

Draft 1 Minutes of the Joint Meeting of the  
**TRINITY RIVER ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP**  
 and the  
**TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**  
 North Fork Grange Hall, Junction City, CA

**August 13, 2015, 9:30 AM**

**Attending Members**

<b>TAMWG Member</b>	<b>Representative Seat</b>
Elizabeth Hadley	Chair, Utility Companies
Tom Stokely	Vice-chair, Commercial Fishing Organizations
Gil Saliba	Environmental Organizations
Joe McCarthy	Local Landowners
Emelia Berol	Environmental Organizations
Richard Lorenz	Trinity County Residents
Paul Hauser	Utility Companies
Sandy Denn	Agricultural Users
Darren Mierau	Environmental Organizations
David Steinhauser	Whitewater Outfitters /Guides
Ed Duggan	Small business Owners
Travis Michel <sup>1</sup>	Trinity River Fishing Guides

<sup>1</sup> Alternate for Liam Gogan.

<b>TMC Member</b>	<b>Representative Seat</b>
Seth Naman	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Adm. Fisheries, Chair
Bruce Bingham	Fish and Wildlife Service
George Kautsky <sup>1</sup>	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Bill Brock <sup>2</sup>	Forest Service
Dave Hillemeier	Yurok Tribe
Teresa Connor	California Natural Resources Agency
Keith Groves	Trinity County
Robin Schrock <sup>3</sup>	Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director

<sup>1</sup> Alternate for Mike Orcutt; <sup>2</sup> Alternate for Terri Simon-Jackson; <sup>3</sup> Non-voting member.

**Non-Attending Members**

<b>TAMWG Member</b>	<b>Representative Seat</b>
Paul Catanese	Local Landowners/Business owners
Kelli Gant	Trinity County Residents
<b>TMC Member</b>	<b>Representative Seat</b>
Federico Barajas	Bureau of Reclamation, Vice-chair

**Designated Federal Officer:** Serving for Joe Polos: Vina Fry, Fish and Wildlife Service, Arcata, CA.

**Other attendees:** Dave Gaeuman (TRRP); Justin Day (City of Redding and alternate for Hadley); Julie Catanese (local resident and alternate for Hauser); Kristi Bevard (local resident and alternate for Stokely); Ray Patton, Clark Tuthill, Jim Smith, and Bill Dickens (local residents).

**Notes:** Kim Mattson (ENW).

### **Action Items Designated during the Meeting**

**Action Item: Work on the statement of goals of the Program and develop a barometer/report card on the website. Seth Naman will forward the metrics to Elizabeth Hadley. Elizabeth Hadley will review goals and develop timelines of achievement to present at the next TAMWG meeting for discussion.**

**Action item: Address the public questions regarding better data descriptions and why not use the cameras for fish counts.**

**Action item: Place information boards at stores or other public places.**

**Action item: Consider placing large ads in newspaper for public notices.**

**Action Item: Robin Schrock will link the website with questions received on [info@TRRP.net](mailto:info@TRRP.net).**

**Action Item: Seth Naman ask about boat ramp development at Lower Junction City.**

**Action Item: Seth Naman will look into the smolt per spawner estimates to convert habitat to smolt production.**

**Action Item: Tom Stokely will write a press release on the Yurok Tribe in the South Fork after talking to Dave Hillemeier.**

**Action Item: Robin Schrock will bring the Google Calendar up to date.**

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

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

Elizabeth Hadley, chair of the Trinity River Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG) opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. She asked attendees to introduce themselves. Hadley noted that the meeting was mainly for improving communication and not necessarily to resolve problems. Seth Naman, chair of the Trinity Management Council (TMC) affirmed the purpose—to renew contacts and exchange information. Naman referred to the agenda and asked for any changes that were desired. Hadley also noted that Jeff Morris would be facilitating.

Travis Michel asked about the closed meetings by the TMC. Naman apologized for not getting the response letter out to the TAMWG on the changes to the by-laws. He was still updating the language to address concerns that were raised. Michel asked if the TMC had discretion to hold meetings or if someone else did. Naman said the TMC could decide this.

#### **2. Tour Lower Junction City restoration site-TRRP staff**

The group toured the Lower Junction City restoration site nearby. Dave Gaeuman of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) provided a guided tour of the site. He first provided an overview from the Dutch Creek Road Bridge and explained the various structures such as

meanders, bars, and wood placements. He explained how the site looked prior to the construction and that it was basically a straight reach with vegetation right down to the right bank with lots of sand and an elevated berm along the river edge. Gaeuman pointed out the fishing area known as the Junction City Hole located at the lower end of the site

Post-construction, the site had a slight bend to the left, riffles, exposed gravel/cobble bars on both sides, woody debris, planted trees, and high flow refuges for juvenile fish. He explained that the bars would be overtopped at the highest expected flows. The site had been exposed to a 10,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) flow this past winter and functioned well with new deposition in front of the woody debris and high flow refugia for juveniles. Public access to the Junction City Hole had been cut off. BLM had acquired the land beneath the Dutch Creek Bridge and they were considering constructing access there.

The group walked down to the gravel bar on the right bank known as RC 1 and 2. Gaeuman pointed out the woody debris root wads that were acquired from California Department of Transportation. He also noted the sapling planting and non-native vegetation.

The group asked a series of questions. Paul Hauser asked how many more fish the site may produce. This prompted a discussion of how the Program assesses fish, or success and how they choose sites for restoration. Seth Naman explained they do not readily know the numbers of fish produced from a specific site, but instead measure the amount of habitat created that is known to support juvenile rearing or adult holding. They choose sites based on a suite of factors including fish habitat, landownership, and time and cost constraints. Robin Schrock noted the fish production model which is under development. George Kautsky also pointed out that the Decision Support System (DSS) but it will not be able to address ocean conditions.

Sandy Denn asked if they do anything to protect the wood structures. Gaeuman said yes they are designed to be stable, but they also want a dynamic system. Keith Grove and Julie Catanese asked Gaeuman about the rearing areas. Gaeuman pointed out an alcove across the river, and a high flow side channel right next to the group. He said willows would likely re-establish and add more overhead cover. He pointed out the riffles that would be a source of invertebrate production. Gaeuman explained the placed root wads up on the bar would provide hydraulic roughness and high flow refugia for juveniles.

Travis Michel said, from a fishing standpoint, that the site looked great. He noted the invasive weeds and wondered about too much stabilization. Gaeuman said the weed would eventually get shaded out and for now, the weeds offered shade.

Darren Mierau asked about the hydraulic scour and bars washing out under high flood flows and of the scientific evaluation of the site. Gaeuman said the issue of encroachment of vegetation from the sides was considered and debated and Gaeuman thought it was not a big issue anymore and that concept was more in vogue in the 1990's. About the danger of washing out, Gaeuman noted that, as the site was upstream of Canyon Creek, it probably would not see more than 12,000 cfs of flow. The 100-year FEMA model may go to 16,000 or 20,000 cfs. Gaeuman did not think this would scour the left bank bar but perhaps more likely the right bank would go. Gaeuman pointed out that the right bank bar was about 2-3 feet higher and filled with sand. This was taken down to the large gravel/cobble layers beneath to allow higher flows over the top. At 10,000 cfs, the flow would be 3-feet over the top of the bar.

Tom Stokely asked about the cost and if there was a noticeable effect on fish from these projects. The cost of the Lower Junction City site was between \$2 and 3 million. About a demonstrated increase in fish, there were several opinions offered. Paul Hauser thought that Wade Sinnen's

presentation to the TAMWG at their last meeting in June showed a slight decline in fish numbers and the river had reached its output capacity. Dave Hillemeier thought that they really couldn't say yet as the response time is expected to be decades. Darrien Mierau asked if they could not use other metrics to filter out extraneous factors such as ocean conditions. Bill Trush suggested use of smolt output in light of spawners (also known as smolt to adult ratios). Seth Naman suggested that they are now seeing some increases at the smolt traps.

Bruce McGregor asked when the restoration projects would end. Robin Schrock said there are 15 more sites to do and they do about 2 per year.

The group next moved on down to the lower end of the site. Here Gaeuman explained how they had widened the river to allow more sediment to deposit. He related how they had considered complex designs here but finally decided to go more simple and widen it. He pointed out the Canyon Creek delta just downstream that creates hydraulic control and they did not want to change that.

The group broke for lunch before returning to their scheduled meeting.

## **Lunch**

### **3. Public Comment**

Clark Tuthill stated that the tribes downstream have high-jacked the Program to create a salmon spawning ground to support their harvests. He felt the steelhead fishery is just as important. He advocated for a change in leadership to promote more creative solutions. He thought the river has overall flattened out and the flow has slowed and this has created warmer water. He advocated for saving spring water in the dam for releases during summer.

Jim Smith said he agreed with Clark's comments and pointed out that while the Program has said there would be no more gravel additions, every project gets gravel injections. These wash into the river. He noted the costs of the program and advocated for a change—possibly let the river rest for a few years?

### **4. Recap from 2014 TAMWG/TMC meeting**

Elizabeth Hadley drew the members' attention to the summary of the joint meeting from last year (handout). She noted it was a highly productive meeting. She pointed out the five agreements on page four and that these would be discussed today to ensure they are still relevant.

She went over the five "Agreements in Principle:"

- 1) All are seeking success of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) though there are different definitions of success.
- 2) All have a role in public outreach.
- 3) All will work to identify where there is agreement about TRRP goals and strategies.
- 4) Where there is disagreement, they will work to seek answers and solutions.
- 5) They will work for effective outreach and avoid using media and processes outside the TRRP until trust improves or move specific protocols are developed.

### **5. Have we implemented the 5 principles effectively?**

Jeff Morris facilitated a free-form discussion. He started by noting the first two of the five Agreements in Principle were "principles" and the last three were "agreements."

Paul Hauser stated they should have a common and agreed upon goal and he suggested it should be recovery of fish. Darren Mierau and Gil Saliba thought that fish were one goal and a healthy river was another. This prompted a discussion of numeric goals for fish. Paul Hauser thought the numeric goals of fish restoration to pre-dam levels were “absurd.” There was a suggestion to post a single page of the goals of the Program and to post these on the door or hand out at each meeting. Elizabeth Hadley admitted that, other than the fish goals, she had trouble reciting the goals for the river and read out loud the goals from a 15-year old flyer about the Program. These goals cited in-channel flows to re-establish physical processes, create spawning and rearing downstream of the dam, and restoration of pre-dam conditions in a dynamic river. George Kautsky related how they developed two fundamental objectives of the Program at a workshop last December held at the Weaverville Library. Seth Naman cited from documents the specific numeric goals by fish species and he also citing the over-arching goal as developed from the workshop as to restore natural production of Chinook below the dam for tribal and sport fisheries and to restore a healthy, alluvial river.

There was general agreement of a need for an easily communicable goal and a way to assess progress. Teresa Connor noted the concept of a “report card” that could be available on the website that would include fish numbers.

Emelia Berol expressed concern over her role at the meeting and whether they should be discussing the five principles versus fish numeric goals. She thought there still was a lot of diversity of opinions and letting everyone to express their thoughts is the only way to come to a common agreement. Elizabeth Hadley explained that there had been a large effort to develop the five principles and they first wanted to make sure these were still relevant.

Seth Naman thought there is pretty good agreement on the goals. He cited documents and metrics that describe goals. He acknowledged disagreement as to whether these are desirable or achievable. Jeff Morris acknowledged that Berol was correct in that there is a better need for public outreach. Berol restated Morris’ statement that TMC agrees over goals but the TAMWG disagrees? She expressed her confusion over this. Gil Saliba agreed that some people do not want to “buy into” the goals—so why would they come to the meeting? He noted that Naman’s read the goals and objectives—so why doesn’t everyone buy into them?

**Action Item: Work on the statement of goals of the Program and develop a barometer/report card on the website. Seth Naman will forward the metrics to Elizabeth Hadley. Elizabeth Hadley will review goals and develop timelines of achievement to present at the next TAMWG meeting for discussion.**

There was more discussion about how each member saw the Program. Rich Lorenz and Paul Hauser said they wished to talk about projections and ways to make them more accurate. They cited the estimates of run size and the State of California’s estimates from the Willow Creek weir. It was suggested that the Tribes could meet with TAMWG members to help explain run size estimates.

Emelia Berol stated there seems to be the most objections to the approach or the methods. She said, “The approach is not on the table.” There may be sensible reasons for this or there may be political reasons. George Kautsky responded that the outreach must be digestible by the public. He reiterated at the workshop 2013 they developed a goal with two methods and means objectives with sub-objectives. They may need to revisit this periodically. The meetings are meant to address any changes in course. He thought the workshop was productive and he encouraged members to review the document that came from it.

Jeff Morris reiterated that they need to state the goals and also the means to achieve the goals. Everyone agrees goal is more fish, but how to get there may have consensus with the TMC but less so outside the TMC.

Paul Hauser said, “We need more fish, and if we had more fish more people would be happier.” Gil Saliba asked, “What should we do?” Hauser said, they spent “hundreds of millions” of dollars and they have not seen more fish. Tom Stokely said according to the SAB assessment the program will fail. He is convinced the program will fail as “all the eggs are in one basket.” If the program would spend \$2 million on watersheds as the Record of Decision (ROD) stated, he would be more optimistic.

Ed Duggan said we all want to see more fish, but “Mother Nature is the most important element.” He went on to ask, “If Mother Nature doesn’t give a good return from the ocean, which we have no control over, how are we supposed to get more fish?” Paul Hauser asked Duggan if he considered the fish goal as unachievable. Duggan thought that pre-dam levels are unachievable but other goals are achievable. Darrien Mierau said they can’t wait decades. He noted that he had not seen that adaptive management is guiding the Program. For example he cited the alcove that filled in by sand and they did not know if it would scour back out. He thought they should be able to monitor this and learn from it. He also cited the re-encroachment onto the channel and asked why that wasn’t being monitored. He also said habitat monitoring is not well connected to smolt production. He asked, “Are we producing more smolts per adult?”

Rich Lorenz said TAMWG pressed for the Phase I review and that took three years. He thought they should be doing reviews every year and should be able to make changes based on this.

Jeff Morris summarized the discussion by encouraging the conversation of Mierau’s and Lorenz’s points on monitoring. Morris recited that there appears to be broad agreement on success. But there is less consensus on how to get there and how quickly to get there. He also noted the need to improve outreach to the public.

## **6. Has TRRP outreach been effective?**

Jeff Morris moved the discussion toward the effectiveness of outreach.

Tom Stokely said, “Actions speak louder than words.” He cited that the solicitor had recently said work could go forward on projects downstream. But he noted that there may be a reversal of that. He could not put out a press release until he saw a contract being let out on downstream projects.

Jeff Morris said outreach should not be a “white wash” for the program.

Dave Hillemeier noted the grant monies available to do watershed restoration. He did not want to see Program restoration projects monies diverted toward watersheds at the Program’s expense. He said that restoration can spend money on tributaries if there is shown a causal linkage with the dam or is linked to success of the CVPIA.

Bill Dickens asked how much work has occurred in watersheds and wanted to see reports on it. He asked about work in Solider Creek. He thinks there has been too much work “carving up the mainstem for salmon.” There has been less work for steelhead. He said that road work does not benefit steelhead.

Keith Groves said his district constituents see the water is being “wasted going down the river or going over the hill” such as using 80,000 acre-feet to move gravel around. Dave Hillemeier responded that a releasing a minimum amount of water in the Trinity River will not benefit fish and that moving gravel helps.

Ed Duggan thought the public doesn't want to go to outreach meetings as they are not taken seriously. Rich Lorenz said when the public gives advice, the representatives will "argue and not listen." Tom Stokely noted the Weaverville scoping meeting for the EIS did not take public comments verbally. Seth Naman expressed regret that TRRP representatives do not listen better. Lorenz clarified that the representatives have listened on Lorenz Gulch.

Travis Michel said we will never know if the program is working if it is managed for harvest and not escapement. He expressed that he is not against tribal harvest but he thought that fish numbers get both over-estimated and then over-harvested "before they get here." Dave Hillemeier said they could go over the harvest rates as this data is available. He said their folks would say the opposite—that under-estimates limit tribal harvests. They should be able to present accurate data. Jim Smith says the upper river stakeholders are "the only group that stands to lose." In some way, they have a more vested interest. Bill Dickens asked about the use of available cameras that are owned by the State.

**Action item: Address the public questions regarding better data descriptions and why not use the cameras for fish counts.**

Julie Catanese said the public "does not think they have a voice" and therefore do not come to the meeting. She asked, "Why can Douglas City muddy the water but the locals cannot dig out their banks or add rip-rap?"

The discussion turned more to specifics of outreach. Jeff Morris drew the group's attention to the handout listing the numbers of public meetings noting there have been a lot of meetings. He encouraged members to review the list and see if there are missing items or information.

Travis Michel asked if they have thought about information boards at the local stores like they do for fires. He thought that most people do not stop to read the boards at the construction sites.

**Action item: Place information boards at stores or other public places.**

George Kautsky clarified that harvest management is not the preferred alternative in the ROD. He said he "feels the upper river stakeholders' pain" as they are the last served. He agreed they need to measure the benefits of harvest. Jeff Morris said that also needs to be translated into public outreach.

Justin Day said he uses the website and it is not always up to date. Robin Schrock noted this is a second job for a staff person. George Kautsky suggested it be rectified for the future. Travis Michel said a larger add in the paper about meetings would help.

**Action item: Consider placing large ads in newspaper for public notices.**

The group had more ideas about improving outreach. Rich Lorenz said the best outreach has been the RCD newsletter. He thought most Trinity County residents will not go into the TRRP website. Dave Steinhauser said as whitewater rafting company owner, he will often speak to his clients about the program. Morris said he gets stopped on the street and the biggest questions are about flows: timing how much when and, "What the hell is going on with the flows?" Julie Catanese suggested they use boxes like real estate sales at construction sites with a one page description. Ed Duggan agrees that everyone does not use the computer to search out information. He noted the need for information to be current. Morris said he carries flyers about the upcoming bike race to hand out. Tom Stokely said there are 390 subscribers to the Trinity River list server that lists information about the Trinity River. Elizabeth Hadley said she uses the website extensively. She said they may need to consider upgrades during the next budget meeting.

Emelia Berol noted two aspects of public outreach; one was the sharing information, the other was influencing public opinion. Morris did not think influencing was as important as clarifying information. He thought was important that people form their opinions on factual information. Kristi Brevard thought public outreach is a “two-way conversation” and in-person is best. Robin Schrock said they get walk in visitors and that is a very good way to reach the public. Gil Saliba said he is concerned about people voicing their opinion and asked if website have a place to voice opinions and ask questions where they could get answers. Robin Schrock said they have an email address where they get questions, and she could make this more available on the web site.

**Action Item: Robin Schrock will link the website with questions received on [info@TRRP.net](mailto:info@TRRP.net)**

As the meeting was coming to a close, several other action items were listed.

**Action Item: Seth Naman ask about boat ramp development at Lower Junction City**

**Action Item: Seth Naman will look into the smolt per spawner estimates to convert habitat to smolt production.**

**Action Item: Tom Stokely will write a press release on the Yurok Tribe in the South Fork after talking to Dave Hillemeier.**

**Action Item: Robin Schrock will bring the Google Calendar up to date.**

#### **7. Next steps for future success - Jeff Morris**

August 25: TAMWG teleconference call to discuss budget.

August 31: Budget meeting.

September 15: TAMWG meeting.

September 16: TAMWG combined meeting with TRRP Sediment Lessons Learned presentation.

September 17: TMC meeting at the Weaverville Library.

#### **Adjourn**

## **Joint Meeting of the Trinity River Adaptive Management Working Group and Trinity Management Council**

**Meeting of August 13, 2015**

### **DRAFT AGENDA**

- |             |   |
|-------------|---|
| 9:30-10:00  | Meet and greet at North Fork Grange                             |
| 10:00-11:30 | Tour Lower Junction City restoration site-TRRP staff            |
| 11:30-12:30 | Lunch (bring your own)  |
| 12:30-12:45 | Public Comment  |
| 12:45-1:00  | Recap from 2014 TAMWG/TMC meeting-Elizabeth/Seth/Jeff Morris    |
| 1:00-2:00   | Have we implemented the 5 principles effectively? - Jeff Morris |
| 2:00-2:30   | Has TRRP outreach been effective? - Jeff Morris                 |
| 2:30-3:00   | Next steps for future success - Jeff Morris                     |
| 3:00        | Adjourn   |