

Final Minutes  
**TRINITY ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP**  
 Monday, April 1, 2013  
 Weaverville Fire Department Hall, Weaverville, CA

**Monday April 1, 2013 9:00 AM**

**Attending Members**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Representative Seat:</b>
Elizabeth Hadley	Chair, City of Redding Electric Utility Department
Gil Saliba <sup>1</sup>	Vice-chair, Redwood Regional Audubon Society
Ed Duggan	Willow Cr. Comm. Serv. Dist., E. Humboldt Co. and small businesses
Richard Lorenz	Trinity County Resident
Joe McCarthy <sup>1</sup>	Commercial Fishing Guide
Tom Stokely <sup>1</sup>	California Water Impact Network
Carrie Nichols	Natural Resource Conservation Service
David Steinhauser	Six Rivers Outfitters and Guides Association
Paul Hauser	Trinity Public Utilities District
Sandy Denn <sup>1</sup>	Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District
Jeffrey Sutton <sup>1</sup>	Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority

Tom Stokely, Gil Saliba, Joe McCarthy, Sandy Denn, and Jeffrey Sutton attended via Webex.

**Members that did not attend**

<b>Member:</b>	<b>Representative Seat:</b>
Liam Gogan	Trinity River Fishing Guides
Emelia Berol	Northcoast Environmental Center
Kelli Gant	Trinity Lake Revitalization Alliance

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

**Others Present:**

Robin Schrock, Ernie Clarke, Andreas Krause, Dave Gaeuman, Eric Peterson, James Lee, and Rod Wittler (Trinity River Restoration Program); Bill Brock (United States Forest Service); Joe Polos and Vina Frye (Fish and Wildlife Service); Wade Sinnen (California Fish and Wildlife Department); Jeff Morris (Trinity County Resource Conservation District); Tim Hayden (Yurok Tribal Fisheries).

Brian Person (Bureau of Reclamation); Seth Naman (NOAA Fisheries) attended via Webex.

**Members of the public:**

Gene Goodyear, Dave Wellock, Jim Smith, Dana Hord

Notes: Gus Kormeier (Ecosystems Northwest).

**List of Motions Made during the Meeting**

**Elizabeth Hadley made a motion to approve the agenda.**

**Rich Lorenz seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Rich Lorenz made a motion to nominate Elizabeth Hadley for President.**

**Paul Hauser seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**David Steinhauser nominated Tom Stokely for Vice Chair.**

**Paul Hauser seconded the nomination.**

**Carrie Nichols nominated Ed Duggan for Vice Chair.**

**Rich Lorenz seconded the nomination.**

**Tom Stokely was elected by a majority of votes.**

**Paul Hauser made a motion to recommend the Consensus Recommendation  
Hydrograph.**

**Tom Stokely seconded the motion.**

**Paul Hauser and Tom Stokely withdrew the motion and the second.**

**Ed Duggan made a motion to make a recommendation for priority of optimizing  
flows for rearing instead of geomorphic.**

**This motion was not seconded.**

**Elizabeth Hadley made a motion that the TMC approve the original ROD dry year  
hydrograph with descending benches.**

**Rich Lorenz seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed with six yes votes by Duggan, Hadley, Lorenz, Saliba, Stokely  
and Nichols.**

**Opposed: McCarthy and Hauser.**

**Rich Lorenz made a motion to accept Gaeuman's recommendation of 1,000 cubic yards of gravel at the Diversion Pool and none at Lowden as the TAMWG recommendation to the TMC.**

**Tom Stokely seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Elizabeth Hadley made a motion that the TAMWG recommends to the TMC that they move forward with developing a Decision Support System.**

**Stokely seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed with six yes votes by Saliba, McCarthy, Sutton, Hadley Lorenz, and Nichols**

**Opposed: Duggan**

### **List of Action Items from the Meeting**

**Robin Schrock and Joe Polos will discuss who should develop and maintain a spreadsheet matrix of TAMWG motions.**

**Robin Schrock will ask Workgroup coordinators to include one-sentence summaries of recommendations made in their bullet points for the Technical Workgroup Summary.**

**Ernie Clarke will send out the document covering the Decision Support System.**

**Wade Sinnen will notify the group about where to view the Pacific Fishery Management Council Habitat Group's Letter once it is made public.**

### **Meeting Minutes by Agenda Item**

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

Elizabeth Hadley, Chair of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG), opened the meeting and asked the members and attendees to introduce themselves.

Hadley asked for any updates or changes to the agenda.

Rich Lorenz asked for a review of the bidding process for projects. Robin Schrock reviewed that bids must go through Grants.gov and the local office does not control that. There are three kinds of contracts: open bids, competitive bids (grants.gov), and agreements with partners and collaborators. Hadley said that they were not able to get a representative from the Bureau of Reclamation at this meeting but they are working on getting someone to report on the bidding process in the next meeting.

There was a request to look at a history of past bids, which types, and how much the contracts were.

**Elizabeth Hadley made a motion to approve the agenda.**

**Rich Lorenz seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

### **Approve Minutes**

Elizabeth Hadley asked to delay approval of the minutes from the last meeting since they were not emailed out and will be made available as soon as they are available.

Hadley reviewed the effects of “sequestration” on travel and the need to combine this meeting into a single day. Ed Duggan raised an issue with a statement about “by-law changes” that was stated in the previous minutes versus the charter changes that were discussed. The notes will be corrected to charter changes.

### **2. Public Comment**

Tom Stokely stated that he is still reviewing the Bay-Delta Conservation Plan Administrative Draft Effects Analysis and the impact on the Trinity River and will be able to comment in the future.

Dave Wellock requested that time be made available during meetings for those giving presentations to make time available to respond to questions from the public. Lorenz raised the point that the prior meeting was time-constrained and the questions were directed towards TAMWG members and there was no time for questions from the public. Hadley stated she would do her best to improve on this point. D.J. Bandrowski stated that the public is always welcome to visit the TRRP offices. Mr. Wellock stated that it is better done in public instead of between two or three people.

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

Joe Polos began election of officers. Ed Duggan stated that in the past they did not rotate the chair amongst the group and he felt that they had burned out the chair on the job.

Elizabeth Hadley offered her name for the position of Chair. There were no other candidates.

**Rich Lorenz made a motion to nominate Elizabeth Hadley for Chair.**

**Paul Hauser seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

Ed Duggan and Tom Stokely entered their names for Vice Chair. They were nominated and Joe Polos passed out ballots for a vote; those on the phone emailed them to Elizabeth Hadley.

**David Steinhauser nominated Tom Stokely for Vice Chair.**

**Paul Hauser seconded the nomination.**

**Carrie Nichols nominated Ed Duggan for Vice Chair.**

**Rich Lorenz seconded the nomination.**

**Tom Stokely was elected by a majority of votes.**

Joe Polos stated that the travel restriction has not changed and that even if money is available they are restricted from over-night travel. Robin Schrock stated that they are working under budget guidelines until Congress officially passes a budget. Polos stated that he will bring up the issue in Sacramento about the need to have face-to-face meetings.

Darren Mierau, Dana Hord, and Brian Bagdanovich have not been approved as TAMWG member alternates and are currently in limbo. The TAMWG has not been able to get any information on

the reason for not being approved. Tom Stokely pointed out that Darren Mierau was to be his alternate.

Polos stated that the by-laws were last updated on May 24, 2011. Ed Duggan requested a copy of the by-laws, and was referred by Hadley to the TAMWG website.

#### **4. Update from the TMC Chair (including budget update)**

Robin Schrock passed out her report (Attachment 1). She stated the 5 % sequestration will be continued through the fiscal year plus potentially a suggested additional 1 %. This makes a \$980,000 cut to the program for this year. The TRRP has gone through items and found efficiencies through work spanning fiscal years, travel, administration costs, and vacancies, but there is still a gap that will have to be adjusted.

Appendix for Phase I review, the SAB has finished reviewing and it has gone to the partners for a 30-day period.

Rich Lorenz raised a point that the TAMWG wanted to see the SAB results. Lorenz's point was that "We want to see the results before we consider another project." Robin Schrock stated that the SAB is reviewing the designs as they are being done, but that is different from preparing peer-review documents. The SAB is also working on its own time and not receiving remuneration. Ernie Clarke stated that their biggest feedback from the SAB has been to create a decision support system. Hadley stated that they have received their appendices and she has not received any comments from TAMWG members.

D.J. Bandrowski reviewed the discussion from the last meeting. The SAB recommended developing goals, objectives, and metrics. The Design Team was given approval by the TAMWG at that meeting.

There is a deadline of Friday, April 12 for comments to be included in the environmental review. Brandt Gutermuth said he can receive email comments. A public meeting was held at Douglas City School where the designs were presented. The presentations were accompanied by a productive discussion about the design features and this worked well to inform the public present.

Robin went over items in the Executive Director's Report. For the June TMC meeting, the TRRP was asked to create a Decision Support System (DSS). The parts for the DSS were already in place except for a fish production "metric." To address this point, the Fish Workgroup attended a workshop and will adapt a Klamath model for fish production for the Trinity River. Program riparian ecologists have developed a model for a system-wide approach for revegetation work.

An evidentiary video development has begun to describe the complexity of TRRP projects to an Administrative Law Judge. It is still being produced and is getting more juvenile fish footage. The partners will review the material and it will be made available for the public.

Aerial photographs of the 40-mile section of the river were made. There was a visit and presentations made by visiting sedimentologists from Japan. A public meeting in Douglas City was held on March 20 for stakeholders and landowners.

Schrock answered questions on the bullet points covered.

Hadley asked about the past decision to develop a matrix for the TAMWG to keep track of decisions made. Jeff Morris stated that there were questions about how to fund it and the need for feedback on features. Schrock clarified that there was also an issue of scope of work in the contract between TRRP and Jeff Morris.

The request could be handled by a spreadsheet covering decisions made, plus Hadley asked for another piece that covers the discussions and issues raised. Joe Polos stated that he and Vina could look at possibly developing a spreadsheet for review of decisions made by the TAMWG.

**Action Item: Robin Schrock and Joe Polos will discuss who should develop and maintain a spreadsheet matrix of TAMWG motions.**

#### **5. Update from the TRRP Executive Director (including TRRP Outreach Program)**

Brian Person made his report by phone. He stated that the sequestration impacts are still in place and hitting the TRRP at 5.2 %. There was discussion of an additional 1 % but that has not been resolved. There was a significant increase planned over 2012, but the sequestration is limiting spending to the 2012 amounts for the first 12 months of the year based on the President's budget.

Sandy Denn asked whether those funds that are allocated are going to be appropriated. Person stated that what is still unclear is the reference whether from 2012 budget or from the planned 2013 budget. Person clarified that federally funded travel is limited to mission critical travel only. Ed Duggan asked for clarification on the effects for TAMWG members. Elizabeth Hadley clarified that TAMWG members will not be reimbursed for mileage, food, or lodging for the remainder of the fiscal year at least. Person stated that the sequestration is separated from continuing resolution.

Person stated that he has made clear to Bureau of Reclamation Director David Murillo about the regional importance of the TRRP. Ed Duggan stated that Murillo gave the impression that the Program is very important but he made the caveat that it is a very difficult budget climate.

Person added that the year started off as one of the driest January, February, and March on record. The NEPA documentation stated no significant impact from the 39,000 acre-foot flow last year, but they are waiting to see the fill of Trinity Lake before finalizing conclusions. Person apologized for not being able to be physically present.

#### **6. Update from TRRP Workgroups**

Robin Schrock began reviewing the Technical Workgroup Summaries (Attachment 2).

She noted that the Flow Workgroup report will report in the afternoon but that, last week, the rainfall-to-date was eight inches below the lowest record for the first quarter. She noted that Ernie Clarke would review the Interdisciplinary Workgroup and that D.J. Bandrowski will cover points this afternoon.

Schrock noted that the Fish Workgroup looked at prioritizing species groups and status of the Klamath model for use in the DSS. They discussed the biological implications of WY 2013 Dry Alternative 1 and Dry Alternative 2 flow schedules.

Rich Lorenz asked for a place in the document to review what decisions were made, not just that "decisions were made." Schrock responded that these are available online and will be presented later in the day as well. Lorenz asked for one sentence summaries. Joe Polos reviewed Fish Workgroup decisions regarding the Hatchery and at the mouth of Grass Valley Creek. The Fish Workgroup discussed the effects of sediment in the ponds at the bottom of Grass Valley Creek on habitat. Schrock noted that these recommendations were made from "one workgroup to another."

**Action Item: Robin Schrock will ask Workgroup coordinators to include one-sentence summaries of recommendations made in their bullet points for the Technical Workgroup Summary.**

The Physical Workgroup reported that the river is transporting significantly less sediment than predicted by the Trinity River Flow Evaluation Study. This group will review this at their next meeting and possibly update the long-term gravel augmentation recommendations.

The Wildlife and Riparian Workgroup submitted their Revegetation Compliance Strategy to California Fish and Wildlife. This document is being reformatted to incorporate more regulatory language.

The Klamath Bird Observatory has delivered three documents, including a look at correlation between bird and fish species.

The Watershed Workgroup projects have been approved by the TMC. Watershed projects are approved for a current year budget and the projects are not implemented until the following year. There are two more meetings scheduled (May 9 and September 12<sup>th</sup>). The Watershed Workgroup is working on a work flow so that projects are planned out more consistently. The watershed projects will undergo a much more rigorous process of approval similar to the rest of the TRRP.

Wade Sinnen asked about the prior discussion of merging workgroups. Schrock stated that the Decision Support System will hopefully provide a better means of addressing this issue.

## **7. 2013 Design Update**

D.J. Bandrowski began the Design Update. Joe Polos stated that the Fish Workgroup has found that juvenile rearing habitat is the limiting factor for fish production.

Bandrowski stated that the Design Team had 11 goals and objectives last year, and these will be different going forward. Bucktail Bridge design is in “full-throttle” and will be completed this June with proposed implementation in 2014 or 2015 depending on CalTrans funding. Trinity County Department of Transportation (TCDOT) will be coordinating the securing of funds through CalTrans. CH2M/Hill is working on the designs and Judy Pflueger is working on a community stakeholder meeting to review those designs.

Regarding the Indian Creek bank stabilization project, the Design Team achieved consensus for a recommendation at their last meeting. They recommended the TRRP not implement the project. The Design Team believed the project had merit but did not have enough habitat to warrant the recommend to proceed with implementation. Wade Sinnen asked for clarification. Bandrowski stated that the Design Team felt the revegetation work would not address the landowners concerns. The TMC will be discussing this decision on April 3.

Bandrowski then presented an update on the Douglas City and Lorenz Gulch projects and passed out aerial photos of the sites (Attachments 3 and 4). There was a meeting on March 20 to offer residents an opportunity to learn about the project. Bandrowski's presentation is available on the TRRP website. The NEPA and CEQA formal 30-day stakeholder input period ends on April 12<sup>th</sup>. Any comment that is received in writing will be documented in the environmental record.

As a representative of the Trinity County Historical Society, Rich Lorenz stated that the Design Team has done a good job incorporating their concerns and suggestions.

Bandrowski reviewed the schedule going forward on the Lorenz Gulch project with construction and re-vegetation work being done by December 2013. If time and funding are available, the contract allows start of some work on the Douglas City project below the 299 Bridge. Robin Schrock clarified that the contracts are awarded from the office in Sacramento.

Rich Lorenz added that Lorenz Gulch was named after his grandparents who lived there. Prior to the dam, it was common to see hundreds of spawning salmon going over the riffles there.

Bandrowski reviewed the aerial photograph overlay of the Douglas City Site (Attachment 4) and where/how the side channels and hydraulic features will be implemented. Items marked with a "C" are construction elements (roads, spoils areas, and work areas). Sinnen asked about what flow levels the side channels are designed to flow at. Bandrowski responded that the changes are incorporating large woody debris into existing structures and the forcing features are for all flow levels. The forcing feature will overtop at 4500 cfs. Lorenz asked about "buy-in" from the fishing guides. Bandrowski responded that there is still concern about it. There was more discussion that indicated that it is now the appropriate time to articulate concerns in writing. There was discussion of the goal of getting more curves in the river to create hydraulic diversity.

Ed Duggan brought forward a point that the original boulder sizes that were discussed were too large to move into the river. The solution made by the Design Team was to use groups of boulders in place of single boulders; and the fishing guides approved of that solution. Bandrowski stated that most of the boulders will be situated underneath the 350-400 cfs level with perhaps a small portion visible above the surface.

Bandrowski moved on to the Lorenz Gulch project. He stated that the gravel bar that is used for boat launches will be closed to vehicular access during and after construction. A new boat launch will be created using a higher, older road and new parking will be created. The design is trying to not compromise the recreational use while protecting the gravel bar. Bandrowski reviewed the structural features of the project. There is a side-channel that was built in the 1990's. This channel currently "activates" at 1500 cfs and it will be modified at winter base flow (300 cfs and up). This side channel was a potentially stranding area that will be opened up and incorporated. The side-channel is designed to not route sediment through it and only catch perhaps 10 % of the main flow. They have found that side channels that persist are usually in places where the entrance and exit straddle a hydraulic control feature.

Bandrowski went over the crossing point and the plan for using a tank in a dump truck with a double-lined containment system to get fuel to the equipment on the south side of the river. This plan has been through coordination with the California Fish and Wildlife Department to reduce the risk of spilling fuel in the river.

The entrance to the lower side channel (R3) is designed to over-top at 4500 cfs. This channel is naturally wet through ground infiltration. Rich Lorenz raised the issue of willows growing over the area. There was discussion of levels of plant growth and shade habitat. There has been some temperature monitoring and the infiltration level is at 4 cfs, maintaining cool water temperatures.

Bandrowski repeated the desire for input and written comments.

One last point was made about design item C-3, a "Natural Forest Health Area" to harvest trees for use in the project. Roughly 300 trees will be harvested with attached root balls. Since the area is within the environmental site limit, a timber harvest plan was not needed.

The 2014 Design schedule was then reviewed. The Design Team is working on moving the process forward to provide more time for reviewing plans.

Lower Junction City was noted for 2014 proposed implementation.

Bucktail/Dark Gulch Redesign was noted for 2014 proposed implementation. Elizabeth Hadley asked about doing a "redesign" when there are still projects to be done. Bandrowski and Schrock went over how redesign was approved and how the prior design was protested by a TMC member group. The addition of the new bridge also opens up the hydrologic potential as the old bridge was a major constriction point that limited the options for that project.

The Dutch Creek project will be designed for 2013 budget but implemented in 2015 due to the Forest Service having a longer “time window.” The Design Team is working on crafting the goals and objectives for the project and incorporating a focus on rearing habitat.

The Hatchery Gravel Augmentation/Channel Rehabilitation Project (joint effort with multiple entities) involves the Forest Service and has a proposed implementation of 2015.

Bandrowski displayed the 11 goals and objectives from 2013 and how they were equally weighted. The TMC, other workgroups, and SAB gave feedback leading to the establishment of a hierarchy of objectives. The fundamental objective is to restore the fishery to pre-dam levels. The hierarchy includes metrics and considerations and provides a more structured approach for starting the design of projects.

By the end of April they should reach a skeleton framework that will be open for meetings and comments in May. Any project over \$1M requires a value engineering review; this review will include experts from outside the TRRP and experts from within, but different areas. Friday July 12, they will have a formal presentation of the value engineering study. The review meeting will be similar to those done for the Douglas City/Lorenz Gulch projects but with fewer objectives.

## **Lunch Break**

### **8. Flow Scheduling Update**

Rod Wittler gave a presentation on the 2013 Flow Scheduling. The March 8 forecast is for a dry year. The Flow Workgroup met on March 28 for a scheduling meeting. They are expecting the water year determination on April 9th. Currently, the state is 100 % in drought. The three-month outlook has our area in below normal. Wittler went over the snow-water content, and showed how we are in the snow-melt already. Currently, Trinity Reservoir has accumulated a little over 1/2 million acre-feet or 18 1/2 inches of moisture as of last Thursday. They are expecting about 900 million acre-feet for the season. It is looking very much like a dry water year, in spite of the recent rains over the weekend. If there is less water available, more is exported to the Sacramento Valley.

The Flow Workgroup only considered dry water year proposals for release. The California Department of Water Resources is now providing a daily inflow forecast, compared to monthly in the past. Wittler went over the temperature targets. Due to the dry year, the temperature requirements are less stringent (warmer) for Weitchpec. Temperature expectations from the lake are a couple of degrees cooler because of a fairly cooler winter. Wittler went over the assumptions in the creation of synthetic weather forecasts. He then showed how the modeling is for meeting the temperature requirements at Weitchpec and Douglas City.

Wittler next went over the Consensus Hydrograph. The Flow Workgroup prioritized providing good conditions for a record number of juveniles from the 2012 strong return. The Flow Workgroup used the Record of Decision (ROD) recommended flow of 4,500 cfs. The descending limb is going to mimic the ROD recommendations. There was a discussion amongst the group regarding the hydrograph not including the boat dance and other requirements for the Klamath River. Rich Lorenz and Ed Duggan raised concern about exporting more water and making a recommendation to the Bureau of Reclamation about not exporting water. Wade Sinnen remarked that the Klamath Basin had a record return, but the Trinity only recorded a very strong but not record return.

Paul Hauser asked that a recommendation about the fall flows be made, given the economic cost of that water. Elizabeth Hadley reminded everyone that the TAMWG is not able to make

recommendations outside the TRRP and that any recommendation on this would need to be made to the TMC.

Andreas Krause then gave a presentation on an alternative consensus recommendation for the flow hydrograph. This alternative was developed after the Flow Workgroup made their recommendation. Andreas Krause and Dave Gaeuman developed their alternative because of a difference of opinion about the effects on sediment transport from reducing the ROD flow from 5 days to 2 days. It was believed before that sediment transport dropped off to zero after two days. Krause and Gaeuman feel this is not accurate and the plan to only have a two-day peak will not meet the sediment transport objectives. There is a need of further analysis.

If additional analysis is not available, they recommend adopting the ROD dry year hydrograph instead of the Consensus Hydrograph. One of the goals is to move sediments deposited at the Rush Creek delta which will require a longer peak.

Ed Duggan asked for clarification on the effect of the two-day peak at the ROD recommended 4,500 cfs. Krause clarified that the 7,500 cfs peak of two days is more effective than a five-day peak at 4,500 cfs. Gaeuman made some further comments showing transport versus the release data, there is an interpretation that fine sediment hysteresis is clockwise all the time. He showed that in some years the sediment release changes from year to year. More than half of the transport occurs after the two days, when looking at 2011 data. Gaeuman reviewed an aerial photo of the Douglas City site with shear stress coloring and how a side channel is in need of higher flows to scour it and help it function as designed.

Wade Sinnen asked for more information on the effects of failure to increase flows. Gaeuman explained that monitoring is going on in locations that do not move greatly, sediment is moving in other locations but will not create the dynamic change intended with only a two-day peak. Krause and Gaeuman are recommending reverting to the ROD hydrograph. There was a discussion of geomorphic objectives during dry years. Tim Hayden and Krause discussed decisions made on the Flow Workgroup consensus recommendation.

Krause responded that more sediment was brought in at Rush Creek, but overall data is not available. 4500 cfs will move the sand, but not much more. There was a discussion of short-term biological gains versus long-term gains from geomorphic processes.

Hadley raised the suggestion that the Flow Workgroup and Physical Workgroup meet to come to a final recommendation.

**Paul Hauser made a motion to recommend the Consensus Recommendation Hydrograph.**

**Tom Stokely seconded the motion.**

Discussion then ensued. Sinnen raised the issue that the habitat is likely saturated with juveniles. Tim Hayden stated that observation crews are seeing more fry than previous years with a record catch of over 1200 in a year. Gaeuman raised a question about the 2,000cfs bench on the rising limb of the hydrograph. Clarke recommended the Flow Workgroup have time for another meeting before asking the TAMWG for a motion. Krause suggested they change the decision made by the TAMWG to be whether fish survival or geomorphic objectives are the priority instead of approving a particular hydrograph.

Joe McCarthy asked for when the recommendation must be made by the TAMWG. Wittler responded that the earliest schedule is for release ramp up starting April 22. There was discussion about the decision timeline with up a need for more than three days prior.

Tom Stokely suggested a default motion be made with a caveat based on the possibility of a future better alternative.

Hadley asked if the TAMWG would be willing to accept the consensus recommendation from the Flow Workgroup, whatever that becomes. There was discussion and suggestion of not accepting “carte blanche” before being presented a particular plan.

**Paul Hauser and Tom Stokely withdrew the above motion and the second.**

Tim Hayden stated that at the time of the Flow Workgroup saw the consensus recommendation being a win-win based on information available. As a representative of the Yurok Tribe, Hayden felt comfortable with having the Flow Workgroup come up with a recommendation by the April 12 deadline.

**Ed Duggan made a motion to make a recommendation for priority of optimizing flows for rearing instead of geomorphic.**

**This motion was not seconded.**

Hauser and Hadley raised the issue that if the TAMWG does not make a decision, then what is the point of the TAMWG.

Tim Hayden noted that the ROD dry year hydrograph was designed to meet the marginal temperature requirements for salmonid rearing. Given more time, the Flow Workgroup can probably produce a better hydrograph. Hadley asked for why the Physical Workgroup was not included in the consensus. Wade Sinnen was asked for his interpretation and whether the alternative is better than the ROD dry year hydrograph. He made the first point that the high returns does not always make an automatic high return three years down the road. Hauser asked Sinnen and Clarke, “Is the ROD dry better than the consensus hydrograph?”

**Elizabeth Hadley made a motion that the TMC approve the original ROD dry year hydrograph with descending benches.**

**Rich Lorenz seconded the motion.**

Hadley amended the motion to include descending benches and it was seconded by Lorenz.

**The motion passed with six yes votes by Duggan, Hadley, Lorenz, Saliba, Stokely, and Nichols.**

**Opposed: McCarthy and Hauser.**

## **9. Gravel Update**

Andreas Krause reviewed the decisions made on gravel. The Physical Workgroup was unable to reach consensus on summer deposits. Dave Gaeuman suggested reducing 2,000 yards of gravel to 1,000 yards at the Lowden diversion pool for the dry year. This represented an increase over the 670 yards made in the past.

**Rich Lorenz made a motion to accept Gaeuman's recommendation of 1,000 cubic yards of gravel at the Diversion Pool and none at Lowden as the TAMWG recommendation to the TMC.**

**Tom Stokely seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

## **10. Riparian Update**

James Lee went over his background and involvement with the TRRP. Lee passed out a document reviewing revegetation performance (Attachment 7). The compliance goal is a 1:1 replacement of impacted riparian vegetation within 10 years of impact. The plants used are those that require water beyond rainfall, these are rushes, willows, cottonwoods and alders.

The general strategy has been to meet this requirement by planting half the area and promoting natural revegetation with the other half. There are roughly 850 acres in the riparian corridor. 54 acres have been affected, and only 6.3 acres have been re-vegetated. 15,000 willow stems have been planted and about 5,000 survived through 2011. This is well below the goal of a 50 % survival rate.

Lee went over using poles planted in holes versus using container stock and maintaining them over three years. The decision has been made by the contractors and they have been choosing to use the containers with maintenance.

Lee asked for questions. Gil Saliba asked about any plans to revisit areas where re-vegetation was not successful. Lee is open to suggestions of areas subject to them being large enough to warrant mobilizing the resources for the planting and the maintenance (at least 3 or 4 acres). Saliba asked about the taking out of berms and then how to prevent the re-vegetation from creating another berm. Lee stated that the flow scour and monitoring are providing the ability to keep it covered and monitored if not successful. The plantings are not going on in the vicinity of the base flow water channel. Carrie Nichols asked about methods being employed. Lee stated that it is at the contractor's discretion as long as they meet their 70 % survival target (controlling competing vegetation, irrigation, tree protector tubes, and even mulching if necessary).

Lorenz asked if the survival rate is worth the cost. Lee responded that they are still working on the ratio of planting versus maintenance but that the preference is on keeping those planted alive.

Ed Duggan gave an anecdote from his group concerning improved planting survival along Willow Creek by means of irrigation. Lee concluded by pointing out the Klamath Bird Observatory report on species abundance within the revegetation areas. The abundance reduces after the revegetation but then rebounds faster than the plants.

## **11. SAB Phase 1 Review**

Ernie Clarke gave a presentation on the draft Phase 1 Review. It is still outstanding and a date has not been made yet. There are appendices that have been completed. The Design Team is vetting designs through the SAB.

Robin Schrock addressed TAMWG's issue regarding decisions by workgroups being made before the SAB has finished their reviews. She pointed out that the SAB recommendations are being incorporated into the workgroups. Ed Duggan stated that the TAMWG's issue is that there has not been any clear report of what works and what does not and decisions are being made without knowing the results of previous actions. Clarke stated that the SAB is giving recommendations or reviews in spite of not having a completed overall report. Schrock cited the variability of each project site and that the experts in each workgroup are incorporating each other's expertise. Rich Lorenz noted the original understanding was that there was to be outside review of design work. He also noted that some members of the TAMWG had concerns about the focus on side channels versus other structures. Schrock replied that the SAB members are independent. Lorenz emphasized that the TAMWG is not criticizing the individuals of the workgroups but rather the structure of feedback to make sure that improvements are being made.

Clarke went over the Decision Support System (DSS) that Jim Peterson presented to the TMC.

**Action Item: Ernie Clarke will send out the document covering the Decision Support System.**

Clarke and Schrock presented three possible solutions for creating a Decision Support System. The TMC will go over the three alternatives on April 3. Clarke described the goals of linking project objectives towards overall objectives. They made a literature review from suggestions made by the SAB and other adaptive management experts.

Many of the literature articles found during the review of DSS examples had only been proposed or were of smaller size or reduced complexity. Clarke displayed a decision support flow model. He then reviewed bullet points on case studies, the first being Horseshoe Crab/Red Knot Management. He cited the Tallapoosa River Flow Management as a contrasting example where a single group is responsible for running the decisions for flow. Australian Wetland Flow Management took eight months to develop a prototype. It focused on long term decisions and did not involve the public in their decisions. The resources were not allocated to management of the DSS.

The lessons learned from the DSS literature review was to engage stakeholders, keep a simple design, and to scope the issue to be addressed. The time involved took 30 days to 5 years with most of the time spent coordinating meetings, performing monitoring, and planning for maintaining it. It was also noted it helped to have a strong leader, and a governance structure.

Clarke reviewed a decision tree showing the next steps after the TMC decision of whether to continue or not with developing a DSS. Bill Brock asked for clarification about the Yes/No decision tree. A "No" would lead to no more work on a DSS.

A basic prototype DSS was estimated to take two years and roughly \$0.5 M. There are basic steps that can be done in that two-year period that can help with decisions being made.

There was a discussion of how the TMC will review this information on April 3. Ed Duggan raised concerns about there being enough information to decide whether or not to continue developing a DSS. Schrock clarified that Clarke's presentation is a high level overview as a scoping exercise in response to a motion by the TMC. Clarke stated that a DSS was the single largest recommendation made by the SAB.

**Elizabeth Hadley made a motion that the TAMWG recommends to the TMC that they move forward with developing a Decision Support System.**

**Stokely seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed with six yes votes by Saliba, McCarthy, Sutton, Hadley Lorenz, and Nichols**

**Opposed: Duggan**

## **12. Set Next Meeting Date and Location and Brainstorm Possible Agenda Items**

Elizabeth Hadley noted that first they needed to schedule an administrative conference call to update and finalize the agenda. The group decided to hold a conference call on the morning of May 17. The group then decided on June 25<sup>th</sup> for their next meeting.

Hadley asked for suggestions on dealing with the travel restrictions. The group valued having Webex/phone conference, but saw it as less than optimal.

The agenda items listed for the next meeting were: budget, process for contractors, and ethics coordination (by Webex).

Rich Lorenz asked for a 10-minute presentation on actual fish run production versus estimates. Wade Sinnen wanted to give an update to members after the close of this meeting.

Discussion can be made but no decision making will be made during teleconference. This can include preparing members for the meeting.

Robin Schrock made a clarification that TAMWG recommendations need to be made clear and made concisely as a group.

### **13. Update on Hatchery Review**

Wade Sinnen gave an update on the Hatchery review. There is a letter of intent to sue calling for the development of Hatchery Management plans throughout the state. The process has begun for prioritizing recommendations and implementation.

Last year was a record for the Klamath Basin with the highest level of harvest quota ever. The tribes got 120,000 and the sportsman 67,000. The upcoming year looks good with the sportsman getting 39,000 fish. Only 13,000 fish were harvested by the sportsmen. Bag limits will be a little less liberal than last year, bag limit suggestions can be sent to Sinnen. The regulation meeting is on April 16<sup>th</sup>.

There is a memo from the Pacific River Management Council endorsing the fall flows. Fish in the ocean are expected to be one half of last year's numbers.

**Action Item: Wade Sinnen will notify the group about where to view the Pacific Fishery Management Council Habitat Group's Letter once it is made public.**

**Adjourn 4:17 PM**

**LIST OF ATTACHMENTS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS**

Attachment 1: Executive Director's Report April 1, 2013. Passed out by Robin Schrock.

Attachment 2: Technical Workgroup Summaries March 2013. Passed out by Robin Schrock.

Attachment 3: TRRP Douglas City "Proposed Channel Rehabilitation Site Environmental Assessment/Initial Study" 2012 Imagery. Passed out by D.J. Bandrowski.

Attachment 4: TRRP Lorenz Gulch 2012 Imagery. Passed out by D.J. Bandrowski.

Attachment 5: Comments on Proposed WY13 Flow Release Schedule. Passed out by Andreas Krause, Dave Gaeuman, April 1, 2013

Attachment 6: Rationale for implementing the ROD Recommended Geomorphic Flows in 2013. Passed out by Dave Gaeuman, Andreas Krause. April 1, 2013

Attachment 7: Revegetation Performance. James Lee

Other Documents:

1: 2013 Trinity River Flow Release Scheduling.

2: Letter to TMC from TAMWG January 14, 2013.

3: Letter to TAMWG from TMC January 30, 2013.