

Draft Meeting Notes

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

Special Meeting

WebEx

February 10, 2022, 9:00 am PST

Attending Members

Representative Seat	Acting Primary
Bureau of Reclamation, Vice Chair*	Elizabeth Hadley*
NOAA Fisheries, Chair	Justin Ly
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Tanya Sommer
Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director	Chad Abel*
Hoopa Valley Tribe	Mike Orcutt
California Department of Water Resources	Brett Kormos
Yurok Tribe	Kyle De Julio*
U.S. Forest Service	Eric Wiseman**
Trinity County	Liam Gogan

Additional attendees: Chad Abel, James Lee (TRRP), Roman Pittman (NOAA Fisheries), Ken Lindke (CDFW), Chris Laskodi (Yurok Tribe), Conor Shea, Nick Hetrick, Nick Som (USFWS), Justin Alvarez (Hoopa Valley Tribe), Radley Ott (CDWR)

Notes: Sabrina Kleinman (EPP)

*Secondary representative serving as Primary for TMC Partner Agency.

**Eric Wiseman participated as the USFS representative in place of Kari Otto and Keli McElroy.

Motions

Kyle De Julio moved to approve the agenda.
Liam Gogan seconded.
Motion passed unanimously.

Liam Gogan moved to pass the minutes as provided.
MO seconded.

Michael Orcutt made a competing motion to defer approval of the December minutes to the March TMC meeting.
Brett Kormos seconded the competing motion.
The competing motion passed unanimously.

Kyle DeJulio moved to accept the recommendation of the Science Coordinator for funding the Science Proposals.
Eric Wiseman seconded the motion.

Tanya Sommer made a competing motion for the TMC to fund the science proposals in the ranking order of the SAB.
Michael Orcutt seconded the competing motion.

Michael Orcutt made a second competing motion to defer action on the FY22 Science Funding until the March meeting.
Elizabeth Hadley seconded the second competing motion.
The second competing motion passed with 7 votes in favor. Yurok tribe was opposed.

Motions (cont.)

Brett Kormos made a motion for the TMC to approve the Scope of Work as provided with the additional of the functional relationship of flow in terms of ROD-implemented flow regimes to the overall SOW in Section 2.0.
Kyle DeJulio seconded the motion.

Kyle DeJulio made a friendly amendment that Section 3.6 and Task 4 be edited to include recommendations from the contractor on how flows could be managed to increase the effectiveness of Phase II rehab sites.
Brett Kormos approved the amendment.
Motion passed unanimously.

Action Items:

- James Lee will direct the Science Proposal authors to incorporate the edits from the SAB and have the SAB re-rank the proposals to provide input to the TMC.
- James Lee will meet with the SAB to discuss the discrepancy on Proposal #5.

Welcome and Introductions

Ly opened the meeting with roll call. Dixon was unable to attend due to a personal matter. Chad Abel would be presenting items from the Executive Director.

Approval of Agenda

Sommer asked why the review of the Science Proposals was moved from the March TMC meeting to this meeting. Lee explained one of the projects wanted to start collecting data for their project this month, but needed their funding confirmed. Lee and Dixon worked with the SAB to get the proposal reviews done early so they could provide a recommendation to the TMC and determine if funding could be awarded sooner than planned. Sommer explained information was

sent to the TMC only a few days prior to the meeting and did not feel that members would be in a position to make a decision. Ly asked when TMC needed to make a decision to prevent impeding the project. Lee explained he was ready to make a recommendation and the project was looking to start data collection by the end of the month. Ly suggested discussing the topic during its scheduled time.

Kyle De Julio moved to approve the agenda.

Liam Gogan seconded.

Motion passed unanimously.

Approval of December Minutes

Liam Gogan moved to pass the minutes as provided.

MO seconded.

Orcutt asked why the TMC was approving the minutes during this meeting as he had not submitted comments and thought the process was being expedited. Ly explained the approval of the minutes was added to the agenda as there was an opportunity to approve them and have an approved copy available for the public before the March meeting. Dixon sent a request for comments by January 24th. Abel noted they had not received Orcutt's comments on the minutes.

Orcutt was unsure if the minutes should be passed as he wanted to make sure the discussion on winter flow variability was captured correctly and preferred to defer approval of the December Meeting minutes to a later date.

Michael Orcutt made a competing motion to defer approval of the December minutes to the March TMC meeting.

Brett Kormos seconded the competing motion.

The competing motion passed unanimously.

Abel asked all comments on the minutes be submitted by Friday, March 4.

Public Forum

No comments were submitted as all meeting participants were from partner agencies.

Program Updates

Abel provided the Program updates. There have been no changes in staffing since the last meeting. Lee has been selected for the hiring panel for riparian ecologist position. The TRRP has a new high school intern, Matthew Brennan. Abel thanked the Hoopa Valley Tribe for having him help with the steelhead marking at the Trinity Hatchery.

In accordance with DOI policy, the return-to-work deadline has shifted to April. Future meetings will likely be a hybrid of in-person and virtual set-ups. The TRRP is working with NCAO and Procurement to purchase low-cost video conferencing equipment to make the meetings work more seamlessly.

NFWF is meeting with TMC members as part of its preparation for the watershed grants. They plan to release the RFP mid-spring, with funding released by late summer. TRRP hopes NFWF will improve the efficiency of the grant award process.

The FY22 budget proposed fully funding a number of vacant positions at the beginning of the year. However, delays in hiring and new vacancies have resulted in salary savings. The TMC decided in June to use those savings for the Oregon Gulch channel rehab project, but it is early to say how much will be available. However, Dixon would like to add \$100,000 to fund the top science projects, increasing the funding to \$350,000. The extra salary funds will be used towards Implementation and Science in the near term, with more available to retool the Oregon Gulch project as it becomes available.

The Trinity RCD created new watershed posters for the program. Copies are available at the TRRP Office if any partners would like one. They cannot be shipped at this moment, but partners are welcome to come by and pick one up.

Weaverville is currently at 67% of normal precipitation for the winter and the B120 for Trinity inflow is tracking for a dry year, but there is still time for an increase.

Roberts Rules of Order and Bylaw Review

Ly reviewed the Roberts Rules of Order for the TMC as there are several new members who have joined over the last year. Ly wanted to provide guidance on how the TMC operates and votes. Of note, he highlighted that the TMC would allow public comments on topics prior to any votes or motions. However, once a motion was made, only the primary representatives or acting primaries would be allowed to discuss. Additionally, only one motion would be discussed at a time. If a competing motion or a friendly amendment is made, only the competing motion or amended motion would be discussed.

Orcutt asked why the discussion on Robert's Rules of order was advanced for the special meeting. He explained the TRRP rule book (operating procedures) was often pulled out when TMC members had a question, and the Refinements Program Document Committee was reviewing these protocols. He noted he was recently made aware that a consensus (8 of 8 TMC vote) is only required for adding new TMC members, but not for changes to the bylaws and operating procedures (e.g. determination of TMC voting majority).

Ly explained providing the Roberts Rule of Order guidance helps to ensure everyone was on the same page, especially with so many new members. The topic was not the reason for the special meeting, and he had intended to discuss the Rules of Order as part of the regular monthly teleconference call. The intent was to present the rules and note the new opportunity for public comments prior to motions. Abel explained approval of the channel rehab review scope of work was the impetus for the special meeting and they later added the decision item for the science proposals. The current topic was just for discussion.

Sommer appreciated having the Rules of Order sent out and having more opportunities for the public to weigh in and provide input. DeJulio agreed and asked whether public comments would

be solicited before or after a motion was made. Ly explained the public could comment before a motion to avoid interrupting discussion among the primaries. DeJulio noted motions are often made organically as part of discussion, making it hard for the public to weigh in. Ly agreed about the challenge in timing public input in the face of potentially organic formulations of motions. The logistics will have to be balanced between integrating public input and the flow of TMC discussion on the particular motion. The change is an improvement for the public to provide suggestions close to real-time, instead of at the beginning and end of each meeting. DeJulio suggested public input could be solicited after a second is made and noted that the application of Robert's Rules of Order was discretionary.

Kormos suggested organizing the meeting agendas to dictate when the TMC receives information, hears public comments, and has council discussions for anticipated motions. The TMC agendas are currently simplistic and adding orders of operation could help meetings proceed in an orderly fashion. Ly suggested a follow up discussion on the structuring of the agenda offline with Brett and any other interested TMC members.

Orcutt noted the TMC primaries may need some flexibility with who can vote and when. During the vote on the agenda, he was having issues signing on, but Justin Alvarez, his alternate, was on and he asked that Justin vote on the motion. He explained it was helpful to have more than one pairs of eyes and ears on a topic and the restriction on primaries only was unnecessary. Ly explained that when primaries are present at a meeting, the expectation is they represent their program, but they can delegate their votes to the alternates, as Orcutt did for the vote on the agenda. Last year, when Bader was Chair, this operation was implemented and will continue this year. The intent of the discussion item was to introduce the Rules of Order guidance and highlight the change to our public meetings to enhance public participation. The TMC can fine tune them at the next quarterly meeting based on suggestions from members on how to proceed. Abel suggested appending the Rules of Order as an appendix to the bylaws once there is an accepted version to provide a format and approach to the bylaws.

Orcutt again asked if the discussion on the Rules of Order and bylaws was in response to his comments during Refinements on the change to the majority vote rules. Ly explained the discussion was to review the Rules of Order guidance and bylaws for all members so everyone is familiar with the TMC's operating procedures. The TMC should review the current draft guidance and they can discuss it further at the March meeting and make revisions then, as needed.

FY22 Science Proposal Recommendations

Lee reviewed his recommendations on which proposals to fund for the FY22 Science Projects. The recommendation was accelerated to accommodate the field schedule for Project #7, which would develop an SRH-2D temperature using temperature data throughout the year. If allowed to start they, they could start temperature measurements this month, which could expedite their final product by a year. Lee summarized his recommendations in a memorandum.

Preproposals were initially solicited by the IDT for the FY22 Science funding. The pre-proposals were reviewed and ranked by the IDT and the SAB for funding. Lee provided an overview of the proposals received. The IDT and SAB rankings were similar, with the SAB rankings contingent on the authors making their suggested changes in the full proposals. The project authors then prepared full proposals with budgets, which were reviewed by the IDT and SAB. Lee posted the SAB reviews to the TRRP website for the TMC the night before the meeting. Lee recommended funding Proposals #6, #5, and #4, with potentially funding #7 if extra funds are available. Lee noted all partner agencies have the opportunity to have a staff on the IDT and to communicate with their IDT representatives about the projects so they have input on the process.

The projects are short-term projects outside of the Program's normal long-term status and trend monitoring projects. The funding was provided to answer questions through short-term projects and fund the development of science tools used by the Program. The IDT initially received 8 pre-proposals for review. All projects had at least 2-3 program partners and other collaborators involved.

The pre-proposals were reviewed and ranked by each member agency and the IDT combined the individual rankings to create its ranking. The SAB was also asked to rank the pre-proposals. Lee noted Refinements is working to adjust the SAB's involvement to begin working directly with the TMC. Currently, the SAB is used by the Science Coordinator and the IDT. For this effort, the IDT compared their findings to that of the SAB. The rankings were similar, except for Proposal #2 and #5. The SAB endorsed funding Proposal #2 contingent on major changes to their budget and changed the scope from a full study to a pilot project. The SAB's lower ranking of Proposal #5 was due to a misunderstanding on the use of the RBM10 model. The IDT, which is comprised of long-term Program Scientists who are familiar with the use of the model in the Program, ranked it higher, while the SAB ranked it lower, assuming it was a stand-alone model and may not have understood the need for a higher budget.

Lee was confident in recommending the funding based on IDT's ranking. Lee did not recommend funding Proposal #2 until they submitted a revised budget based on the SAB's recommendations. Currently, Proposal #2's budget would be well over budget for the funding. The SAB recommended other adjustments and changes to the other projects to improve the projects and refine their budgets, but all were recommended for funding. Lee has discussed the changes with the other authors. Lee recommended releasing the funds to the authors once the changes are addressed. The funding recommendation is \$60,000 more than the initial \$250,000 available for funding, but doable if the extra \$100,000 is added as proposed from salary savings.

Sommer asked whether the SAB would re-rank the projects based on the authors addressing their comments and changes. As an external review group, their input on the ranking would be helpful for the TMC to understand why there are discrepancies between the IDT and SAB rankings. Lee explained the higher ranking of Proposal #2 was contingent on major edits to the project while the lower ranking of Proposal #5 was due to a misunderstanding on the utility of the RBM10 model. Lee explained he was unclear on when the SAB should work with the IDT and when the

TMC thought they should provide input. Revisiting the reviews with them at this stage could further delay funding and starting the projects.

Sommer agreed but asked why the SAB rankings were set aside when there was an opportunity for the project authors to revise their proposals and the SAB could reconsider their rankings based on the responses. Lee explained it was a timing issue as they had already done two reviews and a ranking of the proposals. He did not think the SAB reviews or rankings were set aside as the project authors are revising their proposals based on the SAB's comments. The IDT did consider the SAB's rationale for their rankings but noted there would always be differences between how the two groups rank projects. The IDT is made of Program scientists who have a good understanding of the Program's needs and its bigger questions. In contrast, the SAB provides a valuable external review, but their work is not directly tied or invested in the Program. Proposal #2 was ranked high but was not ready according to the SAB, while Proposal #5 was ranked low by the SAB but is more valuable to the Program than SAB considered. Sommer thought it was a red flag that the SAB's input did not influence the project rankings.

Lee explained the SAB is currently at the same level as the IDT and there is a recommendation to have them work more directly with the TMC, which may mean the IDT no longer consults with the SAB. The transition in SAB's role is something the IDT is working on understanding. Kormos shared Sommer's concerns and thought there needed to be greater transparency on the SAB's reviews so the TMC could understand the differences in their input rather than take Lee's word for it. Lee explained the IDT's discussion of the proposals is documented in their meeting minutes over the last few months. However, the IDT did not produce a report like the SAB. Kormos recommended developing a report for comparison.

Orcutt asked if Lee's recommendations were based on the initial \$250,000 or above it. Lee explained Dixon identified an extra \$100,000 in the budget. The TMC approved \$250,00 and the IDT is asking to raise the funds to \$350,000, which would cover Proposal #7 with extra funds. Orcutt asked if the TMC was also scheduled to approve the \$250,000 for the channel rehab scope of work, as he had expressed concerns about whether the funds were approved or not. Lastly, Orcutt noted there were concerns about the relationship between the IDT and the TMC. As he understood it, the IDT is based on consensus, although there can be dissenting opinions. The inclination seems to be that the TMC representatives should align their views with the IDT. He asked how much authority and priority should be given to IDT recommendations. Lee explained the IDT member are long-standing Program scientists with a good understanding of the Program's needs. The SAB provides an external lens for the Program but do not depend on the Program's funds. Lee personally puts a lot of stock in the IDT's recommendations and thinks the SAB is good for a second review and reality check on their rankings. He found the similarities between the rankings encouraging. When the SAB and IDT differ for philosophical reasons, those differences should be probed more, but when the differences are technical, Lee finds it easier to reconcile.

Orcutt explained that during the discussion on winter flow variability, there was a push to implement it on December 15, but the foundational studies were not in place. He asked if the proposed studies would inform if and when water should be released. Lee explained the RBM10 and SRH models and Proposal #6 could. The other studies are less related to winter flow variability. Lee noted the proposals were solicited in September and were not in reaction to the winter flow discussions. Orcutt recommended additional discussion on the topic due to concerns about how policy decisions were vetted and communicated, but thought it was a topic for the IDT to explore.

DeJulio explained the SAB reviewed the projects twice: once as pre-proposals and again as full proposals. During the second review, the SAB provided specific recommendations for the projects independently but deferred the opportunity to re-rank the proposals. DeJulio asked if their recommendations on the full proposals were consistent with the recommendation Lee was making to the TMC. Hadley asked whether that made the SAB's initial ranking invalid. Lee explained the SAB only provided reviews and were not asked to re-rank the full proposals. Hadley noted that the SAB's rankings of Proposal #2 and #5 could have changed. Lee noted that Proposal #2 was ranked higher contingent on the authors making substantial changes to the project. Hadley asked which project needed to be started earlier. Lee answered it was Proposal #7. Hadley asked whether the TMC was being asked to fund the recommended projects with the extra \$100,000, whether the budget for Proposal #2 showed the updated budget, and if the updated budget would further increase their funding request. Lee explained revising Proposal #2 would lower its budget as it would become a pilot project. The SAB had concerns about using visual estimation and suggested doing a pilot study. Once revised, the project could come under the \$350,000 total, but the authors may want to go a different route. Because of the size of Proposal #2, only two projects would be funded as proposed. The project could be reconfigured and done in the future as it had good support from the SAB.

Sommer asked how the SAB's ranking of the pre-proposals were used when deciding which projects would submit full proposals. Lee explained they used the top five listed by the IDT and asked the SAB to review the full proposals. Sommer noted that using the SAB's ranking would fund their first three proposals using the cap of \$350,000. Gogan asked how the IDT and SAB differed in their rankings for Proposal #5. Lee explained the project would improve the RBM10 model the Program uses to predict water temperatures. The SAB ranked the project and assumed it was stand-alone model. However, the model is used to comply with water temperature targets and evaluating flows. It is an input for several other models the Program uses. It takes tributary and accretion inputs into account when modeling mainstem flows, especially in places like Junction City where flows are higher than at Lewiston because of the tributary inputs. The model is also used for evaluating frog production, riparian hardwood recruitment, and scour. The model is more important than the proposal indicated. While the IDT was aware of its value, the SAB was not. Gogan recommended the discrepancy be clarified in the future and wanted to know how important the SAB ranking was as it did not move the overall rankings. Lee explained it provided another lens on projects, but it may change as the TMC works through its relationship

with the SAB. Currently, the SAB works closely with the Science Coordinator and the IDT, but they may work directly with the TMC. Lee was unsure if it was his place to decide how to use their information other than presenting their findings. While it is important to understand discrepancies, it would be unreasonable to think they would be exactly the same. How the TRRP incorporates the SAB's input and do business should be in the Program Document.

DeJuillio noted that the only project the SAB had reservations about funding was Proposal #2, which they did not recommend funding as currently proposed. All the other projects they recommended fully funding. The funding for the projects was approved in June and the intent was to get the projects on the ground this fiscal year. Lee agreed and noted that additional reviews may affect the timing of projects.

Ly asked if the IDT members recused themselves when ranking the proposals. Lee explained they did not as all the projects are done by Program partners. However, all the projects had 2 to 3 partners involved and were collaborative which made it impossible to recuse individual members. Ly thought it would be helpful to know which entities were tied to the projects. Ly agreed with Sommer's accounting of what projects could be funded based on the SABs ranking. Hadley asked where the SAB reviews were located. Lee recommended looking at the IDT notes for November and for the meetings after that.

Orcutt asked why TMC was asked to decide on the proposals now and if it was tied to the status federal budget (Continuing Resolution). Lee explained the funding was unrelated to the federal budget. The original plan was to review the proposals in March, but the authors for Proposal #7 asked they be moved up so they could collect data this month and get their project ready a year earlier. The rest of the projects are flexible on when they could be funded.

Kyle DeJulio moved to accept the recommendation of the Science Coordinator for funding the Science Proposals.

Eric Wiseman seconded the motion.

Tanya Sommer made a competing motion for the TMC to fund the science proposals in the ranking order of the SAB.

Michael Orcutt seconded the competing motion.

Abel noted the SAB did not recommend funding Proposal #2 unless it was scaled down to a pilot project. If their pre-proposal rankings were used it would be against their own recommendation.

Kormos thought information provided to the TMC and the process for reviewing the proposals was flawed and did not provide sufficient information from both independent assessments adequately. The process flaw is in how the IDT reviews and receives information versus how the SAB completed full and partial reviews of proposals. He hoped staff could learn from the discussion to make the review process more transparent and easier for the TMC to understand.

DeJulio pointed out that the competing motion, as stated, would go against the recommendation of the SAB by fully funding Proposal #2. Sommer explained her intent was for the authors of Proposal #2 to address the SAB review and fund it based on the lower cost.

Hadley agreed the TMC did not have all the information to vote and asked whether they should consider focusing on Proposal #7 since they are asking for expedited consideration, which would give the other authors time to refine their proposals for the March meeting. Ly suggested deferring the decision to the March meeting. Hadley asked whether that would no longer make Proposal #7 an option. Lee explained the project could be done but would delay the final product by a year. He noted the project was looking for a commitment to start through a TMC motion, but funding could wait. Kormos was concerned whether the SAB would shift their rankings for Proposal #2, which would no longer fund Proposal #7, noting that a lack of information on the rankings was preventing the TMC from making a decision to move one project forward. Orcutt agreed with deferring to March so the TMC could get better information on the project standings.

Michael Orcutt made a second competing motion to defer action on the FY22 Science Funding until the March meeting.

Elizabeth Hadley seconded the second competing motion.

Lee asked whether the SAB should re-rank the proposals for the TMC. Kormos thought it would be useful since their feedback was not incorporated and it would give them an opportunity to understand the utility of the model. He thought it was a glaring deficiency to have the SAB review items they may not fully understand and should be remedied. Lee added that having the authors rewrite their proposals and have them reviewed and re-ranked by the SAB may push past the March TMC meeting and could result in the TMC getting information at the last minute. Kormos understood and suggested getting a report from the IDT to compare with the SAB. He wanted to let TRRP staff determine what could get done and provide by the meeting.

DeJulio noted the process has differed than how other solicitations have been treated and it did not give authors clear expectations of the process. He thought it was negligent to not outline the process and that if the TMC wants additional layers of scrutiny for projects, it needed to be laid out at the start. He recommended laying out a proposal process at the beginning as it was unfair to the authors to change the process as they proceeded.

The second competing motion passed with 7 votes in favor. Yurok tribe was opposed.

BREAK

Channel Rehabilitation Review SOW

Abel reviewed the final Scope of Work (SOW) for the Channel Rehab review. The work is intended to solicit a third party to evaluate the design and implementation of physical restoration actions and develop actionable recommendations for future projects. Abel reviewed each of the proposed tasks and subtasks and the requirements for each. The proposal includes the assembly of an expert panel, meetings with the IDT, public involvement through public meetings and discussions, site visits to past and future sites, development of a retrospective report, and a final report with recommendations on various restoration practices and Program activities. The final

report will be presented to the full TMC, which should be well advertised so the public can participate. The SOW was developed with the help of many TMC members.

Ly asked if NOAA's comments were incorporated in the latest draft as they had submitted theirs after the initial deadline. Kormos noted the State of California submitted their comments and not all of theirs were incorporated. The State saw a critical omission in the SOW on the functional relationship between the implemented ROD flows and the restoration activities being reviewed. They thought it was problematic to evaluate floodplain restoration and their effectiveness without considering whether the implemented ROD flows inundated areas when fish were present and able to use them. He added that the intent was not to have the panel review flows under consideration or winter flows, but solely those flows that may have provided added benefit to existing restoration work. The evaluation could be useful for understanding the functional relationship between flows and restoration work. The State was concerned that omitting the analysis would not provide useful or meaningful input. Abel noted they did receive comments from the State, but they were not incorporated as they were submitted late. He agreed that flows do not always coincide with when juveniles were in the river.

Ly asked whether the TMC already approved the budget for the task and if TMC should focus on approving the scope of work. Abel confirmed it was and explained the discussion is a fatal flaw review of the SOW. The funding was approved in June and many thought it was important to do the review now since the last one was completed after Phase I more than a decade ago. Orcutt noted that while the decision was made in June, it appeared to be less certain in December. He raised concerns about the budget approval during the SOW comment session. He added the Phase I review and this review are an order of magnitude different for what they are getting for \$250,000 since the review is still under debate.

Kormos asked for any objections or comments to his comment on adding a review of the functional relationship of flow to the SOW. Abel noted the State's comment was for Objective 2.0 that "We should consider our ROD flow management in those considerations for this objective." Hetrick asked if the contractor would be conducting group interviews with just engineers or fish biologists or if it would be a diversity of disciplines from each agency for Task 3.2. Abel thought they would do group interviews with each TMC entity.

Lindke thought it was a big omission to not include flow in the review. He did not think it was possible for an independent scientist to evaluate the effectiveness of channel rehab work if they did not know the flows interacting with the site. Floodplains are constructed at specific elevations based on flow and the purpose is to inundate them with water for additional habitat and food for fish. Those areas are only functional under certain conditions and if they inundate when fish can no longer take advantage of them, it would be an important thing to consider. He explained they are not looking for a wholesale evaluation of flow, but some analysis should be made. The top recommendation from the Phase I review asked how TRRP activities, flow management, and sediment augmentation directly affect salmonid populations. The scientists recognized the need for that evaluation and they would be ignoring it again for this evaluation

without it. Abel added the State also added that these three actions do not function independently, and flow is the most abiotic factor affecting each.

Brett Kormos made a motion for the TMC to approve the Scope of Work as provided with the additional of the functional relationship of flow in terms of ROD-implemented flow regimes to the overall SOW in Section 2.0.

Kyle DeJulio seconded the motion.

DeJulio asked if the motion would limit the contractor from exploring other flow regimes. Kormos said it would as he intended the contractor to see how effective the rehabilitation work is with the flows they implement. DeJulio thought the analysis could hint at the potential for other flow regimes by looking at their effectiveness in Phase II.

Ly asked if the SOW asks the contractor to make recommendations for channel rehabilitation work and flow. Abel explained they could provide input in the Final Report as they make recommendations. He suggested they could infer how to address flow based on their analysis. Ly thought they should ask for that recommendation to determine if it is an issue.

Orcutt asked if the SOW should be reviewed by the IDT and if that would delay the SOW since it adds in uncertainty and could be unclear. Abel explained the SOW had been developed with input from TMC representatives and technical staff, with several IDT members providing comments. Additionally, the IDT would be one of the first groups to meet with the contractor after the kick-off meeting.

DeJulio agreed with Lindke that assuming the Program's management actions were independent was misguided as they interact with each other. For Task 3.6, many of the questions asked are directly related to flow, but the only way to look at the functionality of the floodplain is to look at the hydrology. To improve the utility of the final document, he recommended specifically asking the contractor to assess how changes in flow could make the constructed Phase II sites function better.

Kyle DeJulio made a friendly amendment that Section 3.6 and Task 4 be edited to include recommendations from the contractor on how flows could be managed to increase the effectiveness of Phase II rehab sites.

Brett Kormos approved the amendment.

Motion passed unanimously.

Abel thanked the TMC for working on the SOW.

Public Forum

Lee asked for direction on the proposal reviews. Ly recommended SAB and IDT review revised Proposals #5, #2, and #7, which are in dispute for funding. The authors should refine them and resubmit for SAB review. Abel added that Proposal #2 should provide an updated budget for a pilot study and Lee should talk with the SAB about their misunderstanding of #5. Then have the SAB re-rank the proposals. Lee was unsure if they could have them reviewed by the March

meeting. DeJulio suggested the SAB could present their recommendations to the TMC directly to start restructuring their relationship. Ly deferred to Abel and Lee on the best approach.

Meeting Adjourned at 12:01 pm