

Final Minutes
TRINITY ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP
 Monday - Tuesday, December 9-10, 2013
 Indian Creek Lodge, 59741 California 299, Douglas City, CA

Monday December 9, 2013 10:00 AM

Attending Members

Member	Representative Seat:
Elizabeth Hadley	Chair, City of Redding Electric Utility Department
Tom Stokely	Vice-chair, California Water Impact Network
Ed Duggan	Willow Cr. Comm. Serv. Dist., E. Humboldt Co. and small businesses
Richard Lorenz	Trinity County Resident
Emelia Berol	Northcoast Environmental Center
David Steinhauser ¹	Six Rivers Outfitters and Guides Association
Carrie Nichols	Natural Resource Conservation Service
Travis Michel	Trinity River Fishing Guides
Gil Saliba ¹	Redwood Regional Audubon Society
Paul Hauser ¹	Trinity Public Utilities District
Jeffrey Sutton	Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority
Kelli Gant	Trinity Lake Revitalization Alliance

¹Attended via teleconference.

Members that did not attend

Member:	Representative Seat:
Joe McCarthy	Commercial Fishing Guide
Sandy Denn	Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District

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

Other attendees: Jeff Morris (outreach contractor); Rebecca Akroyd, Dave Wellock (local landowner); Andy Hill (CaDFW); Chase Lance (BLM); Kristi Wagner (TCWMA); Lucetta Nelson and Richard Tate (USFS); Darren Mierau (CalTrout); Josh Stuart and Renee DeSmet (BOR); Robin Schrock (TRRP); and D.J. Bandrowski (TRRP) presented via telephone.

Notes: Gus Kormeier (ENW).

List of Motions Made during the Meeting

Ed Duggan made a motion to approve the agenda.

Paul Hauser seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Tom Stokely made a motion that the TAMWG recommend that the TMC ask the SAB to determine whether or not there is a causal linkage between the watershed restoration throughout the entire basin below the dams and the construction and operation of the Trinity River Division (TRD).

Kelli Gant seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 7 yes votes, 2 no votes, and 1 abstention.

Tom Stokely made a motion that the TAMWG recommend to the TMC that funds be made available for noxious weed mitigation on main-stem restoration projects and that the TRRP coordinate efforts with the TCWMA.

Emelia Berol seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Paul Hauser made a motion for the TAMWG to make a recommendation to the TMC that the Flow Workgroup in their proposals for Normal, Dry, and Critically Dry Years include a reservation of water for Fall Flows to protect fish, like has been done over the last two years.

Kelli Gant seconded the motion.

Motion passed 7 yes votes and 3 no votes.

Tom Stokely made a motion to approve the minutes from the September 2013 meeting.

Ed Duggan seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Action Items Designated during the Meeting

There were no action items assigned during the meeting.

Meeting Minutes by Agenda Item

1. Welcome, Introductions, Approve Agenda and Minutes

Elizabeth Hadley, Chair of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG), opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda.

Ed Duggan made a motion to approve the agenda.

Paul Hauser seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of the minutes was moved to the end of Tuesday, to allow TAMWG members time to review their copies.

Kelli Gant made a motion to approve the minutes.

Paul Hauser seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Public Comment

Dave Wellock, landowner on the Trinity River, spoke about the damage to his irrigation system that occurred in 2011 from the gravel augmentation that was done. Mr. Wellock requested a letter be sent to his family detailing when higher flows will be made. He has spent thousands of dollars on handling the gravel augmentation that has affected his irrigation system.

At a prior meeting, experts stated that the gravel from the Lowden project got “out of hand” and he believes this work is responsible for his hardship. He is asking that projects be stopped until all the local property owner concerns are addressed.

Elizabeth Hadley accepted his comments. Rich Lorenz asked that some discussion be scheduled for the next meeting for Mr. Wellock's concerns.

3. Designated Federal Officer Items

Joe Polos, designated Federal Officer, reported on a few management items for the TAMWG. He began with the by-laws. First, Polos brought up the idea of discussing term limits in Section 400 of the by-laws. In 2001, a set of by-laws were created. In the interim, the act of rotating the chairmanship amongst the members was sidelined. Ed Duggan would like to reintroduce the idea that the chairmanship should be for a two year term with a year off, to reduce the burnout that has happened with prior chairmanship and members.

Ed Duggan made a motion to amend the by-laws Section 400 that a chairman be rotated amongst the members and limited to a two year term with at least a year off between terms.

The motion died for lack of a second.

During the discussion of the motion, Paul Hauser noted that it is hard enough to find someone willing to be the chairman, and the chair can be changed at any time. Rich Lorenz seconded Hauser's statement about burnout and filling it. Kelli Gant agreed that if someone does not want to be chairman, then they can step down.

Polos then reviewed the Action-Tracker spreadsheet. Vina Frye has been working on improving and cleaning up the information that is stored on the spreadsheet. Polos was looking for feedback on the quality and type of information shown. Kelli Gant asked about the age of information kept on the spreadsheet. There is a running total showing the origination date of information. Duggan appreciates that the information is kept up to date and the effort made in filling in the information. He supported Polos statement of posting the information on the website. Duggan then asked for a short review of current information on the spreadsheet at each meeting. Hadley stated that it is helpful to see what has been done, to avoid rehashing or repeating work already done. Gant asked for clarification about “Response Status” equals “Yes” indicates something has been completed. Duggan reiterated about this being a “public agency” and it is helpful to make it accessible to the public.

Polos noted that Bruce Bingham is the new Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) Arcata Office, Field Supervisor. Bingham was not able to be at this meeting, but he will be the future Designated Federal Officer.

Tom Stokely had submitted eight questions about information dissemination and Polos asked the TAMWG how they would like to go over the responses. Stokely wanted to review the openness of workgroup meetings to the public and the excusal of members if there is a conflict of interest. Stokely asked about the exclusion from the participation of the three local watershed restoration groups (Trinity County Resource Conservation District, [TCRCD], Hayfork Watershed Research and Training Center, and the Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program, or 5C's) in the Watershed Workgroup. Robin Schrock stated that when the technical workgroup is making recommendations to the TMC, they should exclude those that are funded through the program from the deliberations.

Stokely asked about whom within the TRRP workgroups are also receiving contracts. Schrock pointed out McBain and Trush are consultants for the Hoopa Valley Tribes and are expected to excuse themselves when funding recommendations are being considered. Schrock referred Stokely to the workgroup manual on the TRRP website.

The workgroup discussions are supposed to be kept to their agendas. Stokely asked about the email lists. Schrock stated that the coordinator is supposed to keep members informed. The DOI scientific standards are supposed to be followed for drafts to be shared amongst members. The Watershed Workgroup is working on a letter to the TMC requesting clarification on the scope of their work.

Ernie Clarke stated that Deanna Jackson's monthly coordination emails are trying to coordinate content with the calendar and can be shared publicly.

Paul Hauser asked about the eight Trinity Management Council (TMC) members being able to make technical recommendations that financially benefit themselves. He asked if this may result in their being able to make technical recommendations that lead to them receiving more funding. He also asked why the members were not included in the conflict of interest rules that are excluding the TCRCD, Watershed Center, and the 5C's program.

There was more discussion about the distinction of built in conflict of interest between TMC members and project work discussion. Rich Lorenz asked about the design of projects. Schrock responded that there are state and federal design teams as well. Lorenz and Hauser discussed the aspect of the TMC members making decisions that lead to more work for themselves. Brian Person stated that the project sites were prescribed from the Record of Decision and that there is no discretion in their design. The workgroups make the recommendations to the TMC, and do not recommend who will do the work. Person stated that the conflict of interest will be different with the tribes due to the trust relationship between the Federal government and the tribes. Paul Hauser stated, "We must recognize the inherent conflict of interest." Person stated that they have done the best they can to deal with the conflict of interest that was preordained in the program. Schrock clarified that it is not just two members, but includes the state and federal agencies themselves. Rich Lorenz asked about the "assumption" of the work going to partners from the beginning. Person stated that the partners were selected because of their expertise and the requirements the regulatory agencies themselves being involved with work on the river.

Tom Stokely recalled that there was supposed to be more independent review of proposals and a significant number of projects going out to bid. Schrock stated that 50 % of the funding goes out to private contracts.

Kelli Gant raised the issue of keeping the TRRP website up to date with information. For instance, she pointed out that the TAMWG meeting is not indicated on the TRRP website and that the public is not aware that the TAMWG is under FACA and not TRRP. Gant stated that the information needs to be available and findable for the public, to improve the perception of being

open to the public. Ed Duggan stated that it is not just Trinity County that is interested in the actions on the river, but fisherman from far outside the area.

4. Update from the Trinity Management Council Chair

Brian Person gave an update on the TMC activities. In terms of the Federal budget, there is a Continuing Resolution in place until January 15th. The provisions and effects of sequestration are still in effect. The across the board cut is at 5.22 %, there is a hint of increased cuts if the continuing resolution goes beyond January 15th.

Person discussed the idea of TMC meeting duration, given the restrictions on travel reimbursement. The group had decided that the agenda would drive the duration of the meeting. The responses to the draft agenda has formed how long meetings go.

Person noted that, at the next meeting, it will be time for elections of the TMC chairs and vice-chair. Person is happy to serve as he can be effective, but would like to see what another leader can bring. Duggan stated that he appreciates Person's responses.

Person stated that the fish population numbers have not come to the expected numbers, but they are still waiting.

A flow augmentation meeting is scheduled for December 19 in Redding by invitation. They will address the question of, "How can we most assuredly protect a fall run from disease with the most efficient use of water?" There is still litigation ongoing about flows.

The hatchery management is not in the purview of the program but closely related to the restoration issues. They are working on a memorandum of agreement between the Tribes, the hatcheries and the TRRP.

There is another lawsuit brought by the Environmental Protection Information Center (EPIC) in response to operation of the hatchery not being permitted by the Endangered Species Act (ESA). There will be a settlement meeting on December 10 in Eureka.

The Regional Director of the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) is preparing a water management plan for the entire area for the expected 2014 water year. Shasta Reservoirs is at 1.8 million acre-feet. There is still time for Shasta to refill, looking at historical records. The draft plan will be out before the next TAMWG meeting.

Regarding the long-term implementation plan, the TAMWG can go through the TMC to the Bureau of Reclamation to make recommendations. Rich Lorenz asked that the Regional plan be included on the agenda for the next meeting. Tom Stokely asked for clarification on how an organization can be invited to the December 19 discussion. Person stated that it is between litigants, tribes, USBR, and technical expertise. The draft augmentation plan will be put out and can be reviewed and responded to. Tom Stokely and Darren Mierau noted their appreciation of Person's help with augmentation flows in 2013.

Person described the reciprocal ratio of inflow versus storage between Shasta and Trinity Lakes.

Person next reviewed the recommendations made by the TAMWG. The travel reimbursement was solved through the FWS. The split on flows was very close to the TAMWG recommendation. The TMC allocated money towards the implementation of the Decision Support System (DSS) Fish Model as recommended by the TAMWG. This was strongly recommended by the Science Advisory Board (SAB). Six of eight data points for the model are already in place. The SAB is strongly urging the program to complete, fulfill, and use the DSS. Person described the intent of quantifying marginal effort to results.

5. Executive Director Update

Robin Schrock covered items in her handout (Attachment #1). Schrock stated that a group from the USGS will be coming to present on the DSS models used on other rivers like the Yakima in Washington. This is so that the technical experts can be more familiar with it. Schrock stated that December 17th there will be a public meeting about the Lower Junction City and Bucktail.

The TRRP has switched to a new DOI system which has led to some delay in paying invoices, but the blackout period is over and the issues are being resolved.

The workgroups were reorganized around the actions done: Flow, Channel Rehabilitation, Gravel Augmentation, Watershed, and Fish. The workgroups will write memoranda to each other when they have questions.

The TMC members have assigned their experts for the workgroups. Andreas Krause has left the TRRP and now works for the Yurok Tribe. There is a hiring freeze waiver for his position, so the TRRP will be able to refill it. They have been lucky in getting waivers to allow them to fill positions when people have left or moved to other jobs.

Schrock noted that Phase II strategic planning is underway and Joe Polos handed out a copy of the chart (Attachment #2). The TRRP overview video is completed, copies are available upon request. Jeff Morris stated that the video is available online from the <http://www.trinityriver.org> website. Morris also stated that there is a new Trinity River Facebook group for keeping abreast of information.

The Native Species of the Trinity River brochure was completed.

The TRRP staff met with landowners and other public stakeholders at two open house on November 5th and 6th. In Lewiston, there was broad public participation from local landowners and fishing guides.

Tom Stokely asked about the taking of public comments at a public hearing on the Draft Environmental Assessment and Initial Study after the December 17th meeting. Schrock will check with Brandt Gutermuth about the timing.

6. Design Update

D.J. Bandrowski phoned in to present the design update and implementation update for 2014 with a bulk of his time talking about Phase II Strategic planning and analysis. The Bucktail project designed by Hoopa Valley Tribe has a January 2014 completion date (80% design level).

There will be a meeting on December 17th at the Trinity County library to discuss National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements for Bucktail and Lower Junction City projects. The target is to have the documents available to the public next week before the meeting on December 17th.

The Dutch Creek project is 95 % on Forest Service property and it will go through a separate NEPA document process for 2015 implementation. The last project for design are the Hatchery Reach by the Yurok Tribe which has just started and will be for 2015 implementation. The Lime Kiln Gulch project is a potential project for 2015.

For 2014 implementation will include Lower Junction City and the Douglas City Upper Half. Bucktail Project is not included in the 2014 implementation due to lack of funding.

Stokely asked about the expected costs of Lower Junction City and Upper Douglas City. Bandrowski stated it is still unclear. Schrock reiterated that there still is not a Federal Budget.

Bandrowski moved to the process of the Phase II Strategic Planning Process. This model was developed to guide decision making, and has incorporated the Phase I review. It involves new quantitative analysis, new statistical analysis, and existing Phase I Review analysis by the Science Advisory Board (SAB).

Darren Mierau asked about strategic metrics on the flow chart. Internally, the groups are still reviewing the information. If one takes the 40 mile corridor, and splits it into 200 meter panels as done by the SAB Phase I review, and with 8 to 10 flow possibilities, the number of variables within each panel will make a complex analysis. This will combine the geometry and hydraulic variables, then the key physical metrics, key biological metrics (pre-smolt, fry rearing habitat), and key ecological/riparian metrics. The biological metrics will be quantified at different flows. Darren Mierau raised the issue that habitat area is not a biological metric and suggested following a fish growth rate or other similar metric. Bandrowski stated that the main intent is to make the approach quantifiable. He is concerned that the data used be quantifiable and repeatable. Bandrowski stated that the spawning data is spatial and already incorporated by the SAB. Mierau commented that other life stages to include would be adult holding areas, which responds to recreational users' interests. Bandrowski discussed the idea of a metric for the panel being distance from a pool greater than 8 feet deep.

Elizabeth Hadley raised concerns about over analyzing information. The hope is to view things in a big way and quantify decisions to justify actions taken. The intent to make the largest good from the actions taken.

Bandrowski stated that the plan is to have this model approved for the next implementation early in the 2014 water year.

Lunch

7. TRRP Contracting

Josh Stuart and Renee DeSmet of the BOR began their presentation on small business contracting. DeSmet has been a small business specialist for Reclamation's Small Business Program for the last five years. The program is decentralized into regions with specialists in each one. The Business and Economic Development program buys commodities and supplies, services, and construction projects. Federal business opportunities can be found on <http://www.fbo.gov>, <http://www.usbr.gov>, or <http://www.grants.gov>. Small businesses are encouraged to become participating merchants in the Department of the Interior's Nations Bank Master Card program for purchasing smaller dollar value items, to register with www.sam.gov and check the bid boards on the Reclamation's website, and reviewing www.acquisition.gov

She reviewed the goals for 2013 versus 2014. Over 65 % of contracts were awarded to small businesses. Josh Stuart interjected that it is difficult for our region to meet the goal of giving contracts to Service Disabled Veterans; the goal is 3 % and is often difficult to reach. Stuart stated that the Federal government has a vested interest in awarding projects to small businesses, given the proportion of the economy occupied by small business. Since Hocker Flat, nine years ago, Stuart has worked on helping the projects with small businesses. Many are 8A contracts which is a certification program created by the Small Business Administration (SBA). Businesses have a certain number of dollars in revenue and go through a long application process. Once certified,

the SBA becomes the prime contractor and the 8A contractor is assigned based on ability for nine years. The SBA teaches them to navigate the marketplace and to run their business.

Rich Lorenz asked about Ammon and T.L. Peterson construction contracts. The definition of a “Small Business” is flexible depending on the type of contract or how it is coded. The “sole source” awards do go through a cost analysis. Stuart stated that the results by these contractors have been very good with little variation between planned and actual cost and have had very few change orders. Women Owned Small Businesses must be owned at least 51 % by a woman. Ed Duggan and Rich Lorenz reiterated the interest in local contractors. Stuart stated that for the Douglas City project they have not received any bids from closer than Redding. DeSmet clarified a “Small Disadvantaged Business” definition in response to Duggan.

“Heavy Civil” has been the largest recipient of contract dollars. The program awards roughly \$100 million per year in contracts in the mid-Pacific Region (Northern California, Nevada, and Klamath Basin in Oregon). Highly technical areas like environmental permitting can often break the small business requirements. Renee DeSmet reviewed some of the larger projects expected to be awarded in FY2014. Trinity River Hatchery has a large project for second quarter, FY2014.

Tom Stokely asked about Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contracts. Stuart reviewed how they work. There are 10 large and 10 small contractors under IDIQ. The contracts are guaranteed amounts, with work requested as needed during the year. The contracts typically go for scientific expertise.

Kelli Gant asked about how the tribes fit into the program. DeSmet stated that they can enter the 8A program. Stuart explained that an 8A firm can change leadership or ownership and restart the 8A program after the nine year program. The 8A program is meant to graduate. Hauser asked about estimates in “sole source” contracting. Stuart explained that in a sole source, the government will do its own estimating separate from the contractor and look at the detailed books of the contractor. Profit is relative to risk to the contractor.

DeSmet explained that the Department of Interior (DOI) is deploying a “joint venture” program to make smaller businesses more competitive on larger projects. Stuart clarified that the businesses must legally bind as a “joint venture.” Hauser and Stuart got into a discussion of the government estimate in sole source contracts. Stuart stated that the largest sole source projects in the region have been for the TRRP. Brian Person asked about mechanism to look at results after a project has been rewarded, Stuart responded that there is nothing currently. There was a discussion about after review.

There was then discussion of learned skills gained by experience and quality involved with re-using the same contractors. The bonding capability is often too low from local contractors. The bonding must be 100 % of the project. The group discussed the design work and in-house versus contracted. DeSmet stated that the SBA 8A Association has a monthly meeting on the third Thursday in Sacramento, with roughly 50 companies that participate every month. There is a new chapter that started last June in Redding. Small Businesses are encouraged to get registered with the SBA.

8. Update from TRRP Workgroups

Ernie Clarke began reviewing the workgroup summary (Attachment 3). The Flow Workgroup has an hour on the agenda for Tuesday.

James Lee the lead for the Wildlife Riparian Workgroup gave an update. Mike Merigliano of the SAB spent a week with the workgroup visiting the river and reviewing work. Chris Hoag also

came out and submitted a trip report. Workgroup members completed avian and herpetological monitoring for the 2013 field season. The data should soon be available for a cottonwood recruitment survey that was performed in October. On Thursday morning, the Workgroup will be touching base to discuss environmental concerns. Kelli Gant asked for details of some successes. Lee stated that they are seeing cottonwood propagation, though less than hoped for. The herpetological review has the USGS compiling past work and this will be the foundation of a monitoring strategy. There has been some study of Foothill yellow-legged frogs and temperature effects. The five focus species the birds are showing stable populations. Stable populations are a success towards meeting mitigation requirements.

Ernie Clarke then gave an update on the Fish Workgroup. They met on November 6 and are working the fish related objectives and metrics. They will present their objectives in late January at the next inter-disciplinary team phone call. For the FY2014, the Fish Workgroup will do model support for juvenile fish production, multiyear analysis of monitoring data, report writing, and technical feedback to other workgroups. Ed Duggan asked about specific objectives for the juvenile fish production. Joe Polos talked about water management to insure strong out-migration and the effects of water-year type and management actions. The Fish Workgroup is working on determining metric results from the descending limb on the hydrograph, to quantify the effects.

Gil Saliba asked about the Phase I review and the desire to establish the DSS, and whether the Fish Workgroup was fitting into the parameters recommended. Clarke responded affirmatively and that the fish production model was the portion of the DSS that was needed to be completed. The May 22 meeting identified the key objectives, the Fish Workgroup will share what has been done at the January meeting. Ed Duggan asked about the gravel augmentation for spawning habitat and whether the “shallowing out” of the river from the gravel has an effect on the river temperature. Ernie Clarke suggested that the discussion be made during the gravel and flow portions of the meeting on Tuesday. Travis Michel was not going to be present tomorrow, but asked about the John Day Restoration project where the river is being made deeper to help keep the river cooler.

Robin Schrock gave an update on the Watershed Workgroup and began by stating that upcoming discussion would be about 2015 projects. Last year, the group decided on over \$600,000 dollars of projects that the TMC decided to fund. The Watershed Workgroup developed a memorandum to the TMC asking specific questions about their objectives and the geographic scope of future TRRP watershed projects, fine sediment reduction and fish productivity projects. The workgroup felt they were getting mixed messages. They initialized a pre-proposal format for TRRP watershed project submissions. The workgroup reached consensus and approved all the pre-proposals to go to full proposals. They asked the Trinity County RCD to provide a list of shovel-ready projects. The full proposals will be in the same format as used before. Full proposals were due by December 6 but will be extended somewhat due to power outages. Tom Stokely reviewed how the Watershed Workgroup has been underfunded based on the ROD, and whether there is a relationship between the fish production and the watersheds. Stokely reviewed the wording of the Record of Decision.

Tom Stokely made a motion that the TAMWG recommend that the TMC ask the SAB to determine whether or not there is a causal linkage between the watershed restoration throughout the entire basin below the dams and the construction and operation of the Trinity River Division (TRD).

Kelli Gant seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 7 yes votes, 2 no votes, and 1 abstention.

During the discussion of the motion, Stokely discussed the intent of sediment reduction from the tributaries. Gil Saliba asked for some discussion of fish passage and the coho. Stokely clarified that tributary restoration was not included in the Record of Decision. Stokely pointed to an example from the 5C's where they rescued 1,000 small fish from a very small ditch that was diverting water.

Stokely brought up the Central Valley Project Improvement Act Restoration Fund where water use contractors are paying towards restoration efforts and their payments go down if the fishery restoration goals are met. Hadley asked for clarification to where money would come from for doing watershed improvements. Hadley asked whether this would require a new Record of Decision. Stokely stated that the SAB would respond to an existing solicitor's opinion. Travis Michel stated that the guides were supportive of moving some focus to the watersheds, even when the Phase I review was going on. Paul Hauser raised the point of whether or not there is a less expensive way to get the results such as through watersheds. Brian Person clarified the legal aspects of the program; the CVPIA is the legal authorization of the program. Paul Hauser suggested looking at the CVPIA before directing the SAB. Stokely stated that there is a 1998 solicitor's opinion that states the money can be spent wherever a causal linkage exists. Hadley clarified that she will oppose the motion on behalf of her constituents who wish to see the projects completed on the main stem.

9. Hatchery Update and Fish Projections

Joe Polos presented on fish projections (Attachment 4). He noted that the TRRP's fundamental objective is to support the fisheries. The fall-run Chinook is the only species/race with a comprehensive harvest-management plan. The green sturgeon and Pacific lamprey are managed by the Tribes. The fall-run Chinook harvest management is based on a harvest rate to allow for a 33 % brood escapement rate with a minimum of 40,700 adults in all years. Allowable harvest is split 50/50 between tribal and non-tribal fisheries (in-river recreation, ocean recreational and commercial). There are quota and seasonal fisheries for different fisheries, with monitoring and after-the-fact analysis of harvest. The in-river run data are compiled by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CaDFW) and the Klamath River Technical Team (KRTT). There is a "Mega Table" that compiles the data of species numbers going back to 1978. The KRTT supports the monitoring with funds in part provided by the TRRP. Polos reviewed the sibling regression used to estimate the number of fish in the ocean relative to the escapement.

Kelli Gant asked about policing the different constituent's allocation uses. Polos answered that the National Marine Fisheries Service manages the ocean zone from 3 to 200 miles offshore. Oregon and California Fish and Wildlife/Game Agencies manage state waters within 3 miles of shore. CaDFW manages in-river recreational and the Hoopa Valley Tribe and Yurok Tribe also manage on their reservations. Darren Mierau (CalTrout) asked about finding a better model for fitting the data than the sibling regression. Polos responded that they have been discussing this for many years.

Polos explained that the population of fish in the ocean moves to the north or south of Eureka/Crescent City based on water temperatures. This makes it difficult to tell which fish are being caught in the ocean, making it too hard to make a mid-season adjustment to harvest amounts. There was then discussion of more immediate data; an over-harvest down river would prevent the program from knowing the success rate. Polos detailed how this year the Yurok Fishery was able to see that the return was going to either be late or lower, it ended up being lower. There is a combination of projection errors and fishery impact errors, with variable maturity and survivability rates across years combined with ocean impacts and fish variability.

The commercial fishery impact is controlled by the original projections. Rich Lorenz asked about politics involved with the harvest amounts being decided by the Department of Commerce. Polos stated that there is a “back and forth,” and an interest in utilizing all the fish they can. There are constraints made by the threatened listings on the Eel River. Polos noted that the TRRP has an escapement goal of 62,000 fish and he showed the graphs detailing the recent past. The estimates for this year seem to be off substantially. They expect to have a better view of what happened by this coming March after more data is in.

Paul Hauser asked what data points would be needed to improve the accuracy of estimates. Polos did not have an easy example but stated that there are some staff looking into some physical variables like El Nino upwelling events. Much of the effort to address the errors will come from impact on endangered species or runs. Tom Stokely asked about fishery adoption of Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) guidelines and about over-harvest penalties. Polos responded that there is typically no divergence in adopting the policies. There was some discussion about in-river over/under harvest. The group discussed whether or not to make a motion with regards to the lower return numbers.

Kelli Gant asked about the effect of increased flows from the lake on temperature. This was affirmed but it was suggested she ask Rod Wittler.

Adjourn 4 PM

Day 2 Welcome

Elizabeth Hadley opened the meeting and asked for any concerns about the days agenda. The group did a roll-call and introductions.

10. Presentation: TRRP Weed Management

Lucetta Nelson (USFS Biologist) described the Trinity County Weed Management Area (TCWMA), a group that meets quarterly to address noxious weed concerns. Bob Morris started by stating his concerns along the river instigated his reason for presenting today. Morris came across a spoils site downriver of the Indian Creek site where he found the largest concentration of Star thistle he has ever encountered.

He reviewed that TRRP and ROD documents define concern for the spread of invasive species, but in his opinion these do not appear to be followed. Morris is very supportive of the TRRP's work. He reviewed the statement of the Best Management Practices, but wanted to point out a weak point in the program. Page 133 of the Trinity River Invasive Species Study states that the TCWMA will consult with the restoration effort agencies on an annual basis, but this has not been happening over the last ten years. There are Trinity County policies stating that herbicide use is a public nuisance and requiring mechanical or manual removal of Star Thistle. Morris reviewed some of the history of transport of Knapweed and Star-Thistle in Trinity County.

Lucetta Nelson reviewed her experience working with Brandt Gutermuth of the TRRP on revegetation efforts. She asked for the support of the TRRP in reducing the spread of noxious weeds whether on Forest Service land or not. Nelson went over the definition of weeds. There are about 129 species of weeds in Trinity County. A noxious weed is a non-indigenous invasive plant that causes ecological and/or economic impacts. There are multiple federal and state acts requiring land managers to control their noxious weeds. The Forest Service has a new public manual that came out recently covering prevention, detection, management, and control. There is a high standard for the Trinity River for recreational impediments, habitat and rare plant effects,

and indirect hydrology, microclimate effects, soil alterations, increased erosion (soil morphology), and habitat loss. There is also the potential of noxious weeds to lead to endangered species listing for other native species. Nelson discussed the interaction of native versus noxious weeds from fire, heavy equipment work. Project equipment is being washed before coming on site, but she stated it is not washed again once on site, or when leaving the site. Nelson then made a call for collaboration with the TCWMA. She asked for a joint effort to hire a Student Conservation Association (SCA) crew to manually treat and monitor priority infestations at TRRP sites. This could be done through the TCRCDD where 10% of the crew's time would be dedicated to public outreach. Another option would be to use inmate crews, but this option lacks in the ability to do public outreach.

Morris asked to clarify that they are representing the TCWMA. There was discussion of the budget for revegetation and weed management. Morris talked about a test of a “natural herbicide” not being effective against blackberry infestations and other very persistent invasives found around the county. Manual treatment of weeds has been found to be the most effective way to control the species.

Elizabeth Hadley then asked for Robin Schrock to discuss her handout. Schrock had asked James Lee to put together notes of TRRP actions concerning invasive species (Attachment 5). Schrock said that this issue was a surprise. Schrock suggested that the issue be handled through the partners (USFS, TCRCDD, and BLM) or the TRRP staff before coming to the TAMWG.

Hadley asked for comments from TAMWG members. Ed Duggan raised concerns about the program being this far along and “the ball having been dropped.” Tom Stokely thanked Morris and Nelson, and stated that it is disturbing that the program has not been following its own mitigation and monitoring program. Stokely opined that this represents another cost against the marginal benefit of the 1 % to 1.6% improvement in juvenile salmonid habitat done by the program. Emelia Berol thanked the TCWMA members and asked to pursue a conversation with the responsible TRRP members. She voiced her support for the idea of having a student crew hired. Travis Michel voiced his concern about blackberry infestations, a major holdup of making it a “free and wild river.” He described the effect of the blackberries on the geomorphology, and that they should be dealt with river-wide. Brandt Gutermuth responded with his appreciation, and the comments about mitigation measures. He reviewed cleaning equipment and the intent to go back and monitor, calling for more interaction.

Morris also introduced Chase Lance (BLM Botanist) and Kristi Wagner (Chair of the TCWMA). There was some clarification of protocol and an interest in addressing the issue.

The TCWMA meets quarterly the 4th Wednesday 10 AM.

Tom Stokely made a motion that the TAMWG recommend to the TMC that funds be made available for noxious weed mitigation on main-stem restoration projects and that the TRRP coordinate efforts with the TCWMA.

Emelia Berol seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

11. 2014 Gravel Recommendation

Ernie Clarke clarified that there is currently not a recommendation for gravel augmentation for the coming year, but that Robert Franklin's report would be informational about gravel augmentation.

Robert Franklin addressed the group via the phone while Ernie Clarke managed his Powerpoint presentation. Robert Franklin, hydrologist for the Hoopa Valley Tribe, is the new Gravel Augmentation Workgroup coordinator. Franklin reviewed the process for finalizing a group recommendation. The workgroup met on December 3 and will meet again in February. Most of the work is done between meetings. At the December 3 meeting, they reviewed the historical records and studies going back to the 1970's. They reviewed studies like marking rocks and finding how far they travelled and modeling studies, and transport monitoring. The workgroup reviewed the Fish Workgroup input to see the movement of spawning as a result of the gravel augmentation. They wanted to know if there were areas in the river where the Fish Workgroup could justify prioritization for the gravel augmentation work. They reached agreement on the criteria to use for 2014 sites. They are mindful for any place putting gravel to need to evaluate the results of placement of gravel, to tailor to the adaptive management aspect of the program. The workgroup intent is to tune the gravel augmentation to the precise variables of the DSS. They are waiting for clarity on what those variables will be from the DSS.

Candidate sites for gravel augmentation for 2014 are the Weir hole, Lewiston Cableway, Upper Lowden Meadows, and Grass Valley Creek Delta. Franklin reviewed the high-level plans for these sites and some of the discussions about concerns. Franklin commented that there is more biological involvement in the Gravel Augmentation Workgroup as there is substantial input coming from the fish biologists. The workgroup will analyze each of the sites, looking at reach-specific transport. Some sediment transports readily from reach to reach, but larger sediment will move based on more localized settings. Gravel storage within a reach is variable; they are using existing studies to learn more about expected transport. The workgroup is also looking into the effect of wood on sediment transport. The workgroup, through collaboration, is expecting to have a February meeting fully informed by analysis. The workgroup has developed a lot of information about the costs, the capacity of the channel to transport sediment, and the knowledge gained from experience of past injections. The gravel recommendation will incorporate this information as they move forward. The four sites chosen will incorporate specific objectives for specific sites. Franklin said that as a group it has been difficult to get definitions of the desired outcomes. He discussed a future workgroup field visit with the Fish Workgroup.

Ernie Clarke then reviewed documents that are available to TAMWG members. There is a template that will be used for future augmentation.

Ed Duggan thanked Robert Franklin for his input. Duggan appreciates that past augmentations will be reviewed, and referenced the Trinity River Guides Association request that augmentations be stopped until the efficacy of past augmentations has been reviewed. Duggan expressed his hope that concerns about wider and shallower channels and higher temperatures be addressed. Franklin stated that this was a concern 20 years ago but that it had been addressed as insignificant in previous modeling. Emelia Berol asked about the four projected sites, where three were dependent during high flows. Franklin clarified that the Weir is only serviceable during high flow, but that the three other sites afford gravel placement during low flow which will then be transported during high flow. Tom Stokely asked about a report with a recommendation about lower gravel inputs than recommended in the Trinity ROD, Franklin affirmed that the appropriate gravel amounts understood now are lower. The numbers indicate lesser volumes, used as an average annual amount since the ROD recommendations. Stokely then asked about five-year (2015-2020) permits and whether there would be an EA. Brandt Gutermuth responded that the hope is to have it available for public review and comment in the fall of 2014.

Paul Hauser asked Franklin relative to the DSS and concerns about past augmentation having caused harm. He asked if it would be prudent to put off injections in 2014 given the knowledge

and DSS being developed. Franklin responded that he is not aware of anything substantial along the lines of gravel causing harm. There have been reports from individuals of change; this includes shallowing of areas reported by fishing guides who are very aware of water depths. Franklin refuted the statement that change is an indication of harm. Franklin stated that the intention is to create shallow, slow water. Hauser pointed out the existing EA is aged, there is a DSS being created, and a new EA being developed, the lake levels are lower. Franklin clarified that the water flow is not shifted for gravel, but rather the gravel augmentation is adapted based on the flow planned. Franklin stated that the group has been “hanging back” in gravel augmentation, yet there has been no indication of a negative biological impact. The workgroup is moving forward with developing a recommendation that will be “harmonized” with information coming available.

Ed Duggan asked about the “shallow slow water,” and concern about the temperature being raised which creates an issue for survivability of young salmon. He asked if the water was getting too warm. Ernie Clarke injected that Rod Wittler is available to address this issue. Rod Wittler then introduced himself. Wittler stated that the thermodynamics described are undetectable by those monitoring temperatures. There are other factors that have a larger effect. Wittler stated that he has not become aware of nor suspicious of gravel affecting temperatures. Wittler reviewed the model developed by Paul Zedonis in the past showing that the shading from trees along the bank was found to have a negligible effect on temperature. Color of sediment has more of an effect on temperature. Time/speed has a larger effect on temperature. Wittler clarified that he is not seeing an effect but he will keep an eye on it. Travis Michel asked about depth of cold pools. Wittler spoke about temperature targets along the river; this is a legal requirement of the Bureau of Reclamation. There was discussion of how a four- or five-year drought would test the system. Michel voiced concerns of the Guides Association about a shallow wide river and a low warm lake.

Rich Lorenz asked about compensation for local landowner impacts and referred to Mr. Wellock's concerns. Lorenz asked if the Gravel Augmentation Workgroup looks at future damage concerns. Franklin stated that they are looking to do something ecological based on criteria. To the extent that it rubs against landowner concerns, the workgroup is aware of these concerns. The workgroup is using science to determine their recommendation, and looks to the TMC to make decisions incorporating stakeholder concerns.

Emelia Berol asked about shallow slow water and if there is an intention to protect or provide for cold water habitat to mitigate a loss. Franklin clarified “shallow cold slow water.” Kelli Gant asked about a “disconnect” on speed. Schrock clarified that it is shallow slow water on the margins of the river, typically under the cover of shore plants. The intent is to create habitat on the margins of the river.

TAMWG members discussed holding off any recommendation until the March meeting, after a complete report. Hauser stated he would like to see a report indicating that there is “a good” being done.

12. 2014 Flow Alternatives

Rod Wittler of the TRRP, began by passing out a handout entitled “Daily CVP Water Supply Report” (Attachment 6a) and another entitled 2014 Trinity River Flow Scheduling” (Attachment 6). Wittler began with reviewing a monthly drought outlook from NOAA. The area is settling into a drought. He reviewed the California Drought Index showing the last 15 years. According to the NOAA three month outlook, the area has an equal chance of having less or more water. The

water year volume, or reservoir inflow forecast, which is now available daily, showed the start of this fall as a little above average but the year is currently dry and getting dryer. The Flow Workgroup decided to start the process earlier. The first meeting was done on August 30. On November 13, the proposals were submitted and analysis is being done on the proposals. On February 27, the workgroup will formulate recommendations for five water year types. The official water year will be set in April.

The workgroup has started with a portfolio, is conducting analyses, will consider them based on the water year, and then forward recommendations to the TMC in late February. Duggan asked about the possibility of a "Late Spring" and the effect on the models on the Daily Observed Volume chart. Wittler explained that every rainstorm will affect the outlook. Eric Peterson has compiled a history of the flows, which is available on the TRRP web portal.

Wittler reviewed proposals for Critical Dry year with little flow, then a Dry schedule proposal. Under the Dry proposal, idea #1 is to do a steep peak to transport. Idea #2 is to do a multi-peak hydrograph to mimic meteorological effects where warm fronts move in and out affecting the snowmelt. The idea #2 would be to test the sediment transport between the first and second peaks. Duggan pointed out that the saw-tooth appears to mimic the pre-1964 flows and might lead to more sediment transport.

The Normal water year proposal has a short, peaked, ascending limb, then a descending limb to have a positive effect on food production and rearing. The workgroup is developing an idea of a slower descending limb (< 0.1 foot/day) to encourage root growth. The short sharp peak is a result of analysis showing that the benefit of a plateau reduces as it continues. The workgroup is hoping to test the results of multi-peak hydrographs.

Wittler reviewed Wet Water Year proposals. There are a couple of proposals with differences in the timing of the peak, based on biological concerns and seed dispersal. On the Extremely Wet year, there is one proposal to move the peak earlier to get a longer descending limb. Kelli Gant asked about the case of an extremely dry reservoir where there wouldn't be adequate water in the reservoir to meet Trinity ROD flows. Wittler responded that the BOR will operate to meet their legal requirements for water delivery based on the water year. Wittler stated that the BOR cannot short the river.

Travis Michel asked about the fall flows for the Klamath. Hauser raised concerns about normal, dry, and critically dry year for water being reserved. There was discussion about how to make a recommendation to the Flow workgroup that water be reserved for the fall flows to protect the fish. Hadley clarified that motions must be directed towards the TMC.

Paul Hauser made a motion for the TAMWG to make a recommendation to the TMC that the Flow Workgroup in their proposals for Normal, Dry, and Critically Dry Years include a reservation of water for Fall Flows to protect fish, like has been done over the last two years.

Kelli Gant seconded the motion.

Motion passed 7 yes votes and 3 no votes.

Stokely supported Hauser's concern but decided to vote against a motion for fear of affecting ongoing litigation. In other discussion Berol asked for clarification of whether this water was inside the ROD flows or not. Duggan and Hauser got into a discussion about the effect of the fall flows. Hauser then stated that the current court case is to determine whether or not the ROD is a minimum or a maximum.

Wittler continued with detailing the ongoing analysis. The question for January is can we monitor it? The next meeting of the Flow Workgroup is January 14, 2014. It is expected that there will be quite a bit of give and take. The total volumes are set, but the shape will involve some customization. At the February 27 meeting, they will build a decision tree which will be handed to the TMC and TAMWG as quickly as they can. Hadley asked for Wittler's suggestion on when the TAMWG should schedule their meeting. Wittler suggested the second week of March.

Hadley asked for questions. Duggan asked to submit a minority opinion with the motion made. Tom Stokely will write and submit it to the Chair.

13. Phase 1 Review

Ernie Clarke was then invited to begin the Phase 1 Review presentation early due to scheduling. Clarke introduced the time as an opportunity for the TAMWG to ask questions. The main report was made available on November 17. Elizabeth Hadley is going to assemble the comments from members which will then be shared with the TMC. There is a deadline of January 17th to submit to the TMC. There was mention that this is TAMWG's opportunity to make recommendations. Hadley asked for comments be given to her by December 20th. Stokely asked about supporting documents. Those draft appendices are recirculated with the main report. Clarke stated that the SAB is not asking for comments on the appendices. Schrock clarified that the appendices are still drafts dealing with technical comments still coming.

14. Approval of the Minutes

Given time being available, Hadley then asked to review the minutes from the September meeting. There was discussion of the minutes.

Tom Stokely made a motion to approve the minutes from the September 2013 meeting.

Ed Duggan seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

The group then decided to meet next on March 17 and 18th. Hadley asked that members consider items for that agenda.

The group then decided to schedule their next phone conference call meeting for January 30th at 10:00 AM.

Lunch

15. Presentation: BLM Land Acquisitions

The presenters did not show and after waiting, Hadley adjourned the meeting.

Adjourn 1:15 PM

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS

Attachment 1: Executive Director's Report December 9, 2013. Robin Schrock.

Attachment 2: TRRP Phase II Strategic Planning Process Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) Prioritization.

Attachment 3: Technical Workgroup Summary December 2013. Ernie Clarke.

Attachment 4: Klamath Basin Fall-Run Chinook Salmon Stock Projection and Harvest Management December 9, 2013. Joe Polos.

Attachment 5: TRRP Invasive Plant Management Actions 2013

Attachment 6: 2014 Trinity River Flow Scheduling December 10, 2013

Attachment 6a: Daily CVP Water Supply Report December 10, 2013

Other Documents

1. TAMWG Action Tracker.
2. Questions on public information for TRRP meetings/information submitted by Tom Stokely.
3. Letter from Hoopa Tribal Council to Chief of the United States Forest Service, October 18, 2012.
4. Klamath River Basin study.
5. TAMWG attendance.
6. Letter from TAMWG to TMC, December 10, 2013.
7. Letter from TMC to TAMWG, December 2013.