

Draft 2 Minutes
TRINITY ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP
 Monday and Tuesday, March 17-18, 2014
 Weaverville Fire District, 125 Bremer St, Weaverville, CA

Monday March 17, 2014 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
Gil Saliba	Redwood Regional Audubon Society
Ed Duggan	Willow Cr. Comm. Serv. Dist., E. Humboldt Co. and small businesses
Richard Lorenz	Trinity County Resident
Joe McCarthy	Commercial Fishing Guide
David Steinhauser	Six Rivers Outfitters and Guides Association
Kelli Gant	Trinity Lake Revitalization Alliance
Carrie Nichols ¹	Natural Resource Conservation Service
Liam Gogan ²	Trinity River Fishing Guides
Paul Hauser ³	Trinity Public Utilities District
Emelia Berol ⁴	Northcoast Environmental Center

1) Alternate for Tiffany Hayes; 2) Travis Michel sat in during day 1; 3) attended day 1; 4) attended day 2.

Members that did not attend

Member:	Representative Seat:
Sandy Denn	Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District
Jeffrey Sutton	Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority

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

Other attendees: Justin Day (City of Redding Electric Utility Department), Bill Brock and Andrea Collins (USFS); Alex Cousins (Trinity County RCD); Wade Sinnen and Tony LaBlanca (DFW), Arnold Whitridge, Jim Smith and Dave Wellock (members of the public); Don Reck (BOR); Vina Frye (USFWS); Robin Schrock, Rod Wittler, and Dave Gaeuman (TRRP); Sara Tanis, Amanda Lee (AmeriCorps); Dave Hillemeier, Aaron Martin, Andreas Kraus, and Tim Hayden (Yurok Tribe); (TRRP), George Kautsky (Hoopa Tribe), Jeff Morris, Christy Bevard.

Attending via teleconference: D.J. Bandrowski (TRRP); Teresa Conor (DWR); Darren Mierau (CalTrout); and Holly Long.

Notes: Kim Mattson (ENW).

List of Motions Made during the Meeting

Gil Saliba made a motion to approve the agenda.

Paul Hauser 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.

Rich Lorenz nominated Elizabeth Hadley for Chair of the TAMWG.

Paul Hauser seconded the nomination.

There were no other nominations.

Elizabeth Hadley was elected 10 to 1.

Kelli Gant nominated Tom Stokely as vice-chair of TAMWG.

Joe McCarthy seconded the nomination.

Ed Duggan nominated himself as vice-chair for TAMWG.

Travis Michel seconded the nomination.

Tom Stokely was elected vice-chair with a vote of 10 to 2.

Tom Stokely made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC to write a letter of support to the BLM for land acquisition along the Trinity River subject to maintaining existing public access and developing new public access for that the BLM continue payment of in-lieu taxes.

Gil Saliba seconded the motion.

The motion passed 10 to 1.

Ed Duggan made a motion that the TAMWG recommend to TMC they make no gravel additions if the water year is Critically Dry or Dry.

Tom Stokely seconded the motion.

The motion passed 6 to 3.

Tom Stokely made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC to adopt the Flow Workgroup recommendations of ROD hydrograph for a Critically Dry year and use JPR Alt 2 hydrograph for a Dry year.

Seconded by Kelli Gant

The motion passed unanimously.

Kelli Gant made a motion that the TAMWG recommend TMC hold a joint meeting with TRRP management staff, TMC, and TAMWG to address the TAMWG list of issues.

Joe McCarthy seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Rich Lorenz made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC to defer outreach until a joint meeting to develop a consensus approach on the outreach.

Joe McCarthy seconded the motion

The motion passed unanimously.

Tom Stokely made a motion that the TAMWG ask TMC to request the SAB if tributary restoration would help with TRRP goals for all species.

Joe McCarthy seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Action Items Designated during the Meeting

There was 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.

Gil Saliba made a motion to approve the agenda.

Paul Hauser seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Approve Minutes

Elizabeth Hadley opened the discussion for the review of the minutes and asked if the edits had been incorporated.

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

Joe McCarthy seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Public Comment

Dave Wellock passed out information to the TAMWG and noted five questions he had asked the program about gravel additions, how they passed on information, and about domestic and agriculture wells. He noted costs he has incurred to his water diversion (pumps and pipes) due to rocks and flow of the river. He went over items in the material he handed out. He noted that he felt he was being “brushed off.” He noted other activities such as Star Thistle eradication and asked if we are “rebuilding a wheel.”

Elizabeth Hadley thanked Mr. Wellock and noted that some of the flow issues will be discussed later this morning.

Wade Sinnen introduced the new DFW fisheries manager for the Coast Area, Tony LaBlanca. LaBlanca made a few remarks, noting he was looking forward to working with the group.

Arnold Whitridge, former chairman of the TAMWG, addressed the group about the progress of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP or Program). His perception was that the Trinity River was becoming more dynamic and more fish friendly. He noted that increased flows are helping but he thought the other portions of the program are also helping. He noted the Program has improved its ecological understanding and that adaptive management seems to be working, but it is still weak in communicating its policies and intentions to the public. He noted that the fishing guides are not supportive of the program. He thought there are other critics of the Program other than the coalition (that had drafted a critical letter). He noted the coalition signers have most problems with the bureaucracy of the Program. They do not understand the response “we need more study.”

Whitridge suggested the TAMWG recommend the TMC respond to the coalition letter in writing soon. This would be much better than the ongoing discussion. He noted the comments should be substantive and they should describe how they think about things such as large wood or pools. His second recommendation is that TAMWG recommend the TMC provide a written policy of working watersheds. He noted causal linkage between watersheds and river function and the issues of the legal interpretation of whether this program is a watershed program. He noted the rules are unclear, the policy of the program is not clear, and this is dangerous. Find a way to have the TMC to “bend over backwards” to be transparent and responsive.

Ed Duggan asked to address the TAMWG as a representative of the in-river sport fishing group. He passed out a handout and asked that the TAMWG review their history by reviewing several position letters that should be in their files. These were letters to the TMC regarding ROD flows to restore the alluvial functions and fish restoration of the Trinity River. He noted that mouths of tributaries should be looked at so coho and steelhead can better access their spawning grounds. Gil Saliba asked for more clarification. Duggan noted that TAMWG asked for flows for restoration and not for storage. A review of the letters would show that ROD water should not be used for storage but be used to restore the river.

3. Designated Federal Officer Items and Elections of TAMWG Officials

Joe Polos, designated Federal Officer, reported on a few management items for the TAMWG. He went over the duties of the TAMWG as identified in the TAMWG charter and bylaws. He went over the Action Tracker and the three items from the last TAMWG meeting. The TMC addressed fall flows item and did not direct the Flow WG to develop flow schedules incorporating fall-flow needs within the ROD allocations. The noxious weed and watershed issues were deferred until the next TMC meeting so that there would be an opportunity for public comment on these issues.

They will be discussed at the next TMC meeting. Elections for chair and vice-chair were held in accordance with TAMWG bylaws that elections are held on the first meeting of each year.

Rich Lorenz nominated Elizabeth Hadley for Chair of the TAMWG.

Paul Hauser seconded the nomination.

There were no other nominations.

Elizabeth Hadley was elected 10 to 1.

Kelli Gant nominated Tom Stokely as vice-chair of TAMWG.

Joe McCarthy seconded the nomination.

Ed Duggan nominated himself as vice-chair for TAMWG.

Travis Michel seconded the nomination.

Tom Stokely was elected vice-chair with a vote of 10 to 2.

4. TMC Chair Update

Brian Person addressed the TAMWG about activities of the TMC. He noted some changes in leadership in the Bureau of Reclamation at the Commissioner level; the Commissioner had been promoted to the Assistant Secretary of the Interior position. He noted the former Commissioner had said that the criticisms of the Program can hurt the funding. Person noted that the Program has to go out to the people to help address these criticisms and they are planning a series of public discussions involving program staff, scientists, and members of the public.

Rich Lorenz noted that during the outreach activities, Reclamation is talking to the public but Reclamation is not listening. He agreed that the dirty laundry must not be aired in the newspaper. He opined that Arnold Whitridge quit because of failure of the program listening.

Person noted that the Program cannot move forward with restoration sites without approval of the TMC and that the TMC is going to consider a pause this year.

Ed Duggan noted that at the public meetings they collect answers but they cannot provide answers right there. Instead the answers are brought back to the TRRP office and answers are posted on the website. This takes time and many of the public do not get their answers.

Tom Stokely noted his participation in the coalition letter was needed, in his opinion, because the Restoration Program and Reclamation are being deceptive and non-responsive by not even mentioning or refuting the contrary findings of the SAB's Draft Phase 1 report in the draft environmental document on Bucktail and Lower Junction City. The SAB report and the draft environmental document were contradictory. He said acknowledgements and talk is fine, but TMC needs to "put something on the table." He expressed his dissatisfaction that the Program is proceeding ahead without addressing the SAB review. He said the Program cannot meet fishery restoration goals for all species without getting into the tributaries.

Person noted that not all readers of the appendices agree with Stokely's interpretation. He noted that work in the watersheds would need to be done under a different authority than the ROD, according to the Solicitor's opinion. The Program does allow monitoring but since the effects of the dam did not go up into the tributaries, they cannot do "brick and mortar" construction

projects in the tributaries. Robin Schrock noted various watershed programs that are currently operating in the watersheds.

Tom Stokely gave his opinion regarding the Solicitor's opinion disallowing watershed work below the North Fork because they lacked a causal linkage (i.e., the dam did not cause any effects in the tributaries). He reviewed two events that led to the position of no watershed work by the Program. He said that former BOR Area Manager Mike Ryan told the Solicitor's Office to say that there was no causal linkage because he was mad that the mainstem program was shut down in 1993 by Byron Leydecker and millions went to the South Fork and other tributaries. Stokely also added that during Trinity ROD EIS/EIR preparation Trinity County contracted an attorney who sent a memo about tributary restoration without the consent of Trinity County that resulted in a Temporary Restraining Order against the ROD in 2002. He cited other arguments made about the watershed being addressed by other programs. He believes the Solicitor's opinion was "concocted" and that the Program may be "vulnerable."

Person moved on with his report. He noted discussions with Mr. Wellock. He noted that the damages to Mr. Wellock diversion was not a tortious act and not eligible for payment under a Tort-claim. The Program decided that the ongoing well program would not include agricultural wells. During the discussions, they discovered a potential opportunity being considered in the San Joaquin River that may be applicable to Wellock situation. Stokely asked why the decision was made not to cover agricultural wells.

Person passed out graphs that showed the low storage of the Shasta and Trinity Reservoirs; storage is slightly above the low storage of the 1976-77 year. He talked about the allocations of water under the contracts (agriculture, M & I, and Sacramento River in-stream) and how junior users will have no water and senior users are going to be reduced.

Person also commented on the December Klamath fall flow meeting to develop a long-term plan for fall flows. This process has been put on hold given the developing drought. Person noted that their intentions are to send flows according to the ROD and regulatory requirements. Don Reck noted, however, that "regulatory relief" is being requested to address drought issues in the Sacramento River.

Several TAMWG members expressed appreciation for the work with Mr. Wellock. Gil Saliba asked if a more comprehensive agency group could come up with a way to address watershed issues. He asked why they are discussing the watershed in a negative way and not in a proactive way. Robin Schrock noted that the program funded the Trinity County RCD to coordinate for the TRRP with the Trinity Watershed Council at around \$60,000 this year, and since 2008.

Lunch

5. Presentation—BLM Land Acquisition on the Trinity River

Charlie Wright, supervisory realty specialist with the BLM made a presentation on land acquisition on the Trinity River. Most lands are acquired using the Land and Water Conservation fund. They are currently working on four parcels. Forty nine acres are being appraised at Hocker Flat; another parcel is 4.8 acres near Douglas City called the Getty Parcel; Rowdy Parcel is 5 acres near Lime Point; and the Marshall parcel is 5 acres near Bucktail. He requested the TAMWG to support the land acquisition program via a letter.

Travis Michel asked about public access and stated he would be supportive if there is continued public access. Wright said they always have pedestrian access but vehicular access depends on the site.

Tom Stokely asked why the BLM acquires property. Wright noted public access and river restoration. He commented, regarding whether the BLM would pay in-lieu taxes, that this is really a congressional thing. It is part of the larger budget approved by Congress, and that it would be paid at some point after the budget is approved. He also noted that they would be doing environmental review.

Wright also said they are not pursuing the Carr Creek parcel. David Steinhauser commented that the Rayleigh Parcel is for sale and the next owner may not be as open to access.

Rich Lorenz said there had been a lot of public access at Lorenz Gulch, but this had been blocked by placement of boulders and that this concerned him.

Tom Stokely made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC to write a letter of support to the BLM for land acquisition along the Trinity River subject to maintaining existing public access and developing new public access for that the BLM continue payment of in-lieu taxes.

Gil Saliba seconded the motion.

The motion passed 10 to 1.

6. Gravel Recommendations

Dave Gaeuman presented overhead slides outlining the Gravel Workgroup's recommendations for gravel augmentation for this coming year. He showed several types of hydrographs that the Flow Workgroup was considering. No gravel should be added if the water year is Critically Dry. For a Dry year, the Workgroup recommended adding 1400 cubic yards at Diversion Pool under the JPR Alt 2 hydrograph or adding 670 cubic yards under the ROD hydrograph. Gaeuman went over some of the rationale citing data on gravel mobility.

Gaeuman noted that he does try to account for sediment inputs from the tributaries. There had been only small amounts of sediment coming from tributaries over the last five years. He also noted that they are not planning a LiDAR surveys for the near term.

Ed Duggan made a motion that the TAMWG recommend to TMC they make no gravel additions if the water year is Critically Dry or Dry.

Tom Stokely seconded the motion.

The motion passed 6 to 3.

Brian Person asked that the TAMWG give their rationale for going against the Gravel Workgroup's recommendation. Ed Duggan said he did not think they were going to have the water to move the gravel. Gaeuman noted that the release will be the same regardless of whether they barely make the Dry year or readily make the Dry year. Rich Lorenz noted that the tributaries would not be contributing much if they barely make a Dry year.

7. Executive Director Update

Robin Schrock passed out a three-page letter that outlined the program updates (Attachment 1). She noted the most important activity since December was providing responses to the Water Quality Control Board on public comments on the Draft Environmental Assessment for the 2014

project sites. She noted the Continuing Resolution is over and they have a budget at around the \$15 million level approved by TMC in September. They have waivers around the hiring freeze for their positions and have hired a design engineer. D.J. Bandrowski would be covering the Implementation update and Ernie Clarke would be covering the Science update.

Schrock wrapped up by noting that the DSS demonstrations have been occurring to familiarize technical staff, the TAMWG and TMC members with DSS technology, that TRRP funds the printing and distribution of the Conservation Almanac through the outreach agreement with the Trinity County RCD, and the website is available to keep up with upcoming events, and to contact Deanna Jackson to be added to the monthly coordination email list.

The TAMWG will be able to review the 2015 budget at their next meeting in June.

8. TRRP Workgroups Update

Ernie Clarke noted that D.J. Bandrowski would be calling in with updates on the Implementation and that he may break his presentation to allow this.

Clarke then went over the bullets on Science Update in the Executive Director report (Attachment 1). Clarke noted that the final Phase I report will be distributed shortly. The flow scheduling process has been adapted to include multiple alternatives this year. He noted the tasks of the Gravel Workgroup. He commented that they are streamlining the review process.

Clarke next commented on the workgroup update and referred to his handout (Attachment 2) that described the activities of the various workgroups. He noted the Flow Workgroup has developed a new hydrograph for Critically Dry years. He noted work on the Fish Workgroup is developing the fish production model. The Gravel Workgroup had recommendations based on the water year determinations. The Wildlife and Riparian Workgroup has no recommendations but are addressing invasive species in the TRRP area. The Interdisciplinary Team holds monthly conference calls. The Design Workgroup was covered by D.J. Bandrowski during his call in (see below). The Watershed Workgroup reviewed proposals and recommended three projects.

Rich Lorenz hoped that they are not altering the natural look of the river. Gil Saliba asked if they could have a presentation on the watershed projects. He said they would like an overview of what the Workgroup thinks are the needs are. Schrock suggested they have the Trinity Watershed Council make a presentation about how they develop and prioritize projects, and then select those for consideration by TRRP. She also suggested that TAMWG have Mark Lancaster of 5 C's give a presentation on the water withdrawal problems in the tributaries that are also contributing to poor watershed health when added to the legacy mining, logging and road problems.

9. Design Update

D.J. Bandrowski called in to present on Implementation updates. He read through the bullets on Schrock's hand out (Attachment 1). These are the in-river projects planned for 2014. He commented on the Douglas City project. He also commented on the Phase II plans. The Lower Junction City design is completed. The Bucktail is 90 % complete but the project on hold pending redesign due to comments and also because a new bridge is needed before the project can move ahead. NEPA work is being done.

Rich Lorenz asked if the Yurok will be handling the bids or doing the actual work at Lower Junction City site. Bandrowski said the Yurok will be partnering with a separate construction company of their choice.

Tom Stokely asked how the designs by the Tribes are approved and if the Design Team is involved and why there are four different design teams. Bandrowski said the Design Team comments at several points during the design process by the Tribes. The four design teams avoid “design by committee” and this avoids being led by those with the “most vocal input.”

Travis Michel asked if they are still going to reroute the river at Upper Douglas City on river right. He noted the guides do not like the forced meander. Bandrowski thought this had been addressed via the NEPA document. Michel asked Bandrowski to come to the next guides’ meeting to present the design.

Bandrowski continued to comment on 2015 plans. He noted that they have no new projects other than those noted and are waiting for the Phase II review input. They will be moving forward with designs on Dutch Creek, Hatchery Reach, Limekiln Gulch, Bucktail, Lorenz Gulch, and Douglas City. He noted a Design Team meeting on March 25 to discuss these projects.

Move to Item 12

The TAMWG was an hour ahead of schedule and decided to hear the presentation of Item 12 before adjourning for the day.

Adjourn 4:30 PM

Tuesday March 18, 2014 9:30 AM

10. Day 2 Welcome

Elizabeth Hadley started the meeting and welcomed the group.

11. DSS Demo

Chris Holmquist-Johnson and Leanne Hanson of the USGS Fort Collins Science Center (FORT) made a Powerpoint presentation via teleconference on their experiences using a decision support system for water management on the Delaware River. He noted some basic premises that conflict is negotiated and through changes to state variables. He listed some state variables: discharge, habitat, temperature, water rights, fish passage, floods, power generation, and riparian condition, among others. He mentioned the use of forecasting and hind casting models. He showed an example of quantification of the effects to habitat using two different flows. He also showed two scenarios of flow alterations on stream temperature and how one scenario increased the percentage of days outside the temperature threshold. He described scenarios as changes to driving variables. He gave an example of a hydrologic scenario generator using mass balancing techniques. Criteria for creating and evaluating alternatives are that it must make sense for interpreting the output (i.e., no black box results).

Ed Duggan asked how they ensure stakeholder involvement and understanding of the process. Holmquist-Johnson said they invite stakeholders at the start and ask if the stakeholders had additional input. Hanson noted that this created an iterative process and that questions must be brought up and addressed early on in the process. Ernie Clarke noted that the SAB also noted that the stakeholders in the TRRP must be brought up to speed on the basic foundation premises of the TRRP.

Holmquist-Johnson next described the decision support system (DSS) as “software to compile information so people can solve problems and make decisions.” The stakeholders choose the state

variables, the effects of scenarios are compared to baseline conditions, and then this is evaluated. The outcomes are displayed in various ways to allow comparison of alternatives. Key elements are decision-maker involvement, transparency, and navigability. Basic gaps are that physical habitat does not determine survival or reproductive success; models are seldom validated; a gap exists between water management and physical and biological variables (e.g., velocity/depth is not adequate). They have learned that DSS is a process and is designed to help people make decisions, not to make the decisions for them.

He showed examples from the Yakima River where they used LiDAR and other raw data to drive habitat modeling in a spatial manner. He showed maps of spawning and incubation overlays that suggesting that effective habitat is where they both overlap as opposed to where they occur separately. He summarized that DSS is based on applied science, provide for specific water management issues, and outcomes are in multiple formats for specific stakeholders. He showed a conceptual flow diagram that noted that various data sets are used to drive 2-D hydraulic models, which feed habitat versus flow, and leads to habitat time series and population projections. These outputs are used for decision making.

Holmquist-Johnson showed how they are using DSS on the Delaware River (REFDSS version 1.1, Bovee 2007). He showed modeled habitat by life-stages and how this may change with flow. He showed examples of where they compared habitat between a wet decade (1980s) versus a dry decade (1990s). He compared different reaches and the over-all basin components.

He showed a demonstration of DSS that showed changes to habitat suitability maps of depth and velocity as a function of flow. He showed how one could view habitat (depth and velocity) as a function of pre and post construction. The maps showed sequential changes over time as the computer ran through a hydrograph.

George Kautsky asked to hear more about what they are doing on the Delaware and to see how it compares to what they are doing on the Trinity. He asked for examples in DSS that might have taken in such a large array of management objectives over long time periods. He asked how DSS may help in to predict outcomes decades from now. He thought the Trinity may be more complex and he asked if DSS be up to the task. Holmquist-Johnson said they do not have examples yet, as the Delaware is working in a fixed bed hydraulic model. He said they are asking these more complex questions both in the Delaware as well as in other river systems but have not specifically applied the DSS to answer these questions at this point.

Since Item 12 had been covered yesterday, the next agenda item was 13.

12. Trinity River Hatchery Update

The TAMWG decided to hear from this item at the end of Monday as they were about one hour ahead of schedule.

Joe Polos presented an update on the California Hatchery Review and the process being implemented for Trinity River Hatchery. He reviewed the history and rationale of the review and covered the recommendations that came from the review. Regarding Trinity River Hatchery, they recommended the ladder not be closed for two weeks in late summer, but that fish that come in at this time by euthanized to avoid hybridization between spring and fall runs of Chinook. All fish should be coded wire tagged and 25 % be adipose-fin clipped. Adults from yearling releases should not be used for brood stock. Jacks should be incorporated into brood stock. Coho management goals should be revisited. Steelhead goals should count half-pounders. Hatchery-spawned fish returning to hatchery should be managed differently than naturally spawned fish. An

MOU is currently under development for establishing the governing board to address recommendation from the report.

Polos noted that a lawsuit has been filed concerning the lack of a hatchery genetic and management plan for the Trinity River Hatchery. It appears that a management plan will be developed.

Polos presented data on the past fall Chinook run. The run was smaller than predicted. Harvest managers are considering reduced harvest regulations this year to meet escapement targets for Klamath Basin fall-run Chinook salmon.

Wade Sinnen made comments on how the models predict fish returns. He noted that, this past fall, they had about 100,000 fewer fish return to the Klamath River than predicted. He noted there are many variables involved and it is difficult to predict accurately. Last year, jacks were slightly lower than normal years. Without fishing mortality in the ocean or river, they expect about 107,000 returning fish next year and this will not be “an above average” season. Sinnen thought they are not returning to more normal, lower returns. He said it appears that the ocean conditions, especially when the smolts first hit the ocean are the major determinants of the returns.

Travis Michel asked about changes to the harvests during the season using real-time data. Sinnen noted that they do not have real-time monitoring. The Didson systems cannot see what species it is or whether it has an adipose clip. Even if you have a count of fish, you still do not know how many more are still coming.

Sinnen described the MSY or maximum sustained yield of returning natural spawners to the Klamath Basin. They think the MSY and what they try to manage for is 40,700 naturally spawning, fall Chinook.

13. Flow Recommendations

Rod Wittler gave a Powerpoint presentation from the Flow Workgroup on flow scheduling and their work on temperature. They have held 6 meetings over the past year. He showed a daily report put out by Reclamation’s Central Valley Operations office regarding the water storages in reservoirs; Trinity is about 50 % full and Shasta is about 40 % full. These are below average levels. The drought was worsening over the first part of the year, but has moderated marginally with the recent rains. NOAA expects the drought to persist or intensify over the next three months. The snow-water contents are perhaps the lowest yet measured. The B120 forecasts of inflow to Trinity Reservoir suggest a Critically Dry water year is developing. This would produce a river release of 369,000 acre-feet. The Central Valley Operations b2 (50 % exceedance) forecast is for a storage of 457 thousand acre-feet (TAF) for Trinity Reservoir by September 2014.

Ed Duggan asked about what April flows may look like. Wittler said it looks like it will track to be a Critically Dry year.

The expected exports via the Carr Tunnel as of February are 896 TAF under a 50 % exceedance, and 720 TAF under a 90 % exceedance. Wittler clarified that not every year has a 50:50 split between exports and down river flows; but overall this is the long-term average.

Rich Lorenz asked whether the Program can release slightly less water down river and store it for carry over. This was answered as “No.” There are no legal provisions to do this. Also, the releases are dictated by the Flow Evaluation Study. However, a decision support system could begin to evaluate this type of scenario.

Wittler next lead the TAMWG through the process of developing the flow hydrograph for a Dry and a Critically Dry water year. The Flow Workgroup recommends the ROD prescribed hydrograph if it turns out to be a Critically Dry year. The Workgroup derived alternative hydrographs in the event this year turns out to be a Dry year. In one alternative, they attempted to introduce multiple peaks to mimics snow melt (Multi Peak); in a second alternative, they attempted to introduce events to aid multiple functions (JPR Alt 2). The Flow Workgroup recommended the JPR Alt 2 if it does turn out to be a Dry year.

Ed Duggan made a motion to follow the Critically Dry water release for this year.

The motion failed for second.

Tom Stokely made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC to adopt the Flow Workgroup recommendations of ROD hydrograph for a Critically Dry year and use JPR Alt 2 hydrograph for a Dry year.

Seconded by Kelli Gant

The motion passed unanimously.

14. Reservoir Operations and Temperature Control

Wittler next presented their work on temperatures as a function of flows. He showed predicted water storages and releases at the Trinity Dam by the Trinity River Division. He showed the “blended operations” used by the Trinity Dam outlet works. He reviewed the temperature targets. This year, they are predicting Lewiston Dam will be releasing water temperatures about 60 F during September. But this does not mean temperatures at Douglas City will be 10 F higher (70 F) since the river reaches an “equilibrium temperature” and they can use “blended operations.” Wittler showed two alternatives of release using blended operations to keep Lewiston Dam release as close as possible to year 2009 conditions or no higher than 55 F at Lewiston using the auxiliary outworks

The TAMWG discussed the future of temperature management. They asked about options for the Carr Tunnel, and management of Lewiston Reservoir to reduce water heating. Wittler explained that there had been a concept to dredge the bottom of Lewiston near the upper end to reduce a natural “ramp” that introduces mixing of upper warm and lower cool water but a specific project is not moving forward at this time. Wittler noted that the cold water curtain in Lewiston was a great idea and one that works well. There was discussion about the carry-over of reservoir storage to maintain temperature. Tom Stokely noted the County had an analysis of the carry-over and they concluded that 1.2 million AF would be needed to keep waters cool enough to carry through a multi-year drought similar to that of 1928-1934. Stokely said he could make this analysis available to anyone who wished to see it.

The TAMWG was about 45 minutes ahead of schedule and decided to address Items 16 and 17 before the lunch break.

Lunch break

15. Panel Discussion of 2014 Projects

This item was addressed following Items 16 and 17. Joe Polos made a few comments on the role of TAMWG so as to keep the discussion on track. He noted that the TAMWG makes recommendations to the TMC to help them move the program forward in a positive way.

Tom Stokely introduced himself as representative of California Water Impact Network and a former planner with Trinity County. He said his motive is for the TRRP to be successful to meet the fisheries goals and he does not think the program will do that if it continues with the current direction. He noted he was annoyed with the draft EA/EIR document released regarding upcoming restoration projects by the TRRP. The EA/EIR was released after the SAB Phase I review but the EA/EIR made no mention of the SAB review and this, he felt, was dishonest. Stokely felt the EA/EIR should have at least referenced the Program's differences with the SAB report. He noted his record of over 30 years of promoting the river at State Water Board meetings, commenting on planning documents, involvement in the development of the CVPIA, extension of the old restoration program, adopting Basin Plan temperature objectives, fighting efforts to undermine the CVPIA, CEQA lead agency staff for the ROD's EIS/EIR, and that he was an alternate on the TMC, and other work since the early 1980's. He opined that the Restoration Program has alienated many locals including members of the TAMWG. He noted that the author of the CDR program evaluation report, Chris Moore, observed large levels of program participant animosity and that Moore thought the Hoopa Valley Tribe was the source of much of this. He does not think the TRRP is a collaborative program but a "rubber stamp." He cited the numerous groups that are signatory to the coalition letter including environmental groups, fishing groups and guides. He noted the letter asks for a break on mainstem projects until proper review. He feels the TRRP is biased against watershed projects.

He listed three mistakes he made that contributed to what he now sees as problems. The first mistake was voting for the super-majority while he served as alternate on the TMC. His second mistake was not pressing to upgrade or replace Bucktail Bridge. The third mistake was when he worked for Trinity County and they hired Gregory Thomas from the Natural Heritage Institute who improperly released a memo on the role of tributaries in the EIS/EIR to the Department of the Interior that eventually was cited as support for Interior's current position on watershed work resulted in issuance of a TRO against the ROD in 2002. Lastly he cited how watershed work under the ROD was arbitrarily limited by Mike Ryan of Reclamation and Ryan argued for that lack of causal linkage existed which directly influenced the unwritten Solicitor's opinion. Stokely wrote a white paper listing reasons for a "causal linkage" to perform watershed restoration work in the South Fork in 2003 that has yet to have any formal response. Stokely said to reach the restoration goals, the Program needs to embrace tributary restoration.

Stokely listed the four things the coalition wants. 1) No Bucktail project right now. 2) The guides do not like the forced meanders at upper Douglas City. 3) No gravel at the Lower Junction City site as it may fill pools downstream. 4) Have the SAB look at tributaries restoration as a means to meet TRRP goals. He noted that watershed restoration (e.g., roads) is part of the ROD while tributary restoration is not. The mainstem work is an experiment, but tributary work is known to succeed and is included in the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's Fishery Restoration Manual. He summarized his statement by saying that he and the coalition would like to "back down" and will do so, if the Program can meet these requests.

Emelia Berol stated that the board of the North Coast Environmental Center, and she herself, supports Tom Stokely. She cited Stokely as one of the most knowledgeable and longest serving stalwarts of the Trinity River and that he deserves to be listened to. Liam Gogan, as president and representative the Guides Association and he said Stokely "got it right on the head." He felt there is a "big disconnect" and that most of the projects have failed. He thought they are not seeing fish response and they are "not getting their money's worth."

Elizabeth Hadley and Joe Polos directed the TAMWG to focus on identifying issues/actions that could help move the program forward.. TAMWG members expressed a desire to have a

discussion on Stokely's list of four items plus any other things the TAMWG wanted. To start this discussion, the following list of TAMWG concerns was compiled.

- 1) Chanel rehabilitation projects generally (scope cost)
 - a) Bucktail Bridge rehabilitation project
- 2) Forced meander at Upper Douglas City
- 3) Gravel augmentation
 - a) Gravel at Lower Junction City channel rehabilitation project
- 4) Tributary restoration—SAB input before Solicitor's opinion
 - a) Access for migrating fish
- 5) Program authority
 - a) TRRP watershed authority
 - b) Authorities beyond TRRP
 - c) Inflexibility
- 6) Outreach program (plans and outcomes)
- 7) Hydrograph design
- 8) Public access to river
- 9) Restoration goal
- 10) Commitments to all salmonids
- 11) Agricultural water diversions

At this time, comments from the public were taken. Dave Wellock noted early work in the basin when agencies dug out holes in the river to capture sediment and now they are filling them with gravel. He thought TRRP is simply "re-inventing the wheel" and they are not listening to the public or paying attention to what has happened in the past. Aaron Martin, landowner on Big Bar and fisheries biologist for the Yurok Tribe noted he wrote the response letter to the editor and not the Yurok Tribe. He stated the need for water in the river and that he is worried about exports out of the basin—how can we control the exports? Christy Bevard, resident from Lewiston, asked for a list of the SAB members as she would like to write to them. Robin Schrock noted she came to the program three years ago and recounted that she received threatened messages over the phone and she was further threatened at a local meeting. Because of this, she was advised by her supervisors not to attend future meetings. Dave Hillemeier of the Yurok Tribe thought a joint meeting with TMC over these issues is a good idea but the list may need to be prioritized. He also thought the issue of misinformation may be needed to be added. Hadley thought she had a good sense of the list to prioritize it.

The TAMWG then returned to Rich Lorenz's motion made during Agenda Item 16. During the discussion of the concerns list and his motion, Lorenz withdrew the motion in favor of the following new motions.

Kelli Gant made a motion that the TAMWG recommend TMC hold a joint meeting with TRRP management staff, TMC, and TAMWG to address the TAMWG list of issues.

Joe McCarthy seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Rich Lorenz made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC to defer outreach until a joint meeting to develop a consensus approach on the outreach.

Joe McCarthy seconded the motion

The motion passed unanimously.

Tom Stokely made a motion that the TAMWG ask TMC to request the SAB if tributary restoration would help with TRRP goals for all species.

Joe McCarthy seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Once the motions were finalized, Emelia Berol stated her admiration and respect for the TRRP staff. She restated the need for an open discussion of the Program objectives as that is what is needed now.

At this point, since the last two items were covered earlier, Elizabeth Hadley declared the meeting adjourned.

16. Program Outreach

Discussion of this item was taken up before the break for lunch.

Rich Lorenz stated he did not think it was advisable to have someone from the community do all the outreach. He proposed that they convene a meeting to handle some of the outreach problems immediately, so as to stop the controversy from boiling on. He thought it would be best for a meeting of some TAMWG members and other stakeholders instead of a holding a larger, joint meeting that would not be able to get ahead of the issue.

Emelia Berol liked the idea and stated she would participate, but her concerns were more with Reclamation policies and not so much with TRRP. Lorenz agreed that the Bureau does too much talking and not enough listening. Joe Polos thought this meeting may be similar to a similar meeting hosted by Brian Person in December regarding fall flows.

Tom Stokely said he has issues with the TMC, the TRRP, and the Bureau and he asked for a show of hands from a majority of TAMWG members that agreed with this statement; several responded by raising their hands. Elizabeth Hadley asked if the TAMWG can recommend that the TAMWG meets with the agencies regarding their concerns. Gil Saliba said before a meeting, the TAMWG first needed to agree on the list of issues.

There was more discussion about the sequencing of a joint meeting then how to do outreach.

Rich Lorenz made a motion that the TMC not do any outreach regarding the coalition letter and the guide's letter until they have a joint meeting with the TAMWG, TRRP management staff, and TMC to discuss the list of issues.

Emelia Berol seconded the motion.

This motion was discussed and eventually not brought to a vote at this time, but was to be voted on after the discussions to be held during Agenda Item 15. (After more discussion after lunch on Agenda Item 15, Lorenz agreed to withdraw this motion in favor of new reworded motions made at that time.)

During the discussion of the motion, Robin Schrock recounted that outreach was active in the Program and cited that \$150K/year was put toward outreach over the past three years producing brochures, meetings, and events. She did not think the TAMWG was acting appropriately according to FACA without first discussing and organizing the issues in a public meeting. She

thought all TAMWG members need to come together to list and prioritize those things the Program should be doing.

Gil Saliba also did not know if everyone yet agreed about the issues and thought it was premature to plan outreach. David Steinhauser agreed with Saliba that the motion was good but should be voted on only after they have more discussion.

Rich Lorenz agreed that the motion should be tabled until after the discussion planned as part of Item 15.

17. Next Meeting Dates and Agenda Items

This item was addressed before the break lunch.

Future meetings were scheduled for:

June 9 and 10 in Weaverville;

September 9 and 10 in Weaverville;

December 9 and 10 in Weaverville.

Conference calls were scheduled for:

May 5 at 10:00 AM;

Future agenda items included:

Phase I, riparian work, Mark Lancaster and watersheds, and the budget. Rich Lorenz asked for more information on decision support. Gil Saliba asked that a watershed presentation cover more comprehensive information than just the Program focus.

Adjourn 2:50 PM

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS

Attachment 1: Executive Director's Report; passed out by Robin Schrock.

Attachment 2: Technical Workgroup Summary; passed out by Ernie Clarke.

Attachment 3: California Hatchery Review Report Trinity River Hatchery June 2012; passed out by Joe Polos

Trinity River Adaptive Management Working Group

AGENDA

Meeting of March 17, 2014---March -18, 2014

NOTE: Times Subject --to Change In---Person -Location: Weaverville Fire Hall
(125 Bremer Street, Weaverville, CA 96093)

MONDAY March 17, 2014

Time	Agenda Item	Presenter
10:00 AM	Welcome, Introductions, Approve Agenda & Minutes	TAMWG
10:15 AM	Public Comment	
10:30 AM	Designated Federal Officer Items	Joe Polos
11:00 AM	TMC Chair Update	Brian Person
12:00	Lunch	
1:00 PM	Presentation BLM Land Acquisition on the Trinity River	Charlie Wright
1:30 PM	Gravel Recommendations	Robert Franklin
2:30 PM	Executive Director Update	Robin Schrock
3:00 PM	TRRP Workgroups Update	Ernie Clarke
3:30 PM	Design Update	DJ Bandrowski
4:30 PM	Adjourn	

TUESDAY March 18, 2014

Time	Agenda Item	Presenter
9:30 AM	Day 2 Welcome	TAMWG
9:45 AM	DSS Demo	USGS
10:45	Trinity River Hatchery Update	Joe Polos

11:00 AM	Flow Recommendations	Rod Wittler
12:00 AM	Reservoir Operations and Temperature Control	Rod Wittler
12:30 PM	Lunch	
1:30 PM	Panel Discussion of 2014 Projects	Tom Stokely, Fishing Guides Association, TAMWG
3:00 PM	Program Outreach	TAMWG
3:30 PM	Next Meeting Date & Location; Agenda Items	TAMWG
4:00 PM	Adjourn	