

Final Notes for Joint Meeting of the
**TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL and TRINITY ADAPTIVE
 MANAGEMENT GROUP**

Straw House, Junction City, CA
 Monday August 20, 2012

Monday, August 20, 2012; 9:00 AM

Attending TMC Members

Member	Representative Seat
Brian Person	Bureau of Reclamation, Chair
Nancy Finley	Fish and Wildlife Service, Vice-Chair
Dave Hillemeier	Yurok Tribe
Mike Orcutt	Hoopla Valley Tribe
Seth Naman ¹	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Fisheries
Bill Brock ²	Forest Service
Curtis Milliron	California Natural Resources Agency
Roger Jaegel	Trinity County
Elizabeth Hadley ³	Trinity Adaptive Management Work Group
Robin Schrock ³	Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director

1) Alternate for Ann Garrett; 2) alternate for Sharon Heywood; 3) non-voting members.

Attending TAMWG Members

Member	Representative Seat
Elizabeth Hadley	Chair, City of Redding Electric Utility Department
Gil Saliba	Vice-chair, Redwood Regional Audubon Society
Ed Duggan	Willow Cr. Comm. Srv. Dist., E. Humboldt Co., and small bus.
Kelli Gant	Trinity Lake Alliance
Richard Lorenz	Trinity County Resident
Emelia Berol	Northcoast Environmental Center
Joe McCarthy	Commercial Fishing Guide
Tom Stokely	California Water Impact Network
Paul Hauser	Trinity Public Utilities District
David Steinhauser	Whitewater Outfitters and Guides

Other attendees: D.J. Bandrowski, (Trinity River Restoration Program); George Kautsky, (Hoopla Valley Tribe); Tim Hayden (Yurok Tribe); Joe Polos and Vina Frye (Fish and Wildlife Serv.); Don Reck, (Bur. Reclamation); Wade Sinnen (Ca. Dept. Fish and Game); Teresa Connor (Ca. Dept. Water Res.); Russ Bennett (Redding Elec. Util.); Robin Cousins and Jeff Morris (Trinity RCD); Debra Chapman and Judy Pflueger (Trinity Co.); Darren Mierau (Ca. Trout); Dana Steinhauser, Arnold Whitridge, Hugh Ashley, and Robin Gregory.

1. Field Tour of the Junction City Site

The group met at the Junction City Grange Hall at the top of the bank of the Junction City rehabilitation site. The site was in the middle of the construction activities. D.J. Bandrowski of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP or Program) welcomed the

group and had everyone introduce themselves. Kent Steffens construction manager for the TRRP introduced the project site and safety issues about heavy equipment working the area. He explained how they need to work within a narrow time window but the project is still on schedule. He explained the need to control turbidity and no exceedances have occurred so far. He said that 80 to 90 thousand cubic yards of material had been excavated and all of it was being placed or disposed on site.

The group looked over the site from the top of the high bank on river right. They next went over to the upstream edge on river left and viewed the functioning split flow channel and the designed logjam at the top. D.J. Bandrowski explained how they adjusted the placement based on input of stakeholders (landowner) and that they were cognizant of the need to maintain the pool on river right. They viewed the complex side channel that had an off-channel pond that was designed to be watered by a subsurface "French drain" design. The group finished their tour at the bottom of the site, standing atop a large skeletal bar/wood structure designed to deflect flow towards the opposite bank and create cutting and an eventual meander. The revegetation crew was beginning their work and was planting willows just downstream.

Questions by the group touched on specifics of the design, what the designs were intending to accomplish, how long the logjams may last, and why they need to control turbidity. There were many side conversations among the participants ongoing simultaneously. Bandrowski introduced the Borruso's who owned land of a large portion of this site and had been cooperating on the design.

2. Field Tour of the Wheel Gulch Site

The group next toured the Wheel Gulch site. This site had been restored last year where side channels and a mid-channel island had been constructed. There were logjams at the tops of the side channels to help stabilize the islands and maintain the separation of flow. D.J. Bandrowski explained the structures at the site. He noted that this site was entirely on private lands and noted the cooperation of landowners. Joe Polos described some of the fish monitoring efforts that are just now getting underway. He noted that 20 to 30 redds were counted in this area this last fall, immediately following the completion of the project. Roger Jaegel noted the need to communicate the success of these projects and the monitoring results to the public.

Lunch at the Straw House

3. Discussion and Observations from Restoration Site Visits

Brian Person opened the indoor portion of the meeting and welcomed the group. He noted the valuable tours that were held this morning and asked the attendees about their thoughts. Emelia Berol commented that she had been to the recent Coho Confab meeting held this past weekend on the Trinity River. There she was able to float the river and that experience helped her understand today's visits to the rehabilitation sites. Dana Hord commented that, so far, in her drives along the river, she hadn't "seen very much," but this tour was very interesting and she learned a lot. Robin Schrock noted that recently the Program office has not been having high numbers of questions from the public. Junction City is very visible from the highway and may look raw. Full bathymetry has been done over the 40 miles this year and this should be valuable to assess how pool fill and scour is going. They do not

know when the TAMWG will be able to see some results from this bathymetry. Roger Jaegel said the biggest concern is pool filling and adult holding habitat; he thought that the monitoring of this will be a concern of the public. Mike Orcutt noted the change of the designation of the hydrologic year and the attendant decisions for gravel management. Orcutt thought it would be good to develop hypotheses about how well the system is working. It was noted that comparisons could be made between design reports and monitoring several years down the road.

Elizabeth Hadley introduced the purpose of today's meeting and noted that she is hoping for collaborative discussion to "come together" and work towards a good plan. She noted they will be hearing presentations from Jeff Morris regarding public outreach.

Brian Person said that if they come away with no action items but they have a better understanding of each other's concerns and ways to communicate to the public that will be a success.

4. Identify Priority Outreach Needs/ Public Relations for the Program (5 program priorities for outreach in FY 13)

Jeff Morris, contractor with the Trinity County Resource Conservation District (TRCD), has been doing public outreach for the TRRP and gave an update and his perspectives on the public. He said his typical meeting is where they attend a public meeting and take questions but do not give answers. They bring the questions back to the Program where they can be addressed. He passed out an 18-page handout of answers to the questions they received at the Willow Creek public meeting held on May 29. He noted that the types of questions can range widely indicating the range of knowledge the public has about the program is highly variable. He noted that it is "tough to get the word out"—they advertise a lot but sometimes only get 5 to 10 people to show up. He recognized that there were questions within this room about how well the Program is engaging the public. He noted basic questions such as: what are the program goals, how is the success monitored, who makes the decisions about water diversion, what is the purpose of all the willows being planted, questions about beavers and other types of fish, why there is no work down river. He said they also get questions with no relation to the Program but are related to the Trinity River such as: does Trinity County get paid for the diverted water and are they going to expand the Trinity PUD.

He asked the group to give him their respective impressions. Is there a solution to the lack of public information? Is this important to the operation of the Program?

Elizabeth Hadley said that yes to both questions, and asked about education and asked how other groups effectively get their information out in Trinity County. Robin Schrock noted the existence of three brochures that were developed by the Program in collaboration with partners. These "were everywhere" and it may not be obvious that they are products of the Program. One brochure was passed out for viewing and is available on the TRRP.net website. Morris noted that these brochures were popular at the County fair.

Mike Orcutt noted that the reason this meeting was put together was the public outcry. He suggested they consider using targeted focus groups to assess the public understanding and their questions. Tom Stokely noted the Trinity List-server is a tool. Kelli Gant said the people in her area are already busy and she suggested that Jeff Morris use existing meetings such as the Lions or real estate groups. Ed Duggan suggested that Morris not get disheartened by poor attendance at his first meetings. Duggan also noted that down-river

communities are concerned about what is happening with the restoration and he suggested that Morris do more work in Humboldt County.

Emelia Berol suggested that the Trinity High School be involved and that the youth do a video project. George Kautsky noted that prop 215 got very good attendance at public meetings and other popular issues have been roadless areas and spotted owls and jobs. Kautsky suggested that the Program needs to communicate that the river demonstrates the health of the watershed and this could be a unifying theme. Emelia Berol noted the presence of grass-roots people at the Spring Chinook Salmon Symposium and the Coho Confab and that this was a result of people getting involved when they were young. Judy Pflueger noted the value of signs that could be read from the highway.

Rich Lorenz said educating the public is not the problem but instead, the problem is the malfeasance or malcontent of individuals. Lorenz suggested the Program work with these individuals that are not happy. He cited several people that complained about some element of the Program, but reported that they did not get a response. Jeff Morris asked Lorenz what he would say to a fisherman that complained he did not catch any trout and suggested that they do not need to take responsibility in certain cases.

Roger Jaegel said the Program would be helped immensely if it communicated Program goals and objectives and if it had a monitoring program that aided an adaptive management program. Morris noted the need to address individuals and their complaints too. Seth Naman suggested they have a simple message such as an advertising slogan.

Tom Stokely said actions speak louder than words and the halting of gravel additions was good, but the delay in the Phase I review is bad. Darren Mierau agreed with Stokely that modification of gravel additions was good but information needs to be put out to put questions to rest. D.J. Bandrowski responded and provided some explanation regarding the status of the Phase I review. He noted the introduction of the Stream Project to help assess various alternatives for design and these will be passed onto to the Science Advisory Board and be integrated with the results from the Phase I review. Debra Chapman said more support would come if the Phase I review was done; she said the public wants to know if the Program is working. She suggested they get better information out. Elizabeth Hadley asked how they decide to address a public issue.

Tom Stokely referenced the memo from the SAB that said the SAB will not be addressing certain answers. Morris thought that this memo was a response to the heightened expectation that the review would be the end all and be all of analysis of the program. D.J. Bandrowski said the Phase I review will be completed in October but would be specific to the sites and a more programmatic review would come next year. Teresa Connor said they need to get information out right away about what is going to be in the Phase I review this October and what is coming later.

Ed Duggan said one "loud no" is more important than many "silent yeses." Roger Jaegel said the Program needs to assess whether that one objection is valid or whether you need more. Jaegel said there are questions that must be answered before they move on: effect on holding habitat. Mike Orcutt asked if the Phase I review will answer whether they need to introduce gravel. They need to communicate that they have a good understanding of what they are trying to do there. On the positive side, they need to look for commonalities to build cases such as with realtors, rafters, and restaurant owners. Tom Stokely asked if the Program will add gravel without the analyses. Dave Hillemeier noted that adult steelhead holding is probably not a limiting factor and the Program has multiple objectives.

5. Discussion of How TAMWG Can Work with TMC and TRRP in Addressing Pressing Community Concerns (Roles and Responsibilities defined)

Nancy Finley introduced this topic by noting that the title should be changed to how Program partners should be working together toward common goals and not individually. She noted that the way people introduced themselves today (e.g., as being employed by or representing an agency or stakeholder) was a sign that the attendees tend to look at the Program from an outside perspective. She then demonstrated this by reintroduced herself as not just employed by the Fish and Wildlife, but also as the vice chair of the TMC and the Designated Federal Officer for TAMWG. She asked that others try to define their roles, particularly as a team member of the Program.

Roger Jaegel said his role on the TMC was as a County supervisor representing 13,000 people. Jaegel further opined that all partners should consider themselves as representing the County residents and on a long-term basis. He said that the Program needs to understand how their actions affect the local people. As a TMC member he needs to attend meetings and do his homework. Gil Saliba said as a resident and a representative of a conservation group, he wants to see the program success measured as more than just fish. Ed Duggan said he has always felt that his representative group comes first. He said he thinks he has seen a recent loss of businesses both local and chains. He thought the Program should benefit fish but also benefit tourism.

Elizabeth Hadley said she wears three hats. Her personal stake is an attraction to the river. She brings two other hats to TAMWG. She was appointed to the TAMWG to represent power users and is interested in continuing water exports to the Sacramento Valley. As the Chair of TAMWG she needs to understand the consensus position of the TAMWG. Kelli Gant noted her involvement from living on the lake and she noticed the lake began behaving differently. She was surprised by what she learned at the Science Symposium. The Lake Alliance's goal is to keep as much water as possible in the lake. As a TAMWG member she began to understand the needs of the river. She balances economics above the dam, power, and the river getting the fish back. She now wants equitable management of the water.

Tom Stokely said he works with the California Water Impact Network and formerly worked with Trinity County. He wants to see the Program to be successful and efficient. He tries to keep the Program to stay out of trouble with the public. Nancy Finley asked that Stokely first try to work within the Program and she noted the trouble for the Program is not knowing what to try to fix first. Stokely said the biggest problem is the majority vote on the TMC and he will go to the public on this issue and see if the Interior Department can do this "from above." Finley said this probably has been addressed before and this would be bringing up old issues. Stokely said this time he would mount a media campaign and would go public to embarrass the Program and get results. Rich Lorenz said that this issue needs to be addressed and noted that lack of addressing issues may be why Arnold Whitridge left. He also said he was happy with Finley.

Arnold Whitridge said one component of his withdrawal from the Program was a lack of discussion and constructive engagement. He said he doesn't understand gravel but he thinks that he should understand how the agreement about gravel will be reached. He suggested a dialog as opposed to "manifestoes." Nancy Finley said there may be two competing goals about gravel additions, and they may not have decided between those two goals.

Brian Person noted that some recommendations by the TAMWG do not need to be over analyzed. There may be others where the TAMWG could provide a rational argument for a

particular action. He acknowledged that Stokely needs to do what he needs to do. But he asked Stokely to take a look at the last couple of years of TMC minutes and look where the lack of a majority hindered the process. He suggested one would find that a super majority would not have harmed the process very much. Arnold Whitridge interjected that sometimes no answers have come. Some answers have been put off on things such as watersheds.

Brian Person responded that certain issues impinge on other issues such as the Bay Delta and this importance creates greater deliberation and thus a slow decision. Nancy Finley pointed out that they are working with the IAP as a draft and it does represent the needs of the program despite that it has not been finalized. Whitridge said he believed it was decided by the regional directors to not adopt the IAP because they cannot agree to the goals. Brian Person said it was his understanding the Interior Department would not accept IAP until they finalized their consultations with the Hoopa Tribe.

Ernie Clarke suggested they develop a plan on how they can come up with a recommendation for next year. Roger Jaegel thought they need to introduce the issue of adult holding into the gravel discussion and, if they do not know the answer, they perhaps need to dredge out some holding habitat as an experiment. Tom Stokely commented on Persons comment on limitation of the super-majority. Stokely noted that perhaps certain motions simply do not get introduced when it is understood that 7 out of 8 votes are needed for passage. He thought that there would be 5 votes to include work in the South Fork. Gil Saliba thought commitment to the Program is hampered by lack of consensus on goals.

Elizabeth Hadley expressed some surprise that some of these questions still are out there. She suggested they need to collect all the questions that are still unanswered. Ed Duggan said he has never seen such diversity as that on TAMWG and simply the fact that the TAMWG can come to consensus is worthy of some sort of answer from TMC. Duggan said he agreed with Whitridge and Stokely that answers are too slow from TMC. Finley said that the answers are slow but they are forthcoming. Jeff Sutton said while he “wears the black hat” as the southern water users, he agrees with Ed Duggan that the TAMWG is diverse and when they reach consensus, they need to be recognized.

Dave Hillemeier agreed with Person that the TMC has recently taken a turn for the better and he argued for efforts to work on consensus. Kelli Gant expressed frustration that certain recommendations are rejected such as membership of Humboldt County. Person noted that the vote failed by a single vote and it “nearly passed.” Emelia Berol noted that lack of answers are not so much from the TMC but from the Solicitor’s office on interpretations or it has been decided “higher up” that the answer is “no.” She said she will never accept the negative answer on the watershed issues of the South Fork. She also asked why the Hoopa Tribe voted against Humboldt County for a seat on TMC. She suspected that Humboldt County has denied Hoopa Valley a seat on the Humboldt County business council.

Mike Orcutt said the Hoopa Valley Tribe’s goals are clear: to restore the river. The Tribe has also worked on the ROD. He said that the recognition of trust responsibility is something that is not well understood and this has created problems. In recent years, the Tribe has worked on three areas: definition of trust relationship, management of Trinity hatchery, and Humboldt County. He referred to Congressional action and funding that is ongoing. He noted that the Tribe is not at the table on the Klamath discussions but Humboldt County is.

6. 2013 Plan to Expand Outreach Efforts

Jeff Morris said they will be considering ways to help with the communication for the TAMWG. He also tracked back through the issues that he wrote down from today's meeting. Among these issues, he noted upcoming working with focus groups (Lions, Rotary, schools, at the library or Odd Fellows Hall). He noted the need to address the loud "noes." They are working on a grant to produce a video of the dynamic face of a changing river where they would mix personal interviews with a wide variety of stakeholders and mix this with technical information. Alex Cousins suggested the TRCD help more with formalizing questions from the TAMWG to the TMC. Morris said they would continue putting the public questions and answers together. They would work on brochures. They would help to define regulatory responsibilities along the river by various agencies. He noted the need to reduce the complexity of the information, setting up some communication forums, and he listed some specific concepts and questions that still need to be considered.

Dana Steinhauser suggested an updated river map. Gil Saliba suggested a simpler story. Robin Schrock acknowledged the extra work that the technical work groups along with the Program partners have done to help with outreach and answering questions. Rich Lorenz asked how they will deal with those groups with issues that have not yet been addressed. Alex Cousins said they want to know about these groups and they will take the questions and develop answers. Lorenz said these groups do not want "warm and fuzzy" answers; they have specific questions about the river.

In closing, Nancy Finley announced that the September meeting will have Solicitors from Washington and they will deal with FACA issues. She suggested that specific questions for the Solicitors should be sent to Elizabeth Hadley. They will also be working on the charter and the changes need to be suggested before the next meeting.

4:30 pm - Adjourn