

Draft 1 Minutes
TRINITY RIVER ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP

September 26-27, 2016

Trinity River Restoration Office, Weaverville, CA

Monday September 26, 2016; 9:30 am

Attending Members

Member	Representative Seat
Elizabeth Hadley ¹	Chair, Utility Companies
Tom Stokely	Vice-chair, Commercial Fishing Organizations
Richard Lorenz	Trinity County Residents
Gil Saliba	Environmental Organizations
Ed Duggan	Small Business Owners
Kelli Gant	Trinity County Residents
Joe McCarthy	Local Landowners
Darren Mierau ²	Environmental Organizations
Emelia Berol ³	Environmental Organizations
Travis Michele ⁴	Trinity River Fishing Guides
Mike Dixon ⁵	Acting Executive Director, TRRP

¹ Left after Item 7 and returned on Day 2; ² attended by phone on Day 1; ³ arrived after lunch on Day 1; ⁴ arrived on Day 2; ⁵ non-voting member.

Members that did not attend

Member	Representative Seat
Paul Catanese	Local Landowners/Business owners
Michael Charlton	Recreational Commercial Guides
Shiloe Braxton	Trinity County Resource Conservation District
Julie Catanese	Public Utilities
David Steinhauser	Whitewater Outfitters /Guides

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

Other attendees: Dave Wellock, Jerry Paine, Diana Paine, Kristi Bevard (local residents); Leslie Bryan, (Redding Electric Utility); Sarah Rockwell (Klamath Bird Observatory); Stephanie Blihovde, Vina Frye, Bruce Bingham, Bill Pinnix (USFWS); Eric Peterson, Todd Buxton, Brandt Gutermuth, Robert Stewart, Jennifer Norris (TRRP); Kyle De Juilio (Yurok Tribe).

Others attending by phone: none.

Notes: Kim Mattson (Ecosystems Northwest).

List of Motions Made during the Meeting

Rich Lorenz made a motion to accept the agenda.

Kelli Gant seconded the motion

The motion passed unanimously.

Tom Stokely made a motion to accept the June minutes.

Kelli Gant seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Tom Stokely made a motion to place any budget savings additive to the existing \$500K watershed budget for FY17.

Kelli Gant seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mike McCarthy made a motion to refer the letters from the public to the TRRP staff.

Gil Saliba seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Tom Stokely made a motion that the TAMWG recommends that the TMC change its bylaws in the following 7 ways:

- 1. Reject the proposal to vote during telephone conference call meetings unless the public is allowed to participate and there is public notice on the TRRP website of at least 2 weeks before the teleconference call meetings;**
- 2. Change bylaws (Section 605a) to eliminate mail/email voting of TMC matters;**
- 3. Shift the voting process (Section 603) from a supermajority to a simple majority (CDR, p. 26);**
- 4. Require a TMC member with a specific programmatic or financial interest in the outcome of a decision by that body to recuse themselves (CDR, p. 27) from discussion and voting;**
- 5. Enlarge the number of voting members on the TMC to provide for a broader representation of interests (CDR, p. 27);**
- 6. Add Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group Chairman as a voting TMC member; and**
- 7. Remove “unanimous” from Section 300.**

Ed Duggan seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

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 noting they had not yet reached a quorum of members said they would wait to approve the agenda and minutes. Hadley asked the members and attendees to introduce themselves.

Once the quorum was reached, the TAMWG took up the agenda and the past meeting minutes.

Rich Lorenz made a motion to accept the agenda.

Kelli Gant seconded the motion

The motion passed unanimously.

Tom Stokely made one correction to the June minutes.

Tom Stokely made a motion to accept the June minutes.

Kelli Gant seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Public Comment

Dave Wellock commented on dredging on the Trinity River and passed out a page from a book on dredging and river conditions. He was advocating for creating deeper pools and for the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) to stop gravel augmentation.

3. Designated Federal Officer Items

Joe Polos, Arcata Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), noted that Liam Gogan and Sandy Denn had resigned their positions on TAMWG. Travis Michele, as alternate, has assumed Gogan's position. Polos said the Fish and Wildlife are moving forward to find replacements. He noted they are working on the renewal of the TAMWG charter and hope to have it ready before the end of the year. He noted the action tracker is up to date and is on the FWS website. He introduced Jennifer Norris as the new Science Coordinator and introduced Mike Dixon as the new RIG Branch Chief who is also serving as the Acting Executive Director.

4. TMC Chair Report

Seth Naman, Chair of the Trinity Management Council (TMC), walked the TAMWG through the TMC letter of response to the TAMWG May 2016 letter for recommendations for action (Attachment 1). Naman went over the TMC's decision regarding the five recommendations/comments in the TAMWG letter.

The TMC approved the letter to the Regional Director regarding Lewiston Reservoir and temperature issues.

The TMC discussed watershed funding but was not in favor of reallocating funding within the Program to watershed restoration. The TMC was in favor of finding other funds for watershed

restoration. Naman described the large watershed programs of the two tribes already in place. Tom Stokely commented that in June the TMC de-obligated \$250K watershed funds and this is opposite of what the TAMWG was requesting. Darren Mierau commented that the Tribe raising additional watershed funds is not a good reason to reduce watershed restoration in the TRRP. Mierau explained that outside funds are essentially taking away from other watershed restoration programs. Kelli Gant agreed with Mierau and asked that science be used to rank projects and suggested that the TMC may be voting for projects that support their particular jobs programs and not necessarily for the science of watershed restoration. Naman responded that there was a ranking developed by the Watershed Workgroup. Stokely agreed with Mierau and noted that the California Fisheries Restoration Grants program funds the entire state and has less funding than the TRRP. He also noted two of the TMC members did not vote on the watershed funding as they had projects under consideration, but that they did participate in the discussion of the funding decisions.

Naman continued his report noting the TMC had a briefing on compliance monitoring costs and annual funding at their June meeting and they will be having more discussion at the September meeting.

The TMC did not adopt the TAMWG's recommendation to revise the Watershed Workgroup rankings for watershed proposals (e.g., shift funds from the large woody debris in the South fork to the Salt Creek Stream Crossing).

Naman commented that the TMC is committed to the TAMWG's interest in working in the watershed beyond the 40-mile mainstem reach.

Next, Naman went over the TMC agenda for their September meeting. He noted there were several spots for public comments. He noted the discussions of edits to the bylaws to address teleconference voting and succession planning. The second day of the TMC is devoted mostly to science issues of flow, reservoir storage, and temperature. He noted that Andreas Krause is working on a way to get more variable flow planning particularly in winter.

Kelli Gant asked when the next phase review would occur. Naman said the Bureau of Reclamation is currently undertaking a Program review as initiated by what had been previously referred to the Fixer Document. Reclamation is working on getting a contractor to perform the review. Rich Lorenz expressed his hope that this next review will occur in a more timely fashion than the Phase I review.

5. Executive Director Updates—FY17 Budget, Implementation, Science Program

Mike Dixon walked the TAMWG through his written Executive Director's report (Attachment 2). He noted the current budget with proposed changes (Attachment 2a) and that there have been a few minor changes since printing the version he had passed out. He noted a series of decisions the TMC needs to make.

Decision 1 is the Program is short about \$120K to make the budget balance and the TMC will need to approve or disapprove four proposed projects. Bruce Bingham asked for more details about the rationale for the species chosen for herpetile monitoring. Dixon said he would be touching on this later this afternoon.

Decision 2 is whether to approve \$36K for hydrologic modeling.

Decisions 3 through 5 are efficiency cuts to some projects.

Decision 6 is whether savings would go to watershed restoration.

The TAMWG discussed the problem of changing funding based on objective science needs versus loss of specific positions within TMC members staff.

Kelli Gant and Rich Lorenz argued for taking advantages of the funds from the efficiencies and that it was not important they consider staffing. It was clarified that the efficiencies in Decision 5 were actually budget cuts based on science priorities. The cuts in Decision 5 would fund currently unfunded projects that were ranked but did not make the first funding cut.

Tom Stokely made a motion to place any budget savings additive to the existing \$500K watershed budget for FY17.

Kelli Gant seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Dixon continued his highlights to the Executive Director's report. He touched on staffing and noted that the permanent Executive Director's position was re-advertised. Jennifer Norris is the new Science Coordinator. They are still seeking a reality specialist, and a civil engineer. Linsey Walker has accepted a new position as grants specialist elsewhere within Reclamation, but will be supporting in the interim as this position is being filled.

Dixon referred to the Workgroup activities (Attachment 2b). He commented on a house in Junction City that could pose a pinch point if a spring storm coincides with a high flow release. This house had an unwilling seller in the past but is currently on the market. He also commented on the need for designs to now meet FEMA guidelines for maintaining the 100-year flood elevations. He noted that Bucktail is moving forward and it has been a great project so far. He hoped they could have a field trip once vegetation is completed. He noted some design adjustments that had to be made in the field at Bucktail and these went well. He reviewed issues at Salt Creek and changes to the channel that may affect landowners' wells. The TRRP cannot use federal funds for the moving of the wells and the landowners are pursuing ground water well installation. He also commented on the noise at Bucktail that caused loss of revenue for a vacation rental across the river.

Dixon noted outreach efforts and listed construction projects for next year as Sheridan, Deep Gulch, and Dutch Creek.

Lunch

6. TRRP Outmigrant Monitoring/TRRP Website

Bill Pinnix gave a slide presentation on screw trapping efforts for juvenile out-migrating juvenile Chinook. There are two traps and these are located at Pear Tree and Willow Creek and are operated by the two tribes. The trap program is currently undergoing a programmatic review. Pinnix described how trap efficiency is calculated and how they calculate out migrant populations. They normally capture 3 to 5 % of the out migrating juveniles. He explained that looking at juvenile fish are a good way to look at the performance of the restoration actions. He explained how the data are reported and they are available on the FWS website and on the TRRP data portal.

Pinnix gave some trapping results. He showed that natural out-migration timing occurs earlier than hatchery out-migration. The Willow Creek trap in the lower river cannot be placed out as early as the Pear Tree trap due to issues of high flow. The Pear Tree trap shows earlier migrants and may also reflect early emergence of Spring Chinook. He showed fork length measures can distinguish age 1 fish from age 0 fish. Most out migrants are age 0. He explained they also use condition factor (Fulton's) as a measure of how bulky or fat the juvenile are. They also capture steelhead

and coho juveniles but do not calculate population estimates but do calculate an index. They also capture juvenile green sturgeon, lamprey, and brown trout at Willow Creek.

They have accumulated 20 years of data and data management is a big portion of their effort. Preliminary analyses indicate that, from 1989 to 2014, juvenile Chinook of natural origin at Willow Creek shows a three-fold increase of out migrants starting about 2005. This is also the start of increased restoration flows. More flow would create more volume of water and therefore more habitat area. Pinnix took a look at the years when low out-migrant numbers occurred such as 2006. That year had very high flows plus safety-of-dam releases and the water was very turbid. The safety-of-dam releases occurred during January and February when the juveniles were still in the gravel. High flows at that time could scour and move the gravel and impact survival. Other low out-migrant years were also associated with high January and February flows and the effect seemed to occur at some threshold of flow.

Pinnix tried to statistically model out-migrant numbers using data on adult populations, flows, and volume of habitat. He found that high January and February flows had a negative effect and the amount of water volume and adult numbers had positive effects. These three variables explained 51 % of the variation in the juvenile out-migrant numbers.

Pinnix explained that one TRRP goal is to have 80 % of the out migrants leaving the Willow Creek trap site (RT80) before specific temperature targets are reached. He showed the timing of RT80 during 2001 to 2015 and that RT80 occurs earlier in dry years and occurs later in wet years. This was also related to temperature. The dry years had warmer water than the wet years. Juvenile Chinook are thought to stay longer with cooler river temperatures. This suggests that the timing and management of water is very important to juvenile Chinook production.

Rich Lorenz said what is important to him is the correlation between actions and fish production. Pinnix said they are showing effects and they will be looking at more variables. Kelli Gant asked if they have reached capacity. Pinnix said it is clear that more water makes more fish. But they could be getting more, but smaller, fish. Gant asked is it better to get the fish to move out and therefore better to manage for a warmer river. Pinnix said they need to monitor fish survival further down river but this will be expensive. He said the salmon production model will help at a very low cost. Tom Stokely said at a recent TMC meeting it was reported that the smolts per spawners is an important indicator of production success. Pinnix said they do not trust their adult-return data to use the smolts per spawner for the earlier years. Gant asked what Pinnix estimated fish survival to be. Pinnix thought hundreds of thousands of fish survive but this was hard to ballpark this number. He noted the value of the salmon production model as the best way to begin assessing effects on fish. The TAMWG expressed interest in more updates at future meetings.

TRRP Website History

Before moving on to the next item, Eric Peterson gave a slide presentation on the TRRP website and proposed changes. He gave a history of the website that started in 2004 and was independent of the government sites. Today they get about 70 hits per day with maximum hits of about 200 hits per day during flow releases. The data portal serves about 26 GB of data outgoing per month. In 2014, the Department of Interior mandated all websites be grouped and managed by a single contractor. The website has been transitioning to this new format and this has provided some opportunities for improvements. Peterson has ideas on how to streamline the look of the webpage and work better for cell phone and to work better with the data portal.

Kelli Gant noted it has been difficult to find specific documents in the past. She asked for easier links to other sites. She asked if they would be able to tell if there was more interest in technical

documents or in history documents. Ed Duggan said the public is interested in the flows. The fishermen anticipate that the fish move with a drop in flow and they also are monitoring the temperatures as a way to indicate better fishing.

7. Compliance Monitoring

Mike Dixon gave a slide presentation on TRRP compliance monitoring. He noted that compliance monitoring is mostly the responsibility of the implementation branch. He first defined compliance monitoring as how well they are meeting their permit requirements. He cited the Minimum Monitoring and Reporting Program and Project Design Elements (MMRP) as described in the CEQA documents.

He described the various monitoring projects. Turbidity should stay below 20 NTUs or 20 % increases over background levels if background is over 20 NTUs. They do monitor this.

Juvenile salmon fry stranding should be monitored after 1.5 year (6 cfs) or less flood event. They mostly monitor this.

Pre-construction surveys should identify sensitive riparian and wetlands. They do monitor this. They also do a 10-year riparian monitoring for loss of wetlands and riparian habitat. They are transitioning from survival to aerial cover monitoring. A Riparian Revegetation and Monitoring Plan (RRMP) is undergoing finalization that will guide restoration.

They should avoid construction around nesting birds. They do this monitoring.

They should survey construction sites for Foothill yellow-legged frogs and Western pond turtles. They sort of monitor this—they have a long-term monitoring program but have not done pre-construction surveys.

Bruce Bingham commented on the need to do pre- and post-construction monitoring in a rigorous way to accomplish compliance monitoring. He stressed the need to have designed surveys to assess the effects of construction and that long-term surveys are not necessarily compliance monitoring.

Mike Dixon continued his presentation. Bats and ring-tailed cat monitoring are required for pre-construction. The TRRP does not do this. Dixon thought this would be relatively easily done.

Dixon noted the likely need to perform the effects of sediment transport modeling.

Gil Saliba thought that the earlier Executive Directors sought guidance over the needed compliance monitoring and she found it their monitoring was adequate. He asked why would we do more costly monitoring. Dixon and Bingham both thought it may save money to bring monitoring up to date as people in those agencies change and they could come back to claim monitoring was inadequate.

8. Letters from members of the public

Tom Stokely took over presiding the meeting as Elizabeth Hadley had to leave. There were two letters from the public, one from Dave Wellock and one from William Koch (Attachments 4 and 5). Stokely said the TAMWG is mostly advisory and that it may be better to have this letter forwarded to the staff.

Mike McCarthy made a motion to refer the letters from the public to the TRRP staff.

Gil Saliba seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

(On Day 2, Elizabeth Hadley pointed out that the TAMWG is only to make recommendations to the TMC and as such the above motion should be considered as a recommendation for action for the TMC to take.)

Dave Wellock explained his letter and said the Trinity River Task Force does not answer his questions. For example he has asked if the Program has evidence for increased fish and he has never received a clear answer. He said he observed the river levels go up 12 inches higher than predicted during the last high flow releases. When he asked the “Task Force” about this, they denied that the river levels had increased. He saw a helicopter working on the weekend, it seemed they may have been billing for over-time. He also asked about the bedload levels below the Bucktail Bridge and why they don’t simply dredge the river below the bridge. He would like to see an accounting of the funding used for seeding and weekend overtime. He said the Program should take responsibility for damage to property from construction projects.

Rich Lorenz opined that the two new TRRP people in the room will make a better effort to respond to these concerns.

Kristi Bevard asked to have the issue of the wells and water at Salt Creek Crossing placed on the next agenda. Tom Stokely asked Bevard to send an email to him, Joe Polos, and Vina Frye.

Adjourn Day 1, 3:15 pm

Day 2, September 27, 2016, 9:30 am

9. TRRP Flow Scheduling Process

Andreas Krause, Yurok Tribe, and coordinator to the Flow Workgroup gave a slide presentation on proposed changes to the 2017 flow schedules.

Use of the Decision Support System

He noted they are now using new models and are considering some new, non-traditional flow releases. The Decision Support System (DSS) is now being used as a combination of different models for flow, transport, and fish to help synthesize the results of different proposed flow releases. Krause explained how a table to evaluate different flow releases may be used to develop scores for each. He explained that he was seeking input from the TAMWG to develop parameters that would be scored for each flow scenario. He passed out note cards for the TAMWG to write down what they thought may be the most important parameters that may be affected by flow. These parameters may be the in the next table they develop to evaluate flows.

Some of the parameters the TAMWG came up with were a size-frequency distribution for fish, temperature effects on fish, impacts on CVP generation and how that would impact California’s greenhouse gas goals, out-migration success, fish size, hatchery versus native fish, survival of other species, results of recent peak flows and successes or failures, water temperature, anadromous fish escapement, effects on riparian areas, effects on spawning habitat, effects on geomorphology and large wood structure, how to achieve sustainable fisheries, redd distributions, timing of spawning, timing of runs, fish abundance, size, survival, river temperatures, exhausting the cold water carry-over.

Krause next projected an output matrix table and walked the TAMWG through it. He noted that the table currently includes parameters for Chinook production, a healthy river, risks, and whether the releases meet policy requirements. This generated some questions about what other species to include and whether to include compliance monitoring. Krause noted the fish production model

currently handles Chinook, and they plan to include other species. Gil Saliba asked about including adult returns as a parameter. Krause said the model cannot handle the ocean survival and therefore cannot predict returns very well. To calculate the production of juveniles, the model needs to know the numbers of adults and their distributions and these will be derived by estimates and surveys. Krause next explained the healthy river parameters. These included measures of scour, temperatures, Foothill yellow-legged frog production, and black cottonwood initiation potential. Tom Stokely asked if they could include wood recruitment. Ed Duggan asked about nitrogen and phosphorus.

Krause explained the potential risks—disease, super-imposition, riparian encroachment. Stokely noted redd dewatering that may occur at the reduction for winter flows.

The policy details included the effects of flooding infrastructure, maximum allowed releases, etc. Darren Mierau asked about uncertainty estimates. Krause said they plan to include these in the future.

Winter Baseflow Variability

Krause explained winter base-flow variability is a new concept and he was seeking input and questions that the TAMWG may have. He said this is simply something the Flow Workgroup is considering and is not recommending anything at this time. He explained that currently the ROD winter base-flow is fixed at 300 cfs from October 15 through April 22. He said that literature suggests greater variability (a series of seven smaller peaks of about 1500 cfs) may have benefits. These would be the same among all the water years and would sum to about 35,000 acre-feet. Kelli Gant asked if they could use the safety-of-dam releases to provide water for the winter. Krause said yes, and it has been coordinated but it does not occur very frequently. Krause listed increased benefits of winter variability as increased salmon production by stimulating macro invertebrates, increasing access to tributaries and other habitats. It may also encourage earlier out-migration in dryer year and delay the onset of frog production. He noted that this will break the flow scheduling will be broken into two decisions—one in December to decide whether or not to adopt winter variable flows and one in March to determine the spring/summer release schedule. The worst-case scenario would be the need to use 35,000 acre-feet out of the spring releases and reduce an already small hydrograph. Krause said they will be able to model this better by December. Kelli Gant asked about a changing climate and a warming reservoir. Krause said they probably cannot include a changing climate right now in the models. Gant also asked about syncing releases in the Trinity with Klamath releases to help in the Lower Klamath. Krause said this has not been done in the past. He noted that flushing out the disease organisms is more a problem above Weitchpec. Kyle De Julio said that they currently do not match the releases with tributary output because the TRRP are not allowed to manage in real time as they need to get approvals ahead of time. Krause said they could follow up with the Bureau before the December meeting about timing releases with storms. They acknowledged the problem of exacerbating flooding during a very large storm. The greatest risk area to flooding would be Junction City. Tom Stokely asked about Bill Pinnix's comments yesterday of winter flows being associated with low out-migration. De Julio pointed out that these winter releases are very small compared to those referred to by Pinnix and the winter releases would have most of their impact above Grass Valley Creek where there is essentially no winter variability.

ROD Infrastructure Improvements

Krause explained that they cannot increase ROD flows until they make improvement to infrastructure to avoid flood damage. He noted that the TRRP has spent \$12 million on

improvements. But there is still one house that is located in the flood zone and is susceptible to flooding. This house is now for sale and this presents an opportunity for the TRRP.

10. TRRP Bird Monitoring

Sarah Rockwell, research biologist at the Klamath Bird Observatory, gave a slide presentation on bird monitoring on the TRRP. She passed out report on bird monitoring as an aid to riparian restoration (Attachment 5). She listed the goals for monitoring—tracking avian response to restoration and to assess territory and nesting to vegetation structure. She noted that birds are good indicators for habitat condition and health. Five species were chosen as good represents of different aspects of habitat—Yellow Warbler, Black-headed Grosbeak, Yellow-breasted Chat, Song Sparrow, and Tree Swallow. They perform land surveys at 10 sites—6 with restoration and 4 that have no restoration (i.e., reference sites). They also do float surveys for other riverine bird species throughout the 40-mile restoration reach. She explained a score card they developed to assess habitat health. Rockwell said they gave an overall grade of B for six riverine species in the Trinity compared to how they were doing in the region. Eagles and American Dippers were increasing compared to the regional trend and Green Heron was decreasing. The riparian birds from the land surveys were rated a B grade with Tree Swallows and Black-headed Grosbeaks increasing, and Yellow-breasted Chats were decreasing; the others were mostly steady. She showed changes in the habitat in the restoration sites compared to the reference sites. Measures at restoration sites were rated as C and Rockwell considered this to be a good score for sites that were yet only 10-years old. Travis Michele asked about sweet clover invasion at sites. James Lee commented that this is not really a problem as sweet clover is a nitrogen fixer and provides early shade but it tends to disappear in two to four years. Rockwell showed results of territory for the six indicator bird species and also noted their overall grade of C. Yellow-breasted Chats require dense vegetation and are at about 50 % of density of reference sites but are increasing. The Black-headed Grosbeaks require the most mature vegetation are only at 20 % of reference but are increasing. Tree Swallows are showing some decreases. Rockwell showed results for nest success and gave the overall score of A which was nearly as good as the reference sites. Tree Swallows that nest in cavities were slightly lower and this may be due to the loss of older alder trees. Rockwell described the Brown-headed Cowbird as a nest parasite that lays its eggs in the nests of others where the other species ends up caring for the cowbird juvenile at the expense of their own. She noted that there was low nest parasitism. Rockwell noted the bird monitoring data suggest that progress is being made toward the restoration goals. Some of the species are less on restoration sites than references sites, but success is nearly as good.

Dave Wellock asked about Killdeer. Rockwell said this species is not specifically monitored but nests are recorded. They mostly seem to fledge before flooding occurs. James Lee asked over what time period declines of species were occurring. Rockwell said she would have to look at the trend data. Lee wondered if the decline was due to the river being less stable. She noted there was a peak in Green Herons in 2008 and there was speculation of whether this was due to fires and that may have been an outlier. Darren Mierau asked if pre-dam conditions favored blackberry and birds used that, do they need to make up those habitats or could that be a reason for declines. Rockwell said they really don't have much data on pre-dam conditions. She noted that overall, riparian conditions have been degraded to about 1 % of original extent in the west. That may mean that they want to encourage higher densities to account for this loss.

Lunch

11. Issues identified at Joint TAMWG/TMC Meeting

Elizabeth Hadley noted she had heard the float and joint meeting with the TMC went well. Joe Polos passed out a list of the issues brought up during the joint meeting (Attachment 6). The issues were mostly related to the communication between the TAMWG and TMC and that the TMC is not listening to the TAMWG, should be more transparent, and the TMC members should recuse themselves from voting on conflict-of-interest issues. Tom Stokely wanted to clarify that the TMC does not ignore the TAMWG but does not adopt the TAMWG's recommendations.

Tom Stokely noted the proposed changes to the TMC bylaws. One change would allow voting on phone calls where the public is not allowed to participate. From his perspective, he had no problem with voting on issues on phone calls as long as the public was allowed to participate.

Mike Dixon passed out a copy of the proposed bylaws changes (Attachment 7). The TAMWG focused mainly on the voting by phone issue Section 605. Bruce Bingham noted that unanimous voting was in conflict with Section 603. He advocated for using Section 603 instead of the word unanimous.

12. Current TMC Issues

Tom Stokely went over a proposed motion to recommend changes to the TMC bylaws. The TAMWG discussed it at some length and modified it.

Tom Stokely made a motion that the TAMWG recommends that the TMC change its bylaws in the following 7 ways:

- 1. Reject the proposal to vote during telephone conference call meetings unless the public is allowed to participate and there is public notice on the TRRP website of at least 2 weeks before the teleconference call meetings;**
- 2. Change bylaws (Section 605a) to eliminate mail/email voting of TMC matters;**
- 3. Shift the voting process (Section 603) from a supermajority to a simple majority (CDR, p. 26);**
- 4. Require a TMC member with a specific programmatic or financial interest in the outcome of a decision by that body to recuse themselves (CDR, p. 27) from discussion and voting;**
- 5. Enlarge the number of voting members on the TMC to provide for a broader representation of interests (CDR, p. 27);**
- 6. Add Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group Chairman as a voting TMC member; and**
- 7. Remove "unanimous" from Section 300.**

Ed Duggan seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Adjourn Day 2, 3:00 pm

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS

Attachment 1: TMC response letter to TAMWG dated June 8, 2016, passed out by Seth Naman.

Attachment 2: Executive Director's Report, September 26, 2016, passed out by Mike Dixon.

Attachment 2a: FY17 Proposed TRRP Budget TMC Quarterly Meeting—Weitchpec, September 28 and 29, 2016, passed out by Mike Dixon.

Attachment 2b: Technical Workgroup Summary September 2016, passed out by Mike Dixon.

Attachment 3: Dave Wellock letter to Trinity River Adaptive Management Working Group, July 11, 2016, passed out by Arcata FWS.

Attachment 4: Bill Koch open letter to fellow citizens of Trinity County August 3, 2016 passed out by Arcata FWS.

Attachment 5: Bird Monitoring as an Aid to Riparian Restoration, report passed out by Sarah Rockwell.

Attachment 6: TMC/TAMWG issues identified at joint meeting, list passed out by Joe Polos.

Attachment 7: Bylaws of the Trinity Management Council with track changes June 20, 2016, passed out by Mike Dixon.

Other Documents

Document 1: Photocopy page from a dredging manual passed out by Dave Wellock.

Trinity River Adaptive Management Working Group

DRAFT AGENDA

Meeting of September 26-27, 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

Monday , September 26, 2016		
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 Report	Seth Naman
10:45 AM	Executive Director Updates – FY17 budget, Implementation, Science Program, etc.	Mike Dixon/TRRP staff
11:30 AM	Lunch	
1:00 PM	TRRP Outmigrant Monitoring	USFWS/YT/HVT
2:00 PM	TRRP Compliance Monitoring	James Lee/Brandt Gutermuth/Mike Dixon
3:30 PM	Letters from members of the public	TAMWG
4:00 PM	Adjourn	
Tuesday , September 27, 2016		
9:30	TRRP Flow Scheduling Process	Andreas Krause
11:15 AM	TRRP Bird Monitoring	Sarah Rockwell/KBO
12:00 PM	LUNCH	
1:00 PM	Issues identified at joint TAMWG/TMC meeting	TAMWG
2:00 PM	Current TMC Issues	TAMWG
3:00 PM	Adjourn	TAMWG