

DRAFT MINUTES  
TRINITY ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP  
JUNE 15, 2004  
Victorian Inn – Weaverville, CA

Tuesday June 15, 2004

The meeting was open to the public.

8:45 AM Convene

Members in attendance:

**Member**

Arnold Whitridge (Chairman)  
Richard Lorenz  
Patrick Frost  
James Feider  
Ed Duggan  
James Spear  
Kevin Lewis  
Serge Birk  
Byron Leydecker  
Elizabeth Soderstrom  
Dana Hord  
David Steinhauser  
Dan Haycox

**Representative Seat**

Safe Alternatives for Forest Environment  
Trinity County Resident  
Trinity County Resource Conservation Dist.  
City of Redding Electric Utility Dept.  
Willow Creek Community Services Dist.  
Natural Resources Conservation Services  
American Whitewater  
Central Valley Project Water Association  
California Trout, Inc.  
Natural Heritage Institute  
Big Bar Community Development Group  
Six Rivers Outfitter & Guide Association  
Miners Alliance

**DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICIAL**

MaryEllen Mueller

USFWS California-Nevada Operations  
Office

**Members not in attendance:**

Zeke Grader, Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's Associations; Jimmy Smith, Humboldt County Supervisor; Jeffery Bryant, American Forest Resource Council; Tim Colvin, Trinity Lake Owners Association; William Huber, South Fork Trinity River CRMP.

**1. Welcome and Introduction**

Chairman Arnold Whitridge opened the meeting and the members introduced themselves. Members of the audience also introduced themselves.

There was a general discussion regarding the agenda. All agreed to follow the agenda, as presented.

The April minutes were reviewed and editorial corrections were made.

**A motion was made by Ed Duggan to accept the April minutes as amended.**

**The motion was seconded by Pat Frost.**

**The motion was passed.**

## **2. Public Comment Period**

There were no comments from the public.

## **3. FY 2005 TRRP Budget-Doug Schleusner**

William Huber arrived at 9:45

Schleusner presented the TRRP program of work and draft budget for FY 2005 (see **attachment # 1**). The purpose of his presentation is to: 1) summarize key budget elements, 2) identify multi-year commitments, 3) highlight areas of concern or differences, and 4) solicit ideas and recommendations.

Spear- Said he noticed a substantial increase in overhead line items, office operations, etc.

Schleusner-Recapped the budget process to date and noted the efforts staff has made to accommodate the subcommittee's recommendations. He also mentioned B-Team meetings have occurred two times per month and TAMWG members are invited.

Leydecker-Asked if SAB input was included in the preparation of this budget.

Schleusner—SAB may be involved in future, but they are only contracted for 20 days of work.

Leydecker—SAB should be given whatever time is necessary to participate effectively.

Schleusner-The ROD says they will be available about 5-10% of their time, but budget is not an issue with regard to their participation.

Birk-Agrees with Leydecker that 20 days is not sufficient for SAB participation.

Schleusner-Agreed that SAB time for participation was an issue.

Leydecker-Asked whether the SAB had the opportunity to provide input?

Schleusner-SAB would prefer to review documents, rather than provide input. This is how SAB participation was envisioned in the implementation plan.

Birk-It may be premature for TAMWG to make recommendations to budget without SAB input to scope of work (SOW). SOW should be developed with input from SAB, then the budget developed.

Leydecker—SAB needs a baseline to work from, but he doesn't see anything in budget that provides that baseline. The monitoring budget is increasing, but the monitoring components appear to be similar to past monitoring elements.

Soderstrom-Is the the 5 to 10% time for SAB participation a limit or a recommendation?

Schleusner-It could be interpreted differently. 10% of time is about 20 days. This has been discussed with members and their level of involvement has ranged from 25—30 days. Some have more time than others.

The next TMC meeting is at the library, June 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup>. To have it as a two day meeting was decided at the April 14<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Schleusner-One decision that the TMC made last week was that the first day of the meeting, the 29<sup>th</sup>, the focus will be on subcommittee recommendations. On the 30<sup>th</sup>, the budget will be focused on. They generally have agreed that not all components of the budget will necessarily be approved.

Schleusner-This group has the option of submitting a formal recommendation. TAMWG is also welcome to participate in the June 18<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Birk-Suggested that Schleusner give TAMWG a call and let them know potential dates for TMC meetings. Also, what option will they have in terms of submitting a budget recommendation to the TMC? It is better to have the discussion here, but the budget is still being developed. Consensus among TAMWG on the budget will be difficult to achieve.

Schleusner—Views the process as taking all input and putting it into recommendation that archives the best mix of objectives.

Birk-Where is the discussion that breaks down each line item?

Schleusner-What is in the budget today is primarily from the previous workshop, but have also identified needs that require greater attention.

Schleusner-Explained TMC direction:

- Complete SEIS
- Emphasize science program
- Accelerate rehab sites
- Improve subgroup organization-expect increases in TMC oversight
- Develop staffing based on workload

-Develop options and tradeoffs

Subcommittee recommendations:

- Emphasize science program
- Continue science framework
- Engage SAB in program activities

Soderstrom-asked about developing options and tradeoffs and the September and December workshops.

Schleusner-The options and tradeoffs is a general request to Schleusner and staff to be prepared to discuss results, the impact of different alternatives, and how recommendations were derived.

Soderstrom-Does the budget present different options and trade offs?

Schleusner-Yes.

Schleusner-Workshops are outlined in the science framework scope of work:

- Recruit fill current TMAG vacancies
- Recruit and fill new TMAG positions second fish biologist (stock assessment, modeling) and physical scientist
- Implement need-based RFP process
- Accelerate rehab site construction (see **Attachment # 1a.** on related work items)
- Recruit fill second civil engineer
- Complete first phase by 2008:
  - Complete Canyon Creek to North Fork first
  - Next 10—"top down" from Lewiston
- Complete river baseline with TMAG
- Seek efficiencies in current efforts
- Seek regulatory relief/streamlining via TMC

Staff priorities

Critical:

- Complete final bridge-related actions
- Correct other infrastructure issues
- Develop integrated mainstem baseline
- Science Framework
- Accelerate rehab site design/construction
- Simplify regulatory, realty and planning requirements (through TMC)
- Need based RFP process with independent review panels

Also:

- Consolidate stream gaging operations
- Complete coarse sediment plan
- Emphasize watershed restoration planning and implementation
- Simplify funding process with multi-year agreements where possible

Require single consolidated proposals for multi-agency activities/studies  
Identify/pursue matching funds by TMC member and other program partners

Soderstrom—Are the TMC recommendations, program evaluation recommendations, and staff priorities all in the budget and are they consistent?

Schleusner-There is a high degree of overlap, much is interpretation. The three sets of information presented are consistent.

Leydecker-Monitoring budget is increasing. Some monitoring is more critical than other monitoring. One solution might be to provide fixed amount for monitoring for critical elements.

Schleusner-The TMAG budget includes modeling, not just monitoring.

Leydecker-All of what has been recommended was also recommended by AEAM staff and not just the subcommittee.

Frost-Noticed that GIS info tech position was not recommended.

Schleusner-Currently, there are higher priority needs, but may be filled in future.

Duggan-Is there a consolidation of monitoring activities by three entities?

Schleusner-Yes, that is one of the recommendations.

Feider-Many of these projects are ongoing.

Schleusner-We have a series of ongoing activities. This year is the first year they have tried to develop outlying funding. In the past, there has been a perception that the budget is a zero based budget, or starting over. However, there are ongoing contracts, and money allocated that continue from previous years.

Feider—How is the program using the data to change or modify monitoring based on results?

Schleusner-One budget item is to evaluate the data, and identify additional needs. Also, there is an evaluation of fisheries data proposed in this budget.

Soderstrom-What percent of the budget would go to need-based RFP process?

Schleusner-Percentage is not identified, that may be something the TAMWG wants to recommend.

Birk-How much discretion is in the budget? How much discretion is there for TAMWG to make recommendations? He prefers to see most of the program be more competitive with guidance of SAB.

Schleusner-Can't provide percentage of what is discretionary.

Birk-We need to justify our recommendations. For example, one that has cost share may be elevated.

Schleusner-First, does it implement ROD?

Birk-ROD allows more leeway for adapting program to achieve objectives.

Schleusner-That is in RFP.

Birk-How does that translate into budget and why certain line items were chosen?

Schleusner-We believe the program of work is appropriate and responsible, as does the b-team.

Schleusner-The program administration has increased, rehabilitation, and restoration has decreased (bridges). One of the reasons monitoring and analysis has increased is because they recategorized staff salaries. Up to this point, salaries have all been showed under program administration but most of the staff is involved in program implementation.

Leydecker-On the ground work is going down?

Schleusner-If anything, more on the ground work is occurring in 2005.

Feider-What is the breakdown in the 38% for rehabilitation and restoration with regard to physical work and planning, etc?

Spear-We used to use percentages for setting priorities.

Schleusner-We did not take that approach, we looked at priorities and projects to decide; no specific percent was allocated for specific elements of a project. This budget reflects the needs and priorities.

Soderstrom-It would be interesting to look at the out-year breakdown. For example, where are we on deadlines or should monitoring be decreased in FY 2008?

Schleusner-That is useful, but breakdowns are not developed in much detail. Fixing arbitrary percent before projects are identified could be problematic in terms of targeting funding for priority projects.

Kraus—Schleusner talked about moving towards need-based RFP process. That is important. That will be developed through the Science Framework. Once that is more established, a monitoring and assessment process will be fleshed out. That will drive the FY 2006 process. FY 2005 is the first step but has not gone through that process yet.

Soderstrom-There is value to looking at percentages now and for outlying years in terms of setting priorities and goals.

Birk-Asked about TAMWG budget and suggested that minutes be improved.

There was a general discussion on the TAMWG budget.

Birk-The TAMWG can get per diem for the TAMWG meetings, but what about the other meetings like TMC)? Is per diem extended to the other meetings? Can we put that question officially in writing?

Mueller-Doesn't know, but there is a fixed amount of money. She thinks it would be ok, but she will check.

Birk-That would be useful to know in making recommendations on the budget.

Mueller-Develop a specific list of things TAMWG they are interested in attending and she will inquire about them.

Weseloh-The charter says that TAMWG does get money for 1-2 day meetings and subcommittee meetings.

Lorenz-There is a million dollars going to TMC. Is that discretionary money? Does TAMWG have any control?

Mueller-Where do the figures for the TMC members come from? It has increased.

Schleusner-We asked the different agencies how much they needed for participation in TMC.

Whitridge-We want to know what we are getting for the money that goes to the TMC.

Schleusner-We asked the representatives what it would cost for TMC participation meetings, staff work, etc. Specific projects should not be in there. We are trying to isolate TMC participation. It is open to discussion.

Mueller-The agencies that receive the money should be fully accountable for the money. The TMC members should justify their amount.

Schleusner-Not all TMC members participate at the same level.

Mueller-The implementation plan did not anticipate funding 100% of the TMC participation, but to focus more on implementation.

Spear-This is a carryover from the old task force.

Weseloh-That was to complete the EIS/EIR. Once that was done, they continued to charge that fee.

Whitridge-This might be one of the places where TAMWG recommendation would be useful.

Birk-Where should this be elevated?

Schleusner-TAMWG can make a recommendation.

Mueller-TMC is aware I will not approve a budget that I do not fully support. There are two ways to bring that forward. TAMWG can have Whitridge present it to TMC or I volunteer to bring it forward.

Mueller-I would like to see something before the TMC meeting that reflects this discussion in order to save time.

Spear-In the past; they have attempted to get the agencies to submit proposals, statements of work, and quarterly reports. He asked if the agencies are submitting those items.

Schleusner-Some of the agencies do submit reports outlining their participation. He does not know what more the TAMWG would like to see in terms of deliverables.

Spear-How do you arrive at costs without deliverables?

Whitridge-We could ask how many hours are proposed, people involved, etc.

Mueller-Stated that for FWS, for example, some of the money is used for the Arcata staff in overseeing restoration program projects and activities.

Birk-That is a good justification. He would like that from the other agencies.

Implementation Budget by subcategory. ( see **Attachment 1b.**)

Schleusner-Bridges total went down, contract was awarded.

Channel restoration budget includes NEPA/CEQA, work staff time, etc. Money left in FY 04 can be used for bridges.

Channel rehabilitation—activities associated with Hocker Flat pilot project, sites below Lewiston Dam, Canyon Creek, NEPA/ CEQA, and permitting.

Modeling and analysis by subcategory.

Schleusner briefly explained each subcategory:

-Stream gauging will be consolidated under USGS

-Water temp modeling has been done by FWS Arcata. The conference at Humboldt State last week identified the need to integrate this with the Klamath river.

-Sediment monitoring and assessment- Sediment budget for the upper 19 miles to determine if ROD objectives are being met. This will include geomorphology assessment and modeling; watershed sediment source control (encourage coarse while discouraging fine delivery), part of RIG budget.

-Fisheries includes outmigrant monitoring, returning adults, hatchery practices, fish health, habitat availability and use.

-Riparian and Wildlife—rehabilitation site revegetation, edge/geomorphic response mapping, invasive/non-native plant/animal studies, avian/herpetological species assessment; macroarthropod/salmonid habitat study, satellite imagery, mainstem mercury impact study.

Schleusner-Asked if there were any questions.

**Member ?**-Have you considered extracting the mercury, they haven't found methyl mercury in Trinity County, there is a way to extract that, it concentrates easily, that might be something to consider.

Schleusner-Krause is working with a group of agencies; we don't have a good understanding of it- amount, etc.

Birk-Please explain funding of hatchery studies. What does this program have to do with production there and the wild-stock interaction?

Glase—It is one of the projects that Feider mentioned.

Birk-I understand why much of the information is needed; however, this seems to be Fish and Game's responsibility.

Glase-Agrees. Should focus on practices not production.

Birk-What practices? They operate under specific guidelines

Glase—For example, tagging.

Birk-I understand that.

Weseloh-This should not be in the TRRP budget. This should be paid for from other funds and should be included as part of mitigation operation. As far as improved

methods, that should be part of the mitigation cost as should be the marking of the fish. He can support the radio tracking being a part of TRRP budget. He would like clarification of what are mitigation costs and what are costs associated with TRPP.

Glase-We need information on returning adults; that is the primary measure of TRPP success.

Anderson-Before TRRP funding, the marking was non-constant and it was difficult to identify and evaluate hatchery vs. non-hatchery adult returns. The TRPP has funded marking 25% of Chinook.

Weseloh-CWT tagging of chinook should be distinct from coho and steelhead marking which is state mandated.

Soderstrom-Two questions: 1. the mercury impact study—why is it under riparian wildlife category?

Schleusner-It is associated with wildlife in the overall budget.

Soderstrom-Is temperature modeling part of the stream gauging?

Schleusner-It is part of stream gauging.

Duggan-Is monitoring at Junction City weir of returning adults an important component?

Glase-That data is some of the most consistent we have.

Duggan—Are we using that weir to monitor effectiveness of TRPP?

Glase-Used in the past for natural v. hatchery distribution, etc.

Weseloh-Also for population estimates

Glase-Yes, we have used them in the program.

Birk-Is any of that data being used as an indicator in terms of success?

Schleusner-We haven't really implemented anything so it is difficult to judge success.

Birk-Disagrees, one might argue that we are using that information when we need to, but ignoring it when we don't want to disclose something. There needs to be more justification on the methods.

Schleusner showed an estimate of available funds. (see **Attachment 2b.**)

Will be requesting \$2.7 million dollar for the restoration fund. In-kind contributions amount to approximately .3 million. Schleusner explained the possibility of using DFG restoration funds. DFG representatives will be presenting to the TMC at the June

meeting. He thinks it is important that we look for matching funds. Budget could be as low as \$9.3 million and up to \$12.5 million

Birk-Asked if the in-kind contributions are reflected in the spreadsheet.

Schleusner-They are not adequately reflected. There are more contributions that he did not document.

Cost of report recommendations:

New Staff positions: \$700,000 (3 positions)

Steinhauser-He has heard that the TRRP has high rent

Schleusner-GSA did a space survey in terms of parking, accessibility, etc. That location was the only one that met the requirements. It's a relatively small cost. The current office is not large enough for expansion and new hires. They will have to expand to the office next door if additional staff is added. The 700,000 has been built into the budget.

Soderstrom-The three new staff positions are in addition to vacancies?

Schleusner-Yes.

Cost of report recommendations (con't):

-River baseline prior to rehab implementation: \$385,000

-Rehab site design/construction: \$1,880,000

Generic Methods to deal with funding gap

-Increase funds (incl. new sources)

-Across the board 15% reduction

-Reduce scope of work for projects

-Phase-in-projects (multi-year)

-No new projects

-Prioritize/delete projects

He chose not to do this. It was premature to send out a spreadsheet that matched the total. He wanted the groups to be able to look at the needs and prioritize, make recommendations, etc.

Spear-Recalled that in the 1984 act, there was a 20% cap on overhead for contracting agencies. Are we under a cap? There doesn't seem to be anything keeping overhead under control.

Schleusner-Agencies have a standard, accepted rate on their contracts.

Birk-Agencies have standard overhead rates.

Leydecker-Sometimes those are very high.

Schleusner-Generally, overhead ranges from 10 to 30 percent. Currently, overhead is just over 2 million.

Birk- What criteria is being used to prioritize projects?

Schleusner-Staff will cover that in their presentation. Program options include (not his recommendations):

- No new staff
- Slower rate of rehabilitation site implementation
- One year moratorium on selected long-term monitoring while evaluating study designs
- Less emphasis on sediment monitoring.

Schleusner-Asked Glase to describe the rationale in prioritizing projects.

Glase-Projects that implemented ROD recommendations were given priority ranking. The fish group developed ranking criteria, but he cannot recall specifically what criteria were used.

Birk-We need that information to make decisions on the budget.

Schleusner-We will provide that information after lunch.

Schleusner-Goal for today was not to ask the TAMWG to approve a specific budget. He is looking for recommendations to present at the TMC. They are still in the middle of the process which TAMWG is a part of.

Soderstrom-Need clearer understanding of cost of report recommendations, TMC recommendations, staff priorities. She would like to know what recommendations they are going with.

Schleusner-That is difficult because some of the recommendations are not very detailed. The AEAM team will take recommendations and develop specifics and costs.

Soderstrom-Would like to understand how some recommendations were taken some were not, and why. Also, would like to understand the TMC recommendation to look at options and tradeoffs. She would like to see alternative budgets, and then go through the budget cut process.

Whitridge-Recommends a 10-15 minute scoping discussion before lunch-what people are interested in.

Leydecker-We need to do a better job of allocating enough time for agenda items.

Birk-The agenda is too ambitious.

Feider-Suggested we go around the table and have everyone list their top concerns.

Leydecker-Agrees.

#### SCOPING

Frost-Dr. Clair Stalnaker recommended establishing a baseline for the upper forty miles to measure successes and failures against. What are the items in the budget that help us to get that baseline?

Leydecker-Implement the ROD. On a short term basis, we need to implement science program with strong support for TAMWG. We are apparently forging ahead without the science because there is no baseline. There is \$385,000 to get the science board up and going. If people can only spend 5-10% of time, maybe they need more scientists to devote sufficient time, knowledge and expertise. He is concerned about administration increasing by one million dollars. Actual on the ground projects decreased by \$8 million. If you include Hocker Flat, then it actually goes down by 40%. We know that sediment is a major problem. We have \$500,000 to improve watershed and some of that is studies. He thinks that they should forget Hocker Flat. He is not in a position to vote on the budget or to come up with suggestions that would provide recommendation to the TMC. He thinks they need to go to the report in order to identify priorities, rather than a proposal driven process.

Feider concurred with many of the observations of Leydecker. He isn't convinced that the priorities are set. It seems to be overly bureaucratic and not streamlined. Permitting should be streamlined to save on costs. Need based budget, not proposal based.

Soderstrom-TAMWG should be included as in-kind contribution.

- Need to cover expenses of TAMWG participation in workshops and other meetings
- issue -Transparent accounting of TMC budget.
- Administration costs should be capped.
- Implementation should be increased.
- Need based projects.
- Budget that examines tradeoffs and different options, not just budget cuts.

Spear-Cap administration costs.

- Concerns about costs of design compared with moving dirt.
- Need more TAMWG discussion on engineered design approach compared with letting river do the work.

Whitridge-Agrees with Spear regarding need for better understanding of rehabilitation design.

- Concerned with monitoring costs and whether it is based on program needs; cap on monitoring?
- Concerned that budget does not provide for the scientific approach the ROD envisioned.
- Concerned with administration costs and TAMWG's ability to influence.

Birk-Disclosure of ranking criteria.

- Hatchery component uncertainties
- Need effectiveness monitoring; monitor with a purpose
- Science framework
- Out year budget numbers
- Wildlife component needs to be considered and discussed
- Should consider adaptive management as a tool rather than waiting for science before starting to implement
- Reevaluate Hocker Flat

Lorenz-Prioritize the ROD components.

- Dr. Clair Stalnaker said that the science is in the flow evaluation report, now we need mechanical rehabilitation. We need a baseline but we also need to start rehab work.
- Prioritize fishery restoration. Watershed restoration is too costly.

Duggan-Rehabilitation should be priority.

- Monitoring is important to determine results
- Hatchery costs should be part of the mitigation program and not the restoration program.
- More work in subcommittees to bring forward items to TAMWG for review, prioritization, and forward recommendations to TMC.

Weseloh- SAB needs to be involved.

- TMC budget need justification
- Tributaries and watershed needs more money
- The hatchery should be funded through mitigation
- The framework needs to be funded at a higher level
- Bias towards Chinook in the budget
- Ceratomyxa shasta is not addressed in any of the line items
- TMC funds, rehabilitation and restoration funds, it is confusing how much the different agencies are getting. He would like to see justification of how those funds are being used.

1:15 Lunch

Meeting was resumed at 2:15.

Whitridge-Making progress on agenda item 7. He asked the group what they would like to do.

Spear- FY 2004, \$14.9 million, but spreadsheet shows \$12.7 million for 2004.

Schleusner-Probably has to do with how they treated DFG money for bridges. He is thinking one includes that and one doesn't. \$14.9 million could also be estimate from draft budget last year, the other could be actual for this year. He will check. There could be some carryover, but you can't assume that it is all carryover.

Schleusner suggested that the director's report be taken off the agenda.

Whitridge-the TAMWG will receive the director's report written out for the TMC in a week anyway.

#### **4. Modeling Case Study – C.J. Ralph, Redwood Sciences Lab**

Likely effects on birds of riparian vegetation changes (see **Attachment #2**).

Cheri Miller from Redwood Sciences Lab: A Model for Predicting Bird Abundance  
This presentation gives us a chance to look at what people can do with all the data that has been collected. RSL is working with TRRP developing predictive models that will allow us to develop a monitoring program for the river to determine whether TRRP is meeting its objectives. The models will be used for adaptive management and bank rehabilitation site design. There is a lot of riparian habitat available along the river, but it is not doing a good job for the fish and river. As the berms are removed, total amount of riparian area will be impacted. As the banks redevelop and the riparian habitat goes through succession, the wildlife species will also go through succession, and new habitat will be formed.

Objectives:

-Use bird abundance patterns and riparian characteristics to predict bird abundance following construction and as riparian habitat develops.

Developing a set of conceptual models from bird response to habitat changes, she presented a wildlife model for bird response. She explained the different inputs to different aspects of the model that will produce results in bird metrics and vegetation metrics.

She showed an example of riparian area mapping.

The most abundant vegetation types were used for the regression tree model. There are 26 vegetation types and 311 vegetation patches. The variable for regression tree analysis were vegetation type river mile, patch size, vegetation type within in 200 meters of station.

She presented example of patch and bird points and types of vegetation.

Yellow warbler, a species of special concern associated with riparian habitats, is one of three species run through analysis. She presented results of regression tree analysis for the yellow warbler. 95 points were heard over whole study area, the regression analysis divides the points into clusters or groups based on certain characteristics. For example 67 points were associated with willow oak points, 243 in white alder, narrow willow and black cottonwood. You start to learn what is affecting the number of birds at each site. The next split was river mile. It was a fairly even split, but the closer to the dam the more occurrences. You have smaller and smaller groupings. You eventually have a measure

of what these birds are looking for. You can use these numbers to predict number of birds you may expect at a similar location that hasn't been surveyed. Then you can begin to predict the number of birds you have over the rehabilitation site or whole area, which ever scale you are interested in. The next step is to find out how many birds are in the study area.

Predicted mean/survey area equals density.

Density times patch area equals predicted number of yellow warblers in patch.

Total predicted number for all patches equals estimated population.

If we monitored pre and post construction, we can get an idea of change in population and general trends. You can do this for all species we have data on. It can give you an idea how to change site design in order to provide better habitat or if it is providing better habitat.

Songs sparrow is another species present. The technique can be used for any species as long as they have enough information. This can provide one indication on the success of the program and the impacts on wildlife.

Lorenz—Have you studied below North Fork in order to use as a comparison to what it will be like with changing riparian habitat?

Mueller—How will you validate model?

Cheri Miller-Sampling will give estimate of population. There has been very small error. Use boot strap method to validate. See how close we are in prediction verses actual places sampled.

Bob Williams—This will work with any species. It derives from the monitoring effort to assess variation in the system. It will allow you to make prediction at any level. It is done for every site below Canyon Creek. They are moving from below Lewiston Dam and below. There is a lot of information that we can use to predict what we have now and what we will have later on. Combined with satellite imagery, we should be able to predict based on vegetation changes. You won't have to fly over, this will ultimately cut down on cost.

Whitridge—You can use this to predict what we have now, is that a bench mark?

Williams—We are working from a baseline, we have that benchmark, baseline.

Cheri Miller—We have counted quite a bit, we have a benchmark in 1990 and later. We are trying to get a handle on how it varies over the years, how do the numbers change and how good are our estimates.

Whitridge—We have a model and some calibration method we are confident in, does that suffice for the benchmark we all seem to agree we need?

CJ—It is a census because we give you the number by certain area. If we take out 20% of riparian, we should be able to tell you how that will affect the population.

Birk—Is this similar to old FWS model?

CJ—It is much better.

Birk—What strikes him, when you look at white alder, narrowleaf willow, the prediction is the same for those vegetation types.

CJ—By patch type, this is a representative patch.

Cheri Miller—Each patch has its vegetation type, the river mile varies, its size, all those things are figured into the prediction.

Cheri Miller—Explained how they collect/band some of the species. All the different types of information will be gathered together.

Williams—This ties into the NEPA and CEQA requirements, flow regime by looking at amphibians, modeling, and to assess restoration sites. It is very integrated with many other indicators.

Birk—Will that ultimately guide you in restoration and types of habitat you are trying to create?

Williams—Gave an example of tree of heaven, it is invasive and the model shows that the birds don't prefer them.

Soderstrom—Do you have a sense of the inter-annual variation of population or will that impact ability to predict?

Cheri Miller—They would like to get 3 to 5 years to get a handle on the annual variation. They think it is quite low.

Whitridge—That is part of the benchmark.

Frost—Do you think there is any relationship to distance from edge of river, are you looking at size, shape location of patch?

Cheri Miller—Yes, they have a whole suite of things they are looking at. Variables are incorporated into the model.

Feider—Given the increase in riparian vegetation since the dam, is it reasonable to assume that we have more birds now?

Cheri Miller-The new flows and condition will probably create a condition that was not there before.

Feider-How do you evaluate if you don't know where we are starting from. Is there a number you don't want to go below?

Cheri Miller-We can't set that number for you. If the riparian habitat is better or more abundant, then riparian habitat dependent species would be more.

CJ—But we don't know that yet.

Williams—The yellow warbler populations are probably pumped up. For example, we will have fewer mergansers because we won't have as much riparian habitat to protect their nests.

Soderstrom—This model could be used for fish?

Williams—If you have the data, you could.

CJ—On the Columbia River, they use regression tree a great deal in predictive modeling.

Birk—Has the TRRP thought about using this type of analysis for fish?

Williams—there is a proposal for combining what we have done here with geomorphic aspects and the fish part. FY 2005

Birk—We are here because of our concern for budget, is there a chance this program won't be continued under the budget? It seems pretty useful. If it works here, we could use it for fish.

Williams—We were told to bring everything to completion in FY 2004 with the understanding that the science framework would tell us how to proceed. Science framework is not done so they went ahead and kept with what they knew was working. They have money for FY 2005, but it ends then. If science framework is not in place then they will go from there. They are preparing to address ROD and TRFE issues. If you look at what they have prepared for the science framework, you see that the hypothesis' are being tested and some additional one that they have proposed. You can go to the website and see where they are in this process.

Birk—This seems like very relevant information and it seems like it will compliment the work Rich Miller is doing. This is the importance of getting the baseline data prior to having massive habitat manipulation. We need to support this issue and we need to think about what your needs are down the line.

Cheri Miller explained that each patch has a different prediction.

Bob Williams-There are 34 patch types and 9-11 geomorphic types.

Birk-Schleusner-As far as budget where does this fit?

Schleusner-We are trying to put this kind of rigor to a variety of things. He thinks it is good to have this overview of some of these projects going on. Looking at a line item doesn't convey everything that has gone into this.

Feider-Which line item is this?

Whitridge-Under wildlife studies, \$155,000.

Birk-Would you expect to spend same amount of money in the out years?

Williams-As far as the out-years, we have projected into the future but have not applied it to the budget because they haven't been asked yet.

Birk—What are the chances of this being cut out?

Williams-The reason it is higher this year is due to applying the model.

Whitridge—We could recommend to the TMC that we think it is important.

Birk-Thanked them for presenting. He is very impressed with the study.

Leydecker-Applicability to other species is also important.

## **5. Channel Rehabilitation Projects – Rich Miller**

Rich presented on the status of the channel rehabilitation projects, summary of progress and schedule (see **Attachment #3**). Brandt Gutermuth will follow up with discussion on permitting requirements.

Effects of the Trinity and Lewiston Dams on channel morphology and fish habitat.

- Showed evolution to entrenched channel
- Rehabilitation site objectives:
  - Remove encroached riparian vegetation
  - Take the handcuffs off the river
  - Initiate natural river processes
  - Re-scale floodplain for current and anticipated flow regime
  - Allow the river to create needed habitat variety
  - Re-vegetate

Showed Hocker Flat design and area delineation: riverine, upland, staging/access

The upland areas are mostly dredger tailings.

Design criteria:

Dry winter low water surface elevation

-Feathered edges

-Seasonal groundwater for revegetation

1.5 year recurrence frequency water surface elevation—at Hocker Flat that is about 6,000 cfs

-floodplain excavation

The theoretical river meander dimension, into at least one of the floodplain areas. They want to give the river as much space as they can to change its configuration.

Floodplain management considerations

-FEMA detailed study area design restrictions. These were not considered in enough detail in the TRFE. The flood insurance studies, accurate or not, dictate flood plain modifications that will elevate base flood elevation. Base flood elevation is the theoretical 100 year flood. The flood insurance study was not detailed. The mapping is not accurate.

This impacts the entire river corridor.

These projects are extensive excavation. They have to haul material away to not change floodplain.

He gave example of engineering design at Hocker Flat. Hocker Flat location is one of the broadest floodplains we have access to. It is a good site to see what the river will do with a lot more room to move.

Presented concept cross sections of feathered edge concept and feathered edge and floodplain concept and explained difference.

Duggan-For clarification, we are taking out area that wouldn't have been there if it wasn't for dam. The 1955 and 1964 flood made that floodplain. He doesn't understand if we take out trees along edge why we have to replace them.

Miller-That's an issue Gutermuth will get into.

Showered Hocker Flat rehabilitation site property ownership. Impacting a high percentage of vegetation. Study limit. Hocker Flat is one of best locations in terms of property ownership. He showed the schedule, construction is scheduled for completion September 2005, revegetation will be initiated in November of that year.

Spear-is there any concern of exposure of that toe or fill of the highway there?

Miller-There has been, but he explained why that will not be a large risk. They have put a buttress/soils to improve the situation. Property owners--7, three primary owners, others are incidental access. This is a simple land ownership pattern compared to upstream. Miller showed aerial of rehabilitation sites below canyon creek.

Showered schedule for implementation. It follows Hocker Flat schedule by six months. Begin in September 2005, Complete construction in February 2006.

Showed map of all forty sites and characteristics of first twenty four, implementation schedule, ending in the fall of 2007. Hocker Flat, below Canyon Creek, ten below Lewiston Dam.

Issue: FEMA, Realty, revegetation—they may find it difficult to revegetate as a one to one replacement. If you put ten sites together, there may be some leeway to revegetate in the most appropriate way.

Environmental compliance—Brandt Gutermuth

Some of the things that keep coming up are environmental streamlining. First, we need to bring in the TMC groups. They have the permits. We need to coordinate with them. There are still problems even when we coordinated. He gave an example of the bridges. They didn't get the bids right the first time, had to change schedule and then had to change all the permits because the season changed. Even when everyone is in agreement, things still change.

He explained some of the different requirements, NEPA and CEQA, and the differences. He explained some of the differences. DWR has agreed to be the CEQA lead for the channel rehabilitation projects.

Gutermuth talked about the possibility of doing a master EIR. You need site specific details. He showed a schedule for the environmental documents of RHT channel rehabilitation sites. They are looking at different options to best do environmental permitting. One is doing a master EIR. In these documents there are a variety of things necessary that could be addressed in a master document. They are going to work out site specific details.

Gutermuth also showed all the different environmental permits necessary.

Presently, we could combine permit applications for the projects. If we get everyone together to start working, maybe we can come up with one permit. Within that, there would be site specific details.

Some of the big issues involved in environmental compliance include: mercury, revegetation—balance mitigation vs. function, pre-application meetings (options to consolidate)—timing of construction for sediment control and vegetation removal.

Birk –Would postponement of Hocker Flat be fatal to program?

Miller-Did not comment on whether it would be fatal to program. We would incur costs because of the progress that has made thus far. Doesn't know how extensive that would be. Not being a scientist, he can't give a recommendation on that aspect. However, he has observation, if it is based on wanting more science, he thinks there is plenty to implement. Hocker Flat and it presents a great opportunity to collect data. Purely budgetary he doesn't comment.

Curtis-Also dealing with the landowners is difficult at these sites. If we stop the project, he would be concerned about landowner issues and the credibility of the program.

Feider-If you stop, it could have political and legal implications that might be less productive.

Jeff Phipps- Is EPA, SWRCB, and FEMA involved in permitting?

Gutermuth -FEMA is more specifically involved in engineering floodplain, but the other agencies yes. NOAA fisheries says they are covered for EIS in mainstem fishery restoration.

Whitridge- Shall we try to undertake the budget?

We still have item 7, although we are covering some of it when talking about the budget.

Weseloh—Suggestions: 1. no one wants to approve a budget today  
2. request clarifications 3. suggest priorities 4. make specific recommendations 5. focus on FY 2005, revisit FY 2006 and beyond when there are changes

General list, he would like people to agree or disagree and perhaps rank.

Agree:

Prioritize budget on SAB, peer review and subcommittees recommendations

Ensure no overlap on budget items

Prioritize rod requirements on peer review and SAB

Identify baseline condition needs

Proposals, need

Streamline administrative costs for program and projects

Include cost shares

Budget options based on priorities based on criteria

Clarify design needs and SAB approval

Breakdown budget for design and construction

Emphasize implementation over administration

Emphasize baseline conditions

TAMWG needs committee to prioritize budget conditions

Monitoring should be linked to success or lack of

Embrace all species especially coho

Disagreements:

Restoration vs. framework first

Hocker Flat-now or wait

Watershed restoration or too costly?

Reduce or increase monitoring, different definitions of monitoring

Specific list:

AEAM—stream line administration costs

TMC-justify budget totals, transparent accounting

TAMWG—budget should be increased to allow for workshops, etc.

Independent review

Information management-increase SAB  
 Increase watershed restoration project implementation  
 Smolt health-add C. shasta for smolts  
 Hatchery-mitigation cost not representative cost  
 Wildlife-include funding for if necessary in out years

Spear-Not a consensus on the TAMWG funding issue.

Weseloh-Explained that he realized that the budget issues were not a consensus.

Birk-Chinook centric issue was not brought up by the TAMWG, it was brought up by Weseloh. There has been time spent on coho, coho needs are different than Chinook. By adding that in, it might complicate what we want our message to be. He wants to get away from Chinook centric language. The term salmonid would be better term.

Weseloh-He doesn't have a problem with dropping that.

Feider-Speculated if the general list would be a good thing to convey to the TMC.

Leydecker—If you take Rush Creek for example, we know the sources and problems are identified and they won't cost millions to fix.

Feider—There is tension on which program the budget should come from and how it is in SEIS.

Leydecker- He would like to clarify that he doesn't care if we throw out Hocker Flat or not. We don't have the science behind the project. If we have to delay Hocker Flat, then delay it, but the point is to get the total operation functioning before proceeding.

Soderstrom-Agrees that we should move ahead with areas of agreement and formalize into recommendations for TMC.

Whitridge—Lets consider list of general agreement.

Schleusner-Wrote down three recommendations that would be particularly good for b team on Friday

1. clarification
2. priorities
3. recommendations

Birk-In reference to the role of tributaries, it is something that needs to be highlighted. There is no effort in the budget that targets any kind of work in tributaries. This should be looked at with respect to project prioritization. We need a list of things to flag, we can flag that issue and later on make formal comments to TMC. He would like to include watershed and tributary restoration. It seems there is an omission there. He would also like to know how to coordinate throughout the process. What they do here today may not be incorporated into final product that the TMC adopts. He would like to know the

process on how TAMWG will be incorporated into process. Need to generate something in writing to TMC from the chair on behalf of the TAMWG.

Whitridge-Today is our only chance to make a recommendation to the TMC for their next meeting.

Weseloh suggested we go down the list and categorize each item into clarification priority or recommendation.

TAMWG decided to go through list

Soderstrom-isn't someone from the TAMWG to be at the b team meeting on Friday?

Yes

1. Prioritize budget on SAB, peer review recommendations—Birk suggested that SAB is not in this cycle, they have not had input on the budget but can be incorporated next year. Whitridge—would like to say next year at this time we will have SAB recommendations. Final recommendation: for FY 06 budget prioritization shall be based on SAB input.
2. Ensure no overlap between budget items: TMC vs. SEIS-co-lead, monitoring v. analysis
3. Prioritize rod requirements on SAB and science advisory board in FY 06 and to the extent possible in FY 05
4. Identify budget items that address baseline conditions—clarification not a recommendation or prioritization
5. Base budget on need not proposals, don't replicate historical efforts, for FY 06 utilize SAB input and science framework
6. Streamline administrative costs or cap them a. for program, b. for projects

Schleusner—Agrees that administrative costs are an issue to look at, but is the TAMWG in support of increased staff?

Weseloh-The administrative costs on projects should be lowered so we have more for projects.

Whitridge-ALot of people here are saying they like everything the program evaluation said. One of the things they said is that they would like the TMC engaged, and that means they will have to have more technical support, so we want them to be involved but want to cut their funding.

Soderstrom-They have \$600,000 to do that, we want them to account for it

Spear-He is concerned about increasing trend.

Weseloh-Suggested we table it.

Whitridge-We can say we are concerned about it.

7. Streamline permitting efforts and costs—Whitridge-maybe the TMC could be doing more, that is, in program evaluation report.
8. Include cost share in the budget-all agreed.
9. Need budget options based on priorities that are clear to all and that utilize criteria, all agreed.
10. Clarify design needs and have SAB review and approve,---parked until next time.
11. Clarify how much is for design and how much is for construction and permitting for each project. Schleusner—most are already broken out should think about the difference between rehabilitation but there are a few more he sees they can do.
12. SAB and peer review roles need to be clarified in terms of budget review.
13. Emphasize implementation over administration. Whitridge—that can sometimes lead to problems because it can be interpreted differently.
14. Within the budget, emphasize baseline conditions so they can move forward and detect change eventually.
15. TAMWG needs a committee to work on budget and be in process.
16. Monitoring should be linked to objectives of the program, all agreed.
17. Embrace all species, especially coho. Duggan—replace with salmonids.

Soderstrom one that wasn't included was the need-based RFP process, the budget would indicate amount available for need based RFP. Identify percent of budget available for that.

Final: 18. Identify available funding for need-based RFP process.

Weseloh-We made it through the general ones. Now move to specific.

#### Budget

1. AEAM—streamline or reduce administrative costs. Schleusner-does that mean you don't want to fill new positions? Birk—the new positions, are they all administrative costs? Schleusner-they would show up under RIG and TMAG salaries but costs of relocating, etc. How do you separate that? Rich—are we in favor of the new positions, we should vote on that. Whitridge-lets settle the matter of the three positions. Birk-you can reduce admin costs in other ways. Duggan—suggested we say look at ways to reduce admin costs. Birk—everyone seems to be in favor of the new positions. Soderstrom-is concerned that the staff will keep moving, or stay for a year, etc. She would suggest that we contract out more. This was tabled.
2. TMC—justify increases, need transparent accounting, all agreed.
3. Agencies should fund their own participation, Whitridge does not want to recommend that as stated. Mueller—stated that her agency basically has said that if they aren't paid for it they won't do it. that issue is a NO.
4. The budget should be increased for the TAMWG to pay for workshops, etc. Lorenz—thumbs down, how can we ask for TAMWG increase and TMC decrease? Soderstrom—doesn't think we need to increase budget, but can be

- reimbursed through the existing budget. Weseloh, there is a thumbs down from Lorenz. No.
5. Independent review committees—secure enough scientists to allow for design, etc (missed). Whitridge—there are too many issues some don't mandate a scientific review. It will be revised to say scientific activities instead of program. Whitridge—that is money taken from implementation. No thumbs down.
  6. Information – increase budget for SAB and peer review for information management. Weseloh-if we increase independent review panel, that should take care of it. no.
  7. Tributaries-increase funding for watershed planning and implementation. There is 500,000 in there now. The 200,000 is not in there because we are not sure where to go yet for FY 05 (Schleusner). Rush creek assessment is ongoing and implementation will be in FY 06. He is uncomfortable with sticking a number in there. Lorenz—thumbs down. Did not pass.
  8. Tributary—watershed restoration project implementation, no money for FY 05, but for FY 06-08. Whitridge-that's the one Schleusner says they are not ready for. Weseloh—disagrees totally. Many think it should be added. Lorenz is not voting no on watershed restoration project implementation. Frost—would not compromise Trinity County watershed program. Frost—there are lots of projects that are so obvious that there is no need to wait. Some need to be identified, but can go forward. Voted no on increasing watershed restoration project implementation.
  9. Increasing funding for C. shasta for smolt health. Weseloh—the needs based thing is not happening this year. Probably talking \$10,000 to \$20,000. Whitridge—would feel better to have Dr. Scott Foot's opinion. Mueller-believes it is being adequately monitored on the Klamath side.
  10. Hatchery—should be part of mitigation costs, except for tagging. Whitridge—there are lots of things the hatchery can do to screw up restoration. Weseloh-falls into clarification category. Whitridge—it doesn't seem reasonable to say everything associated with hatchery shouldn't be funded except tagging. Weseloh—there are only 3 budget items under hatchery. Weseloh-we can say fish marking at the hatchery should be mitigation costs. Glen??—maybe say change to identify mitigation costs versus restoration costs. Not addressed.
  11. Include cost for wildlife in out years if necessary. Schleusner—going to do that anyway.

Mueller will send out charter and checklist of things she needs and the other part is ways to modify charter. If they want to be reappointed, there is a checklist to fill out. It is also a reasonable time to apply. Mueller will have to justify who they selected and why.

Whitridge—Did not get to program evaluation. The TMC is devoting a full day to it at their next meeting. Anyone is welcome to go to the TMC meeting.

Schleusner- The budget team meeting is on Friday, anyone is welcome to attend.

## **9. Assignments and Calendars**

The next meeting will be scheduled electronically

## **10. Public Comment**

No public comment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

## **Summary of all Motions passed**

- 1. April Minutes: Approval of minutes from April 2004 meeting  
A motion was made by Ed Duggan to accept the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Pat Frost. The motion was passed.**

## **List of Attachments**

This lists the materials that were handed out during the meeting.

1. Doug Schleusner: FY 2005 TRRP Budget
- 1a. FY 2005 Project Descriptions
- 1b. Draft FY 2005 Budget and Out-Year Projections
2. C.J. Ralph: Modeling Case Study
3. Rich Miller: Channel Rehabilitation Projects