion does not invoke re-design but consultation and that it does not stipulate agreement must be reached.

## **5. Large Woody Debris & Public Safety**

David Steinhauser introduced this item by commenting on the increase in emphasis of woody debris in the Program. He noted the value of woody debris in side channels and its value in creating complexity. He asked that safety issues be addressed too. He noted that 2011 higher flows moved a lot woody debris and there were two near-drownings. There was a recent drowning on the South Fork caused by woody debris. People have been directed to contact the Forest Service if they observe a wood hazard because the Program cannot remove wood. He expressed his curiosity that the Program has not addressed this directly and has not been given attention in environmental reviews. He asked if the Program considers artificially added wood a “natural occurrence” and therefore is not considered in environmental review. If the Program is introducing more wood into the river, they are increasing risk. Steinhauser suggested that perhaps the Program could coordinate with other agencies to address the dangers via education to the public, better training for rescue crews, moving hazardous wood to more safe positions, alter designs to avoid creating hazardous log jams, and give consideration to the loading of wood into the Pigeon Point recreation area.

Patrick Higgins, consulting fisheries biologist, commented on the research of large woody debris and noted that much wood is introduced via upslope debris torrents and not from riparian zones. Naturally large log jams do form, but if large jams are forming in boating reach, this calls for attention. Arnold Whitridge asked if the Program should accept responsibility for liability for wood. Sandy Denn said the lack of direction about the dangers of wood within the written guidance may be an attempt to avoid liability. Robin Schrock said that the TRRP is very proactive regarding this issue. They coordinate with the BLM, and RCD to remove wood, but the TRRP has to work within their legal framework. The wood is designed to create geomorphic function and fish habitat. DJ Bandrowski acknowledged that wood, especially at high flow, is hazardous and this is recognized by the Program. They try to address this by signing at boat launches. They have had opinions and guidance from their solicitor, who has advised them to place signage but that the Program does not have the authority to remove wood.

There was discussion of the need to address dangers to the public and also the liability of the Program. Alex Cousin thought it would not be difficult or costly to remove wood that is a clear danger. He agreed that the RCD could start some informal discussion about how this may be addressed.

**David Steinhauser made a motion the TAMWG recommend the TMC to request the Interior Solicitor provide written opinion about large woody debris and public safety.**

**Emelia Berol seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**6. Science Program Updates**

Ernie Clarke, Science Coordinator for the TRRP, provided updates on both the Science Program and on the Big Questions for the TRRP. For FY2012 tasks, Clarke noted an adult fish review underway and the sampling design workshop. He noted the work on development of Performance Measures to assess restoration success and provided a handout on this (Attachment 3a) and a handout on an example assessment on salmon rearing habitat (Attachment 3b). He reported that the FY2013 workplans are being prepared and that most workplans will be reviewed. Two recently reviewed reports are in revision and should be ready for release soon. Two other reports are in process. He noted that the development of a database and standardized methods to submit data to the program are underway. The Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) has developed standardized methods for tracking their work and decisions. He said these actions will facilitate integration and information sharing. He mentioned Lewiston appraisal study is underway to evaluate cold water transmission through Lewiston Reservoir (Attachment 3c).

**7. “Big Questions” for TRRP guidance and assessment**

Clarke explained the idea of Big Questions came from suggestions from the Platte River program (Attachment 4). The IDT is considering edits and appropriateness of the questions. He noted that Question 5 considering out of basin factors had some concerns, the question of adaptive management may not be needed as it is obviously integral to the Program. Elizabeth Hadley thought the question were straightforward enough. She agreed that out of basin issues should be considered but that they may be beyond the control of the Program. She also thought Question 7 should be focused on changes to the hydrograph, and not volume. Sandy Denn asked if any actions of the Program are exposing them to liability.

**8. Watershed projects in 2012; Watershed Assessment**

Robin Schrock, Executive Director of the TRRP addressed this issue and her Executive Director's report together as a combined presentation. She noted that half the \$500,000 in funding for watershed projects has been allocated. The other half is dedicated towards a watershed assessment (Attachment 5b). It was thought that the first step is to perform a one-year project that will develop a geo-spatial database to capture a description and show existing projects. This was done in the Columbia Basin and it will help to formulate collaborative partnerships and more integrative projects. It has undergone several versions and its current form is considering the 40-mile restoration section with an option to include a greater geographic area. She noted that the funding does not yet exist. It was hoped that Congress may come forward with funding. She said this discussion of funding helped to form an initiative and the possibility of extramural funding.

**9. Executive Director's report**

Schrock passed out a copy of the Executive Director's report (Attachment 5a). She noted that there is increased emphasis on integration of the implementation with science portions of the Program and there is an increased emphasis on public outreach. She mentioned that the CWIN and Guide's letter has been elevated to the Congressional level and the TMC chair will be responding to it. There is a possibility of full-year continuing resolution and possible budget cuts. She sees her job to look beyond the regular program for funding as this has worked well

for other programs. She publicly praised Ernie Clarke and DJ Bandrowski for moving the Program forward in organization and planning and noted that they reported on the respective Implementation and Science programs.

Jeff Morris, the newly contracted Outreach Coordinator, presented his plans for education and communication for the TRRP. He gave his background in public relations in non-profit boards. He noted the complexity of the Program and how he needs to explain things to the public. He noted the woody debris meeting in October and lessons learned (too long of a meeting). He praised the staff of the TRRP. He has meet with the IDT team. He commented on comments received at his most recent public outreach meeting. He said the comments were wide ranging from opening the river to year round fishing to keeping sediment off riverside residents lawns. He said he is assembling a sense of their positions. Ed Duggan thought the public wanted specific answers to questions, but for now the TRRP staff does not attend. Most questions were written down so that the answer could be properly addressed.

**Rich Lorenz made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC and the Executive Director respond timely to written communications from stakeholders and from the public and that they, at a minimum, provide that entity with a timeline of the expected response.**

**Emelia Berol seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

#### **10. Designated Federal Officer Topics**

Randy Brown thanked everyone for submitting their information regarding membership renewal. The request has been passed on to Washington and to the Regional Office. It has been three weeks and they are still waiting for a response. It was noted the TAMWG memberships expire on January 12, 2012.

Emelia Berol asked for more guidance on procedures for FACA committee members. She suggested they have a general guidance presentation.

Brown next noted the departures of two long-term TAMWG members. He thanked Pat Frost and Arnold Whitridge for their commitment and that he was sorry to see them leave the TAMWG. They are both leaving the TAMWG and this was their last meeting.

Following Brown's comments, Chairman Whitridge adjourned the meeting.

**Meeting adjourned.**

## **LIST OF MOTIONS**

**Ed Duggan made a motion to accept the September 2011 minutes.**

**Joe McCarthy seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Elizabeth Hadley made a motion that the TAMWG recommend to the TMC that they direct the TRRP to proceed with the 2012 projects (Lower Steiner Flat, Upper Junction City and Indian Creek) and Phase I review as planned, while publicly providing the timeline for the review now, a status update by March, and to be completed in July. This does not include a decision on gravel injections as the TAMWG asks that the results of the gravel analysis be brought before them before any gravel injections are performed.**

**Sandy Denn seconded the motion.**

**The motion failed on five for votes, six opposing votes, and one abstained.**

**Rich Lorenz made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC to direct the TRRP to proceed with the 2012 projects (Lower Steiner Flat, Upper Junction City and Indian Creek) after consultation with concerned stakeholders. The TRRP should continue with Phase I review as planned, while publicly providing the timeline for the review now, a status update by March, and to be completed in July. This does not include a decision on gravel injections as the TAMWG asks that the results of the gravel analysis be brought before them before any gravel injections are performed.**

**Elizabeth Hadley seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**David Steinhauser made a motion the TAMWG recommend the TMC to request the Interior Solicitor provide written opinion about large woody debris and public safety.**

**Emelia Berol seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Rich Lorenz made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC and the Executive Director respond timely to written communications from stakeholders and from the public and that they, at a minimum, provide that entity with a timeline of the expected response.**

**Emelia Berol seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**LIST OF ATTACHMENTS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS**

Attachment 1: WY2011 TMC response to TAMWG letter of September 20, 2011. December 7, 2011. Handed out by Arnold Whitridge.

Attachment 2a: TRRP Implementation Update. December 9, 2011. Handed out by D.J. Bandrowski.

Attachment 2b: Scope of Work and Evaluation Criteria for the Trinity River Restoration Program's Phase I Channel Rehabilitation Project Review. November 4, 2011 Draft. Handed out by D.J. Bandrowski.

Attachment 2c: Phase 1—Design Summary Fact Sheet for Hocker Flat. Handed out by D.J. Bandrowski.

Attachment 2d: Trinity River Guides Association Float Trip with TRRP Program Partners. August 19, 2011. Handed out by D.J. Bandrowski.

Attachment 3a: Performance Measures. Handed out by Ernie Clarke.

Attachment 3b: TRRP Performance Measure: Chinook and coho salmon rearing habitat. Handed out by Ernie Clarke.

Attachment 3c. Scope of Work: Appraisal Study Lewiston Reservoir Cold Water Transmission. Handed out by Ernie Clarke.

Attachment 4: Trinity River Restoration Program—the Big Questions. Handed out by Ernie Clarke.

Attachment 5: Trinity River Basin Watershed Assessment—Draft Scope and Discussion. Handed out by Robin Schrock.

Attachment 6: Executive Director's Report. December 9, 2011. Handed out by Robin Schrock.

**Other Documents:**

1. Letter from TAMWG Chairman Arnold Whitridge to TMC Chairman Brian Person Sept 20, 2011.
2. Trinity River Adult Fish Holding Habitat Assessment.
3. History of Interactions with the Trinity River Guide Association.
4. Legislative and Administrative Linkages between Restoration of the Trinity River's Fish and Wildlife Resources and Watershed Restoration in the Trinity Basin
5. Adult Fish Holding Habitat Assessment – Data Sheet
6. Addendum to Public Safety and Large Woody Debris
7. Comparing Two Methods Used to Mark Juvenile Chinook Salmon: Automated and Manual Marking