

Draft 2.1 Minutes
TRINITY ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP
 Monday and Tuesday, June 9-10, 2014
 Weaverville Fire District, 125 Bremer St, Weaverville, CA

Monday June 9, 2014 9:00 AM

Attending Members

Member	Representative Seat:
Elizabeth Hadley ¹	Chair, City of Redding Electric Utility Department
Tom Stokely	Vice-chair, California Water Impact Network
Gil Saliba	Redwood Regional Audubon Society
Bruce Nelson ²	Willow Cr. Comm. Serv. Dist., E. Humboldt Co. and small businesses
Richard Lorenz	Trinity County Resident
Joe McCarthy	Commercial Fishing Guide
David Steinhauser ³	Six Rivers Outfitters and Guides Association
Paul Hauser	Trinity Public Utilities District
Emelia Berol	Northcoast Environmental Center

1) Attended by phone for day 1 and first half of day 2. 2) Alternate for Ed Duggan. 3) Attended day 1.

Members that did not attend

Member:	Representative Seat:
Kelli Gant	Trinity Lake Revitalization Alliance
Carrie Nichols ⁴	Natural Resource Conservation Service
Liam Gogan	Trinity River Fishing Guides
Sandy Denn	Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District
Jeffrey Sutton	Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority

4) Alternate for Tiffany Hayes.

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

Other attendees: Justin Day (City of Redding Electric Utility Department); Pat Frost (Trinity County RCD); Dave Wellock (member of the public); Vina Frye (USFWS); Robin Schrock, Eric Peterson, D.J. Bandrowski, and Rod Wittler (TRRP); Sara Tanis and Amanda Lee (AmeriCorps); Mike Merigliano (Science Advisory Board); Mark Lancaster (Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program); Tim Hayden (Yurok Tribe); Wade Sinnen (Ca Fish and Wildlife).

Attending via teleconference: Elizabeth Hadley, and Holly Long (San Luis Delta Mendota Water Authority), Dave Hillemeier (Yurok Tribe).

Notes: Kim Mattson (ENW).

List of Motions Made during the Meeting

Rich Lorenz made a motion to approve the agenda.

Gil Saliba seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Paul Hauser made a motion to accept the December 2013 TAMWG minutes.

Joe McCarthy seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Joe McCarthy made a motion that the Chair and Vice Chair of the TAMWG better clarify the letter sent on watershed work that includes a distinction of tributaries and watersheds.

Rich Lorenz seconded the motion

The motion passed unanimously.

Gil Saliba made a motion to support the budget as presented.

Paul Hauser seconded the motion.

The 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

Tom Stokely, Vice-Chair of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG), opened the meeting and asked the attendees to introduce themselves. The group reviewed the agenda and made some minor adjustments. The hatchery update would be tomorrow. Charlie Chamberlain's presentation would not be made this meeting.

Rich Lorenz made a motion to approve the agenda.

Gil Saliba seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Approve Minutes

Tom Stokely asked if there were any changes to the March TAMWG minutes.

Paul Hauser made a motion to accept the March 2014 TAMWG minutes.

Joe McCarthy seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Public Comment

Wade Sinnen, Department of Fish and Wildlife, noted he was accepting comments on data summaries for salmon and he had information on fishing seasons for fall Chinook. Amanda Lee of the Watersheds Stewards Project introduced herself and that they were holding a volunteer day to pulling invasive weeds. Information is listed on the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) website and the env-trinity list serve.

Mr. Dave Wellock, landowner on the Trinity River at Grass Valley Creek, gave his public comment on Tuesday morning and is recorded here. Mr. Wellock noted that not all of his questions were yet answered following at a recent meeting and he wished to describe his views. He referred to letters he had received from Executive Director, Robin Schrock and an earlier letter he had received from Acting Executive Director Jennifer Faler. He commented on “No Trespassing” signs and how he has managed them. He also expressed concern over his lack of knowledge of the procedures he was expected to follow and multiple agencies he had to contact. He said he had expected to work with California Department of Fish and Wildlife and not the TRRP. He noted the letter from former Acting Executive Director Jennifer Faler thanking him for access to the river across his property and read from parts of it. Wellock noted that the contractors and government inspectors were good to work with, but not the “higher up” directors. He also cited activities that he was being prohibited from doing, such as rip-rap placements. He felt that some follow up was lacking.

3. Climate Change and Water Management in the Tributaries

Mark Lancaster of the Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program (5 C’s) gave a PowerPoint presentation on Watersheds, Climate, and Water Conservation. He noted it focused on Weaver Creek, which is a good surrogate for California as it contains urban, salmonids, wilderness, mining, and water diversions. He explained that the formation on the Five Counties program came about with the listing of coho salmon and the local leaders wanting to be proactive. Their primary goal is to protect the economic and social resources of Northwestern California by addressing salmon issues. Their highest priorities are barriers, water quality, water quantity, education, incentives, habitat improvements, and to avoid lawsuits. Since 2000, they have removed 72 barriers and have seen coho return to creeks—he showed photos of steelhead behind the Post Office in Weaverville and coho in the concrete channel through the Forest Service compound.

Lancaster next switched his presentation to the problems of climate change for fish. He showed data on precipitation records that showed no large changes in annual precipitation, but increased variability. Since 1974 Weaverville precipitation data show greater frequency of either very wet or very dry years, whereas the average precipitation has not changed over the entire record of over 50 years. He showed that this year combined with 2013 is shaping up to be one of the driest. The data also shows warming and that the snowpack is decreasing. This water year, Weaverville has received 16.3 inches whereas the average for this period is 35.7 inches.

Lancaster recommends that the citizens of Trinity County do not grow a garden in order to conserve water for fish. He said that even small domestic pumps can dry out a stream. He showed his trickle charge tank that slowly stores water in a 1,000 gallon tank to later be pumped out. He thought this is perhaps the single best thing riparian landowners can do to help maintain streamflow in small creeks.

Climate change may bring on increased fire. He showed fire history of three local fires since 1994-2009 where 60 homes were lost, 8,500 acres burned, and 13 lives lost. Stand replacing fires

hurt flows for fish. He said we are now in an “ecological conundrum.” He witnessed Weaver Creek instantaneously dry up, kill thousands of fish, then refill, and wash the dead fish downstream. He speculated it was due to combined water withdrawals in the middle of the afternoon, by trees and people, and was capped by a water truck pulling water out of the creek upstream. He noted that coho like low-gradient habitat and do not use creeks very much below Canyon Creek, except Sharber Creek. He noted that Weaver Creek provides the best habitat but is the most impacted. He showed photos of replaced culverts that can now convey bedload. He noted the creeks lack large woody debris and that levees and road crossings prevent woody debris routing. He showed how new bridges helped in several areas. Finely Creek, a 300-acre watershed that is a tributary to Little Brown’s Creek is important as a refuge that needed a barrier culvert replaced. Now fish can get further upstream. He showed photos of out-sloping roads and removal of roadside ditches. He showed a diversion dam in the East Weaver Creek and other future projects in Weaverville. He noted that the TRRP has funded some of these projects.

Lancaster gave some facts about water use. 44 % of Trinity County self-supplies their water and he speculated that much of this is withdrawals from surface water. In 1988 the County passed a restrictive floodplain development ordinance. The State and Federal Endangered Species Act has slowed down restoration and made it more costly, but it also has brought in more funding. They performed an assessment in 2009 of water use in Trinity County that showed the various uses of water by groups. It concluded they were very water limited and development would impinge beneficial uses. He said one solution is to get out of the tributaries for water and look to the Trinity River for water withdrawal and increased storage

Emilia Berol asked about gray water. Lancaster said it is legal in California now. Tom Stokely asked about Weaverville Water District pumping more water out of the Trinity River and their 3 cfs and the annual budget. Lancaster said Weaverville has a progressive rate system that larger users pay less per gallon. The cost of pumping from the Trinity loses money for the District. So the District is looking at water conservation. They are considering using reclaimed water for irrigation, but this would cost the users too much and they will need outside funding. As to the annual budget of the 5 C’s, it was typically \$1 million but this year is \$0.75 million. Lancaster said he has no program funds and was volunteering his time that day. Wade Sinnen asked about the California fish passage forum. Lancaster said they are receiving funding dollars for fish barrier removal projects.

4. Trinity Watershed Effort

Pat Frost, former manager of the Trinity Resource Conservation District (RCD), filled in for Alex Cousins and gave a PowerPoint on their strategic plan. The Trinity RCD is the only special district that covers the entire County. It was formed in 1956 as a Soil and Water Conservation District to provide technical assistance to private landowners on a local level. California law requires a long-range plan that covers five years. Issues to be addressed includes education, forest health, watersheds, agriculture, recreation, and listing of accomplishments for the 5-year period.

The RCD can participate in the development and implementation of watershed plans and assessments. The goal of the plans is to restore fisheries, wildlife habitat, and conserve soil and water resources. These goals have led to a number of objectives and two guiding documents. The first document was the sediment TMDLs for the South Fork Trinity and the Trinity River mainstem. Frost noted that the management plan that was supposed to come from that has sort of languished (the regulatory hammer never fell). The second document that was guiding to the Trinity RCD was the Trinity River Record of Decision as the RCD was to participate in the program. He noted that they have always been strong partners with the Five Counties Salmonid

Conservation Program. They avoided competition and divided up their expertise. The 5-Cs focuses on the County roads and fish barriers; the RCD focused on private and federal roads and upslope projects but has no regulatory powers.

He showed a list of criteria for funding of watershed projects they use to choose watershed projects for funding. These included complete planning, reduction of sediment at efficient costs, consistent with the Trinity River EIS and watershed plans, NEPA planning, leverage of additional funding, and multiple fishery benefits.

Tom Stokely asked about the annual budget. Frost said it was typically \$1.5 million but it moves around with projects and there is a good amount of pass-through funding. Wade Sinnen asked if the RCD applies for Ca Fish and Wildlife grants. Frost said they had in the past, but there are becoming restrictions to make applications more difficult. Mike Merigliano asked how to know when a creek is off the sediment TMDL list. Frost said the South Fork adopted narrative objectives, but other tributaries gave each landowner an allowable amount of sediment. But no monitoring is being done.

5. BDCP Presentation

Tom Stokely gave an update on the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (Twin Tunnels Project). The plan is to build two tunnels to move water from the lower Sacramento River delta to the state pumps in the southern Delta. The purpose of the project is to provide water reliability and ecosystem restoration. The cost is estimated to be \$16 to \$25 billion for the infrastructure paid by the users, and \$9 billion for restoration paid by government. Stokely said the project will allow additional diversions to meet full contract amounts for CVP and SWP contractors. But he said it was not clear from where the extra water would come. He speculated some of it would come from the Trinity and some from the Tuscan aquifer in the Sacramento Valley. There are two scenarios being considered for bay-delta flows: a high delta outflow to the bay with less export and a low outflow with higher exports to the water users. The modeling they are using assumed that there would be no change in operations/diversions for the Trinity. But Stokely thinks this does not represent reality as they have not determined from where the water will come. Currently their modelling is having trouble meeting water temperatures on the Sacramento or meeting the outflows at the bay delta. One alternative being modeled but not considered is to ship water earlier from the Trinity during the spring to keep the Sacramento cooler. But Stokely said this would warm the Trinity. He said the bottom line is that they don't have the water available to make the Twin Tunnels pay for itself. The Bureau of Reclamation has its best water rights in the Trinity River and that makes Trinity water a target for exports and there are no constraints on exports out of the Trinity, even though in stream fishery flows are established.

Stokely explained that his organization the California Water Impact Network supported promoting legislation such as a proposed bill AB 1914 (Chesbro). They are seeking three things. First, conform the Bureau of Reclamation's state water permits to Trinity ROD flows of 594,500 AF. The existing water permit requires the Bureau to only release 120,500 acre feet downriver, and the 474,000 acre feet difference is considered to be "abandoned" under the state water code. Second, the water permits need to include a provision to meet basin plan temperature objectives for spring Chinook. The Bureau of Reclamation claims they do not need to comply with those objectives. Third is that the Bureau should follow the Biological Opinion that says to maintain a minimum pool levels in Trinity Reservoir to the end of September.

Stokely expressed that the Bay Delta Conservation plan is a huge risk to the Trinity River and is basically a way to get a 50-year permit for water that will limit their spending for restoration and

may allow additional exports out of the Trinity River. The tunnels will lift the physical constraints for moving water south.

Joe McCarthy asked if the tunnels will be on the ballot. Stokely said the infrastructure funding will be paid by contracted users and will not be on the ballot, but that funding for restoration is in the water bond scheduled for vote in November. He noted that the deadline for comments is July 29, 2014 and more information can be found on the C-WIN website (www.c-win.org). Rich Lorenz asked if the area of origin rights will be protected. Stokely said, in theory, yes. But he explained how the City of Davis applied for a right, but there were so many protests they determined that it would be too expensive legally to defend, and they elected to simply contract for their water.

Paul Hauser said the Trinity County PUD is “in line” with Stokely for different reasons. He noted the timing of water going over the hill. Without water going over the hill, electric rates would go up dramatically. He said they opposed AB 1914 on cost issues. He said California needs more storage. He re-emphasized that the PUD and C-WIN are in alignment on the peripheral canal issue. About area of origin rights, he said that the County should get a dollar value for that water going over the hill. It could be millions of dollars per year for the County.

6. DSS Update

Joe Polos gave a quick update on the Decision Support System (DSS) and efforts on getting models going. Progress is being made on the fish production models and a workshop is planned for July. A two-dimensional hydraulic/habitat model is being developed for the upper 40 miles of the Trinity River by the staff of the BOR Denver Technical Center. Outputs for this model will be analyzed and used as part of the Phase II planning effort. Additionally, the 40-mile 2-D model will be integrated with the information developed by the finer resolution 2D habitat modeling being developed as part of the TRRP habitat assessment.

7. Update on Settlement Agreement of Trinity River Fish Hatchery

This item was postponed to Day 2, but is recorded here. Don Reck gave an update on the Trinity River hatchery lawsuit that claimed the hatchery was violating the Endangered Species Act. An out-of-court agreement was reached and approved by the court. The consent decrees said the Bureau of Reclamation will draft a hatchery genetics management plan (HGMP) for coho and take input from the plaintiffs. This was done on May 30, 2014. Reck noted the plan had to be prepared in six months and this had some ups and downs. A federal Section 7 consultation by NOAA Fisheries is needed that will go out for public comment.

Gil Saliba asked what the general goal is. Reck said the plan will direct genetic management that integrates mingling of hatchery and native fish but not threaten recovery of native fish. The plan stipulates reduced production to slightly above half of past levels (448,000 steelhead, 300,000 coho). The hatchery OM contract expires this August and a new contract is being developed with the California Dept. Fish and Wildlife and the Hoopa Valley Tribe.

Lunch

8. Phase I Review

Mike Merigliano of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Phase I review and an update on what they did for the review and an opportunity to answer questions. He said it was a huge review that included research of raw data and the Trinity and fish

are a complex system. Originally the SAB thought they may simply look at the completed projects. He noted how the project grew and cited as an example the development of a data-frame that is being used by the fish group. He commented that the SAB may have been “above-the-fray” but not “all knowing” and for that reason, the interchange with the program during development of drafts was helpful.

Merigliano gave some background on the review and the purpose of the TRRP program. The Phase I review focused at four scales: design element (e.g., side channels), site (e.g., Sawmill), reach (a stretch of river with similar characteristics), and system (the river and bottomland from Lewiston to N. Fork). They reviewed series of reports on hydrology, geomorphology, fish populations, riparian vegetation, rehabilitation sites (designs, as-built, objectives when available). They also reviewed basic data.

Merigliano gave some results of the restoration activities. Juvenile and fry habitat suggested pre-construction “dip” in habitat at mid-level flows of about 1000 cfs. Merigliano suggested the dip was due to the berm. The post construction data suggested that this mid-flow dip disappeared. He next showed graphs of system-wide habitat by years and these showed increases in habitat since 2000 when the habitat area was derived by a modeling approach. Habitat area measured in 2009, 2010, and 2011 show a dip in habitat in 2010. But this may have been due to the rotating panel design and the 2010 sample may have missed habitat hot-spots such as the Rush Creek Delta.

Coarse sediment storage has increased except for Douglas City. Between 2009 and 2011 pool depths have generally increased due to increased flows and reduced fine sediment. In some upstream reaches, decreased pool depths were associated with terrace lowering rather than gravel augmentation alone. At reaches far from gravel augmentation, terrace lowering and gravel augmentation does not influence changes in pool depths very much. Redds are being spread out from Lewiston Dam, which is a desired result. Smolt out-migration graphs at Pear Tree were highest in 2012 (5 million), second highest in 2008 (3.5 million) and generally less than 2 million for the remaining years (2006-07 and 2009-2011). Smolt out-migration at Willow Creek shows an annually increasing trend that topped at 3.5 million during 2012. Habitat appears to be increasing in both constructed habitat and unconstructed habitat but faster in constructed habitat.

The SAB used modeling to evaluate trends in habitat improvements. They found they are on the right track, but progress is slow. The suite of design diversity is good. It is difficult to predict how certain actions may move the TRRP forward. The SAB recommended the use a Decision Support System (DSS), use of opportunistic design strategies, use metric to quantify fish growth and health, and to evaluate the change in design strategy.

Rich Lorenz asked if it would be more effective to removing berms instead of the highly designed constructed projects. Merigliano said they really don't have data on the river at large. Lorenz asked if berm removal should be studied. Merigliano said it has been done at project sites, and it does work. Lorenz noted they seem to be evolving away from berm removal and is this good? Merigliano said they do not know if fish are “attached” to edge or to large areas like bars. He noted that fish are attached to cover. In Montana, cutthroat trout like to be more separated. Robin Schrock noted that berms are being cut and removed at construction projects. D.J. Bandrowski noted that they have observed that berms are not as prevalent as originally thought.

Gil Saliba asked if they should look back at some of the earlier projects such as Hocker Flat. Merigliano said the GRTS sampling may pick up changes at Hocker Flat but will not be site-level changes unless the GRTS segments happen to fall on it just right. He also said that the river is likely evolving and creating habitat and perhaps this could be included in the fish monitoring. Tom Stokely asked about a graph that showed higher habitat increases since 2000 and if this was

due to flow more than construction. Merigliano thought both. Stokely asked if they really know if it is working or not. Merigliano said they are creating habitat. Merigliano discussed the 400 % of habitat to see a doubling of smolts. He thought that was not necessarily a goal or even needed but it was more of a point by which you could detect a difference in smolt outmigration. He commented on the large outmigrant population estimate of 5,000,000 in 2012 and said they don't really know if this was due to increased adult returns suggesting that habitat is not limiting. He speculated that the relationships may not be linear. Stokely asked if the TRRP was a "grand experiment" and if there was any guarantee of success. Merigliano agreed that it was a grand experiment and that was no guarantee of success. He noted that a grand experiment is not necessarily counter to a restoration program. Gil Saliba asked about hydrographs and whether the hydrograph should be more variable. Merigliano said that most natural hydrographs do not have the benches like the Trinity. But this constant flow is needed by the fish habitat monitoring. Wade Sinnen asked about the habitat trend that was modeled and if this suggested that the early habitat increases were due entirely to flow, and if the recent increases are also flow related. Merigliano noted that the pre-2005 measures only have two data points. He could not say whether flow would have increased the habitat trend, but the constructed habitat seemed to increase habitat faster than unconstructed.

Dave Hillemeier asked if this was a grand experiment or do we know what is going to happen; he asked how the TRRP compares to other large programs. Merigliano said he was not so familiar with other large river programs so he could not comment. Tim Hayden thanked the SAB for their hard work and that the final review has some good things to say about the program and he appreciated that. Merigliano said that in the early drafts there was a tendency to focus on the things to fix and not so much on the good aspects of the program. Wade Sinnen asked about habitat at high flows and if this enhances survival or produces more fish. Merigliano said the inundation time is short and speculated that it is likely survival oriented.

9. Vision of a Restored River to Help Guide Restoration

This item was rescheduled for the next meeting.

10. TRRP Riparian Efforts

James Lee gave a PowerPoint presentation entitled "Riparian Vegetation Approaches and ESA Species." He noted his presentation would provide an update on riparian management approaches and start a discussion on this topic. He touched on some points of the importance of riparian vegetation—shade, organic matter and food sources for invertebrates, slows invasive species, habitat (aquatic and terrestrial), and slows wildfires. He noted that riparian vegetation was a function of river flows. He also noted the effects of hydraulic mining that introduced more sediment and the dredging mining that reduced the fine sediments in the floodplains. The water table surface is normally about the same as the river surface and there are large areas with surfaces 6-feet above the river making difficult conditions for vegetation. These are now barrens such as Turner's Bar that are clear of native trees but may be dominated by non-native smaller plants.

He noted that the regulatory goal is to replace any lost vegetation due to construction activities. He was asked whether riparian vegetation has changed on the Trinity River. He thinks after mining the valley bottom was pretty barren. He estimated that vegetated area has increased since 1960 from 300 acres to 900 acres in 2012 out of about 3,000 total available acres. The most economical way to rehabilitate riparian is via hydrology management. He showed a modified spring flood hydrograph that is less steep on the descending limb that is being used to help establish cottonwoods. Also they try to maintain a stage decrease of not more than 0.1 stage

decrease per day as this is good for cottonwood root growth. In previous years' surveys they typically have seen mature cottonwood trees but few to no younger trees. Today they are seeing signs of cottonwood establishment at low elevations near the river surface. Where they see older riparian stands now at 10-feet above the river suggests that either the terrace has aggraded or the river has downgraded. It costs at least \$20 per cubic yard to try to remove terraces. They have used poles to plant cottonwoods and willows but these have not worked as well and survival is about 20 %. They are now using more container stock to get more diversity of plants and better survival. He said they put in 3-years of maintenance of irrigation or plant protection cages to help get plants established.

Dave Wellock asked about the use of sweet clover. Lee said there is a lot of it already out there and it comes in at first but then fades out after about 3 years. He thought the disturbance acts to scarify the seeds that are in a large seed bank. Wade Sinnen asked if they incorporate large woody debris. Lee said that black cottonwood is one of the fastest growing trees and this would become a source of large woody debris. Sinnen asked why there is no conifer recruitment in the barrens. Lee said that the soil is too poor, consisting of mostly cobbles.

Adjourn 4:00 PM

Tuesday June 10, 2014 9:00 AM

Tom Stokely opened the meeting and addressed adjustments to the agenda. He asked Dave Wellock to make his public comment at this time. Mr. Wellock's comments are recorded above in Item 2, Public Comment.

11. Designated Federal Officer Items

Joe Polos presented several items for the TAMWG. He noted the Action Tracker that he had handed out and that it was posted on the Arcata Fish and Wildlife website (Attachment1). Polos commented on Robert's Rules of Order and noted that the TAMWG Charter, in general follows the rules. Polos noted that Ed Duggan had opined that the rules were not being followed strictly enough. Gil Saliba thought that things are going well and that the Chairman should have the prerogative to manage the meeting. The TAMWG members all agreed.

Elizabeth Hadley noted her challenge in balancing comment from the public with the discussion by the TAMWG. Stokely opined that it is best to have the TAMWG speak first, then let public comment. Rich Lorenz noted that Hadley had handled things very well. Saliba noted that the public may be characterized as two groups: those that are participating in the program and those that are not. There was discussion of when to schedule the public comment. There was suggestion to keep it at the same time for all meetings and at the beginning of the meeting. It was also discussed to allow public comment during the voting or development of action items.

Polos noted that it was time for TAMWG membership and Charter renewal as these will expire on January 14, 2015 and no meetings can be held after that time without renewals. He commented that everyone's renewal is up at the same time. He listed the requirements for membership: represent a pertinent group and have authority to speak on their behalf. These groups include recreation, economic, environmental, local etc. The TAMWG members serve 3-year terms. Polos asked for all information for renewal or new members to be received by July 31 to avoid delays in appointments. They plan to do press releases and asked that TAMWG members also spread the work to seek new/additional members. He listed the information needed: contact info, resume,

and a letter of support (individuals can self-nominate). Appointees cannot have a conflict of interest or receive financial gain associated with the TRRP. Polos said he would be emailing TAMWG members a nomination process form (Attachment 2).

12. TMC Chair Update

Brian Person, Chair of the Trinity Management Council (TMC) gave an update on a TMC items. He commented on Mr. Wellock's concerns and noted that the TAMWG had done their job in forwarding it to the TMC more than a year ago. He reviewed that the TMC agreed to include support for domestic wells but not agricultural wells and not use TRRP funds to reimburse Mr. Wellock for damages. He reviewed an alternative manner that the Bureau of Reclamation may be able to pay for damages. It is now up to Person to develop the documentation to resolve remaining concerns of Mr. Wellock.

Person commented on how TMC handles Roberts Rules of Order. TMC was concerned over too much public input to some of their meetings. They decided to adhere to a strong bias for discussion by TMC members. They allow public comment just prior to TMC voting. There is a special allowance for comment by TRRP staff. He said the TMC felt this is working.

Person commented on the joint TAMWG and TMC meeting. The facilitator noted to him that Person has a challenge to manage the diverse views among the two groups. It was made clear the need to acknowledge these differences of philosophy of river restoration. There was a decision to wait on public outreach until after this meeting and Person noted there is still work to do.

Person commented on Trinity Reservoir storages and noted much low storages in Trinity and Shasta compared to the 15-year averages but slightly above the all-time lows for this time of year in 1977. Both reservoirs are dropping about 0.5 feet per day. At end of September, Shasta will be just over 1 million acre feet of storage and this will be very low. At the end of October Trinity Reservoir will also be very low but will still be able to generate power.

Person listed responses by the TMC regarding TAMWG recommendations in their March letter and passed out the response letter as a handout (Attachment 3). The first recommendation was for the TMC to write a letter to BLM supporting land purchases. This is in progress. Second was to not inject gravel if the year was dry or critically dry. The TMC decided to inject under dry, but not under critically dry. Since the year is now officially critically dry, no gravel will be injected. Third the TMC adopted the Flow Workgroup recommendation. Fourth, a joint meeting with TAMWG was held. Fifth, delay public outreach until after the joint meeting. The TMC is looking more closely at problem definition and are considering holding a panel discussion explaining construction sites and use of science that would allow questions by public. This is not yet in motion. Sixth, regarding preparation of a request to the SAB if there is a nexus between watershed restoration and TRRP goals, an email was sent and the SAB requested a formal written request. Seventh, regarding the recommendation to provide funding for noxious weed management, the TMC felt that James Lee's coordination with the County efforts and the funding passed on to these efforts fulfills this recommendation.

Rich Lorenz commented that outreach to the general public is not so much a problem as evidenced that few members of the public come to the TAMWG meetings. He opined that the public is not the problem but the problem is more the TAMWG's concerns with the TMC.

Tom Stokely asked about the difference between watersheds and tributaries as being the management focus to meet program goals. Person acknowledged this difference. Stokely asked if Person would take this distinction at the next TMC meeting. There was discussion about the

difference between tributary and watershed restoration activities. Robin Schrock noted that the TRRP can differentiate between funding given for tributaries or watersheds and provide a summary if needed. Stokely noted that the ROD defined watershed work as sediment reductions upslope and on roads, whereas tributary work had more to do with barrier removal, screening diversions, and habitat construction. Schrock noted the level of work provided by the TRRP to tributary work and that this is often not acknowledged. Gil Saliba asked if Ernie Clarke includes this tributary work in his cost analyses and if it is then part of the discussion of allocation of funds. Schrock affirmed that it is and said they would provide it again. Paul Hauser commented that outreach issue goes back to how they define success. They can never achieve pre-dam levels of non-hatchery fish and this failure will prevent satisfaction for the public. Tom Stokely noted that he would work on a better definition of tributary.

Joe McCarthy made a motion that the Chair and Vice Chair of the TAMWG better clarify the letter sent on watershed work that includes a distinction of tributaries and watersheds.

Rich Lorenz seconded the motion

The motion passed unanimously.

Person commented on Lorenz's opinion that the problem has more to do with the TAMWG and not so much the public. Following this line, Person noted the TAMWG Charter and its mission and acknowledged the need for the TMC to do work at this level with the TAMWG.

Tom Stokely noted his respectful disagreement with Lorenz and opined that the problems do go beyond the TAMWG and includes the general public and its dissatisfaction. The lack of public attendance at meetings is a measure of lack of confidence.

Emelia Berol commented on the public's perception that the program is heavy handed on the engineering side and the public does not understand the engineering. If the public sees success on the river, such concerns would fall away. She noted that the watershed work is not well presented at the meetings and that she does not have a clear view herself. Robin Schrock noted that much of the Five C's work is being co-funded by the TRRP and she acknowledged that this could be better promoted. There had been an article in the Trinity Journal that the TRRP funded \$350,000 to the 5-C's.

13. Executive Director Update

Robin Schrock passed out a handout on the updates on the TRRP (Attachment 4). The biggest news was the release of the Phase I review. She noted that 2014 is a critically dry year. She noted some upcoming work on stream design with the Forest Service. The Lorenz Gulch site dedication was very nice and members were encouraged to visit the site. She noted that D.J. Bandrowski will be giving the implementation update and Joe Polos will be giving the science update. Public outreach is being addressed via website updates including the Phase I review, flow release information, and a calendar of events.

Schrock passed out the budget as a handout (Attachment 5). The total for FY 2015 is \$15.6 million; Science totals \$5.2 million and Implementation totals \$7.6 million.

Tom Stokely asked if there is still funding of monitoring of steelhead and coho. Joe Polos noted \$608,000 for the Willow Creek weir that includes those species. There is no funding for fish in tributaries as this is handled by Forest Service. Wade Sinnen noted they are trying to work with Five Counties, but acknowledged that work on coho is lacking. Polos said that staff from various

agencies participates in dives in the tributaries for annual spring Chinook salmon counts. Schrock said their staff also participates.

Stokely noted the decreased funding for watersheds in the Implementation budget. Schrock said that \$500,000 was all that was submitted this year.

Gil Saliba made a motion to support the budget as presented.

Paul Hauser seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

14. Science Coordinator Update

Joe Polos gave the Science update for the TRRP. Polos handed out a 2015 Year Science Workplan (Attachment 6). There is now a fisheries biologist position open for the TRRP that will be employed through the Fish and Wildlife office.

Polos went over several of the major activities such as monitoring and work on the fish production model as part of the DSS. He summarized some of the ongoing discussions such as channel rehabilitation project in the vicinity of the hatchery.

Polos next covered Item 16, workgroup updates at this time. This discussion is recorded under Item 16. After covering Item 16, the TAMWG returned to Item 15.

15. Implementation Branch Chief Update

D.J. Bandrowski, Implementation Branch Chief of the TRRP gave update on Implementation plans. He noted a recent river float on the Dutch Creek site; this is in planning with 30% design with implementation in 2015. The Upper Douglas City will start soon. The next project is the Bucktail redesign. Construction planned for 2014 is under redesign for this coming fall. The Bucktail channel rehabilitation work is directly linked to the bridge project. They do not know when the bridge will be replaced, NEPA is going out. The Hatchery Reach project included gravel augmentation in 2006 and this will be reconstructed with additional gravel but is currently on hold awaiting fisheries considerations. Limekiln Gulch is in planned for implementation for 2015.

They are developing a Phase II plan that must be approved by the TAMWG and TMC. It will include a modeling effort that will guide decision making. Their effort includes the development of a 2-D hydrologic model for the entire 40 miles of river. He noted this has not been attempted before for such a large piece of river. They are calibrating output with measured flows over a wide range of flows.

Robin Schrock noted that Bandrowski and other staff have been successful in competing for extra funding in many of these extra projects such as modeling and large woody debris.

Bandrowski presented a PowerPoint on design changes at the Douglas City project. They reconsidered new ideas and input from stakeholders. The design changes warranted additional analyses and a public meeting planned for July 1. The changes will alter the footprint but the design intent is the same. He showed an aerial photo and noted the main part of the project being the forced meander creating a large bend to the river right or north. New enhancements were to place a larger "plug" in the main channel that creates the forced meander so that it does not overtop until 6,500 cfs. This was to ensure it does not wash out. The plug will be composed of large wood and boulders on the upstream side with 6 to 12 inch material on the downstream side. The downstream side will be a backwater alcove. Bandrowski next explained rationale about how to protect the forced meander from washing out on the downstream side using a permeable

channel. He noted the “ripple effect” of such last minute changes and that this could affect the NEPA or contractual steps. The TMC approved the moving ahead with this project redesign on their teleconference call.

Rich Lorenz asked if the fishing guides have been consulted. Bandrowski said they are trying to be transparent with the public and will be seeking informal comments.

16. Update from TRRP Workgroups

This item was discussed before Item 15. Joe Polos gave update on workgroups and passed out a handout summarizing their work (Attachment 7). Flow Workgroup is dealing with a critically dry year of 2014 and the need to protect temperatures in the river. Reclamation is doing modeling and the Trinity Dam low level by-pass may be used that foregoes power generation. He noted that spring Chinook would normally have gone above the dam to hold during summer and now they must survive below the dam and they need cooler water for this.

The Fish Workgroup is addressing difference in results from adult run size estimates (Willow Creek Weir, redd survey, and carcass survey).

Rich Lorenz asked when the Program might demonstrate increases in fish due to the Program. Polos noted work on a cohort reconstruction to track Trinity natural stocks could be used to indicate changes for Trinity fall Chinook salmon. But this will take some time. Polos stated that the production of juveniles that was part of Mike Merigliano’s presentation needs to be scaled by spawners to show potential changes resulting from restoration actions to account for different and variable spawning escapements. Evaluating data on habitat, juveniles, and spawners is a better way to assess the Program. . He commented that the goal is to restore pre-dam natural fish that would have occurred below the dam. The program has a goal of 62,000 fall Chinook spawners but this may have been hit once in 25 years. Wade Sinnen noted that 2/3rds of fish are allocated to harvest and, given that, an extremely high production in the ocean is needed to meet the spawning goal. Alternatively a cohort analysis would allow a way to account for harvest. Paul Hauser commented that the Program needs to restate these goals to reflect reality of harvests. Robin Schrock noted other goals and metrics such as habitat restored. Hauser said the public will not accept habitat as success but will accept fish.

Polos continued with the workgroup summaries. He commented the Watershed Workgroup is coordinated by Sean Ledwin and is summarizing watershed funding. The Interdisciplinary Team will be working on the DSS implementation and other recommendations of the Phase I review.

Lunch break

Upon return from lunch, Vice-Chair Tom Stokely noted that they no longer had a quorum and this would prevent holding votes on motions or action items.

17. Follow-up Discussion from May 15 Joint TMC/TAMWG Meeting

Joe Polos passed out a handout summarizing the joint TMC/TAMWG meeting (Attachment 8). The TAMWG members took a few minutes to review it. Justin Day passed out a communications plan developed by Elizabeth Hadley (Attachment 9).

These documents stimulated a long discussion. To start, Brian Person commented the communication plan is nicely done and a logical approach but he asked if this is the problem that needs addressing first. There may be other issue such as fundamental differences in program goals that should be addressed first. Joe Polos said the communications plan is very helpful and he

agreed with Person and cited the third paragraph in the joint meeting summary citing program vision differences.

Gil Saliba thought one communication problem is the slow receipt by TAMWG of TMC minutes—perhaps the TAMWG could see draft TMC minutes. Otherwise he felt communications are good. Person described how the review is slowed at the TMC level and that they could do better. Tom Stokely asked that the TMC minutes be made available more quickly and Person said they would take this up at the next TMC meeting. Schrock suggested they publish at least the TMC motions and action items.

The discussion covered what items should be addressed internally versus externally. Rich Lorenz admitted that he could not make the joint meeting. He reviewed the problem as he saw it. He reviewed how the guides wrote a letter directly to the TMC and did not go through the TAMWG. He thought the issues like those of the guides should be addressed first internally by the TAMWG process. Joe McCarthy thought telling groups not to write a letter does not really “work” for him. Lorenz agreed that, in the long run, the TAMWG cannot tell anyone to not write a letter. And Lorenz also commented that if he received a letter, he would address it the next day. Gil Saliba thought they agreed at the joint meeting they would try to work within the system first before “going public.” Emelia Berol said they should work internally on “dirty laundry,” but the guides’ letter resulted because that group was not satisfied with the current resolution. If we are going to work internally, then “we need to take the issues seriously.” She noted her dissatisfaction with a response that “the Solicitor decided against it.” With such an answer, she said she would ask for the Solicitor’s phone number. McCarthy agreed with Berol’s comments but thought they also have a procedural issue. He noted the guides were not happy with the internal mechanism and no one can tell them to not write a letter. He also thought the joint meeting summary was unnecessarily negative. Justin Day said the communication plan would not solve the major issues of the program; it is more of a tool. Person clarified that the Charter does not allow the TAMWG to go outside the TMC advisory process. Polos affirmed that it does not. Person concluded the only recourse is for TAMWG members to write a letter from their representative organization. Tim Hayden noted progress that had been made over communication with the TMC and TAMWG, the facilitator helped very much, and he would like to see that discussion continued. Robin Schrock clarified that the Program’s responses to the guide’s letter were part of the EA process and the responses are on line.

More discussion occurred on the internal process and some of the frustrations of some TAMWG members. Berol commented that she felt the TMC and TRRP program staff have heard the TAMWG and have made efforts. She said her frustration was more with the BOR in Washington and their rigid approach and that suggested a “limited” commitment. She cited a comment in 1993 made by Russ Smith of BOR that he had come to recognize the need to take a more holistic approach. However, Berol thought they are still struggling with that concept today. If the TRRP is committed to restoring the river, short of removing the dams, they need to consider all the other alternatives. Person asked for clarification that Berol’s perception of a lack of commitment is signified by lack of work in the watershed. Berol affirmed this. She also noted that she did not mean to infer lack of commitment by the local Bureau of Reclamation employees. She further cited that the flow study did not consider more flow that 48 % of flow being returned to the river as evidence of a lack of consideration of all the alternatives. Joe Polos reviewed some of the thinking that went into the ROD and why preferred alternative was narrowly focused on the mainstem and tributary work that focused on fine sediment reduction. Additionally, the Flow study was only one of several alternatives considered during the NEPA process that resulted in the ROD and there was an alternative that recommended larger releases into the Trinity. He said that

they lack the legislation and authorization that had existed in the previous program that allowed for more extensive work in the watersheds. Jeff Morris reviewed the analogy of the two circles described in the joint meeting report—an inner circle of the 40 miles and the large circle of the entire watershed. He asked how the TRRP in its work in the inner circle can support the needs of the larger circle. Tom Stokely agreed with Berol's comments and noted his own discouragement following the joint meeting. He recalled an early conversation with a solicitor, Dana Jacobson, in how she was trying to find a way to work in the South Fork. But according to Stokely, Mike Ryan, a former director, opposed South Fork work by in response to criticisms by Byron Leydecker that stopped millions of dollars of planned work by the BOR. Stokely said he was discouraged that the 5-C's and the South Fork Watershed group is not being adequately funded. Stokely expressed a different take on lack of commitment. He thought that "throwing money" at projects is not success. The expensive main stem projects may be better spent in tributaries. He noted a series of previous reports where recommendations have not being followed. Person noted he had no relationship with Mike Ryan and he said the Solicitor's and their opinions are only trying to keep the project within the "four corners of the law." Berol said she came to the area in 1971 and at that time everyone then spoke of the 1964 flood which created an almost primal fear. She opined that another 100-year flood without watershed protections could wash the projects down river. Robin Schrock suggested that TAMWG members can help watershed projects by searching for funding opportunities.

Gil Saliba commented on Paul Hauser's earlier opinions of the need for more realistic goals for the Program. He agreed to work on this with Hauser and present on it at the next meeting. Wade Sinnen noted that the development of the goals and the underlying science supporting it is not very clear. The goals are expressed in the IAP but they seem to be lacking in documentation. He thought they need to address more modern goals such as improvement of the fishery, which seem to be occurring. This may be best addressed by an outside expert to take the politics out of it. He noted some have suggested 40,000 as a maximum sustained yield is more reasonable for the entire Klamath basin. He suggested 1,400 coho or 6,000 Spring Chinook may be too low, whereas 40,000 steelhead may be too high. Joe Polos noted that this discussion on differences in goals came out of the joint meeting and is something the TMC and TAMWG need to be working on. Gil Saliba noted they need to agree on something we can all work on. Schrock said that we are well on our way to determining what those fish numbers should be via the fish production model and the DSS. Tom Stokely found the 1978 letter from the California Department of Fish and Game establishing the goals and he will send it out.

18. Identify Potential Agenda Items for Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for September 9 and 10. Topics suggested for the agenda included watersheds and the South Fork, program goals, and Charlie Chamberlain's presentation. Rich Lorenz suggested a review of the TAMWG's list of issues that had been developed for the joint meeting to make sure none were still lingering. Joe McCarthy suggested they discuss public comments on mornings and afternoons. Lorenz asked for another update by on implementation projects. A conference call was scheduled to address the agenda on August at 10 AM-noon.

Adjourn 3:00 PM

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS

Attachment 1: TAMWG Action Tracker handed out by Joe Polos.

Attachment 2: Nomination process. To be emailed to TAMWG members following the meeting by Joe Polos.

Attachment 3: TMC Chair report/letter response to TAMWG, passed out by Brian Person.

Attachment 4: Executive Director's report, June 9, 2014, passed out by Robin Schrock.

Attachment 5: FY 2015 TRRP budget proposed passed out by Robin Schrock.

Attachment 6: TRRP fiscal year 2015 preliminary science workplan summary, passed out by Joe Polos.

Attachment 7: Technical Workgroup Summary, June 2014, passed out by Joe Polos.

Attachment 8: TRRP, joint TMC/TAMWG meeting, May 15, 2014, passed out by Joe Polos.

Trinity River Adaptive Management Working Group

DRAFT AGENDA

Meeting of June 9-10, 2014

NOTE: Times Subject to Change

In-Person Location: Weaverville Fire Hall (125 Bremer Street, Weaverville, CA 96093)

To join the telephone (audio) conference only for June 9:

Call-In Toll Number: 408-792-6300

Access Code: 579 521 080

To join the WebEx conference for June 9:

URL: <https://trrp.webex.com/trrp/j.php?MTID=mda54085953c9f4bff9bdc3fed1dec2d4>

Password: Abc123!

To join the telephone (audio) conference only for June 10:

Call-In Toll Number: 408-792-6300

Access Code: 577 909 859

To join the WebEx conference for June 10:

URL: <https://trrp.webex.com/trrp/j.php?MTID=m99ac3ea7693a52330e6ade568e160955>

Password: Abc123!

MONDAY June 9, 2014		
Time	Agenda Item	Presenter
9:00 AM	Welcome, Introductions, Approve Agenda & Minutes	TAMWG
9:15 AM	Public Comment <i>Note: In accordance with traditional meeting practices, TAMWG will not act on any public comment item during its current business meeting</i>	
9:30 AM	Climate Change and Water Management in the Tributaries	Mark Lancaster
9:45 AM	Trinity Watershed Efforts	Alex Cousins et al
10:45 AM	BDCP Presentation	Tom Stokely
11:15	DSS Update	Ernie Clarke/DJ Bandrowski
11:45 AM	Update on Settlement Agreement of Trinity River Fish Hatchery	Don Reck
12:00 PM	Lunch	
1:15 PM	Phase 1 Review	SAB
2:15 PM	Vision of a Restored River to Help Guide Restoration	Charlie Chamberlain et al
3:15 PM	TRRP Riparian Efforts	James Lee
4:15 PM	Adjourn	

TUESDAY June 10, 2014		
Time	Agenda Item	Presenter
9:00 AM	Designated Federal Officer Items (including Action Tracker Update, Robert's Rules of Order, Membership Process and Schedule, and Charter Renewal)	Joe Polos
9:30 AM	TMC Chair Update	Brian Person
10:00 AM	Executive Director Update	Robin Schrock
10:30 AM	FY15 Budget	Robin Schrock
11:00 AM	Science Coordinator Update	Ernie Clarke
11:30 AM	Implementation Branch Chief Update	DJ Bandrowski
12:00 PM	Lunch	
1:15 PM	Update from TRRP workgroups	WG coordinators/Ernie/DJ
1:45 PM	Follow-Up Discussion from May 15 Joint TMC/TAMWG Meeting	TAMWG
3:45 PM	Identify potential agenda items for next meeting	TAMWG
4:00 PM	Adjourn	