

Draft 2 Minutes
TRINITY ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP
 June 16-17, 2015
 Weaverville Fire Hall, 125 Bremer, Weaverville, CA

Tuesday June 16, 2015 9:30 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
Joe McCarthy	Commercial Fishing Guide
Emelia Berol	Northcoast Environmental Center
Richard Lorenz	Trinity County Resident
Paul Catanese	Resident and business owner
Kelli Gant	Trinity Lake Revitalization Alliance
Paul Hauser	Trinity Public Utilities District
Sandy Denn	Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District
Darren Mierau	Environmental Organizations
David Steinhauser ²	Six Rivers Outfitters and Guides Association
Ed Duggan ²	Willow Cr. Comm. Serv. Dist., E. Humboldt Co. and small businesses
Travis Michel ³	Recreational/Commercial Fisherman

¹ Justin Day sat in on Day 1. ² Arrived after lunch on Day 1. ³ Alternate for Liam Gogan, arrived on Day 2.

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

Other attendees: Kristi Bevard (resident and alternate for TAMWG member Tom Stokely); Julie Catanese (resident and alternate for Hauser); Dan Ehresman (NW Env Center and alternate for Berol), CJ Ralph (FS retired and alternate for Saliba), Bill Trush (Rivers Institute and alternate for Mierau); Dave Wellock, (resident); Vina Frye (USFWS); Robin Schrock, Ernie Clarke, Robert Stewart, Todd Buxton (TRRP); George Kautsky, Mike Orcutt, and James Lee (Hoopa Valley Tribe); Wade Sinnen (Ca Dept. Fish and Wildlife).

Notes: Kim Mattson (ENW).

List of Motions Made during the Meeting

Paul Hauser made a motion to approve the agenda.

Kelli Gant seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Paul Hauser made a motion to nominate Elizabeth Hadley as Chair and Tom Stokely as Vice-chair.

Richard Lorenz seconded the motion.

Gil Saliba made a motion to nominate Ed Duggan as Vice-chair.

Joe McCarty seconded.

Elizabeth Hadley and Tom Stokely were elected as Chair and Vice-chair, respectively, via written ballots.

Rich Lorenz made a motion to accept the September 2014 TAMWG minutes.

Ed Duggan seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Kelli Gant made motion that the TAMWG request the TMC to obtain the latest water year forecast.

Emelia Berol seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Kelli Gant made a motion to change the Communication Guide definition of TAMWG to reflect the wording of the TAMWG Charter Item number 3 last sentence "...to recommend policy and provide management input, in an advisory capacity, about restoration efforts to the TRRP through the Trinity Management Council (TMC)."

Lorenz seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 10 yes votes and 1 opposed.

Tom Stokely made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC to recommend the BOR limit Trinity River diversions this year to Sacramento River to the minimum amounts necessary to meet Trinity River Basin plan objectives.

Rich Lorenz seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 6 yes and 5 no votes.

Paul Catanese made a motion that the TAMWG recommend that the TMC not hold closed executive sessions unless they adopt the Brown Act criteria as part of their by-laws.

Tom Stokely seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Action Items Designated during the Meeting

Seth Naman will to email the language regarding TMC closed sessions to Tom Stokely.

Robin Schrock will send a copy of the TMC letter of support for Lewis temperature control.

Robin Schrock will send out the Solicitor's letter describing the types of work to be allowed in tributaries.

Elizabeth Hadley will forward Paul Zedonis' email on flow to TAMWG members.

Elizabeth Hadley will send out an agenda in advance of the Joint Meeting.

Elizabeth Hadley and Joe Polos will follow up with Josh Smith on a possible presentation on illegal water diversions in Trinity County.

Meeting Minutes by Agenda Item

1. Welcome, Introductions, Approve Agenda and Minutes

Tom Stokely, Vice-chair, opened the meeting for the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG). He asked the members and attendees to make introductions.

Stokely asked for comments on and approval of the agenda.

Paul Hauser made a motion to approve the agenda.

Kelli Gant seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Stokely next asked for nominations for Chair and Vice-chair of TAMWG.

Paul Hauser made a motion to nominate Elizabeth Hadley as Chair and Tom Stokely as Vice-chair.

Richard Lorenz seconded the motion.

Gil Saliba made a motion to nominate Ed Duggan as Vice-chair.

Joe McCarty seconded.

Elizabeth Hadley and Tom Stokely were elected as Chair and Vice-chair, respectively, via written ballots.

Approval of Minutes

Tom Stokely suggested the TAMWG wait until after lunch to approve minutes to allow time for one last review. After lunch, Tom Stokely submitted minor edits. The following motion was made.

Rich Lorenz made a motion to accept the September 2014 TAMWG minutes.

Ed Duggan seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Public Comment

No comments.

3. Designated Federal Officer Items

Joe Polos, designated Federal Officer, had several items to report. As this was the first meeting following the renewal of the TAMWG Charter and there were several new members on TAMWG, Polos covered a basic introduction to TAMWG which is a committee that operates under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). Polos first thanked the members for participating and devoting their time. He noted that the decisions in Washington DC delayed the re-approval of the TAMWG and that was the reason for not holding the March TAMWG meeting.

Polos next explained the TAMWG Charter as a document to help guide the TAMWG and its organization as an advisory group to the Trinity Management Council (TMC). Polos went over some of the operations and duties of the TAMWG noting the by-laws on voting, quarterly meetings, and notifications in the Federal Register. The meetings generally follow Robert's Rules of Order. Notes from the meetings are taken and posted to the website. The Action Tracker tracks motions and recommendations made by the TAMWG for the TMC and actions taken.

Tom Stokely clarified that if a regular TAMWG member shows up for a meeting, the alternate should not claim travel expenses. Also it was clarified that members may not claim expenses for attendance of other meetings except for the Chair's or Vice-chair's attendance of the TMC meetings.

Kristi Bevard asked whether she should identify as an alternate TAMWG member or a member of the public during public comments. Tom Stokely said as a member of the public.

4. Trinity River Restoration Program (background/refresher)

Robin Schrock gave a detailed Powerpoint on the background and history of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP).

Schrock started by noted the important foundation documents—the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA), the Trinity River Flow Evaluation Report (TRFER), the Trinity River Environmental Impact Statement (TREIS), and the Record of Decision (ROD). The program started in 2001 but, due to litigation, the first ROD flows were not until 2005. The FWS and the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) have co-leads over the program. A portion of the program funding is what is called “reimbursable” costs that come from water users under the CVPIA. Other funding comes through FWS and through BOR. She identified technical “workgroups” which make recommendations to the eight TMC entities for restoration projects. The TMC entities are the FWS, BOR, Forest Service, Hoopa Valley Tribe, Yurok Tribe, Trinity County, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and the State of California Resources Agency. Outside groups also provide guidance such as the Science Advisory Board (SAB). The TRRP is composed of an Implementation Group which handles construction and a Technical Modeling and Science Group which guides science and monitors projects. She noted that no one person makes a decision and all partners have inputs.

The budget is a complex process of working within the President's budget and then the program's needs to derive specific line items to account for every dollar spent. Permits are also complex and challenging and need to address a variety of environmental regulations. Schrock noted the two specific legislation sections of the CVPIA that provides funding for the program.

She noted that the ROD preferred alternative of the Trinity River EIS/EIR is very “prescriptive.” However, the program uses an adaptive management approach which allows for change. Partners

and public often have differing opinions on actions to take. The basic restoration approach is to promote physical processes to allow a complex channel to form to provide rearing and spawning habitat. The goal is to restore the natural populations of salmon and steelhead in the river. It is still an “unknown” as to how long fish may take to respond. So far, they have completed 32 projects out of a planned 47.

Modeling efforts that support the program are fisheries, hydrology, and geomorphology. Flow releases are set to reflect the hydrologic year predicted by the state of California in April. There is a sediment management effort to reduce fine sediment and replace spawning sediment and a watershed restoration effort. Monitoring is big component. Reporting includes responses to Congressional inquiries, annual reports, TMC and TAMWG quarterly meetings, CVPIA annual report and other performance reviews.

Schrock closed her presentation by noting that program success is the result of a well-designed TRRP, the FACA input, the technical workgroups, the known water year availabilities, and good funding.

TAMWG asked questions about gravel sources and mining versus natural, progress of the fish production model and DSS, and the geographic extent of the program.

At this point, Tom Stokely noted that the meeting was ahead of schedule and at his suggestion, the TAMWG addressed agenda Items 9, 10 and 13. After that, the TAMWG broke for lunch.

Lunch

5. Trinity Management Chair Update

Seth Neman, Trinity Management Council (TMC) Chair, gave an update of the last TMC meeting and activities. He noted the TMC meeting next week and invited attendance.

Naman described a proposed change the TMC is considering to their by-laws to allow holding closed-door sessions. He explained the value of having closed-door meetings was to allow members to speak freely and deal with sensitive issues. They plan to produce meeting summaries of closed meetings.

The TAMWG had several concerns over the TMC holding closed sessions. Kelli Gant noted that California and Federal laws provide specific rules for publically funded groups holding closed sessions and she said that “not wishing to speak in front of the public” is not one of them. She noted that sensitive information on contracts and such is one of about five reasons for holding closed door sessions.

Tom Stokely asked if the TAMWG Chair can attend closed sessions and Naman thought “no.” Paul Catanese asked why the TMC would want a closed-door session other than for personnel actions. Naman said the TMC wants to be transparent but they felt that situations may arise where the TMC would feel they need to talk openly and frankly but not in public. He said it was a need to have this flexibility for special conditions. Gant said, as a member of other boards, she has to simply overcome the reluctance to say things in public; she thought the TMC may be going down the “wrong road.” Emelia Berol noted that there are times when there are things that need to be talked about in confidence such as government-to-government discussions. Naman agreed and said that these go on now. Naman said that no voting would occur during these meetings. Justin Day asked that the language of the closed door meetings be made available to the TAMWG. Naman agreed to do so.

Seth Naman will to email the proposed language regarding TMC closed sessions to Tom Stokely.

Naman asked Ernie Clarke and Joe Polos to comment on other situations where closed sessions are used in public agencies. Ernie Clarke described closed door meetings that were held in Florida in the Everglades restoration and these discussions might have included lawsuits, or other issues such as one agency having a negative effect on another. The results would be made available after the meeting. Joe Polos noted that executive sessions were not uncommon in other federal collaborative projects. Polos said partners may need to discuss divergent views or actions that are not in line with the group.

Sandy Denn commented that when she serves on other boards they have to “air their dirty laundry” in public. Catanese and Gant noted that the TMC is funded by the public and excluding the public doesn’t seem right. Sandy Denn said that agencies in the State of California can hold closed meetings but only according to the Bagley-Keene Act.

Naman moved on to his next item and noted that Humboldt County still has interest in becoming a TMC member. Most, but not all, TMC members support this. However, the County does not want to submit it to a vote if it will not be passed. Naman said the TMC is unlikely to take it up for a vote at the next meeting.

Ed Duggan asked about the idea of having a Humboldt County representatives coming to a meeting. Naman said that the County did not want to ask for admittance if they were not wanted—he noted a County Supervisor characterized it as “the County did not wish to grovel over it.” Kelli Gant pointed out that TAMWG had failed to pass a motion to recommend Humboldt County be a member of TMC and that Humboldt County had not participated in TAMWG recently. Tom Stokely clarified that some years earlier, the TAMWG did pass a motion for TMC membership. Ed Duggan also pointed out that Humboldt County had participated in TAMWG and County Supervisor, Jill Gardner, was a representative on TAMWG for a year. But TAMWG meetings were on the same days as her Supervisor meetings and she eventually had to drop attendance at TAMWG.

Naman moved on to his next item and reported that the TMC passed a motion to write a letter to continue pursuing temperature control in Lewiston Reservoir. Tom Stokely asked for a copy of the letter.

Robin Schrock will send a copy of the TMC letter of support for Lewiston temperature control.

Naman next noted the joint meeting between the TMC and TAMWG that is scheduled for August 13 at the North Fork Grange. They planned for a group meeting in the morning, and an afternoon session to tour the Lower Junction City site. George Kautsky asked that the sessions be reversed to avoid the afternoon heat.

Naman noted the public float June 26 and that he will be attending that and he hoped to see everyone there. Naman closed by saying he will step up his efforts to maintain communication with the TAMWG.

Rich Lorenz asked if the TMC can change the flow schedule volume based on new information. Naman said no, it would take a change to the ROD to change the flow volumes. Naman noted that the timing of some flows (but not annual volumes), for example in March, were changed based on changes in the water year predictions. He acknowledged that more water is being exported to the Sacramento to address temperature issues there.

Kelli Gant made motion that the TAMWG request the TMC to obtain the latest water year forecast.

Emelia Berol seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

6. Executive Director Update / FY16 Budget & workplan

Robin Schrock, Executive Director of the TRRP passed out a handout constituting her report (Attachment 1). She noted that the President's budget for FY2016 is not finalized but it appears to indicate decreases in the TRRP budget for FY2106. Brandt Gutermuth is the Acting Implementation Branch Chief. A new SAB member is being sought. Dr. Todd Buxton is the new fisheries biologist. Ernie Clarke has accepted a new position and will be leaving and Joe Polos will serve as Acting Science Coordinator. A 2016 Investigation Plan has been completed and work is continuing on the fish production model. Three 5-year water quality permits have been re-certified. Upper Douglas City, Limekiln Gulch, and Bucktail 1 projects are scheduled for constructed this year. She noted the public float on June 26. She noted a number of new documents and publications.

Ed Duggan asked about the Bucktail project and bridge replacement. Schrock said the upstream portion of the project can be constructed with the existing bridge. Stokely asked about the environmental documents. Schrock said they are out and available.

7. Science Update

Ernie Clark said he would also cover the Implementation and Sediment Updates as part of his Science Update. He introduced Todd Buxton as the new fisheries biologist from Idaho. Clarke also noted Robert Stewart as the new hydrologist and that these two new arrivals complete the unfilled positions for the TRRP.

Work group updates

Clarke passed out a summary of the Workgroup activities for the past quarter (Attachment 2). Fish Workgroup met March 15 and contributed to the Science Workplan habitat assessment and population assessments and are considering synthesis reports. Gravel Augmentation Workgroup did not meet this quarter. They will be working on plans for five reaches. Wildlife and Riparian Workgroup distributed a riparian and vegetation mitigation and monitoring plan to cooperating agencies. Interdisciplinary Team provided input on several documents. Design Workgroup held a teleconference meeting and discussed projects and assessment strategies. Watershed Workgroup created a draft request for proposals and is developing a white paper on causal linkages of proposed project activities and the Trinity River Division.

Gil Saliba asked about work outside the 40 miles. Robin Schrock noted the request for watershed proposals is being reviewed for geographic scope. She noted that the Solicitor redefined the geographic scope to be from Lewiston Reservoir to the confluence with the Klamath River. It was the Solicitor for the Yurok who spoke to the Reclamation Solicitor regarding this. For further information she suggested they contact Dave Hillemeier of the Yurok Tribe.

Clarke next passed out copies of 2016 Preliminary Science Workplan Summary (Attachment 3). He noted the design team is now asking what are the most important questions to be answered on each design. He noted an upcoming meeting in Weaverville on September 16 on Lessons Learn on Sediment and Gravel.

DSS update

The Science Symposium next spring which will be focused on the Decision Support System (DSS). He passed out a handout on the DSS which listed the various models being used in support of the DSS and their status (Attachment 4).

8. Implementation Update

Ernie Clarke gave some updates on the environmental permitting on the three projects to be constructed this year.

James Lee gave a Powerpoint presentation titled Wildlife and Vegetation Environmental Compliance Monitoring. The riparian effort monitors for vegetation, birds, amphibians, and reptiles as required by CEQA. California has a policy of no net loss of riparian habitat. Vegetation is an indicator of habitat quality. The Program maps vegetation annually at construction sites and every five years on the 40 miles. They also monitor western pond turtle distribution and effects of flow on foot hill yellow-legged frog egg survival. Birds are good indicators riparian conditions. A report on trends has been prepared and is in review. Generally, the trends indicate that riparian birds are staying steady or increasing.

George Kautsky asked if planting more trees may be in opposition to the idea of allowing a more meandering channel. Lee said that most of the vegetation work is at higher elevations above the river edge.

Gil Saliba asked if vegetation shade is considered as favorable habitat for fish. Robin Schrock said that yes, cover for fish is being monitored.

9. Gravel Augmentation

This item was discussed before lunch. Robert Stewart gave a Powerpoint presentation on Gravel Augmentation. He described the short-term goal is to provide increased storage for geomorphic changes to benefit salmon and the long-term goal is to derive a balanced sediment budget to support biological response.

Stewart went over the design steps of determining injection point, equipment, source of material, size of material, and volume. He described how he performed a synthesis of the prior work in the Trinity and this was used to help guide additions for this year.

Sediment monitoring is accomplished by sediment transport, aerial photography, bathymetric surveys, particle tracking, and geomorphic mapping. They are finding that transport distances are moving less than expected. Paul Catanese asked what is the source of the gravel filling the fishing holes? Ed Duggan also commented that he thinks holes have been filled. He asked, "How can we reconcile what I see with what the data show?" Stewart acknowledged their data collection started in 2008 and that Duggan has been around for a longer time however the data suggest limited filling of pools. Catanese noted that some pools have filled in since 2008, though not all pools. He wondered if gravel additions that may benefit salmon spawning may be hurting steelhead holding. Stewart asked that they send him emails with questions that could be addressed in greater detail at the Lessons Learned Workshop planned for September 16 in Weaverville. Joe Polos also noted that, years ago, holes were often dredged or even over-dredged to maintain holes. Robin Schrock noted that more 11,000-cfs releases are needed to move gravel. Tom Stokely noted that most of the gravel recommendations made by the TAMWG have been ignored by the TMC.

10. TRRP Communications Plan – Status

This item was addressed before lunch. Justin Day explained the Communication Plan as a means to facilitate information flow and help the public understand how to participate. The Plan was approved recently by both the TAMWG and TMC.

As a way to facilitate communication, Tom Stokely said he and Elizabeth Hadley try to forward emails they receive pertaining to TAMWG business. Kelli Gant noted the goal statement in the Communication Plan differed from the goal as stated in the TAMWG Charter.

Kelli Gant made a motion to change the Communication Guide definition of TAMWG to reflect the wording of the TAMWG Charter Item number 3 last sentence “...to recommend policy and provide management input, in an advisory capacity, about restoration efforts to the TRRP through the Trinity Management Council (TMC).”

Lorenz seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 10 yes votes and 1 opposed.

Emelia Berol voted no.

11. Public Comment

No comment.

Adjourn for the day 4:05 PM

Wednesday June 17, 2015 9:00 AM

Elizabeth Hadley, Chair of TAMWG, opened the meeting for Day 2. Hadley went over the remaining items on the agenda and noted that they may finish early.

12. Public Comment

No public comment.

13. Solicitor’s Guidance on TRRP Watershed Efforts

This item was addressed before lunch on Day 1. Robin Schrock announced that the Solicitor’s new guidance is that the watershed efforts extend down to Weitchpec. Up to this point in time, the watershed efforts were considered to only extend to the North Fork of the Trinity River. Schrock said she would send out the letter from the Solicitor that defines the types of work allowed.

Robin Schrock will send out the Solicitor’s letter describing the types of work to be allowed in tributaries.

14. Flow Management

Elizabeth Hadley reported that Paul Zedonis from the Bureau of Reclamation could not come to make this scheduled presentation. She said he did send an email on the three points about which the TAMWG had requested information. She said she will forward his email to TAMWG members. Basically work is in progress. An EIS is being developed for BOR’s long-term flow

plan; an EIS is also being developed for this years' potential flow augmentation; work is ongoing regarding Central Valley water management and plans for winter run salmon in the Sacramento.

Elizabeth Hadley will forward Paul Zedonis' email on flow to TAMWG members.

Rich Lorenz noted his concern that if additional water must be released to Sacramento for temperature management, this may create worse conditions in the Trinity. Ed Duggan also noted that he had read in plan 90-05 that water from one watershed cannot be used to cool water in another watershed for protection of fish.

Tom Stokely clarified that "harm" in the Trinity is defined by specific temperatures at specific points during the fall and this prohibits exports for temperature control and really does not protect from exports for other things such as salinity control. This is a loop-hole that has not been closed. He said there is not much to do this year as the "cat is out of the bag." However, he felt that a statement of intent and concern should be made.

Tom Stokely made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC to recommend the BOR limit Trinity River diversions this year to Sacramento River to the minimum amounts necessary to meet Trinity River Basin plan objectives.

Rich Lorenz seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 6 yes and 5 no votes.

Voting no were Hauser, Catanese, Gant, Denn, and Hadley.

Discussion by TAMWG included comments that this places ESA fish in Sacramento versus ESA fish in the Trinity and water exports from one basin to the other. If the State Water Board were to amend law would cost millions to change the water rights; however if BOR applies for the change, they pay costs. Paul Hauser said he could support this motion in a dry year but not in a wet year as the power generators would lose money. Stokely clarified his motion to apply only to this year. Sandy Denn said area of origin applies to the Sacramento and this is not a good way to approach this problem. Denn said she would address it via a minority opinion. She mentioned their irrigation district argument for area of origin water rights in their recent lawsuit was denied. Darren Mierau asked why the Bureau was not here today. Joe Polos said he got a call this morning and Zedonis "had a conflict." Elizabeth Hadley said she would vote no as she agreed with some of the comments on the larger issues brought up. Stokely argued for the motion citing much is unknown about specific operations, and the BOR was not present, so it is best to be proactive and make this statement. The individuals voting no agreed to develop a dissenting opinion to go with the motion.

15. Status of Fish Returns and Goals of the TRRP

Wade Sinnen of California Department of Fish and Wildlife gave a Powerpoint presentation with a series of graphs on Status and Trends of Trinity River Anadromous Salmonid Populations.

Sinnen noted one of the earliest known reports of pre-dam fish numbers in the Trinity River was by Moffett and Smith who collected fish information during 1942 to 1946. They estimated 12,000 and 9,000 passed Lewiston in 1944 and 1945, but they acknowledged that these estimates were not complete counts as they counted no coho and less than 500 steelhead. Moffitt and Smith considered spawning habitat would be limiting upon construction of dam as most of the preferred spawning areas were above the Trinity Dam. This view is in contrast to today's Program view that considers juvenile habitat to be the most limiting factor. Moffitt and Smith made preliminary recommendations of annual releases of 120,000 acre-feet and maximum flows of 300 cfs.

During 1964-70 was the decline of fishery (but poor estimates), hatchery construction, and degradation of the river. In 1971 a task force was created. In 1980 an EIS was completed, public restoration laws were passed, tribal harvests established, and monitoring and marking fish initiated. The Flow Evaluation Study looked at flow needs at different water year which cumulated with the ROD in 2000.

Sinnen next explained methods used today to estimate fish numbers. They use mark and recapture that involves tagging returning fish captured at weirs, releasing the fish, and then to looking at mark to unmark ratios at hatchery and at other recoveries by fisherman, carcass recovery, or rewards for tags. They can estimate populations that pass above the weir and estimate the hatchery component. The weir is operated only 5 day a week.

Sandy Denn and Paul Hauser had questions about errors in sampling. Sinnen acknowledged issues such as wild fish have lower tag recovery rates. Paul Catanese asked if 100% marking would help. He noted that with partial marking of fall Chinook, fisherman can't tell if their catch is hatchery or not. Sinnen said, yes, but it would be more costly. Also, 100% mark may lead to selective harvests in the oceans and, while other states do it, California is reticent about it. George Kautsky pointed out that they really don't know the true value of the returning fish because they cannot estimate the extent of potential bias; they are only able to estimate the variances about the estimates.

Sinnen noted two weir locations Junction City and Willow Creek, which focus on spring and fall Chinook returns, respectively. He then showed a series of graphs of estimated fish returns and hatchery versus natural returns by year using mark recapture data from these two weirs.

Spring Chinook run-size estimates above Junction City Weir from 1978 through 2014 have averaged 17,000 fish (adults and grilse) per year. But this has been highly variable from year to year, ranging from few thousand in the early 1990s to over 60,000 in 1988. There appears to be lower returns in the ROD flow years starting in 2005, where most returns were under 10,000 fish per year. The periods of high returns in the late 1980s and early 2000s are thought to reflect good ocean conditions.

The hatchery versus natural component of adult spring chinook escapement 1992 to 2014 (included South Fork counts and other areas and after removing harvests) has averaged slightly above 5,000 natural versus slightly above 8,000 hatchery fish. Straying from hatchery can be up to 40% near the hatchery. The goal of Program is 6,000 natural adults.

Fall Chinook Run size passing the Willow Creek Weir during 1977 through 2014 has averaged 43,620 adults and grilse. High of 150,000 in were observed in 1986; lows of several thousand were observed during the early 1990s. Sinnen pointed out that the early 1980s had heavy ocean harvests of Klamath River fish and the returns have been more consistent (less variable) in recent years.

The hatchery versus natural escapement of fall Chinook has averaged 15,213 natural versus 19,505 hatchery fish. These are not just fish that returned to hatchery but escaped harvest. Natural fall Chinook escapement per year ranges from a high of 42,000 to a low of about 1,000 with no clear trend over time, though Sinnen noted the high escapement of 39,000 in 2012. Natural fall Chinook escapement goal is 62,000 fish and Sinnen acknowledged that the goals derivations are not well defined. This prompted a discussion about the realism of such a goal. Paul Hauser opined that it was an "insane" goal that costs his rate payers more money. He asked how one would recover 62,000 fish with only 25% of the remaining habitat available. Sinnen responded that perhaps the more fundamental objective in federal legislation is to provide

increased fishing opportunity for commercial, tribal, and sport fisheries. George Kautsky noted the goal was for the entire basin. Ernie Clarke commented how the one of the fundamental goals of the Program was to create a functioning river with an over-arching objective of increasing fisheries. Additionally he clarified that the hatchery is operated to mitigate for the lost salmonid production from above Lewiston Dam and the downstream restoration efforts are not meant to make up for those lost habitats.

Sinnen pointed out the Klamath Basin fall Chinook run size has averaged 130,782 from 1978 through 2014 with the highest returns of 320,000 fish in 2012. They estimate that the Trinity River has contributed on average 44% of the total Klamath fish.

Sinnen next presented on estimates for other salmonids. Coho run size upstream of Willow Creek is dominated by hatchery returns (1900 natural versus 12,000 hatchery). This presents a potential harvest of excess hatchery coho. The natural adult coho escapement goal is 1400. The highest returns of coho were 9,000 in 2004 and there were several years of low returns in the hundreds.

Fall steelhead above Willow Creek has shown a big increase since 2001. Steelhead returns have averaged 15,000 per year with a high of 55,000 in 2007 and a low of several thousand per year prior to 1998. There has been a reduction in hatchery releases of steelhead smolts from 800,000 to 352,000 due to a recent lawsuit. This is presenting a “grand experiment.” Of the steelhead returns, 5,000 are estimated to be natural with 12,000 are estimated to be hatchery. The goal is 40,000 total natural steelhead returns. If one adds in summer and winter steelhead, the estimates of fall returns would likely double. But the non-fall returns are too difficult to monitor. Steelhead are thought to utilize tributaries. Other monitoring such as Didson cameras may work in winter when only steelhead are returning. But multiple species identification is difficult.

Sinnen went over some of the harvest limit decisions made by the agencies. Fall harvest for the current year is first modelled by past returns to arrive at an estimate of ocean abundance. Then goals for escapement are allowed, and then in-river harvests are set at 15% of ocean harvest. Spring Chinook limits are two fish per day with area closures such as the South Fork to Weitchpec and the Salmon River. Coho harvest is not allowed. Travis Michel asked about the Hoopa Valley Tribe’s plan to harvest coho this fall. This is currently being considered via consultations with NOAA Fisheries. Michel asked if Hoopa Valley Tribe can harvest excess hatchery coho why not do the same in the ocean? Sinnen said that the ocean has mixed stocks and would take more work.

The limits for steelhead are two marked fish per day. Sinnen said you can generally keep hatchery steelhead in any river in California. They don’t want hatchery straying into natural spawning.

Klamath basin adult harvest allocation of fall Chinook for ocean tribal in-river combined has averaged 79,000 and has increase over time.

Sinnen wrapped up his presentation with tables describing how they do age composition of Chinook. They sample scales of captured fish in a large effort. As an example, they estimated that for 2007 there were 515,000 age-3 fall Chinook in the ocean, 26,100 age-4 fish, and 4,700 age-5 fish. Sinnen noted that in 2006 fall Chinook fishing was closed. They want to protect the natural escapement of a minimum of 35,000 returns to the Klamath. This has not been changed to 40,000.

TAMWG had questions were about reduced releases of coho from the hatchery from 500,000 to 300,000 and why release coho at all. Sinnen acknowledged hatchery fish straying and reduced fitness, and creating competition. He noted a delicate balance and that the hatchery is a mitigation facility to replace what was lost. Other questions were why were Chinook smolt releases not

reduced? Sinnen said it was not a listed species and steelhead were thought to be potential predators. Paul Catanese advocated marking 100% of Chinook juveniles.

There was other discussion about Program funding priorities for fish monitoring. Tom Stokely noted the 2016 Workplan give a low priority for adult fish monitoring and asked if the budget is cut, will monitoring of adult fish be limited? He said that the number of returning adult fish is the ultimate goal of the program. Sinnen admitted it may not get funded. Ernie Clarke defended the priorities and noted the SAB said the DSS will help with making decisions about priorities. Also there has been consensus from the Fish Workgroup have helped to set the priorities. Joe Polos also reminded the group that the SAB and its independent review recommended the Program implement complete assessments and with the priorities identified in the IAP and other information needs of the Program (habitat, outmigrant, physical, riparian, stream gaging, etc.) the focus on has been on fall Chinook harvest and spawning escapement (WC weir, Yurok harvest, Hoopa harvest, lower Trinity sport harvests, lower Klamath sport harvest, and age compositions).

16. TMC – Current Issues

Elizabeth Hadley reviewed that this item was to catch any other items that were not listed on the agenda. Tom Stokely announced that he had just received the email from Seth Naman on the track changes version of the TMC proposed closed session. He said he would send it on and read it aloud. Elizabeth Hadley recalled the TMC meeting she attended where this was discussed. She said a few folks wanted closed door sessions but that BOR had noted that they couldn't discuss personnel issues outside their agency. The TMC members were tasked to go back to draft new language and she thought this is not a done deal.

Paul Catanese made a motion that the TAMWG recommend that the TMC not hold closed executive sessions unless they adopt the Brown Act criteria as part of their by-laws.

Tom Stokely seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Some of the discussion of the motion included whether or not this motion would have value or would work. It was noted that the Tribes may resist following the Brown Act. Emelia Berol suggested instead to simply ask for transparency. Mike McCarthy said he had done some research last night, and thought that this is not a simple matter and their resolution may not have any effect. Others suggested that the Tribes are not giving up their sovereignty by agreeing to follow these rules. Tom Stokely still thought it is a good idea to express their thoughts and a motion is good way to do this.

17. TAMWG/TMC Joint Meeting – August 13

Elizabeth Hadley noted the meeting will be a tour at 9 AM, lunch, and a two-hour afternoon meeting lasting to 3 PM. One of primary purpose is to have communication. Hadley listed three possible discussion topics: where have we grown?, what are the strategies?, and outreach. Kelli Gant thought the topics were too broad and suggested they develop three questions. Rich Lorenz did not think outreach was important. Ed Duggan agreed that outreach is occurring but the public is not showing up. Hadley said they can remove outreach. Darren Mierau noted different watersheds and different restoration approaches that could be used. Hadley said she and Seth Naman will work up an agenda and get it out in advance of the meeting.

Elizabeth Hadley will send out an agenda in advance of the Joint Meeting.

18. Identify Potential Agenda Items for Next Meeting

At the end of Day 1, Tom Stokely asked for input for next meeting scheduled for September 15. Kelli Gant asked for a cold water pool discussion. Gil Saliba asked about illegal water diversions. Wade Sinnen said there have been enforcement actions and he could ask law enforcement about it. There were questions about flow gages and fish returns. Stokely noted that there may be interest in supplemental flows.

Elizabeth Hadley addressed the topic of agenda items at the end of Day 2. She again stressed that September 15 would be a one-day meeting. But she encouraged members attend the September 16 meeting for Lessons Learned for sediment. This would also be considered an official TAMWG meeting and reimbursements would be paid. She also notified members that the TMC meeting will be held on September 17. She said during the TAMWG meeting on September 15, they would address the standing items of DFO, reports, but should not discuss gravel since that was the topic for the September 16th meeting. Cold water pool and budget were mentioned as two items.

19. Public Comment

Wade Sinnen noted a request for water use and permitting of marijuana in Trinity County as a TAMWG agenda item and that he could look into this. Ernie Clarke noted that the Watershed Center in Hayfork had a small grant to look into this. Josh Smith, Sean Ledwin, and Mark Lancaster may be able to tie this together. Ed Duggan suggested it be illegal diversions not just marijuana.

Elizabeth Hadley and Joe Polos will follow up with Josh Smith on a possible presentation on illegal water diversions in Trinity County.

Ed Duggan opined that TAMWG represents the stake holders but stakeholder input has been decreasing. TAMWG used to be involved in budget and project decisions but not so much now. He opined that the Executive Director listens less to the TAMWG now.

Kristi Bevard noted State regulations can fine illegal diversions up to \$10,000 and she supported the broadening of the diversion discussion to all illegal diversions.

Ernie Clarke announced that today was his last time joining the TAMWG. He reflected on Duggan's comment that TAMWG has not been marginalized. He cited the four ways TAMWG has input (e.g., sediment, budget, flow). He also noted that Robin Schrock is a great boss and is really committed to the river. He closed with a statement that he has enjoyed the work and patience of the group. The TAMWG gave Clarke a round of applause.

Joe Polos noted the Communication Plan as a means to as a way to help stop things that may fall between the cracks and avoid a sense of loss of input.

Adjourn 12:10 PM

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS

Attachment 1: Executive Director's Report, June 16 2015, handed out by Robin Schrock.

Attachment 2: Technical Workgroup Summary, June 2015, handed out by Ernie Clarke.

Attachment 3: 2016 Preliminary Science Workplan Summary, handed out by Ernie Clarke.

Attachment 4: Decision Support System, handed out by Ernie Clarke.

Other Documents

Trinity River Adaptive Management Working Group

DRAFT AGENDA

Meeting of June 16-17, 2015

NOTE: Times Subject to Change

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

Tuesday, June 16, 2015		
Time	Agenda Item	Presenter
9:30 AM	Welcome, Introductions, Approve Agenda & Minutes	TAMWG
9:45 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>	
10:00 AM	Designated Federal Officer Items (including Election of Officers, Review of charter and bylaws, administrative procedures, action tracker)	Joe Polos
11:00 AM	Trinity River Restoration Program (background/refresher)	TRRP
12:00 PM	Lunch	
1:15 PM	TMC Chair Update	Seth Naman
1:45 PM	Executive Director Update/FY16 Budget & workplan	Robin Schrock
2:30 PM	Science Update (Work group updates, DSS update)	Ernie Clarke
3:00 PM	Implementation Update	Dave Gaeuman
3:30 PM	Gravel augmentation (short term needs, long-term gravel plan status)	Dave Gaeuman/Robert Stewart
4:00 PM	TRRP Communications Plan – status	TAMWG
4:30 PM	Public Comment	
4:45 PM	Adjourn	

Wednesday June 17, 2015		
Time	Agenda Item	Presenter
9:00 AM	Public Comment	
9:15 AM	Solicitor's Guidance on TRRP watershed efforts	Robin Schrock
10:00 AM	Flow Management (WY2015 CVP water management update, BOR long-term fall flow plan update, fall flow plan for WY15)	BOR
11:00 AM	Status of fish returns and goals of the TRRP	Wade Sinnen
12:00 PM	Lunch	
1:15 PM	TMC – current issues	TAMWG
1:45 PM	TAMWG/TMC Joint meeting – August 13	TAMWG
2:00 PM	Identify potential agenda items for next meeting	TAMWG
2:30 PM	Public Comment	
	Adjourn	