

Final Minutes
TRINITY RIVER ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP
 December 10, 2015
 Trinity River Restoration Office, Weaverville, CA

Thursday December 10, 2015 9:30 AM

Attending Members

Member	Representative Seat:
Elizabeth Hadley	Chair, Utility Companies
Tom Stokely	Vice-chair, Commercial Fishing Organizations
Gil Saliba	Environmental Organizations
Paul Catanese	Local Landowners/Business owners
Travis Michele ¹	Trinity River Fishing Guides
Richard Lorenz	Trinity County Residents
Julie Catanese ²	Public Utilities
Ed Duggan	Small business Owners
Darren Mierau	Environmental Organizations

¹Alternate for Liam Gogan. ²Alternate for Paul Hauser

Members that did not attend

Member:	Representative Seat:
Emelia Berol	Environmental Organizations
Kelli Gant	Trinity County Residents
Sandy Denn	Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District
Joe McCarthy	Local Landowners
David Steinhauser	Whitewater Outfitters /Guides

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

Other attendees: Dave Wellock, Kristi Bevard, Bill Hill, Jim Smith (residents); Teresa Connor (Ca Dept. of Water Resources); Vina Frye (USFWS); Paul Zedonis (Bureau of Reclamation); Robin Schrock, Robert Stewart, Dave Gaeuman, and Brandt Gutermuth (TRRP); George Kautsky, Robert Franklin, James Lee (Hoopa Valley Tribe); Wade Sinnen (Ca Dept. Fish and Wildlife), Phil Fishella (Forest Service); Seth Naman (NOAA Fisheries), Shane Quin (Yurok Tribe).

Notes: Kim Mattson (ENW).

List of Motions Made during the Meeting

Ed Duggan made a motion to approve the agenda.

Gil Saliba seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Julie Catanese made a motion to accept the September 2015 TAMWG minutes.

Darren Mierau seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Tom Stokely made a motion that the TAMWG recommend to the TMC that the \$250,000 allocated to watershed in 2015 be re-allocated in 2016.

Paul Catanese seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Ed Duggan made a motion that TAMWG recommend that the TMC conduct an inventory of the tributaries connectivity to the mainstem for any remedial action for fish passage.

Travis Michele seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Action Items Designated during the Meeting

Tom Stokely will draft a one-page document summarizing TRRP goals for the next TAMWG meeting.

Meeting Minutes by Agenda Item

1. Welcome, Introductions, Approve Agenda and Minutes

Elizabeth Hadley, Chair, opened the meeting for the Trinity River Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG) and asked the attendees to introduce themselves. Two minor changes to the agenda were made.

Approval of Agenda

Ed Duggan made a motion to approve the agenda.

Gil Saliba seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Julia Catanese made a motion to accept the September 2015 TAMWG minutes.

Darren Mierau seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Public Comment

Dave Wellock announced a settlement between himself and the Bureau of Reclamation for which he expressed his satisfaction. He thanked Tom Stokely, Federico Barajas, and Brian Person for their help with the long process. He related his experience at the recent public meeting for Bucktail construction site and opined the TRRP was not listening to the public.

Tom Stokely announced that Kelli Gant was appointed to the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. He also noted that the 50,000 acre-feet was released for Humboldt County.

Kristi Bevard asked if notice will be given to the public if they are not allowed to attend the Efficiencies subcommittee meetings. She asked how will this affect outreach to the public.

3. Designated Federal Officer Items

Joe Polos designated Federal Officer thanked those for attending given the weather. He noted the action tracker is on the website and that Seth Naman will be touching on other items.

4. TMC Chair Update (includes update on TMC efficiencies sub-Committee)

This item was addressed following Item 6. Seth Naman, Chair of TMC, passed out copies of the TMC letter describing responses (Attachment 3) to TAMWG letter of recommendations (Attachment 4). The TAMWG recommended an additional \$1-2 million be transferred from mainstem work to watershed restoration work. He explained the reluctance of the TMC to do this as it would slow the progress on the mainstem. Instead, the TMC allocated \$0.5 million to watersheds. He noted the establishment of the TMC Efficiencies subcommittee to seek ways to free up more funds for projects such as watersheds. The TMC agreed to allow the TAMWG chair to attend the Efficiencies subcommittee meetings, but the TMC felt it was more appropriate for the public to bring their concerns via the TAMWG.

At this point, Naman asked for input regarding this policy. Kristi Bevard asked who may attend if neither the TAMWG chair or vice chair cannot attend the subcommittee meetings. Elizabeth Hadley responded that this had not yet been determined. Bevard stated that she disagreed with the current design. She also sought clarification that the subcommittee would be a short-term group lasting a couple of meetings or perhaps 6 months.

Rich Lorenz thought it would be good to allow members of the public to attend if they had something to add. Naman responded that the subcommittee would want to hear comments from the public, but they should contact the chair or vice chair of TAMWG. Darren Mierau said it would help to have notice of an agenda or what would be discussed so the TAMWG, as representatives of the public, would be prepared to provide input. Naman responded that notes from the last meeting are forthcoming.

Ed Duggan opined that small work at the mouths of streams would help native fish considerably by opening up access for spawners and juveniles. He did not want to see a reduction in funding for tributaries. He thought simple dredging may be a good idea. Naman agreed that tributaries are important, especially for steelhead and coho and noted ongoing work by the Hoopa Valley Tribe. Gil Saliba recommended Duggan prepare a write-up for the Watershed Workgroup. Hadley noted that Sean Ledwin will be giving a watershed workgroup presentation this afternoon. Tom Stokely noted the Record of Decision stated that \$1.9 million per year for watersheds be allocated. He expressed his frustration over this. Naman agreed and expressed his frustrations over this too and noted that budgets for watershed work have not always been followed. He noted the difference of

opinions over fine sediment inputs from tributaries such as Grass Valley as to whether it was positive or negative effects. Phil Fishella noted the Forest Service inventory data of tributaries and that these show that large woody debris and pool depths are often lacking. Many tributaries go dry by fall. He noted that Weaver Creek has good steelhead but snow pack is important; but basically, there is not enough water. Gil Saliba noted that much of the funding for watersheds does not get used as a result of the complexity of Bureau of Reclamation funding. Can't the Program perform this work? Naman agreed that perhaps this could be better done within the Program. Donna Rupp said that watershed work is succeeding as agencies are doing good work in watersheds.

Elizabeth Hadley asked that Naman go over the TMC meeting agenda for next week to fulfill the Item 9 discussion. Naman passed out the TMC agenda and noted the business topics that will be covered during the first couple of hours, followed by the TRRP Executive Director's report. After lunch topics include watersheds and spending levels and why spending has been ineffective, implementation status and progress, and Efficiencies subcommittee with any recommendations. The next day will have the Science Advisory Board members. Following SAB will be the low 2015 Chinook redd counts (lowest since counts began in 2001). After a farewell lunch for Robin Schrock, afternoon items include Trinity County Resource Conservation District outreach, TRRP website, TMC elections, and next year's meeting schedule. Rich Lorenz asked who actually picks the SAB members and expressed concern that the SAB picks their own members. Naman said he will look into the exact process.

5. Executive Director, TRRP staff, and Working Groups update

This item was address following Item 3. Robin Schrock passed out a copy of a memo constituting her report (Attachment 1). Schrock said the continuing resolution may be resolved tomorrow depending on Congressional action. \$3.3 million is being allocated for construction in FY2016 which is the highest ever. Clair Stalnaker is rotating out as a SAB member and will be attending the Trinity Management Council (TMC) meeting. An acknowledgement for his work is being planned. Schrock's last day will be next week and her separation will officially be December 31.

Elizabeth Hadley took this opportunity to thank Schrock for her work and the TAMWG gave her a round of applause.

Schrock noted several science updates: work on FY2017 workplan, Healthy River objective, Fish Production Model). A funding opportunity announcement will be released for watershed funding. She noted progress on the River Corridor Concept.

Schrock noted construction work at Limekiln Gulch and Upper Douglas City. The Environmental Assessments for Bucktail is currently out for public review and the Programmatic Biological Assessment for aquatic and terrestrial will soon be out. Lower Dutch Creek and Deep Gulch planning and design efforts are moving forward. Schrock passed out a diagram from the Logic Model showing the sequence of sites by condition (Attachment 1a).

Schrock noted the progress of the public outreach which included booths at festivals, articles, journals, emails, and public meetings. She pointed out seven publications and reports this last quarter. She noted the data packages available for download such as aerial photography on the TRRP website. She reminded the TAMWG about the upcoming TRRP Science Symposium March 30-April 1.

Finally Schrock thanked Joe Polos for serving as the acting Science Coordinator as his term was ending this month. Polos noted that Damian Ciotti from the Fish and Wildlife Service Sacramento Office will be the new acting Science Coordinator and should be on board next month.

Schrock and Polos also gave an update on the Technical Workgroups and Schrock passed out a handout (Attachment 2). The Fish Workgroup meet twice to discuss a synthesis report, plans for FY2017, and video technology. The Gravel Workgroup met twice and finalized their summary document for Lessons Learned workshop. Other workgroup meetings this past quarter were the Interdisciplinary Team, Design, and Watershed. The Watershed workgroup has received 16 pre-proposals for watershed work totaling \$1.5 million. Conflicts of interest are being sorted out regarding proposing groups that also serve on the Watershed Workgroup.

Tom Stokely asked about possible special treatment for tribes that receive funding for design, then do the construction, and perform the inspection for their construction projects. Schrock noted there is no special treatment for tribes as there are extensive reviews of budget and funding. Rich Lorenz asked that since the tribes are getting the contracts, does this mean there no other competitive bidders. Paul Catanese also asked if the tribes are also on the TMC aren't they essentially voting for themselves? Teresa Connor clarified that the contractor is selected by the USBR and follows the USBR procurement process. The TMC does not vote on or select the construction contractor.

Lunch

6. TRRP Lessons Learned Workshop – Sediment Management (Recap)

This item was addressed before lunch. Robert Stewart gave a Powerpoint presentation on the Sediment Lessons Learned Workshop. He described the outline of the workshop using the agenda. Items included gravel transport, river changes, fine sediment, and augmentation.

Stewart summarized each presenter's message. He reviewed that Robert Franklin presented the sediment management strategies. The short term goal was to add gravel below Lewiston Dam and the long-term was to balance the sediment budget (inputs=outputs so to maintain the complexity).

Stewart next reviewed that Andreas Krause presented the observed sediment transport rates. Krause had reported that the current estimated transport rates are an order of magnitude less than envisioned in the Flow Evaluation Study. The reason is not known. This means that lower augmentation rates are needed. George Kautsky asked about more details regarding the difference between the expected and measured transport rates. Stewart said he did not know how the expected transport rates were developed but no measures were made pre-dam. Jim Smith asked if they are now reducing gravel additions. Gaeuman responded that the area below Indian Creek is not a large focus of gravel addition. Gaeuman said they are putting in less upstream and are looking at 1900 cubic yards per year which is about an order of magnitude less than the Flow Evaluation Study recommended. He noted they do put in gravel with the projects which are separate from the augmentation program.

Stewart continued his summaries of presenter's messages. Stewart reviewed Dave Gaeuman's presentation on the sediment budget. Gaeuman had reported that they have achieved pre-dam sediment levels in the river from Lewiston to Douglas City, but the uncertainty is still large. A few pools have filled significantly and many pools have deepened. Fill that is occurring is related to terrace lowering. Darren Mierau asked about the graph that showed continued widening of the error bars on the estimates of gravel levels. Gaeuman responded that he thought the error bars were actually less than the graph showed.

Stewart reviewed Jenny Curtis's presentation on the USGS geomorphic assessment. Curtis had reported that the active channel has expanded as a result of bank erosion and channel rehabilitation and that most of the change occurred prior to 2001 during a period of high flows.

Stewart reviewed Dave Gaeuman's presentation on the fate of gravel augmentation. Gaeuman had reported that the gravel propagates downstream similar to a conveyor belt. The augmented gravel has not traveled very far. Therefore it should be added near the sites where it is needed. Stewart showed Gaeuman's data from Lowden Ranch that suggested fluvial transported gravel is superior to mechanically placed gravel in creating complex habitat, creating larger hydraulic gradients, providing improved temperature modification and trapping organic matter.

Stewart next reviewed Kyle De Julio's presentation on gravel effects on spawning habitat. De Julio had reported that the sediment has caused a change in Chinook spawning preferences. They have observed minimal impacts on the rearing habitat at low flows. Habitat gains may only occur at specific flows.

Finally Stewart reviewed Andreas Krause's presentation on fine sediment. Krause reported that they have noted a large decrease in fine sediment from tributaries. It is unclear if the goal of the program has been met. He recommended a synthesis of the data and setting of targets.

Gil Saliba asked about the USGS assessment of habitat. Stewart said Curtis looked at physical changes and not biological habitat and she found widening, particularly in the lower reaches and at tributaries.

Rich Lorenz asked if the river was doing better prior to 2001 (i.e., more change), is the construction not having the intended effect? Stewart noted that the earlier time period of Curtis' study (e.g., prior to 2001) covered a longer time period than the recent period, so a comparison is complicated. Stewart said he can provide a copy of Curtis' report on the TRRP website.

7. TRRP Goals, objectives, and definition of completion

Elizabeth Hadley introduced this topic and prefaced it by saying that this item had been requested by two members that were not in attendance today and it was to be a review for new TAMWG members and as a review of the Program. Tom Stokely initiated the discussion and led the TAMWG through a handout that summarized the legislative history for the TRRP (Attachment 5). He noted the authorization of the Trinity River Division of the Central Valley Project, the subsequent observations of declining fish, and the establishment of fish return goals in 1979 by the then Director of California Fish and Game, Charlie Fullerton. Stokely noted that no one knows where Fullerton came up with these return numbers but these numeric goals were adopted in subsequent documents. Congress passed the Trinity River Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1984 which embodied the goals but did not specify numbers. The Central Valley Project Improvement Act directed that the fishery goals of the 1984 law (PL 9-541) be fulfilled. The Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Management Reauthorization Act of 1995 (passed in 1996) clarified fishery goals to increase harvest for depleted tribal, commercial, and sport fisheries. Finally Stokely also addressed "completion" as defined to be when CVP beneficiaries will be able to reduce payments to the CVPIA Restoration Fund when restoration in Section 3406 have been completed.

There was more discussion about opinions about what exactly the goals were and which have already been met.

Rich Lorenz asked if the current numeric goals can be summarized in a single page. Gil Saliba asked if they have an idealized harvest goal. Wade Sinnen said different groups have different

opinions on this. George Kautsky said he could make available their white paper on harvests that was synthesized by Program technical specialists recently. Wade Sinnen noted the TRRP goals for coho do not meet NOAA's definition of recovery goals.

Hadley noted they will put together a one-page summary of the numeric and verbal goals. Tom Stokely said he could do this. There was more discussion about goals and what the TAMWG wanted as goals. Darren Mierau clarified that some are dissatisfied with the high escapement goals, that harvest goals have not been established, and that it is desired to have this summarized in a one page document. Hadley said once the one-paper is ready the TAMWG might address the harvest goals at the next meeting.

Julie Catanese thought the TAMWG needs to discuss what exactly completion means. Hadley thought it was to complete the 43 channel projects. Catanese thought it was restore fish, reasoning that if fish are restored, they may not need to complete all the projects. Some opined that the TAMWG is not capable of determining numeric goals. Wade Sinnen said the TAMWG may be able to verbalize public desires such as better fishing opportunities for coho or steelhead. Hadley developed a list of what to include in the one page.

Naman clarified that there are two over-arching goals and then there are objectives that contain numeric or quantifiable steps toward the goals.

Action item: Tom Stokely will draft a one-page document summarizing TRRP goals for the next TAMWG meeting.

8. TRRP Watershed Restoration Goals

Sean Ledwin gave a Powerpoint presentation on the Watershed Workgroup activities. He described the TRRP watershed goals: to reduce fine sediment and improve fish habitat connectivity.

Ledwin reported that reduction of fine sediment has been successful as a result of watershed work in Grass Valley and increased flows of the ROD. Quite a few projects, particularly fish passage have been done.

Ledwin next reported on the Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) for 2016. Legal review determined projects anywhere in the Trinity Basin could be funded as long as there is a "causal linkage" to the CVPIA impacts. The announcement was supposed to go on Grants.gov but this has been delayed. They instead solicited pre-proposal and got 16 from the 5-Counties, Trinity County RCD, the Watershed Center, and the Yurok Tribe.

Ledwin described some of the projects being performed outside of the Program. One is being performed by the Hoopa Valley Tribe in Supply Creek. The creek channel had been straightened by the Corps of Engineers following the 1964 floods. The current design is to lower the terraces and remove the levees. D.J. Bandrowski called in via phone to describe another project being performed by the Yurok Tribe in the South Fork Trinity. The project will place 250 trees via helicopter to trap fine sediment, create fish habitat, and increase complexity.

Bill Brock rounded out the watershed presentation, with a Powerpoint presentation on watershed restoration activities in the Trinity River Basin performed by the Forest Service. Brock passed out four handouts (see other documents at the end of the minutes). He first complimented TAMWG for having a strong watershed position. He noted the road conditions of the watershed and cited that there are 5500 miles of Forest Service roads in the Trinity basin with 22,000 stream crossings. Many old culverts are now failing. Replacement of culverts or decommissioning of roads can be expensive. The Forest Service has secured just under \$9 million over the past 20 years, 2/3rds

which have been funded outside the Forest Service. He estimates the Forest Service needs \$120 million for the next 20 years. He showed the results of culvert failures and catastrophic debris torrents. He noted the need to do emergency work when they have fires.

Tom Stokely made a motion from the TAMWG recommend to the TMC that the \$250,000 allocated to watershed in 2015 be re-allocated in 2016.

Paul Catanese seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Darren Mierau asked who is coordinating watershed planning. Donna Rupp thought the TRRP was doing some of this via their work with other agencies through the watershed council. Mierau asked about work other than fine sediment and whether they are certain fine sediment is actually a problem and he asked about water conservation projects that may conserve summer water for streams. Rupp said many of the groups currently performing watershed restoration are non-profits and they have different agendas and she also cited projects addressing water storage.

There was a discussion about tributaries that were blocking fish entrance at their mouths. Paul Catanese thought the work to unblock tributary mouths could actually be considered work in the mainstem as that is where the blockage was located.

Ed Duggan made a motion that TAMWG recommend that the TMC conduct an inventory of the tributaries connectivity to the mainstem for any remedial action for fish passage.

Travis Michele seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

9. TMC – current issues

This item was covered by Seth Naman during Item 4.

10. Public Comment

No public comment.

Before adjourning they considered the conference call in January. TAMWG meeting dates will await TMC schedule to be set next week and set them during the January conference call.

Adjourn 2:30 PM

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS

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

Attachment 1a: Diagram from the Logic Model showing sequence of restoration sites by condition, passed out by Robin Schrock.

Attachment 2: Technical Workgroup Summary December 2015 passed out by Robin Schrock.

Attachment 3: TMC letter to TAMWG December 8, 2015, passed out by Seth Naman.

Attachment 4: TAMWG letter to TMC September 16, 2015, passed out by Seth Naman

Attachment 5: Legislative & Administrative History of TRRP and Fishery Restoration Goals. Working Draft, passed out by Tom Stokely.

Other Documents:

1. Summary of 10/15 TMC phone meeting prepared by Tom Stokely.
2. Trinity Management Council meeting agenda for December 16-17, 2015.
3. TRRP Program Goals handed out by Tom Stokely.
4. Watershed restoration in the Trinity Basin, Powerpoint slides, handed out by Bill Brock.
5. Performance Report: October 2013-April 2015, handed out by Bill Brock.
6. 2015 Post Wildfire Impacts handed out by Bill Brock.
7. Region 5 Ecological Restoration handed out by Bill Brock.
8. TMC and TAMWG--TRRP Rehabilitation Project Implementation and Compliance Update.
9. Proposal to Address Refinements of the TRRP
10. Watershed Workgroup Update PPT
11. Sediment Lessons Learned PPT
12. USFS Watershed Restoration PPT

Trinity River Adaptive Management Working Group

DRAFT AGENDA

Meeting of December 10, 2015

NOTE: Times Subject to Change

Location: Trinity River Restoration Program office (1313 South Main St, Weaverville, CA 96093)

Thursday, December 10, 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	Joe Polos
10:15 AM	TMC Chair Update (includes update on TMC efficiencies sub-Committee)	Seth Naman
11:00 AM	Executive Director, TRRP staff, and Working Groups update	Robin Schrock
12:00 PM	Lunch	
1:00 PM	TRRP Lessons Learned Workshop – Sediment Management (Recap)	Robert Stewart
2:00 PM	TRRP Goals, objectives, and definition of completion	TAMWG
3:00 PM	TRRP Watershed Restoration Goals	Tom Stokely/Sean Ledwin
4:00 PM	TMC – current issues	TAMWG
4:15 PM	Public Comment	
4:30 PM	Adjourn	