

**Final Minutes**  
**TRINITY RIVER ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP**  
 May 24-25, 2016  
 Trinity River Restoration Office, Weaverville, CA

**Tuesday May 24, 2016; 9:30 am**

**Attending Members**

Member	Representative Seat
Elizabeth Hadley <sup>1</sup>	Chair, Utility Companies
Tom Stokely	Vice-chair, Commercial Fishing Organizations
Richard Lorenz	Trinity County Residents
Gil Saliba	Environmental Organizations
Ed Duggan	Small business Owners
Julie Catanese <sup>2</sup>	Public Utilities
Joe McCarthy	Local Landowners
Paul Catanese <sup>3</sup>	Local Landowners/Business owners
Sandy Denn	Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District
Michael Charlton	Recreational Commercial Guides
Shiloe Braxton	Trinity County Resource Conservation District
Travis Michele <sup>4</sup>	Trinity River Fishing Guides
David Steinhauser <sup>5</sup>	Whitewater Outfitters /Guides
Caryn Hunt DeCarlo <sup>6</sup>	Acting Executive Director, TRRP

**Attending by Phone**

Member	Representative Seat
Darren Mierau <sup>7</sup>	Environmental Organizations

**Members that did not attend**

Member	Representative Seat
Emelia Berol	Environmental Organizations
Kelli Gant	Trinity County Residents

<sup>1</sup> Replaced by alternate Leslie Bryan on Day 2; <sup>2</sup> alternate for Paul Hauser; <sup>3</sup> did not attend on Day 2; <sup>4</sup> alternate for Liam Gogan; <sup>5</sup> arrived after lunch on Day 1 and left at the end of Item 9 on Day 1, attended on Day 2; <sup>6</sup> attended on Day 2; <sup>7</sup> did not attend on Day 2.

**Designated Federal Officer:** Joe Polos, Service (FWS), Arcata, CA.

**Other attendees:** Dave Wellock (local resident); Kristi Bevard (local resident and alternate for Tom Stokely); Vivian Helliwell (Inst. For Fisheries Resources/PCFFA); Leslie Bryan, Holly Johnson (Redding Electric Utility); Justin Alvarez, James Lee (Hoopa Valley Tribe); Andreas Krause, Kyle De Juilio (Yurok Tribe); Sarah Rockwell (Klamath Bird Observatory); Charlie

Chamberlin (BOR), Vina Frye (USFWS); Robert Stewart, Brandt Gutermuth, and Todd Buxton (TRRP).

**Others attending by phone:** Wade Sinnen (CDFW).

**Notes:** Kim Mattson (Ecosystems Northwest).

**List of Motions Made during the Meeting**

**Tom Stokely made a motion to accept the agenda.**

**Sandy Denn seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Sandy Denn made a motion to accept the April meeting minutes.**

**Tom Stokely seconded the motion**

**The motion passes unanimously.**

**Gil Saliba made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC direct Program partners to determine the costs of environmental compliance monitoring for riparian, herptiles, sediment, and gravel so that it can be funded annually in the implementation budget.**

**Ed Duggan seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Tom Stokely made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC to increase watershed funding from \$500 K to \$2 million and funded through proportional cuts from all other discretionary line items.**

**Sandy Denn seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Joe McCarthy made motion to accept the FY17 budget with the above motions exceptions.**

**Ed Duggan seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Rich Lorenz made a motion to reduce the South Fork LWD funding from \$188 K to \$93K and transfer the difference to the Salt Creek Stream Crossing.**

**Gil Saliba seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Leslie Bryan made a motion that the TAMWG express pleasure that the Watershed Workgroup and the TMC has expanded the watershed program beyond the 40 miles to include the entire watershed and the TAMWG recommend the TMC work with the Program Partners to identify, coordinate and prioritize projects for the watershed program.**

**Ed Duggan seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Tom Stokely made a motion that the TAMWG write a letter to TMC supporting the TMC's request for an appraisal level study of Lewiston Reservoir.**

**Rich Lorenz seconded the motion.**

**After discussion, Rich Lorenz pulled his second and the motion died.**

**Gil Saliba made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC adopt the proposed letter of May 23, 2016 from the TMC chair to the Reclamation Regional Director regarding the Trinity River temperature control issues.**

**Rich Lorenz seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed 10 to 2.**

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

None.

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

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

Elizabeth Hadley, Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG) chair opened the meeting and asked the members and attendees to introduce themselves for the benefit of two new TAMWG members. She noted that Federico Barajas would be calling in at 9:45 am with the TMC report and that they would break to receive his call. A presentation by James Lee on monitoring was added to the agenda under Item 9, TMC Issues.

#### **Approval of the Agenda**

**Tom Stokely made a motion to accept the agenda.**

**Sandy Denn seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

#### **Approval of the minutes**

**Sandy Denn made a motion to accept the April meeting minutes.**

**Tom Stokely seconded the motion**

**The motion passes unanimously.**

## 2. Public Comment

Kristi Brevard asked if she or other people could request items for the agenda. Elizabeth Hadley said that they could with three weeks prior notice to allow time to be published in the Federal Register.

Dave Wellock commented on the spring flow release. This year it was supposed to be 10,000 cfs. His gage at his property suggested a greater release. He asked about the release being done on a weekend and the extra expense of overtime pay. He also asked if the releases were wise given the drought. He noted few questions being answered at a recent public meeting with the Trinity River “Task Force.” One question he has had was whether or not there has been any increase in fish in the recent decade and there was no clear answer at the meeting. He also asked about changes in the bed elevations at the Lewiston Bridge. Elizabeth Hadley said she would talk with Wellock at the break about several of these questions. Tom Stokely suggested he put these questions in writing and submit a letter.

Tom Stokely said 2015 was the second lowest return for naturally spawning fall Chinook to the Trinity River since record keeping began about 1975. 1991 was worse.

At this point, Federico Barajas made his scheduled phone call and the TAMWG broke to take his report (Item 4). The TAMWG returned to public comments following Barajas’ call.

Wade Sinnen of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) provided an update on fish returns via telephone. He noted that last year fish returns were typical of a cyclic downturn. This year the CDFW has allowed a small quota for harvest of 183 adults spring Chinook in the Trinity River. They expect 52,000 fall Chinook to return to the Klamath River mouth and 30 to 50 % will come up the Trinity. Tribal quota will be 7400 fish which will be less than one fish per tribal member.

Ed Duggan asked if they may close the spit early this fall and open it later on. Sinnen said no it would be the same as last year. Duggan asked about the 2016 ceremonial tribal closures. Sinnen said he was not aware of the details but he knew the Forest Service would close some of the riparian access for the Karuk Tribe.

Darren Mierau asked timing of the returns and if there were any efforts to manage quotas for fishing to avoid excess take of early run such as the Shasta. Sinnen said it is a concern, but no. Sinnen suggested that it may not have been demonstrated that there is a negative effect on particular stocks. He said that Mierau could bring this up at a Fish Commission meeting.

Travis Michel asked about the one adult and one jack daily limit and if it applied to the spring Chinook. Sinnen said yes, it will be the same as last year and the same as fall limits. Possession limits will be two adults and two jacks. Michel asked how long Sinnen thought the season would last. Sinnen did not know and said it depends on how large the run actually is and how fast the quota is reached.

Ed Duggan asked if the lower Trinity would be shut down once the upper Trinity had reached its quota. Sinnen replied in the positive—he noted that this years’ quota will be small but in most other years with good expected fish returns, the quota is not met.

Paul Catanese asked why they are “dipping” below the 40,000 quota for natural escapement. Sinnen said the analysis showed the population could sustain going below the floor for a year or two but not regularly. He referred him to the Pacific Fishery Management Council (on their website) pre-season report for more information.

On the final public comment, Andreas Krause noted the Flow Workgroup is changing their process for flow scheduling and he asked that this be put on the fall and December agenda. One idea is to make earlier releases in March. When the TMC deliberated on the flow schedule in March, a private business owner requested that business effects be considered. Krause wanted to let the TAMWG know of this concern. He requested that the TAMWG do outreach on flows to the businesses.

### **3. Designated Federal Officer Items**

Joe Polos, Designated Federal Officer, reported that the appointment of new members had gone well. He noted FWS website with updates on recent meetings such as the DSS. There will be a fish derby for kids at Sky Lake near Burnt Ranch. Polos said he spoke with the business owner noted by Krause about the Program.

Ed Duggan said the Orleans Ranger District, Rod and Gun Club, and the fire department is also putting on a fish derby for kids during the last week of June.

### **4. TMC Chair Report**

Federico Barajas, Trinity Management Council (TMC) chair, called in to give his report. He first noted the upcoming TMC meeting June 1 and 2 in Eureka, CA. He said he hoped to be able to approve the FY2017 budget at this meeting. They will have presentations on the regulatory compliance of the Program, current conditions of flows, channel implementation plans for this summer, adaptive management as a way to move forward by the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), effectiveness monitoring and lessons learned by the Design Team, watershed projects by the Watershed Workgroup, and temperature management by the Flow Workgroup.

Gil Saliba asked, regarding the budget there is a large portion for monitoring fall Chinook, how is this shift to this species justified given the Record of Decision? Barajas said this effort was prioritized as relatively high by the Program partners. He noted the Bureau also considers the other species important also and they are continuing looking for ways to fund these efforts.

Barajas continued his report and noted that Mike Dixon from FWS has been hired as the new Branch Chief. Caryn Hunt DeCarlo, current acting Executive Director is still serving during the hiring of a permanent director. He announced he is leaving the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) and has accepted a new position with the Bureau in Sacramento.

Tom Stokely said Barajas has done a great job. He asked about the status of the Executive Director position. Barajas said that human resources office has been modifying wording of the vacancy announcement and he expected it to be finalized in a week or two.

Rich Lorenz asked what the final determination for the water year was. Barajas said it is a Wet year and the releases have been designed for this. He noted the website.

Paul Catanese asked about the peak spring release. Barajas said it was 10,000 cfs in two peaks. Catanese asked if it was higher. Barajas thought if it was higher, it was minimal. There will be a publication on the actual releases and he can make this available to the TAMWG.

Kristi Bevard asked about the environmental assessment by the BLM. Barajas said it would be NEPA and they would coordinate with the Bureau.

Elizabeth Hadley said Barajas would be missed by the Program.

## 5. DSS Update

Tyrell Dewebber, research scientist at Oregon State University, called in to give an update on the Decision Support System (DSS) workshop held in March. The purpose of the DSS is to support decision making and guide monitoring; this will assist learning about how to manage the river. It should be useful for the TAMWG and TMC.

He reviewed that the workshop consisted of a set of detailed presentations on day 1 and a practice session using DSS on day 2. He gave a summary of the practice session where they looked at three alternative hydrographs using DSS: a ROD type hydrograph, a slightly modified 2012 hydrograph, and a natural hydrograph. He explained they used fish models to produce predicted numbers and sizes of smolts passing Pear Tree under the three hydrographs. The numbers of fish produced was not very different among the hydrographs, but the mass of fish was much increased under the natural hydrograph. The DSS process next looked at modelled bed scour and mobility under the three hydrographs. The natural hydrograph had higher scour and bed mobility. The DSS looked at establishment of black cottonwood. Cottonwood needs to be able to grow their roots fast enough to stay within the declining wet zone along the river during the spring and summer. Their model estimated the number of establishment sites under the three hydrographs under a normal water year. The modified 2012 produced the greatest number of sites, and the natural hydrograph produced the lowest. Lastly the DSS considered the effects of the three hydrograph on survival of yellow-legged frog egg masses. The natural hydrograph produced the greatest number of initiation days for successful egg masses. Also, the natural allowed egg masses to start earlier in the year which was thought to be more successful for frogs.

Dewebber summarized the model results for each hydrograph. He asked the TAMWG if they could use this table to choose a hydrograph. This initiated a set of questions. Paul Catanese asked if the fish production shouldn't be broken down by species and he asked about the rationale for cottonwood production. Dewebber said fish models for coho and steelhead have not been developed yet so they could only produce Chinook data. Regarding cottonwood, it has been recognized that a healthy river with recruitment of cottonwood is good for overall function which will help fish. Catanese asked why not just plant cottonwoods instead of using water to help them. Dewebber noted that they have had trouble getting plant establishment and that it seems the water drawdown is important. Ed Duggan asked about correlation between screw traps at Pear Tree and Willow Creek and if it was an indicator for survival. Dewebber said the habitat model that produced smolts is only available for Pear Tree but is under development for downstream reaches. Joe Polos added that the fish production model only goes to the North Fork but they are extending the model down to Weitchpec. They will be able to use the Willow Creek data to help validate survival in the model. Duggan asked why spend money on the two traps if they are not using the data to help understand survival? He also noted that in the 15 years he has been in the Program they have not moved beyond fall Chinook. Shiloe Braxton asked about error terms produced by the model. Tom Stokely said that about eight years ago the Science Advisory Board recommended the screw traps not be funded as their value was questionable. Julie Catanese asked about the choice of 2012 for the analysis year and if they could use it for this year. Dewebber said for this exercise they chose one year that they could model. Polos said for next year, they may use this approach for flow scheduling. Andreas Krause added that this exercise was a hypothetical application of the DSS and that they may start bringing these types of summary tables for the TAMWG to decide on flow scheduling.

Duggan and Sandy Denn noted that fish production has always been recognized as important but they now also recognize that other elements of a healthy river such as shade and scour are important for fish production. Gil Saliba noted the problem of over-compensating for things like

yellow-legged frog when the river may have been too cold for frogs originally. Paul Catanese said that in the upper Trinity, steelhead are more important than salmon. He asked about comparisons between the Trinity and Klamath as a way to assess the success of the Program.

## **Lunch**

### **6. Trinity River Brown Trout Study**

Justin Alvarez, fisheries biologist with the Hoopa Valley Tribe gave a presentation on his study of brown trout in the Trinity River. Brown trout were introduced prior to the 20<sup>th</sup> century and were thought to exist at low numbers. More recently, the population was noted to have increased, particularly after the dam was built and again during the recent years. His objectives in his study were to assess population numbers, age structure, growth and diets. He is in the second year of study from the dam down to the North Fork using boat electrofishing. He captures, processes, and then marks and releases fish about 8 inches to 30 inches. He measures size, takes a scale or fin clip, does a stomach sample, and tags captured fish. Some fish are also radio tagged.

Regarding movement, most fish have a home area as small as 50 m, but some will move long distances. He estimates there were 1500 individuals over 20 cm in length in the study reach in 2015. The largest fish captured was a male 78 cm long and weighed over 10 pounds. Stomach samples shows brown trout eat a variety of fish (coho, steelhead, lamprey, dace, and sculpin), salamanders, and frogs.

In order to understand the potential impact of predation by brown trout on managed fish juveniles, he performed a caloric calculation by the population of 1500 brown trout. He estimated the population of the 1500 brown trout had a total mass of 1611 kg and they needed 9678 kg of food as consumption per year. He estimated the food could be as many as 483,000 fish but more likely 203,000. The brown trout could not get this amount of energy based on an insect diet alone. He contrasted this potential consumption with the 300,000 coho smolts that are released per year from the hatchery. He noted that these coho are not in the river for the entire year. He noted there are also potential feed the hatchery release of 4.6 million Chinook and 800,000 steelhead. His data showed that the brown trout concentrate on these fish during the release periods and they show large growth during these release periods. The releases constitute an artificial energy boost for the remainder of the year and promote greater growth. Being larger, they will have a larger impact on the native fish when the hatchery fish are not present. If he tried to account for the fact that larger fish grow more slowly, the consumption estimate increased to 11,844 kg.

Alvarez concluded that coho and steelhead are disproportionately impacted by brown trout. Brown trout could be managed and it would require political will. He posed the question of how to balance the predation effects on a \$150 million investment in recovery with a small but active recreational fishery that target the brown trout. Another question he posed was whether rainbow would take over that niche that was vacated by brown trout.

In his final comments and answers to questions, Alvarez noted that brown do follow the smolt release. He said a fisheries scientist at Red Bluff studying otolith chemistry of brown trout in the Sacramento did not see evidence for brown trout going to the ocean but they did go to the estuary. Regarding temperature requirements, 17.5 C is "not good" for brown trout but they can survive up to 20.5. Alvarez thinks that this year his data suggests there are much fewer brown trout. Last year, may have been a banner year. Lower numbers this year may be due to high numbers of lamprey, clarity of water promoting trout movement to tributaries, and changes at the hatchery causing shorter residence times of released steelhead.

## **7. Upper Trinity River Tributary Access Survey**

Robert Stewart hydrologic engineer with the TRRP gave an update on the tributary survey. The survey was prompted by concerns about the ability of fish to gain access to the tributary as a result of bedload buildup at the mouths of tributaries.

Stewart said they went out and looked at tributary mouths in the upper 40 miles of the Trinity River in January. They limited their study to 3<sup>rd</sup> order and smaller tributaries. They measured bed profiles in the mouth of tributaries and estimated the river stage needed to reduce or remove any impediment to fish access. They found that 1st order streams were not passible as were most 2<sup>nd</sup> order streams. Third order streams, for the most part, were passible. They estimated that flow rates of 2,000 cfs in the main stem would allow fish passage in most streams with impediments. As their study was done in January and he acknowledged that more passage issues may arise during coho spawning as flows are lower in October and November. He has not received any responses from guides about stream mouths.

Tom Stokely asked how realistic was it to release enough water to allow better access for fish. Stewart noted that access was needed only during limited times and this was typically during periods when tributaries would be at higher flows. Stewart also commented that small streams were noted to hold fry suggesting that fish may actually be accessing small streams.

Gil Saliba asked about the seasonality of access such as during low-flow periods and if they may be following through with more surveys.

## **8. Water Management - Temperature Control**

Tom Stokely gave a presentation on temperature in the Trinity River. He reviewed the history reciting promises in 1955 prior to dam construction that the fish would not be harmed. In 1984 legislation recognized the need for fish restoration. In 1990 State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) adopted Water Right Order 90-05 that established the 56 F water temperature standard at Douglas City and the North Fork after September 15. In 1992, the North Coast basin plan for temperature objectives was approved by the NCRWQCB, SWRCB and USEPA

Temperature objectives for the Trinity River at Douglas City include 60 F during July 1-September 14 to protect holding salmon and 56 F in the fall for salmon spawning. But Stokely pointed out that there are no real requirements for the Bureau to meet these objectives as part of their water right permits from the State. Water Right Order 90-05 does not apply the 60 F objective and the 56 F objective is only required when water is moved to the Sacramento River for temperature control.

Stokely next moved on to Trinity and Lewiston Reservoirs and the management of water levels and specifically the management of cold water. Trinity Lake refills more slowly than other reservoirs and therefore draining the reservoir has longer-lasting impacts. Water in Trinity Lake is drawn down via the power generating outlets on the dam that are submerged in the lake. As the level of the lake gets lower, the upper warm water layer gets closer to the outlets allowing warmer water to be released to the Trinity River. There is a deeper auxiliary outlet accessing cooler water but it does not generate power. The Record of Decision (ROD) calls for 600,000 acre feet (AF) of water be the minimum pool carryover for fall storage in Trinity Lake, (400,000 AF with power by pass). The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) did not issue minimum pool requirements for Trinity as they did for other Shasta and Folsom in late 2015.

Stokely explained that Lewiston Reservoir is shallow and gets warm. Keeping the Trinity River cool requires exporting water to the Sacramento River. The Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) has

considered temperature modifications such as removal of Lewiston Dam, dredging, a tunnel pipeline bypass, and raising Lewiston.

Trinity County did a study of water volumes needed to manage Trinity River temperatures. The study estimated balance carryover in Trinity Lake should be 900,000 AF. Another study considered the amount of carry over storage was needed to keep fish alive in Trinity River during a 7-year drought. That study concluded 1.250 million AF at start of drought would keep fish alive through 7-years of drought.

In 2000, the BOR conducted a study of enlarging Trinity Dam and the benefits with increased carryover storage. The study was unpopular in Trinity County. The BOR concluded it wasn't worth it to raise the dam as the watershed was too small compared to the size of the reservoir.

Stokely made concluding comments. Late summer releases from Trinity dam are done for the Lower Klamath fish health but this was not considered in the ROD. He stressed there needs to be more carryover storage as absence of cold water is dangerous for fish. The assurances that "everything is okay" are unsubstantiated. He said there are lessons to be learned from the drought of 1977 when warm water diseases killed fish at the hatchery. Bypassing the power plant for fisheries conflicts with power production. Climate change will result in more rain and likely warmer water which will create more uncertainty. Stokely closed with his recommendation for a 900,000 AF carryover at September 30. They need to allow banking from one year to the next. They need to reduce delta exports. He recommended changes to the BOR water permits to include temperature objectives and export limitations.

Stokely's presentation prompted discussion of water management in the dams. Rich Lorenz asked if Stokely would make a motion. Stokely said not yet. Hadley said they had made motions in the past regarding carryover storage. She said if a motion were made, the TMC may not consider it at the next meeting since they will be focused on budget; it might be best to wait and present such a motion at a later meeting.

Gil Saliba noted that the ROD is inconsistent as it is based on inflow to Trinity Reservoir, but releases deplete the reservoir. How should we draft a motion for storage and address this inconsistency? Stokely said cold water storage is the way to manage for these things.

Brandt Gutermuth noted the EIS on fall flows may be a way to make comments on lake levels. The draft may be available by this fall or winter.

Andreas Krause said the TMC meeting on June 1 and 2 will be considering a letter to BOR to fund an appraisal study on the Lewiston temperature modification and this may be a good way to make a motion. Stokely said the TAMWG may recommend the TMC to write to Reclamation in support of the appraisal study of Lewiston Reservoir. Krause said you could add in temperature management or cold water carry-over as part of the appraisal study. The concern of the TAMWG was that the current 600,000 AF was inadequate to maintain cold water in the Trinity River especially in years of multiple drought.

Dave Steinhauser asked about the role of BOR and State Water Resources Control Board. Stokely explained that the SWRCB regulates water quality and quantity. The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQRB) issued Waste Discharge Requirements and classified warm water as a pollutant under the Clean Water Act in the late 1980's but it was overturned by the SWRCB to have temperature requirements put into water rights. SWRCB Water Right Order 90-05 implemented Sacramento River temperature objectives into Reclamation's water rights. Stokely said that Trinity River temperature standards need to be in the terms and conditions in the BOR water right in permits from the SWRCB as well.

Tom Stokely made a motion after extended discussion.

**Tom Stokely made a motion that the TAMWG write a letter to TMC supporting the TMC's request for an appraisal level study of Lewiston Reservoir.**

**Rich Lorenz seconded the motion.**

During the discussion, Sandy Denn said she would like to evaluate some of these issues and specifically the proposed letter from TMC to Reclamation before voting on a motion. Elizabeth Hadley said she would also like to think about it. Stokely said there will certainly be impacts to CVP water users. He said he can send his PowerPoint file to Julie Catanese. He suggested the TAMWG ask for the Appraisal level of analysis on Lewiston Reservoir. Hadley said it could be rephrased to recommend if TMC were to move forward, also assess the impact of carry-over storage. Gil Saliba also wanted to see the letter. It was decided that Andreas Krause would forward it for review that evening and the TAMWG will delay the vote until Day 2. The motion was further discussed on Day 2 following Item 11.

## **9. Current TMC Issues**

A presentation by James Lee, riparian ecologist with the Hoopa Valley Tribe was added in under this agenda item. Lee gave a presentation on costs of wildlife and riparian monitoring and he included recommendations on efficiency and cost savings. The wildlife and riparian monitoring budget is about \$1.6 million. .

Lee said that permit compliance guidance for riparian efforts are vague but the 1984 Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Act does give clear guidance for wildlife and riparian work. He suggested the Program revisit the language of the Act as part of an assessment of riparian monitoring. He also recommended seeking clear guidance on the monitoring for CEQA compliance. He showed an example of what clear definition of riparian habitat from a recent scientific review by Brinson. Using this definition, he thought the Program has not had large negative impacts on riparian habitat. His third recommendation was to adopt the Brinson definition of riparian habitat.

Lee said that questions are often raised about why the Program is monitoring birds. He noted that birds are good indicators of habitat, but their habitat is typically species specific. He cited the need to balance monitoring for science with monitoring for compliance. He cited an example where birds have increased in areas that failed to remove vegetation. He recommended they develop a list of focal bird species for monitoring.

Herpetological monitoring has focused on yellow-legged frog and pond turtles. He recommended the Program pause monitoring for one year and use that time to establish clearer goals.

He recommended they maintain riparian mapping funding, but reallocate funding for a synthesis that reduces data collection and shift more effort to reliance on models.

He noted there is a lot of dollars spent on channel revegetation, but he did not see room for much savings. Normally revegetation costs 15 % of total project costs. He recommended the Program formalize this portion of the budget and demonstrate to the State that this large amount of funding demonstrates that they are in compliance with "no net loss." He also suggested they may try to do revegetation work in non-construction areas if the construction area has low promise for success.

He recommended they remove the additional flexibility funding for revegetation from the budget, but only if some of the other recommendations are also followed.

Elizabeth Hadley asked if this proposal was circumventing the normal budget process. Lee said it was conceived just a week ago once it was discovered there was a budget shortfall. It had not gone through the Wildlife and Riparian Workgroup and it was more policy level.

Gil Saliba said, historically, there had been a lot of negative comments directed toward riparian work. He liked what Lee has done. He noted that at times there have been conflicts between frogs and fish. He agreed it doesn't make sense to try to revegetate areas that don't support vegetation.

Tom Stokely said the 1955 act said to preserve fish and wildlife, the 1984 act provided funding, but later acts omitted the mention of wildlife. Sandy Denn thought the connection was clear that the riverine habitat is dependent on riparian.

Paul Catanese asked why set aside monitoring for a year on frogs and pond turtles given they are listed species. Lee noted they are State species of concern.

Travis Michel asked about restoring vegetation in a dynamic river and whether it is better to let the river decide. Lee said it may be better to wait one year after construction to see what the river wants to do. Currently the revegetation is designed before the site construction start and is based on a model of what the site would look like. Revegetation work is part of a contract with some rigidity and doesn't allow the year wait.

### **Adjourn for day 4:00 pm**

### **Wednesday May 24, 2016; 9:00 am**

Tom Stokely, vice-chair, chaired the meeting on Day 2.

#### **10. TRRP Managers Report**

Caryn Hunt DeCarlo went over her written report (Attachment 1). She noted several activities including the DSS workshop, compliance progress on channel projects, coordination with the tribes regarding construction, flow hydrograph, gravel augmentation, hiring of the Implementation Branch Chief, and refining the budget.

She noted that the spring release did peak at 10,300 cfs but it averaged 10,000 cfs. Public complaints were received over a variety of issues. This prompted a discussion about notifications and the well grant program.

Regarding personnel at the TRRP, Joe Polos reported the FWS is interviewing three candidates and a top selection has been made for the Science Coordinator and an offer is being prepared.

DeCarlo noted the memo from the Watershed Workgroup and its recommendation to reduce funding to all watershed projects by 2.7 % in order to stay within budget (Attachment 2).

Brandt Gutermuth provided the Implementation update. He described the process of updating the floodplain map at the Bucktail Site and the new requirements on the project. One issue is the effect of the project on the floodplain elevations. This process has entailed a series of reviews regarding compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program. Ed Duggan asked if the new FEMA floodplain map is only for the top 40 miles. Gutermuth said he could send out the County website where the information is posted.

Gutermuth commented on the progress of the Sheridan and Deep Gulch projects. Both are off of Sky Ranch Road near the Sheridan Hole and are mostly on BLM property. Coordination with

BLM, public outreach and environmental documents are in progress. Tom Stokely asked about the \$12 million estimated cost of Chapman Ranch. Gutermuth said these are estimates and the high cost is due to a long side channel that will provide rearing habitat.

Travis Michel asked how many side channels are operating as planned and what is the success rate. He thought that the large side channels stay open, but the smaller channels such as Trinity House Gulch do not seem to have water the next year. Gutermuth said the function is designed to change over time. Some funding for designs for 2016 was redirected at effectiveness monitoring and they are hoping to find out more about how they are working. He noted that modelling shows that the Chapman side channel will produce a lot of habitat, but it is not known how long it may last.

DeCarlo continued her presentation and mentioned personnel changes. Michelle Gallagher has taken a new position with the Bureau in New Mexico. Mike Dixon will be joining the Program as the Implementation Branch Chief. Dixon has a Ph.D. in conservation biology and comes from the FWS as an area manager of wildlife refuges in Wyoming and Colorado. They are still seeking candidates for the Executive Director position. DeCarlo lauded Gutermuth for his exemplary work as acting Implementation Chief and acting Executive Director.

DeCarlo finished with a list of the public outreach efforts.

## **11. TRRP FY17 Budget**

Caryn Hunt DeCarlo walked the TAMWG through the FY17 budget (Attachment 3). She noted that based on proposed changes from the TMC representatives at the April meeting, the budget is now over the allocated \$15.0 million. This has caused a review and the process is still in progress. DeCarlo went over the budget refinements to date (Attachments 3 and 3a).

Gil Saliba asked about the Fixer. Joe Polos explained that the Fixer Document was a request from the Tribes for a review of the Program regarding failure to follow through on issues such as adaptive management. They requested an external review of the Program and funds need to be set aside for this process.

DeCarlo directed the TAMWG to the Implementation line items. She noted there were concerns over the monitoring for wildlife and gravel such as the level of monitoring and if they should be placed into the Science budget. If these were placed into the Science portion, there would be no funds to cover them and some are required for permit compliance. Gil Saliba noted this issue had been addressed several years ago and opined it should be settled and not revisited again. DeCarlo agreed but she takes multiple phone calls from partners expressing varying opinions on this.

There was a discussion regarding gravel monitoring and costs, timing of gravel acquisition, and the reductions to the gravel additions to the river. Travis Michele commented that the Program has done a great job in redressing the fisherman's concerns and they have all learned a lot.

DeCarlo moved on to the Science portion and Polos walked the TAMWG through his overview sheet (Attachment 4b) that described the Science project changes. Reductions were made in effectiveness monitoring of channel biophysical and large wood, and coded wire tags of fall Chinook. Projects that did not get funded were creel surveys, scale analysis, mapping riparian, active bar and DSS, delta monitoring, cohort reconstructions, emergency needs, and validation of weir run size estimates.

Tom Stokely suggested that the TAMWG have a presentation at the next TAMWG meeting on the downstream migrant traps as this is one of the only ways to assess the success of the Program. He

noted the SAB recommended this not be funded as they are not getting the value from this. Part of the problem was that the reports were not getting out.

Stokely next asked the TAMWG about crafting a recommendation to the TMC regarding the budget. Stokely noted their recommendations from the previous meeting and recommended they keep the recommendation for increased watershed funding. This prompted a discussion about funding and conflicts of interest on the TMC. DeCarlo mentioned the effort to pull out the compliance monitoring out of implementation is a problem.

**Gil Saliba made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC direct Program partners to determine the costs of environmental compliance monitoring for riparian, herptiles, sediment, and gravel so that it can be funded annually in the implementation budget.**

**Ed Duggan seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Shiloe Braxton abstained.**

Tom Stokely made a motion the TAMWG resubmit their last recommendation to the TMC to increase watershed funding.

**Tom Stokely made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC to increase watershed funding from \$500 K to \$2 million and funded through proportional cuts from all other discretion line items.**

**Sandy Denn seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Joe McCarthy made a motion to accept the FY17 budget with the above motions exceptions.**

**Ed Duggan seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Shiloe Braxton abstained.**

There was a discussion about lack of funding for fisheries monitoring. Vivian Helliwell of IFR asked why there is no money for fisheries monitoring. Joe Polos explained the prioritization in the Science projects and that the fisheries monitoring fell below the funding available. Helliwell asked if these were important to assessing the success of the Program. Tom Stokely said it is of concern, but it is less of a restoration task and more of a fisheries management task. Ed Duggan said it would be one way for the TMC to force others to come up with the funds. He thought it should be in FWS budget.

At this point, the TAWMG returned to the watershed funding (Attachment 2). The question was whether the TAMWG should recommend any changes to this budget. One question was if the first project woody debris loading in the South Fork should be unfunded as it had already received \$600 K from other sources. Other opinions were to not try to overrule the Watershed Workgroup.

**Rich Lorenz made a motion to reduce the South Fork LWD funding from \$188 K to \$93K and transfer the difference to the Salt Creek Stream Crossing.**

**Gil Saliba seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Shiloe Braxton abstained.**

Kyle De Julio commented on the perspective of the Watershed Workgroup. He noted the Workgroup had prioritized sediment reduction and the Salt Creek was slightly beyond this particular scope.

The TAMWG next drafted a motion on watersheds after some discussion.

**Leslie Bryan made a motion that the TAMWG express pleasure that the Watershed Workgroup and the TMC has expanded the watershed program beyond the 40 miles to include the entire watershed and the TAMWG recommend the TMC work with the Program Partners to identify, coordinate and prioritize projects for the watershed program.**

**Ed Duggan seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Shiloe Braxton abstained.**

### **Reconsideration of the Motion made on Day 1 during Item 8**

Tom Stokely then asked the TAMWG to return to the motion of yesterday in Item 8.

Sandy Denn did not support the motion citing that the letter was “not connected” to the motion. She said the appraisal may be eliminating examination of negative consequences. Gil Saliba said he supported the letter. The motion from yesterday that was not passed was revisited:

**Tom Stokely made a motion that the TAMWG write a letter to TMC supporting the TMC’s request for an appraisal level study of Lewiston Reservoir.**

**Rich Lorenz seconded the motion.**

**After discussion, Rich Lorenz pulled his second and the motion died.**

Another motion was then drafted. Gill Saliba remade a refinement of the motion to support the letter recommending alternatives for Lewiston reservoir. Sandy Denn and Leslie Bryan did not support the “laundry list” in the letter.

**Gil Saliba made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC adopt the proposed letter of May 23, 2016 from the TMC chair to the Reclamation Regional Director regarding the Trinity River temperature control issues.**

**Rich Lorenz seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed 10 to 3.**

**Voting no were Sandy Denn, Leslie Bryan, and Julie Catanese.**

### **12. Public Comment**

Kristi Bevard asked that the unfunded watershed projects get put in the top of the list next year. Kyle De Julio said they would be reviewed if they were resubmitted next year. Bevard suggested the agenda for next TAMWG meeting include a review of the lack of a grading ordinance in Trinity County.

Tom Stokely said that could be an agenda item along with downstream migrant traps. Rich Lorenz noted that Paul Catanese had asked for a comparison of restoration effects in the Trinity with the Klamath River.

Sandy Denn noted the vice-chair met the adjournment time exactly.

## **Adjourn 12:15 pm**

### **LIST OF ATTACHMENTS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS**

Attachment 1: Executive Directors Report, May 25, 2016.

Attachment 2: Watershed Projects Final Rankings Memo to Caryn Hunt DeCarlo from Watershed Workgroup, May 3, 2016.

Attachment 3: FY2017 Proposed Program Budget, draft 5/24/2016.

Attachment 3a: Changes to Budget from FY17 Proposed at April TMC Meeting.

Attachment 3b: TMC FY17 Budget Overview.

Attachment 4: Letter from TMC Chair, Federico Barajas to Bureau of Reclamation requesting the appraisal study of Lewiston Reservoir, May 23, 2016.

### **Other Documents**

1. Letter to TMC from TAMWG, April 5, 2016.
2. Technical Workgroup Summary, May/June 2016.
3. TRRP DSS Workshop Agenda, March 29-31, 2016.
4. Stokely's ppt on Trinity River Temperature Issues.
5. Trinity Brown Trout ppt Alvarez
6. Tributary Mouth Access ppt Stewart
7. DSS ppt DeWebber

## Trinity River Adaptive Management Working Group

### DRAFT AGENDA

Meeting of May 24-25, 2016

*NOTE: Times Subject to Change*

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

Web Conference: <http://www.mymeetings.com/nc/join.php?sigKey=mymeetings&i=442336293&p=&t=c>

Conference Call: 866-715-1246, pass code: 4251781

<b>Tuesday, May 24, 2016</b>		
<b>Time</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Presenter</b>
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 Report	TMC Chair
10:45 AM	DSS Update	Tyrell Deweber
11:45 PM	Lunch	
1:00 PM	Trinity River Brown Trout Study	Justin Alvarez
2:00 PM	Upper Trinity River Tributary Access Survey	Robert Stewart
2:45 PM	Water Management-Temperature Control	Tom Stokely
3:45 PM	Current TMC Issues	TAMWG
4:00 PM	Adjourn	
<b>Wednesday, May 25, 2016</b>		
9:00 AM	TRRP Managers Reports	ED, Sci Coord, Implement Branch Chief
10:00 AM	TRRP FY17Budget	TRRP Staff
12:00 AM	Public Comment	
12:15 PM	Adjourn	