

Meeting Notes

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

June 7-8, 2023
Blue Lake Casino
Brundin Conference Room
777 Casino Way
Blue Lake, CA
MS Teams Video Conference

Day 1, June 7, 2023 9:00am

TMC Members

Primary	Representative Seat
Don Bader	Bureau of Reclamation, Acting Chair
Nick Som	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Seth Naman	NOAA Fisheries
Eric Peterson	Trinity River Restoration Program, Acting Executive Director
Mike Orcutt ¹	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Brett Kormos	California Department of Water Resources/Fish & Wildlife
Tim Hayden ²	Yurok Tribe
Eric Wiseman ³	U.S. Forest Service
Liam Gogan	Trinity County

¹Justin Alvarez served as representative during first part of Day 2

²Kyle DeJuilio served as representative on Day 1 due to schedule conflicts.

³Keli McElroy was in attendance for part of the meeting, but Eric Wiseman served as the representative for all TMC votes and discussions.

Others in attendance: James Lee, Todd Buxton, Oliver Rogers, Elliot Sarnacki, Jeanne McSloy, Kiana Abel (TRRP), Emelia Barnum, Derek Rupert, Jo Anna Beck, Tom Patton (Reclamation), Conor Shea, Bill Pinnix (USFWS), Kyle DeJuilio, Chris Laskodi (Yurok), Heidi Carpenter-Harris, Patrick Flynn (Trinity), Radley Ott, Ken Lindke, Morgan Knechtle (CDFW), Trevor Morgan (CDWR) Justin Alvarez, Cassandra Holman, Chad Martel, Karl Seitz (Hoopa Valley), Roman Pittman (NOAA), Eric Wiseman (USFS), Lauren Alvarez (BLM), Chad Smith (Headwaters), Ben Snyder (SWCA), Greg Koonce, Emily Alcott, Caitlyn Alcott, Matt Kandolf, Michael Burke (InterFluve), Katrina Harrison, Kyle Sipes (McBain & Associates), Beverly Fickes (Clear Creek Community District), Amber Carman (Trinity Watershed Alliance), Jacque Hostler-Carmesin (CA Fish & Game Commission), Paul Hauser, Andrew Johnson (TPUD), Don Hansen, Mackenzie Butler, Cory Inouye, Josh Cozine,

Notes: Sabrina Kleinman (EPP)

List of Motions

Brett Kormos moved to approve the appended June Meeting Agenda.

Kyle DeJuilio seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Seth Naman moved to approve the March TMC Meeting minutes.

Kyle DeJuilio seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Nick Som moved for the TMC to adopt the final draft of the Program Document, subject to any edits required upon DOI Review.

Seth Naman seconded the motion.

Michael Orcutt offered a friendly amendment to remove "subject to any edits upon DOI Review."

Som and Naman approved the amendment.

Motion passed with seven votes in favor and one opposed. Hoopa Valley voted against.

Brett Kormos moved for the TMC to insert the following language to the TRRP's Bylaws in the appropriate locations:

The TMC retains unilateral authority to set the agenda for all quarterly meetings and maintains the authority to vote on any decision items set forth in said agenda. Members of the TMC will attempt to resolve matters of dispute during TMC proceedings with the understanding that any recommendations made to DOI as a result of a TMC vote can be disputed by individual TMC members with DOI outside of the TMC process. The TMC is an advisory body and as such does not hold the authority to implement certain decisions where the authority lies with DOI.

Kyle DeJuilio seconded the motion.

Nick Som made a competing motion to table to insertion pending DOI review of the Program Document.

Liam Gogan seconded the competing motion.

Motion failed with three votes in favor and five votes against. NOAA Fisheries, Hoopa Valley Tribe, Yurok Tribe, State of California, and Trinity County voted against

Naman offered a friendly amendment to the original motion to add that "*by individual TMC members*" *before* "with DOI" [emphasis of insertion added]

Kormos and DeJuilio approved the amendment.

Som added a friendly amendment to add "pending DOI Review of the Program Document."

Kormos and DeJuilio approved the amendment.

Motion passed unanimously.

Brett Kormos moved to rescind the letter to DOI and consider further communication with DOI Regional Directors as necessary.

Kyle DeJuilio seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Nick Som moved to approve the limiting factors analysis funding as a the top priority for FY23 surplus funding and defer decisions on the rest of the list for the July TMC Meeting.

Don Bader seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Brett Kormos moved for the TMC to approve the proposed FY24 budget with the understanding that future decision may be needed to balance the budget.

Liam Gogan seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Welcome and Introductions

Bader opened the meeting. He will serve as Acting Chair for the TMC while Tanya Sommer is on detail. Som will serve as the USFWS representative. Peterson is currently serving as the TRRP Executive Director while Dixon is on active duty in June.

Approval of Agenda

Kormos thought the agenda was incomplete. During the March TMC meeting, the TMC agreed to consider adding language to the bylaws to clarify the TMC's role and authority with DOI as proposed by the State. The language has been added to the Program Document, but Kormos would like the TMC to also consider adding it to the bylaws as proposed in March.

Bader noted the language was being considered by the Regional Directors as part of the Program Document. Kormos thought the language in the bylaws and the Program Document should move forward in concert. He thought it was inappropriate to preclude it. Orcutt suggested adding the item as part of the Refinements portion. He thought the interplay between the changes and process for the bylaws and the Program Document were unclear and wanted to discuss.

Bader explained the omission was not intention and recommended adding it at 1 pm along with a discussion on the letter to DOI. Kormos explained the Yurok Tribe made a motion in March to continue with the letter He recommended addressing the two items separately with the Yurok Tribe providing guidance on the letter. DeJuilio thought the letter needed to be reconsidered. He thought the letters request for an explanation of any changes to the program document and for the intervention in the TMC agenda in September were a separate issues. Bader agreed to two separate decision items on the bylaw and the letter to DOI. Naman asked for a break between 9 am and 12 pm on Day 1 and for someone to email the proposed bylaws language. Orcutt wanted to clarify the decision items for Day 1 due to schedule conflicts he had for Day 2. Bader clarified the only decision item planned for Day 2 was on the budget.

Kormos moved to approve the revised June TMC meeting agenda.

DeJuilio seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Kormos agreed to email the bylaw language during the break.

Approval of March TMC Meeting Minutes

Naman moved to approve the March TMC meeting minutes.

DeJuilio seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Comments on Non-Agenda Items

No comments were submitted by the public or TMC entities.

Report from Executive Director

The Program has been busy with Oregon Gulch construction. They plan to complete bulk excavation in July, which will shift to final touches. The Program has also worked on gravel augmentation and on programmatic EA for watershed restoration projects.

Organizational Updates

Pre-recruitment for the public affairs specialist has started and the official notice will fly at the end of the fiscal year. Abel is currently serving a detail. Abel has also developed a monthly newsletter for the TRRP. Those interested, should email her to be added to the distribution list.

Dixon received 14 well-qualified applicants for the environmental compliance specialist position. They have made an offer, which is being reviewed by HR. While Dixon is on active duty, Lee and Peterson will trade off serving as Executive Director. Additionally, Lee is detailing as the Implementation Branch Chief, which will likely become permanent. Peterson is also detailing as Science Coordinator.

There are some significant budget adjustments needed for the FY23 budget due to grant funding the Yurok Tribe received for the Oregon Gulch project, which allows the Program to complete the project earlier while freeing up funds in the FY23 budget. Dixon prepared a prioritized list of items for TMC consideration that will be discussed as part of the budget.

Just under \$500,000 was awarded in watershed restoration grants, which will be reviewed on Day 2. InterFluve also completed its review of rehabilitation projects and will present their recommendations for Phase III. The IDT has reviewed the retrospective report but not the recommendations.

Implementation Update

The Program is working on five rehabilitation projects in various states of progress. The Sky Ranch project is at the 60% design phase with a completed value engineering study. The project is currently held up by land transfers between Trinity PUD, USFS, and the BLM. Rights-of-entry have been secured and the project could start in 2025 or 2026 pending the land transfers.

Oregon Gulch is moving along, with off-haul planned for completion on June 28, leaving grading, excavation, and spoiling. They are 65% done with excavation and most of the site is about 1 foot from its final grade elevation. By the end of July, most excavation should be done and revegetation work should start. No irrigation is planned. Some local residents have visited the site and those interactions have been pleasant.

A draft conditions report is under review for Evans Bar. Bill Rich, who is a cultural resources consultant who lives in the area, has organized local residents to discuss their concerns, questions, and comments to make the design process more efficient. A concept design has been prepared, but concrete designs are still in development. Gogan asked that the TMC be CC'd in those discussions.

The State and Yurok Design teams are working on a 60% design for the closeout for Sawmill following years of gravel processing. Compliance for Upper Conner Creek has also started now that the 60% design is done. The CLOMR is currently in process. Smith Pitt gravel quarry should also be obtained soon from the BLM for contractor use.

There are two EAs in development; one for new gravel augmentation sites and a programmatic one for watershed restoration projects. The Program is holding a meeting on June 20 with the BLM for gravel augmentation, while the watershed EA should be done by the end of the year. This year's gravel augmentation was completed by moving 2,800 cy at both Lowden and Cableway sites.

Outreach

The TRRP started a monthly newsletter, the River Riffle, in May. Those interested in joining the distribution list should email Abel (jabel@usbr.gov). The Program also increased its Facebook activity with a total of 749 followers, with the top post on a tree that fell near Oregon Gulch that blocked boat access.

The 2022 Annual Report is almost complete; the PDF version is online while a story map version is in development. The Program published an article in the Conservation Almanac in May while there have been several articles published in local news outlets. Most are focused on Trinity Lake levels and why they are not as high as others in the region.

The Program has hosted several public events, including presentations to the Sacramento Fly Fishing Association, townhall meetings with Supervisor Ric Leutwyler and Congressman Huffman, and a meeting with the Trinity County Board of Supervisors. Science on Tap continues to be a successful public event series. The last presentations were from the BLM archaeologist on mining history and from the Integral Ecology Research Center on illegal cannabis. Other public events include a public float planned for June 24, and various camps and workshops around Weaverville.

Science Update

The TMC-approved Science Plan is now posted online. Recruitment for the SAB continues, with applications due June 16. Peterson has not seen much response and encouraged TMC members to send information to potential candidates and organizations.

The IDT has started planning a science symposium for next winter once the new SAB is seated. Meanwhile, the limiting factors analysis will be a major topic in FY24. The study should identify bottlenecks affecting salmon throughout their life cycle. While habitat was considered a major bottleneck in the Flow Study, additional analysis is needed to determine other factors impacting fish as more habitat is available. The IDT plans to use NFWF to solicit a group to develop a study plan with TRRP input, which will start in the FY24 budget.

The 2022 Topography Model collected by the Yurok Tribe will arrive soon. The Program provided funds to the Reclamation Technical Services Center for hydraulic modeling over the

next fiscal year and it should be done in early FY24 using aerial photography obtained in July. Several publications are in final edits with two recently posted online on watershed activities.

Work Group Updates

Most of the Work Groups did not meet during the last quarter based on guidance from the Program Document to reduce meeting frequencies.

Discussion

Orcutt asked who decided the leadership assignments for the vacant TRRP staff. Peterson explained Dixon made the decision with Bader's oversight. Orcutt explained hiring decisions for major roles in the TRRP were usually made with input from the TMC, noting the decision to permanently move Lee to the Implementation Branch Chief position. Orcutt asked whether the watershed grants had previously covered compliance and design work. Peterson explained the Program had previously funded planning projects.

Orcutt asked if the Phase II Implementation Review Report would be reviewed by the TMC. Peterson explained InterFluve would present their recommendations with the final report delivered in July. The retrospective report was being reviewed by the IDT. Orcutt thought the IDT was being used to circumvent the TMC and asked if the TMC would be asked to review and approve their report. Peterson explained the report was a technical review of the history of the TRRP with recommendations the TMC could consider implementing.

Orcutt was concerned about public relations and inclusion of all the stakeholders in communications and events. When the TRRP releases public messages about the Program, they need to be cognizant of all the participants. A recent article on the Yurok Tribe's grant award created havoc on the Hoopa Valley Tribe. Kormos asked Orcutt to explain the Tribe's issue with the article. Orcutt explained the announcement, along with comments from Huffman, excluded the work and contributions from the Hoopa Valley Tribe. He has also encouraged holding public events near Hoopa Valley for years with few results. Abel offered to meet with Orcutt to develop downriver events. They have talked about bringing Science on Tap to Willow Creek and Lewiston.

Orcutt thought the Program could be getting ahead of itself if the limiting factors analysis revisited the results of the 2000 ROD. Peterson explained the Flow Study, to which he referred, found that habitat was a major limiting factor for the fish. While habitat may still be limiting, it has increased since then and the fish are still not coming back. The study will look at the influence of other factors. Orcutt asked for an update on the cohort reconstruction to understand the composition of catches and escapement. Peterson explained there were coding issues with the software needed for the reconstruction study. Those updates are being addressed by the Reclamation Technical Service Center with funding proposed for early next year. The results could be used for the limiting factors analysis but not for the reconsultation.

Ott asked how many applications Peterson received for the SAB position as he had a few hydraulic engineers he had contacted. Peterson stated he had not seen many applications and encouraged Ott to have the candidates apply.

Cory Inouye asked why the TRRP was not doing any work on winter variable flows impacts on restoration or the local economy. Peterson explained winter flows were being considered and analyzed under the current reconsultation effort. Naman added the reconsultation would provide a more robust analysis on changing flow patterns for NEPA and Section 7 coverage. The analysis would model the alternatives to look at socioeconomic impacts as part of the process. Gogan asked if the analysis would look at the costs to Trinity County from the flows. Naman explain it would and that the public could also comment and provide input.

Gogan asked if the TMC would consider using some of the excess Program funds to address other areas where fine sediment contributions changed from negligible to high following the Monument Fire, similar to the Deadwood Creek project. Naman explained the Program cannot stop sediment from entering the river, but they could synchronize mainstem releases with tributary flows so when the sediment enters the river, the river can transport it. It is one of the reasons to have flows in the winter months as steady state flows are insufficient.

Phase II Implementation Review and Recommendations

The InterFluve team presented their recommendations for the TRRP following their review of Phase II channel rehab projects. These were independent recommendations made without influence from the TRRP.

The review covered work done in the main restoration reach within the 500-year floodplain. Interfluve conducted several site visits, held one-on-one interviews with project entities, and met with the public. They prepared a retrospective report, currently under review by the IDT. The retrospective report is intended to review the overall work done by the Program based on the site visits, public meetings, entity interviews, and reviews and research available. InterFluve developed 14 recommendations for the Program moving into Phase III.

For Management Actions, the following recommendations were given:

1. **Continue to refine flow management.** More work is needed to understand how the various ecosystem functions, uses, and flow regimes affect food webs, evolution, and ecosystem processes. Run off events affect many aspects of ecosystem function and the complex mosaic of riparian habitat. Work is needed to better mimic unimpaired flow regimes throughout the year in the flow schedule. Elevated summer base flows may contribute to suboptimal temperatures for juveniles, so considering flows below 450 cfs may be needed to emulate pre-dam conditions.
2. **Plan additional channel rehab activities at completed sites.** Many of the sites completed during Phase I have the potential for improved ecosystem function through more dynamism and topographic complexity. All reach types could benefit from an increased use of large wood to improve hydraulic complexity and emphasize submerged

habitat values. InterFluve identified several large stands of alder as ready sources. They also recommended leverage planning tools to identify opportunities based on varying land ownership and varying geomorphic priorities.

3. **Identify additional gravel augmentation sites.** This is already in development with the current gravel augmentation EA. Based on the Hoopa Valley Tribe's active gravel bar mapping, there are reaches that are low in gravel. Most of the gravel augmentation is done upstream based on the conveyor belt model of gravel movement. However, moving gravel inputs further downstream could benefit gravel starved areas.
4. **Tie project goals and objectives to the geomorphic setting.** Different portions of the restoration reach vary in their alluvial processes. Tying the restoration approach to the site-specific geomorphic setting could provide more achievable project success criteria while acknowledging the scope and scale of human impacts on geomorphic conditions.
5. **Update the channel design guidelines.** In 2011, the Program developed channel design guidelines with McBain Associates to ensure design teams had a similar level of depth of understanding and caliber of approach. Updating the guidelines is recommended to connect how the designs are addressing the ROD goals and objectives and ensuring consistency over time.
6. **Increase support for vegetation management by reframing it as a standalone long-term management and stewardship action.** As the science and practice of restoration has evolved, there's more evidence of the interconnection between vegetation, hydrology, and geomorphic processes and on the role of vegetation on salmonid habitats and life cycles. Understanding the ecological succession of vegetation will take time, especially in highly altered systems.
7. **Standardize the basis of design reports.** These reports outline what analyses were done, how the design was developed, and the features evaluated. Developing a standard template is recommended as previous reports are inconsistent and hard to use to determine how projects met specific targets and objectives. Using a standard template would justify why a design does or does not meet specific objectives and provide a common practice for how designs are evaluated.
8. **Standardize and adopt post-project appraisals.** While the Program is invested in monitoring and learning, having common basic information evaluated can prevent appraisals from being onerous. This could include event driven and standardized monitoring periods (e.g., monitoring after geomorphic events versus vegetation monitoring). It could also utilize modern technology, such as capturing drone-based LIDAR for project sites in addition to the four-year data updates.

For Programmatic and Operational recommendations:

9. **Improve integration between science work groups and design teams.** Communication between these groups should occur more often so the design teams can integrate and use interim findings from the science work groups in their designs.

10. **Formalize mentorships within the Program.** Setting up a formal program so older staff can pass down their knowledge to newer staff. There is a high potential for losing institutional knowledge that could affect the future of the Program that is exacerbated by the nuanced skills and experienced used by the TRRP that is not taught in educational programs (i.e., construction oversight, design surfaces, permitting strategies). Mentorships could last one project cycle.
11. **Incorporate lessons learned from other regions.** While every region works differently and uses different approaches, they do have similar problems. The TRRP could benefit from knowledge gained by other groups and could bring it knowledge to a broader regional perspective.

For public engagement recommendations:

12. **Shift the Program and public narrative towards on-going management.** The public currently thinks of the Program's work as infrastructure work. However, thinking of the restoration work as a garden could help the public understand that returning to projects is what's needed to keep them functioning.
13. **Incentivize landowners to participate in projects.** Landowner participation has varied and is limited by the scope and location of projects. There is an opportunity to expand the toolkit to work on private lands by providing additional incentives for landowners to be part of the process. One example is to provide incentives for landowners to allow the channel to erode parts of land not currently in use. This could also include Safe Harbor agreements for landowners.
14. **Look to progress along the engagement spectrum.** While the Weaverville office has an open-door policy and all TMC meetings are open, there are barriers that keep the public from engaging or feeling that they can engage. The current approach puts the onus on people who want to be involved to engage while trying to overcome barriers to scientific understanding and information accessibility. Using the Spectrum of Community Engagement to Ownership, projects could move one step further on the spectrum (e.g., from Inform to Consult or Consult to Involve) to improve public engagement and involvement.

For the final report, InterFluve will review the IDT's input on the retrospective and incorporate input from today's discussion into their recommendations before submitting.

Discussion

Orcutt asked how many authors of the Flow Study they interviewed as part of the retrospective. Caitlyn Alcott noted they interviewed work group and TMC members. They did speak with himself and Scott McBain, who were involved in the Flow Study. Orcutt noted the study included several key people, such as Clair Stalnacker, and he was curious about their input, especially as the recommendations did not distinguish between flows and different races of fish with different life histories. Emily Alcott explained their report did look at the different life histories but their recommendations do not look at what to do for the different species. Koonce

added their team provided a higher-level look and more specific recommendations should be developed at the work group level. Lee added their contract only specified interviews with the IDT, Trinity River technical experts and Program entities and did not include interviews with Flow Study authors.

Orcutt asked if they used a published wood augmentation report for their recommendations on large wood placement. Caitlyn stated they used a woody debris report produced by the TRRP awhile back. On the increased emphasis on revegetation, Orcutt asked how much of the revegetation recommendation was influenced by regulatory requirements versus habitat needs along the river. Emily Alcott explained their focus was on habitat needs, which largely exceed the regulatory requirements. Lee added CEQA requires the Program to replace vegetation impacted by rehab projects. However, more value has been placed on habitat values than vegetation in recent years, which has included lower floodplains and reconnecting rivers. Vegetation has increased in these areas independently of compliance measures. Orcutt noted the Program has historically run into controversy when trying to move the flows to match pre-dam conditions. Shifting the waters moves it outside the requirements and parameters of the original analysis.

DeJuilio liked the recommendations, noting some were already being implemented. However, he was concerned the Program has not been successful when trying to implement similar recommendations in the past. He recommended including potential barriers to implementation for each of them so the TMC can understand how to implement them more successfully. Emily Alcott added the recommendations assume the 2000 ROD is fixed but identify other knobs that could be used under adaptive management. Koonce added the social dynamics within the TMC are important for getting the work done. They are currently in an era where the human influence on the system is greater than it's ever been, which makes it more important to manage the system in a way that will extend beyond us.

Som felt the recommendations could apply to any group and asked if any were Trinity-specific, such as specific design strategies. Caitlyn Alcott noted the geomorphic recommendations were strongly tied to differences within the restoration reach. Kondolf noted the double whammy of mining impacts and the dam cutting off high flows were major impacts on the Trinity. This affected turnover of the bottomlands and coarsening of surface materials. While the impacts are recognized by the Program and the Flow study, the influence was not fully appreciated in earlier projects. This history and the institutional dynamics on the Trinity create unique aspects to the river and its management, especially with the way the Tribes have been essential for working with the State, County, and federal governments. Caitlyn Alcott added the list was very Trinity-specific and while some may be recommended to other programs, all programs have common things they should work on. Som had expected recommendations on their design strategy and how they conceptualize and implement designs. Koonce thought the Program has done a level of design and investigation that are as good as any in the county. The challenge is moving the context of the river's dynamics to align with those upstream, which is challenging since the river

is cut off from that part of the watershed. The gravel in the river is a manifestation of all prior flow events and the Program needs to use machines to build those. The biggest improvement is for design reports to review how they meet the 84 targets and objectives.

Naman added the Program is embarking on its biggest change to flow manipulations in the past 20 years and asked if Snyder had any recommendations on how to bring the public along with them while they explore development of a pre-dam hydrograph. Snyder had anticipated greater resistance to reducing summer base flows, but many noted that the fire situation has dramatically shifted recreation earlier in the summer to avoid smoke later in the summer in recent years. Most were not against the idea of reducing summer flows since they were not using it as much during that part of the year for business. He recommended providing opportunities for public input and having discussions to explain ecological values.

Sarnacki asked if their recommendations or analysis evaluated the impact of other environmental factors such as climate change, invasive species, fire, or agricultural pollution. Emily Alcott explained they focused on fish and the plants that support life history strategies, but noted they could include that information in the final report. Koonce added the work groups were very aware of how climate change could impact the region, which were considered in developing the recommendations.

Gogan asked how the TMC could address public buy-in for projects since the TAMWG was disbanded and it will be a few years before a new group is stood up. He added that the public would likely not agree that the Program has an open-door policy as you need to make an appointment and most people have jobs. As a social project, he thought the TRRP was failing at social engagement, which is why they were not getting public buy-in. The illegal cannabis industry also needed to be considered as they are detrimental to tributaries and the water system. Also, the economic losses from the winter variable flows were a disaster for the upper portion of the river, and in addition they lost the entire salmon season. Gogan recommended opening times outside of the Program's 9-to-5 schedule and not always leaning on appointments. He also recommended reframing what the Program is *going* to do to what they are *thinking* of doing to make it more inclusionary. The current framing feels like people must come to the Program's side to be included rather than the Program coming to them for input. Dylan Sacco asked what public input the Program has considered for projects.

Abel explained the main issue they've encountered with the public is their inability to make changes in the way the public wants to see it done. Since the TAMWG was disbanded there hasn't been a forum for the public and the TRRP has not had a public affairs person for close to three years. In the meantime, she tries to answer any questions from the public and the Program does try to arrange events on the weekends and evenings.

Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, a member of the California Fish and Game Commission, received over a dozen calls during the winter flows from folks in Trinity Center and Weaverville asking if they could do anything about flooding they experience. She understood the flows did recede and it was part of a prescriptive plan, but folks felt like they were not being listened to or that the

impacts to their property were not considered. While the Program has a wealth of knowledge, it can be hard for the public to process and stay abreast of the topics or understand them. The message she hears is that word of mouth and citizen science aren't considered. She appreciated the evening events and the newsletter and asked to make an appointment with the Executive Director to understand how she could help. The Program needs to figure out how to bring information to folks without a scientific background, so they understand what is happening and why.

Amber Carman, from Trinity River Alliance, added the information is often hard to digest. While the public is not going to have the same depth and breadth of knowledge as Program staff, they still have experience that could help. Also, not everyone is comfortable going to a bar for the Science on Tap events, but noted the upcoming public float could be a good opportunity. The newsletter too could bridge some of those gaps, but not everyone wants their name on another mailing list and suggested posting it online. She liked DeJuilio's idea of identifying fail points and recommended developing online surveys or mail to get information to people. Many community members wear multiple hats, and the TRRP is often on the defense when engaging with the public. She recommended educational workshops where the public can learn hands-on and digest the information in different ways, maybe with support from local teachers or community members.

LUNCH

Program Document

The Refinements process started in 2014, when both Tribes met with the DOI Regional Directors to request an independent review of the TRRP. During the first stage, Headwaters provided a list of recommendations, and in the second phase they addressed the recommendations by producing a Program Document and Science Plan for consideration by the Regional Directors. Kormos noted the agenda stated the adoption of the final Program Document would be subject to edits and asked if the TMC would update the Program Document to address such edits. Bader explained the DOI Solicitors would provide advice, but the Regional Directors would have final approval and may have some edits. Kormos was not sure the TMC should approve a document if any changes were substantive or the TMC did not agree with them. He proposed allowing the TMC to respond in case of substantial edits. Bader explained when he and Sommer met with the Regional Directors in November about the Program Document, they did not have any major concerns and he expected most comments to be minor. As the Refinements process has morphed over time, he thought it was fair for the TMC to review the Document, weigh in, and recommend it to the Regional Directors. Gogan noted minor or small changes could be relative and agreed any changes should be reviewed before the TMC comes to a final agreement.

Som asked if there were edits to the Program Document that Kormos had not reviewed. Kormos explained the State added language it thought was important that was omitted at one point with unclear explanations as to why. The TMC is also considering a letter to get direction and feedback from DOI, so communication is not unidirectional and to note the TMC is dissatisfied

with its current relationship with DOI. If the document the TMC submits can be changed, then the role of the TMC remains uncertain. Naman asked if the proposed motion could be changed to allow the TMC to address any proposed changes.

Smith explained the TMC's relationship with its federal entities is not uncommon for other programs and is a challenge to address. The Program Document was developed as a statement of how the TMC wants to do things. Initially, Headwaters made three recommendations to the TMC: create cooperative agreements for all entities, create a program document, and create a science plan. The TMC opted to work on the latter two, while incorporating cooperative agreements in the Program document. Unfortunately, work on the Program Document started just as the pandemic hit, which meant all work was done virtually. The ultimate test for the Program Document and the Science Plan will be what happens over the next several years as the TRRP and the TMC uses both documents to make work more efficient, inclusive, and better for making decisions. While some changes may not seem like much, they may have a larger impact on the ground.

While the Science Plan was approved in March, the Program Document Development Committee (PDDC) has been working to finalize the Program Document. The Program Document is focused on the organizational structure, process, and functions to help the TRRP function more smoothly with more success. It was developed with a small group of TRRP entity representatives in the hope of getting the TMC to recommend the document for Regional Directors approval. When meeting with the Regional Directors, Smith felt they understood the PDDC's work on both documents, and they were not interested in tinkering with the language. There was some discussion on the State's language, but he did not expect significant edits from the Regional Directors.

The document is short and comprehensive and can be used as a template for speaking with the public and for keeping the Program aligned with the definitions, terms, and directions that guide it. It sets the Program up for how it will operate in Phase III with implementation and science priorities. During the last PDDC meeting, Smith held a test vote and while they did not get full consensus, Smith felt most of the PDDC supported the document.

He went over the document, its organization, and attachments. While some wanted major changes to the TRRP, such as creating a joint directorate between the Tribes and DOI for decision-making, the document uses ideas and options from other programs that fit with the TRRP. Key changes are placing the IDT with staff, providing more structured science planning and budgeting processes, and tweaks to provide smoother and clearer functions. Charters were updated and created for the IDT and the SAB to make them more robust. A hallmark piece was the decision to form a new and improved stakeholder group (TSAC) to engage the public and provide more focus and understanding for decision-making and money allocations for the TMC. The State's proposed language on the role of the TMC was added and could be an area where the Regional Directors may make changes.

The team has wrestled with conflicts of interest as there was concern that decision makers were approving projects that directly benefit their organizations. What makes the TRRP unique is its internal capacity to do the work with each entity having incredible staff expertise on the Trinity that is not easily replicated with consultants. It's a benefit and why the TRRP should continue to use its own people. To address conflicts of interest, they developed guidance materials on how TRRP will decide when to use its internal expertise and when to contract out while giving leaders a grounding in how to approach the work.

The documents are intended to guide Phase III of the Program, but a time frame was not set as it depends on how long it takes to collect the information needed to answer the proposed questions. There are implementation and science priorities, general language on reviews and cross checks, and latitude for the Executive Director to make some changes. The majority of the work for the Program Document is in the attachments. Attachment 1 reviews how the Program Document addresses the key findings from the original Refinements assessment. Attachment 2 started as the Law of the Trinity, similar to what's known as the Law of the Colorado. However, the Law of the Colorado is not a definitive document and is more amorphous than originally believed. Instead, Attachment 2 outlines various decisions points for how the TRRP was formed and how it operates. Attachment 3 outlines the updated organizational structure. It recognizes the collective structure of the Program, emphasizes the SAB's role with the TMC, and elevates the role of stakeholders in the TSAC. Attachment 4 is the bylaws and is intended to be updated as bylaws are amended so they remain independent. Other attachments include the TSAC, SAB, and IDT charters. The TSAC charter is being developed as it must follow a specific structure as a FACA committee and requires DOI approval. Lastly, the Science Plan is also included.

Discussion

Ott highlighted that the TSAC intends to set frequent meetings to help members understand the Program and the science as they start..

Kormos thought the biggest changes and point of contention would be the State's proposed language. He has asked various DOI staff what the issues would be and why and has not received a clear answer. Som thought the contention would in the TMC making recommendations when authority for decision-making is with DOI. Kormos explained his intent was to set appropriate expectations for the TMC since it's been ambiguous and it was suggested that the language was unacceptable and he wanted to understand why.

Orcutt explained the process started when the Tribes met with NOAA Fisheries, USFWS, and Reclamation to address issues with the Program's structure. The Regional Directors approved an evaluation. During the Refinements process, the group has suffered from uncertain funding, attrition, and poor attendance. Hoopa Valley approves of the document, but it has not met their expectations. For example, the Law of the Trinity was intended to outline the legal decisions for the Trinity and why the Program exists. These decisions date back to 1955 and were refined through litigation and administrative actions. Both Tribes approved the goal statement for the Program with assurances from Congress that the TRRP would restore dependent tribal and non-

tribal fisheries in good faith. Since then, the intent has moved outside Hoopa Valley's control. The other item was the joint directorate. Hoopa Valley has been straightforward about its intent but the changes in the Program stem from policy directives buttressed by solicitor opinions and advice. As a result, the TRRP is narrowly focused on fisheries with little discussion on the role of hatcheries. The Hoopa Valley Tribe believes the statute requires their concurrence and without it, there should be and could be a violation of the ROD. There are other issues beyond the scope of the TMC. Some have been interpreted in the court system, but sovereignty of Indian Tribes is subject to the interpretation of the Tribe and not the federal government.

Bader noted the document is not intended as an end all for the Program and the Hoopa Valley Tribe has other avenues it can pursue. It also does not preclude other actions taken by other Tribes or agencies. He saw the document as a depository for new people entering the Program to help them understand the TRRP and the TMC. Currently, there is language for review by the Regional Directors. He understood the TMC was not trying to change its authority, just clarify it, and he asked the TMC to keep an open mind on how the Regional Directors may respond.

Kormos clarified the State's language is intended to clarify TMC's current authority and to prevent what happened in September 2022 from happening again. He was hopeful that the reasons behind any changes are communicated.

DeJulio reviewed the proposed letter to DOI in response to the events at the September 2022 meeting and felt they were stale and proposed tabling the letter. He would like direct communication with the Regional Directors to explain any changes. Some of the issues the PDDC has encountered may be from the Program Document trying to incorporate aspects of the recommended cooperative agreement, which was not pursued. However, good work was put into developing the Program Document and it will benefit the Program.

Som moved for the TMC to adopt the final draft of the Program Document, subject to any edits required upon DOI review.

Naman seconded the motion.

Orcutt thought the last part of the motion was implied and recommended removing it as the Directors may approve the document as is. DeJulio asked if the motion meant the TMC approved any edits made by DOI. Som explained the motion was consistent with the State's proposed language on the TMC's authority. DeJulio disagreed because if DOI has edits the TMC disagrees with, they do not approve and thought the language was ambiguous. Bader explained the TMC was advising the Regional Directors on the document and the Directors would decide if they accepted it as the decision makers. Naman suggested revising the motion to say DOI edits would trigger additional TMC review. Som explained the TMC has already had its chance to weigh in.

Orcutt offered a friendly amendment to take out "subject to any edits required upon DOI review."

Som and Naman accepted the amendment.

Motion passed with seven votes in favor and one opposed. Hoopa Valley Tribe voted against.

TMC Bylaw Amendment

Kormos moved for the TMC to insert the following language in the TRRP's Bylaw document in the appropriate location:

The TMC retains unilateral authority to set the agenda for all quarterly meetings and maintains the authority to vote on any decision items set forth in said agenda. Members of the TMC will attempt to resolve matters of dispute during TMC proceedings with the understanding that any recommendations made to DOI as a result of a TMC vote can be disputed by individual TMC members with DOI outside of the TMC process. The TMC is an advisory body and as such does not hold the authority to implement certain decisions where the authority lies with DOI.

DeJuilio seconded the motion.

The TMC discussed the motion at the March TMC meeting and its intent is to make the relationship between the TMC and DOI clearer while establishing processes for issues to be resolved to the extent necessary.

Som made a competing motion to table the motion pending DOI review of the Program Document.

Gogan seconded the competing motion.

Kormos felt the language in the bylaws and the Program Document should be addressed in concert and asked if the updated bylaws had been signed since the last meeting. Bader explained all the bylaw edits proposed in the Program Document were approved except for changes to the voting majority. They had not yet been signed. Kormos wanted to understand why the TMC should wait for DOI's review. Som and Bader felt better about supporting the change to the bylaws knowing the Regional Directors approved the language in the Program Document.

The competing motion failed with three votes in favor and five opposed. NOAA Fisheries, Hoopa Valley Tribe, Yurok Tribe, the State of California, and Trinity County voted against.

Kormos intended to recognize the TMC may act on an item that some members may disagree with. The amendment codifies how Tribes and agencies can dispute decisions with DOI.

Naman offered a friendly amendment to add "by individual TMC members" after disputed.

Kormos and DeJuilio approved the amendment.

Gogan thought the amendment added clarity to the Program Document. Kormos felt amending the bylaws codified the current paradigm of the TMC's authority. Som was uncomfortable with voting having just read the amendment. Kormos explained he proposed the language in March to give members time to consider and review it. Orcutt thought the last sentence was contradictory since the prior statement was that the TMC set its own agenda and decision items. Kormos explained the last sentence communicated that while the TMC votes on how to make its recommendations, it does not have authority to implement the decisions. Orcutt asked if that entities could still circumvent the TMC in other ways. Kormos noted that if individual members disagree, they can dispute a decision with DOI outside of the TMC. Kormos asked if those uncomfortable with the amendment would approve of adding "subject to review and approval by DOI." The TMC agreed to table the motion until Day 2.

BREAK

Upper Conner Creek 60% Project Design

Kyle Sipes and Katrina Harrison from McBain Associates presented the design developed with the Hoopa Valley design team. The design addresses two legacy bars near the Junction City campground and incorporates the 2005 Hocker Flat and 2006 Conner Creek restoration sites. Legacy impacts at Upper Conner Creek from mining and flow regulation have resulted in a loss of rearing habitat from channel incision and riparian berm development. The project design will restore juvenile rearing habitat, promote dynamic geomorphic processes, and create conditions for riparian vegetation while relocating an existing boat launch to reduce traffic on the floodplain. The design reconnects the mainstem to the floodplain by identifying elevation thresholds for rearing habitat and riparian vegetation communities while increasing wetted footprints at low flows and increasing wood totals.

Two alternatives were developed for the 30% design. Alternative 1 was based on the approach used at Chapman Ranch while Alternative 2 used stage zero concepts. Based on comments on the 30% design, the team reconsidered whether they were gaining enough juvenile habitat based on the costs for the project, if there was enough topographic variation at lower inundation thresholds, and if the design resulted in active geomorphic processes to achieve its goals. The 65% design was a combination of the two alternatives, which adds mainstem riffles to reduce excavation, increases juvenile capacity through topographic variation, and has areas that inundate at a range of flows. Sipes reviewed the specific design features, such as constructed riffles, upland spoils, constructed complex habitat, and three different wood placement features.

The Design Team analyzed the proposed design against the existing conditions and the 30% design alternatives to determine differences in salmonid habitat, hydraulic outputs, and any changes to the floodplain elevation. When looking at the 30% design alternatives, Alternative 1 had a dramatic increase in fry and smolt habitat at 1,000 cfs, but a dramatic decline at higher flows and a loss of fry habitat at flows above 6,000 cfs. While Alternative 2 did not have the same losses, capacity gains were limited at higher flows. Both indicate a need for greater topographic complexity at lowered surfaces. The iterative process used to develop the 65%

design sustained at least a doubling in habitat across flows ranging from 750 to 8,500 cfs. The height above river analysis indicated the increases in open water and emergent margin habitats.

The remaining challenge moving forward is gaining landowner participation for the R-3 area proposed for spoils materials, downstream of Junction City. The adjacent landowners are currently unwilling to work with the Program and current planning and phasing for the existing spoils may need to include several river crossings and extensive transport. Next steps include a review of the design by landowners, beginning environmental compliance and permitting processes, and beginning the 90 and 100% designs.

Discussion

Bader asked if permitting had started. Lee explained they started the CLOMR and are moving forward with an EA. Peterson added the project is on schedule for implementation next year after Oregon Gulch. Som asked how long it would take until the meanders form. Sipes was unsure as it depends on high flows over the next few years. The design team is working on modeling for the geomorphic design with Conor Shea. DeJuilio asked if the modeling would be used to address landowner concerns about pools. Sipes said it would as the modeling indicates the pools should double. DeJuilio suggested looking at other locations for the boat launch as the proposed site would be unusable at high flows and the team should consider a high flow-access site. Lee asked how much excavation was anticipated with the design. Sipes estimated around 140,000 cubic yards, but it could change. Alvarez noted the lower channel would also reduce the velocity of the river. Wiseman asked if a backwater effect was considered when increasing the elevation at IC-1. Sipes explained the riffle would not be higher than the downstream riffle.

Trinity River Juvenile Chinook Survival Study

Chad Martel and Alvarez presented on a Chinook survival study the Hoopa Valley Tribe conducted in 2022. The study used juvenile salmonid acoustic tags (JSAT) to monitor and track fish in the River to determine their survival rate. The tags are surgically implanted and emit an audio signal every 5 seconds using a unique code to track the individual fish. Receivers are installed at various points along the river where the fish must pass to track their movement. If a fish fails to pass through subsequent gates, it is assumed as dead.

In the spring of 2022, the team tagged and released 252 juveniles at North Fork Screw Trap. The samples included hatchery and natural origin fish released in six batches between April 14 and May 27. The team used extended-release times to observe the fish over temporal and spatial flow changes. Sixteen receivers were placed at key locations along the river from the screw trap to the mouth of the Klamath. Locations selected to look at potential mortality hot spots. Two receivers were placed at Smokers Fall and four were installed at the Klamath to improve detection.

While the model estimates lower survival on the Trinity than the Klamath, when adjusted for distance, the two were fairly similar and relatively high for reach-specific survival. The team found no differences in survival based on origin, weight, or size. Some variation was detected based on changes in temperature and travel speed. Survival increased with temperature increases

up to 20°C, after which it dips from 0.99 to 0.96. In terms of speed, the results were not as clear as temperature and the team is still working on them. Mean migration time from release to the mouth of the Klamath averaged 37.2 days for successful fish. The quickest fish completed the run in 7.6 days while the slowest fish took 73.6 days. Migration time did change over time and survival decreased the longer a fish traveled.

They also looked at fish travel behavior, noting that some fish would quickly move to different segments and then stay for long periods before continuing on again. However, they did not see a relationship between migration pattern and survival.

Discussion

Orcutt asked if the batch numbers corresponded with fish size increasing with subsequent releases. Martel explained it did not and they saw little difference in migration time with size. Smaller fish did migrate a bit faster than larger fish but the difference in size was between 9 mm and 15mm. DeJulio noted other studies indicated that migration time and temperature were related in adults and asked if that was incorporated. Martel said they did not. Naman was unclear on the differences between large and small fish as there was not a lot of difference between the two groups. Martel explained the batches did not have much difference in size and they did not see much difference on survival based on size.

Alvarez noted the study will continue over the next three years. They have started releasing fish, releasing 400 fish per partner agency, for a total of 1600 fish annually. The migration route was also extended to the dam. The four-year study should provide data across temporal and spatial flows and survival rates. Estimated cost is around \$2 million for the four-year study between the four agencies. Som explained a lot of the cost was for equipment and Alvarez noted the tags were \$250 each while the receivers could be reused. The USGS is doing a similar study as they will be using the same terminal receivers, but they have not compared studies. The study was not funded by the TRRP.

Kormos asked if they were planning to correlate flow with survival. Martel explained they are currently seeing decreasing survival with increasing speed, which is counter intuitive. Kormos posited it could be the influence of temperature on flow as most studies indicate higher flows increase survival. Martel hypothesized that habitat may also create the need for the fish to slow down in areas. Som asked if any fish stayed for long once they hit the Lower Klamath. Martel noted the fish pretty much kept going once they hit that receiver. Kormos suggested looking at the Trinity and Klamath Rivers and below the confluence separately.

Adjourn for Day 1 4:40 pm

Day 2, June 8, 2023, 9:00am

Welcome and Non-Agenda Items

Beverly Fickes asked how stakeholders would be vetted for the TSAC. She represents the Clear Creek Community District, who is interested in participating. She also noted a typo in the

Program Document. Peterson recommended emailing him about the typo. Som explained he will start the hiring process for a TSAC coordinator. Once the hiring process is done, that person will reach out to the TRRP, the TMC, and the public on how to participate. There are regulatory components that must be met as part of the process, but USFWS will try to make them clear. Amber Carman asked that the Trinity River Alliance be included. Som agreed to coordinate communications with Gogan so people were not left out.

TMC Bylaw Amendment (cont.)

Som made a friendly amendment to add “pending DOI review of the Program Document.”

Kormos and DeJulio accepted the amendment.

DeJulio clarified that the TMC should not sign the bylaws if the related change was not approved in the Program Document. Bader explained the motion would add the change to the bylaws subject to review by DOI in the Program Document.

Motion passed unanimously.

TMC Letter to DOI

The letter to DOI was originally proposed in December to request having DOI leadership speak to the TMC about why agenda items were withdrawn from September’s agenda. The TMC also wanted engagement with DOI leadership at the end of the Refinements process. Som noted he had not had time to confer with Sommer on the letter because it was added on Day 1. His understanding was USFWS received harsh criticism from their chain of command on the letter. Bader explained Sommer had drafted the letter and ran it by USFWS solicitors, who did not approve of sending the letter as a USFWS supervisor representing the TMC. The letter is currently on hold and Bader noted he would also need to run the letter by his folks and would likely get a similar response if they decided to send it. It has been nine months since the agenda items were pulled and the TMC is owed an explanation on why the bylaws and winter flow discussion were removed from the agenda 5 minutes before the meeting. Naman asked if Bader or Som could provide the details. Bader did not want to overstate the circumstances and needed to talk to his leaders beforehand as there was active litigation on the matter.

DeJulio thought the letter was stale since the TMC may have addressed the deficiencies. However, one of the goals of the letter was to understand DOI’s interventions in TMC affairs. Another reason was to engage the Regional Directors as the Refinements process was ending. Kormos agreed with DeJulio’s recommendation to rescind the letter.

Bader explained he and Som could circle back with DC leadership to get an explanation on the events in September. In talking with Reclamation, they do not want to do that again as there were complications. The more the TMC can function locally, the better it will be. DeJulio explained the TMC wanted to know what the boundaries were and when they were crossed. The Yurok Tribe did not want decisions on the Klamath or the Trinity made in DC, but did want direct communication between the Regional Directors and the TMC rather than digital relationships.

Bader agreed to circle back with Reclamation and update the TMC at the July call. Kormos added the TMC should understand why DOI decided to preclude the TMC from a decision rather than letting TMC decide and make its recommendation to DOI. Since the original motion was made by TMC, another motion was needed to rescind it. Naman asked if sending the letter depended on the DOI representatives' discussion with leadership. Bader suggested taking a motion on the July call if the TMC was not satisfied with his response on DOI's actions in September.

Kormos moved to rescind the letter to DOI and consider further communication with DOI Regional Directors as necessary.

DeJuilio seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

BREAK

Bader noted that while the TRRP focuses on restoring the fisheries due to impacts from the dam, there is not much information on how mining affected the fish before then. Peterson noted a study by Andres Krause ([2010](#)) estimated mining raised the channel by 10 feet. Peterson estimated that mine tailings could make up just under 50% of the bank in some areas below Lewiston. DeJuilio noted the 1955 flood flattened many of the legacy mine tailings, making them unrecognizable. Naman noted mining moved to the Trinity when it was restricted along the Sacramento River, as there were fewer limitations. Abel added mining was restricted because farmers were upset about the sediments deposited on their lands. Pinnix noted mining also increased the amount of mercury deposits in the tailings that still affect salmon. Peterson added that pre-mining estimates were roughly based on tribal populations and consumption rates. Based on how large the populations were when they started monitoring in the 1910s, well into the mining era, it would be easy to imagine that salmonid populations were considerably larger before then.

2023 Watershed Restoration Grant Projects

Alvarez reviewed the projects funded by the TRRP watershed grant program, as administered by NFWF. Four projects were submitted for funding and all four were approved, with total funding just below \$500,000 and around \$22,000 in matching funds. Now that NFWF administers the grants, the Watershed work group participates on the review committee that approves the funding. The projects are currently being reviewed by NFWF's Directors and Congress for approval. Notices will be sent on June 16 to the grantees to start work. Most of the projects are continuations of previous projects, which meant Phase I project reports were included in the project proposals.

East Weaver Creek Dam Removal will remove the dam used when the previous intake was replaced. Deadwood Carr Fire Sediment Reduction project will work on erosion control for roads and adjacent mine tailings as a follow-up to their previous sediment control planting project in Mill Gulch. Indian Creek Fish Passage Barrier Removal will address the area above the previous

Indian Creek project by applying the stage 0 design approach. Lastly, the Douglas City Community Service District Feasibility Study will look at using tanks to store water from the mainstem to manage water use in the summer, like systems on Browns and Reading Creeks.

Discussion

Gogan asked if the Douglas City project would use water near the infiltration systems for Douglas City at Weaver Creek. Alvarez noted the project was a feasibility study so it would depend on the findings of the assessment. Gogan asked if the project at Indian Creek was similar to the previous restoration project as the design seemed different. Alvarez explained the plans in the presentation were from the first Indian Creek project. The new project is for the valley below the bridge using a similar approach as the first project.

Gogan noted the Browns Creek resilience program had room for 5-6 more tanks to draw water in the winter to avoid summer draws. With drought becoming more common, he wondered if it could bring water back to the creek when flows are low. He asked if similar systems should be given priority higher up in the watershed since it would result in more savings overall. Som posited the study may include a look at the landowners and their support of changing system operations. Alvarez explained the project was from the Watershed Center out of Hayfork with a history of working with the landowners. Gogan added there was a lot of illegal cannabis cultivation in that area and was hesitant to fund projects benefitting illegal operations.

Buxton thought the application of the storage tanks was a shot gun approach. In Washington, their funding board uses a statewide priority list that ranks priorities for different watersheds. He would like to see a similar approach on the Trinity to increase spending toward ecosystem health. Alvarez explained the Watershed work group discussed prioritizing funding and felt NFWF also supported it. However, the primary goal has been to expand access to projects for species of interest. However, the TMC can only recommend priorities to include in the RFP for the grant proposals. Buxton suggested having the TRRP set priorities to use funds more efficiently in the watershed since it can be unclear where the fish are spatially and temporally.

DeJulio noted the USFWS' Integrated Fisheries Monitoring Plan could be used as part of a prioritization scheme as they've done extensive work in the basin over the last four years. Naman asked if there was uncertainty about whether different tributaries were impacted by water use as he was unclear why feasibility studies to address water shortages were prioritized. Buxton added the goal of the program was to increase fish populations and if they are uncertain if projects support fish, it could be wasteful since the extent of anadromy in places like Browns Creek is unknown. Naman explained the salmon recovery plan does have a distribution layer paired with the State's surveys and tools with recent distribution data. Som suggested pursuing federal funds to do the prioritization assessment. Gogan noted Buxton's wife and Rogers were huge proponents of the Browns Creek project and was unsure why there was backpedaling as it was an important tributary to restore.

Pinnix did not think Buxton was unsupportive of the assessment and supported using the USFWS' Plan as the Trinity was one of the first watersheds to use it. The plan is dynamic and

adjustable with metrics that can be used for prioritization needs. Lindke offered to compile the suggested documents and tools for the Watershed work group to consider as it would be good to see projects that were specific to their needs rather than an open solicitation.

Alvarez noted the current grant process is halfway between open and specific. The solicitation notes where the TRRP would like to see work done and applicants need reference the recovery plan as its part of the ranking. Wiseman noted the Watershed work group did use factors to weigh and filter projects. Fish distributions are well documented and while there may be half-mile portions where it is uncertain, barriers to migration and the extent of anadromy are well documented.

DeJuilio asked if Buxton's proposal on prioritizing watersheds took landownership into account as the bottom lands of the Trinity have more private land which can make it difficult to plan projects as landowners may be unwilling to work with the TRRP. Buxton explained landownership varied between watershed as different areas could refine their priorities but was unsure if landownership was a factor. While it takes more effort to get people on board, it is almost always possible with communication on the benefits of participating.

BREAK

CVP Operations and Trans-Basin Diversion Allocations and TRD Infrastructure

Patton presented Reclamation's 50% forecast from the beginning of May. The original forecast estimated Trinity Reservoir storage at 2268 ft by the end of May and the actual elevation was 2288 ft. Current storage is similar to the projection given at the beginning of the month, with another 4.8 feet added due to good inflows. Reclamation estimates that end of September will be well above 1100 ft.

At Shasta, end of May storage was estimated at 4,412 ft, and is on track, with September storage estimated at 3,365 ft. The max storage allowed in December is 3,350 ft, making flood operations likely at the beginning of the year. With the Shasta in good shape, the Trinity could be full again if there is a good winter, which will further limit the use of Trinity if conditions continue.

Patton explained Trinity diversions are used to manage Whiskeytown Lake and projected releases for the upcoming year will be miniscule. Gogan asked if the releases in August were for temperature support on Clear Creek. Patton explained they were for Clear Creek below Whiskeytown Dam when things typically dry up over the summer. Bader also noted the releases in April to fill Whiskeytown. However, if they can delay those, they can use the water for temperature diversions on the Trinity. Patton added the diversions are not based on a specific formula but rather balancing Trinity and Shasta storage knowing Trinity takes longer to refill. Flows support Clear Creek, Whiskeytown, and Trinity temperature needs while avoiding power impacts at the power plants. Bader added that while the average has been around 50/50 between Trinity and Shasta, there is no rule on how to distribute them.

In 2021, conditions were looking okay coming out of the drought as Shasta storage was low and the State set minimum storage at 1.25 maf by the end of September. Reclamation diverted a lot

of the water from the Trinity. However, by the end of 2021, the snowpack on the Sierras only contributed about 600 kaf of inflows, which all evaporated and drew down Trinity while they were diverting. Naman asked if 1.25 maf would be the new minimum set for Shasta. Bader explained the minimum was set there to keep their coldwater objectives. However, it didn't help as they went into their third critically dry year. Naman noted Trinity takes over twice as long to regain storage as Shasta, resulting in a disproportionate drawn down of the Trinity to the Shasta. Bader explained Reclamation did not want to do that again. Right now, Oroville is less than a foot from its top and Fulsom is also higher with more water in the hills that could be used to manage salinity.

Next year has the potential for El Niño condition, which could mean less diversions from the Trinity as it could worsen conditions on the Sacramento side. The Sacramento side is also looking at a 75% allocation for the reconsultation and will be looking at multi-year drought scenarios for building back storage. For this year, with Shasta being full, they probably won't do diversions since Shasta dam is at 5kaf with another 2 maf still to come. While Trinity did not completely refill, the amount that came in was higher than originally estimated. Patton cautioned that the forecasts can always be higher or lower than actual conditions and they never know what they're going to get as conditions can always change. Reclamation tries to be flexible and work together. This year's conditions are looking better for that.

Abel asked for clarification on what zero diversions means as there's always a little water that moves through the dams to keep them operational. She asked Patton to clarify the differences between Trinity water releases and average daily releases. Patton confirmed there was flow going through the pen stocks that's pretty minimal as they cannot completely shut off flows. When they schedule a diversion, they post the number and the schedule online, but it could change intermittently based on what's needed for power. Bader added Trinity can have higher releases when power is peaking. But restoration releases come from Lewiston to the river not Trinity Dam, except when they are diverting water to Carr.

Andrew Johnson asked if the flows needed for temperature objectives at Clear Creek were in the table. Patton explained it would depend on conditions. As temperatures get warmer and Lewiston Lake warms up, water can get warmer below Lewiston into the Trinity. In some cases, releasing water from Trinity Reservoir through Lewiston is too warm, so it's diverted through Carr to keep it from warming up. Johnson asked if the volumes could be quantified and modeled for future scenarios to determine the amounts used for such operations. Patton explained they did not have a specific number but improvements to their temperature modeling on the CVP, including at Trinity and Lewiston, should improve the whole system and they can look at quantifying volumes and impacts in the future. The amount needed to keep things cool can vary from 100 cfs to 1000 cfs between reservoirs. They take the volume of the lake into consideration and they estimate about 2 kaf through Carr to keep water from warming up, but there are other factors considered, including meteorological conditions and the temperature of the water out of Trinity.

Lindke asked if diurnal flows helped minimize the amount of cold water needed for temperature objectives. Patton explained there was disagreement on the diurnal releases as there is a lot of mixing that occurs. It's also hard to quantify the benefits along with the timing of flows and power generation needs. They prefer to generate power at certain hours while balancing power benefits with fishery benefits. They are looking at better modeling to get a better idea of those needs. There is also a need for additional gaging and pen stock flow meters to track water through the plant and at the auxiliary outlet. Buxton added that Reclamation is monitoring temperatures at several locations, and they should be able to pick up the effects of diurnal flows on temperature dynamics.

Pinnix asked if there was capacity to divert water in the late summer or early fall if needed for temperature management. Patton explained there was potential if Bader's team received the information in time. Reclamation is also planning an outage at Carr tunnel from October through the winter. Since Trinity has a large volume and the forecast is for a cold winter, there should be plenty of cold water and they do not expect to see the same temperature issues this fall.

Amber Carman asked how the extra inflow into Trinity would be used and whether it would be diverted or added to storage. Bader explained it would all contribute to storage. Carman asked if there was potential for using cooling curtains at Trinity or Lewiston. Bader explained there were two curtains at Lewiston that pull the colder water for releases.

When Reclamation worked on the intake in October, Trinity was just below 500 kaf. The intake is a vertical column with hollow jet tubes. The outer portion of the column is surrounded by dark gates that control the temperature as the water is pulled in. The structure makes it difficult to provide much temperature management or adjustments because of how it operates. Carman asked whether inflows at Lewiston would be used for restoration flows. Patton explained when releases are scheduled out of Trinity Lake, they look at inflow coming in, but it can be hard to manage as the Keswick side usually has more inflow than Lewiston. If flows are short lived, they divert through Carr Power Plant but releases to Trinity below Lewiston are fixed and they try to maintain a steady flow. Most of the extra inflow will be used to keep Trinity higher. What's good for the hydrogeneration plant is also good for the grid. When there's an emergency, Reclamation will back down or increase generation to keep the grid stable. Using Carr increases generation and diverts little water over a short period of time.

Abel asked if there was value to adding gages at each tributary contributing to Trinity Lake. Patton explained the gages at the lake record pool elevations and releases are measured using the gages or other equipment allowing them to back calculate flows. Thus inflow is calculated using the known release rate, elevation, and evaporation. Gaging all the tributaries would be too difficult for a large lake like the Trinity where small changes in pool elevation correspond to large changes in area. True inflow is around 50 cfs and ranges between 0 and 100 cfs. On a short-term basis, the numbers would be screwy but they may make more sense at a larger scale.

Trinity River Hatchery Improvement Plans and Operational Changes

Reclamation received \$65 million in funding through Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) for improvements to the Trinity River Hatchery (TRH). The hatchery was originally constructed in the 1960s after the 1955 Trinity River Project was authorized by Congress and was considered the most modern facility at the time. Many of the structures from the original hatchery are still in use. The hatchery kept salmon afloat on the Trinity during an era of extensive habitat loss. However, after 20 years of operations, a facilities overview in 1977 noted significant problems. Raceways operated with low volumes and they had issues with predation. In 1984, the Trinity River Hatchery Modification Program invested \$10 million in today's money in updates. A temperature curtain was installed to manage temperatures and the juvenile release point was moved. A concrete conveyance was also installed at the head of the hatchery near the fish ladder to make it easier to catch fish.

Reclamation has internal records that have monitored various maintenance needs and upgrade recommendations to improve the hatchery and its functionality, the most important of which is a 2022 Infrastructure Review report prepared by Four Peaks Environmental. These reports and recommendations were used in Reclamation's application for BIL funds. The Four Peaks document, especially, formed the basis for the proposed improvements.

The report is based on site visits and discussions with partners and staff at the hatchery. It notes the hatchery's inadequacy at meeting its current mitigation and production goals and has detailed diagrams for how water is conveyed. Since its installation, water is gravity fed through the facility. Reclamation would like to maintain that to avoid the need for costly pumps and maintenance. Four Peaks proposed three different alternatives for each of the key elements they explored to give Reclamation a range of options to suit its needs. The new facility will include headquarters as well as new adult and juvenile holding ponds. New intake alternatives are included to better manage water and conserve cold water. Covers are proposed for the raceway to reduce sunburn and temperature pollution. A key recommendation was installing bypass systems to take features offline for maintenance, which is not currently feasible.

Each alternative provided cost estimates. Reclamation used all the preferred alternatives and preliminary estimates for keeping the hatchery operational during construction. The award was based on those estimates. Rupert is currently looking for experienced project managers and Reclamation is considering working with the Technical Service Center to support the project. They are seeking a complete design-build purchase request along with permitting.

Discussion

Bader asked what the estimated timeframe was for the project. Rupert estimated it would take around 2 years to design and four years to construct. Hayden asked if the hatchery's technical team would be involved in the planning to continue operations. Rupert explained the technical team was active in discussions on how to manage construction to keep operations going. Bader noted the plan is to start at the intakes and move through the facility to prevent a shutdown, which is the approach Four Peaks recommended.

Carpenter-Harris asked if the presentation could be viewed after the meeting to disseminate the information. Bader recommended including it in the newsletter. Rupert offered to run the project details through Public Relations to make it publicly available. Knechtle recommended talking with folks involved at the design-build hatchery projects on the Klamath and Fall Creek regarding lessons learned for operating and transitioning to new facilities. Rupert was interested and had spoken with a colleague who worked at the Leavenworth Hatchery for advice. Part of why they decided to do a design-build was because that project did separate awards for design and construction, and it caused delays due to questions from the construction team on the design. Putting the two tasks together can streamline the process. CDFW is also doing an alternative analysis for 20 hatcheries as well.

DeJuilio asked if the Four Peaks report was available to the public. Rupert agreed to check as he would love to see it on the TRRP website. Bader noted the costs estimates may need to be redacted.

LUNCH

CVP Reconsultation Alternatives

Reclamation has worked on the reconsultation for the Trinity River Division since last summer; meeting with interested parties to think through potential management options, with its last one in May. Bay Delta Office is currently taking comments on the draft alternatives over the next three weeks, until Friday, June 23. The alternatives for the Trinity River Division were set up to mirror similar frameworks proposed for the other CVP tributaries also being reconsulted. Jo Anne Beck noted the alternatives are still under development and have not undergone modeling or higher level reviews. Each varies based on storage management, variable instream flows, Lower Klamath augmentation flows, and temperature management.

The No Action Alternative would maintain current operations under the 2000 ROD. Alternative 1 (Water Control Plan) would implement flows seen prior to the ROD under the 1992 CVPIA. This alternative was developed to show the effectiveness of non-flow measures and the 2000 ROD and mirrors planning seen on other tributaries. The 340 kaf restoration flows are the only ones proposed.

Alternative 2 (Multi-Agency Deliberation) incorporates actions made by Reclamation, CDFW, NOAA Fisheries, the Tribes, and USFWS and would shift flows to earlier in the season for fishery benefits. Two different approaches are proposed under adaptive management. In addition to both flow management strategies, Alternative 2 would also manage Trinity Lake levels for multi-year drought with a minimum planning volume of 1.2 maf for end of September storage and stepped management for each subsequent dry year.

The first method is a trigger-based method that includes a number of synchronized flow events based on storm events and weather forecasts. The size of the flows would use the February and March B120s until the official water year is determined in April to prevent overspending the year's flow volume. The second method is to use an algorithm based on Coffee Creek to mimic

the natural hydrology with constraints to prevent flooding, maintain flow schedules and ramp rates, and conserve water year volumes to prevent overspending based on the water year. Once totals hit a certain level, the flows are switched back to base flows. This method was presented to Reclamation leadership to address concerns and ensure it was developed for NEPA analysis. Naman added it also includes regular check-ins and a scheduling process once the water year is determined to use the remaining water after April 15. While the proposal is to use Coffee Creek, the hydrology of any other stream could also be used to provide feedback. Flynn asked how large flows would be since they would start before the water year determination. Som explained it would start conservatively and use the February B120 as an estimator. When the method was used based on previous flow years, it did not result in overspending. Flows then get more refined as water conditions progress throughout the year. DeJulio added water is released prior to the water year determination, it's just set at 300 cfs. This method would refine how earlier water volumes are used.

Orcutt asked if it was legal to use the 340 kaf flows under the CVPIA. Beck explained it was being analyzed to mirror management on other tributaries. Orcutt noted one of the alternatives evaluated flows prior to the ROD, which assumes the ROD is deficient in some way and may give the perception there is a surplus of water to allocate. He asked how thoroughly it would be evaluated as it assumes information not available under the guise of adaptive management. If a surplus is validated, how would water be reallocated. Beck explained the alternatives were not finalized yet. Orcutt was concerned about Alternative 1 and the data and reasoning used to support it. Since the ROD was released, the courts have decided that is the water they can use in specific time frames, but the alternatives are shifting that. Bader explained shifting the flows was part of adaptive management under the ROD. DeJulio added that while Alternative 1 was intended as an analog for the Trinity, there may be another approach that would make more sense. Som agreed as the original Trinity River EIS likely compared something like Alternative 1 to the ROD and the ROD was deemed better. Bader thought there could be a better way to explain its purpose as it was intended not as a better approach but as a bookend for the analysis.

Additionally for Alternative 2, the temperature targets were changed based on new information with the location shifted to Lewiston. Peterson added the target was changed after 2021, when they achieved temperature compliance but water in the hatchery was still too warm. The juvenile temperature target shifted from Weitchpec to the North Fork and was changed to a rearing target. The downstream targets also have less influence on dam release temperatures. They are not trying to take them out but trying to correct them by adding other targets.

Orcutt asked if the Proviso 2 flows to Humboldt County were included. Bader thought they included a placeholder for the flows but they will add it to the list to make sure they're documented in the alternatives. Orcutt asked if they picked Coffee Creek or Salmon Creek for the algorithm method as he thought Salmon River may not be the best proxy as it has different listed species and limited water. Som explained they picked Coffee Creek since its upstream of

the watershed and a shared river. There were merits and deficiencies with using it which he was open to discussing later.

For Alternative 3, the minimum pool and diversions would be the same as those in Alternative 2, Instream flows would have a naturalized base flow pattern based on seasonality, day length, and how the river responds, with lower levels in the mid to late summer and higher levels in late winter to early spring. Flows increase in the summer based on the Flow work group's advice and then recede in the winter based on the water year type. This alternative allows for analysis of lower summer base flows in drier years and how to use carryover storage based on the April forecast. Gogan noted that three out of the five water year types would drop summer base flows below 450 cfs. Peterson explained this would be an opportunity for NEPA to look at the potential impacts of doing so.

Orcutt asked how these levels were evaluated against the pre-dam levels the Program is charged with meeting for spring Chinook. In 2019, Hoopa Valley Tribe took preventative action under Proviso 1 to move fish out of the river, which will occur more often in drier years. He wondered about how this option would address those concerns. Rupert explained the alternative was shortened from its original version and would be subject to adaptive management. Overall the alternatives are trying to look at ways to rebalance water use. There are components that are not captured in the summary, such as daily differences in day length that affect how long water could be released at different flow rates. Buxton added that the 450 cfs flow rate was also unnatural for the system as the river is 45% smaller than it was before the dams when base flow could get as low as 80 cfs. The 450 cfs rate was given to help restore salmon. Orcutt thought the Program had a tendency to look at the upper reach for pre-dam conditions but not the lower reaches for scouring and outputs. It is an eddy fishery with the same fish moving to the upper reaches with cumulative effects by the time they get there.

Alternative 4, Risk Informed Operations, manages flows similar to the ROD with a planning minimum of 750 taf. However, if storage is below 750 taf, the volume allocated under the ROD would be reduced by 15% to accelerate storage build-up. Base flow rates would be the same as under the ROD while Lower Klamath and temperature management targets would be the same as the No Action. Bader asked if dry was based on dry or critically dry water years. Gogan asked if the 15% reduction would also affect the 450 cfs base flow as well. Peterson asked if Alternatives 3 and 4 were being considered simultaneously and how they would affect base flows.

DeJuilio noted there were asterisks for the storage volumes outlined in Alternative 2 but not for the other alternatives, noting the 15% reduction should be subject to analysis. He also asked for an explanation of the planning minimum and if it would be the same for all areas in the CVP. Beck explained the asterisks denoted values that could be adjusted with modeling. The 750 taf planning minimum was based on established studies as the new end of September minimum. Planning minimums was a term recommended by the CVP office, but Beck will check with the other offices to confirm. DeJuilio noted that different planning minimums (1.2 maf, 900 maf, and 750 taf) have all been studied in different documents and thought they should all be subject to

analysis. Bader explained since Reclamation cannot control hydrology or conditions, they set operation targets that are subject to conditions and recommended modeling it as well.

Orcutt asked if the EIS would evaluate how to use the 15% reduction and if there was an option to carry over the fishery flows to other times when they would be beneficial. Bader assumed it could stay in the reservoir, be added to the restoration volume at another time, or be diverted. Orcutt noted the law gives priority to fisheries if diversions are held for carry over and asked it be looked at. Bader noted the CVP and TRD processes would be integrated but they would have to look at it.

Lindke asked whether the review was looking for major problems or issues with the alternatives or if they were looking for ways it could be attacked. He also asked what the implications were for the water going to Humboldt County under Proviso 2. Bader explained Humboldt's analysis is ongoing and they could not give Reclamation their plan before they finished this EIS. For now, they will include the volume, but they will not be able to include the details of what they are doing. Lindke noted the way volumes are released has implications on the Trinity and asked what would happen if their methods were not available in time to include in this effort. Bader explained they would prepare a supplemental.

Naman asked if the Trinity-side consultation was still on schedule. Beck explained they are trying to maintain the schedule but it would depend on if they can keep things moving after this review period. Comments can be emailed to Jo Anne Beck (jbeck@usbr.gov).

FY24 Budget Proposal

Peterson reviewed the prioritized list of options for using surplus FY23 funds. Dixon, Lee, and Peterson met with Program partners to discuss both the FY24 budget and how to spend the FY23 funds. The priority list for FY23 has been adjusted a few times, but the current list reflects everyone's input and interests. It is still unclear how much will be included in the surplus funds, but Dixon hopes to have a clearer estimate sometime this summer.

The priorities for the surplus FY23 funds include:

1. **Fund the first stage of the limiting factors analysis.** The current plan for the limiting factors analysis would have all funding under FY24, which would be ambitious. Some of the funds could be used to start developing the analysis study plan.
2. **Design support for Upper Conner Creek, Evans Bar, and Sawmill close out designs.** All three design projects are underway and have used most of their budgeted funds. Using surplus funds would provide additional funds for their work in FY24. Orcutt asked if the Phase II review would be done in time to inform the design teams. Peterson stated it would be ready and one recommendation was to update the design manual, which should be done independent of the current design work on the schedule.
3. **Complete the facies/gravel grain size map for the river.** This task was originally approved by the TMC but was delayed due to questions raised during the SAB review. While the questions have been resolved, the mapping is still incomplete. It was intended

to align with the 2022 topography map and they do not want to delay it longer as it may alter its connection with topography changes in the next year.

4. **Forward fund multi-year agreements.** This could consume the bulk of the remaining funds but could free up additional funds for implementation.
5. **Forward fund gravel processing.** This would also free up funds for implementation and increase the Program's gravel stockpile.

Orcutt asked if there were estimates for the items. Peterson explained estimates are still being resolved but they did have estimates for the first part of the limiting factors analysis and the facies map. The limiting factors analysis is under the Executive Director's discretionary limit, but it has not been approved by the TMC for funding.

Buxton asked if funds could support the hyporheic study as they lost a year due to delays in ordering equipment. They were planning to link the hyporheic study with the macroinvertebrate study to understand ground water dynamics but have missed the opportunity to do so due to the delay. Bader did not want to add additional funding items to the list as the current list were items previously discussed with the TMC members. Gogan asked if that meant the macroinvertebrate study was not done as there was a proposal to use it as part of the winter flow evaluation. Peterson clarified the macroinvertebrate was done but the hyporheic study was delayed. He added that surplus funds would likely be around a million dollars.

Naman asked why the limiting factors analysis estimate was low. Peterson explained the first stage was to develop the study plan, which would be used to figure out how much was needed for the full analysis. The hope is to use FY24 funds for the analysis.

Orcutt felt more comfortable deciding on the funding list if there were allocation percentages or totals they could use rather than a blanket approval for how to use the funds and suggested waiting until Dixon was back. Peterson suggested using totals for the limiting factors study plan and the facies map with percentages for the rest. Bader was not comfortable waiting until September and suggested making a decision at the July meeting. However, he was not okay with rolling the funds into multi-year agreements. Peterson noted that waiting until September could be too late to get funds to NFWF for solicitation as their contracting deadline is in July.

Som is unable to attend the meeting in July and asked if they could move forward on the limiting factors analysis and reconsider the others when Dixon returned.

Som moved to approve funding the limiting factors analysis as the top priority for FY23 surplus funds and defer the decision on the rest of the options for the July TMC Meeting.

Bader seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

The FY24 operating budget is a slight reduction from the FY23 budget, due to a \$300,000 reduction in Reclamation's funding. The program administration budget covers costs for the Weaverville office, the note taker contract (which will change to a new contractor this year), and technical assistance funds for the partners. Costs will remain relatively the same with some incremental increases. Flynn confirmed the amount to Trinity County was the negotiated amount. The total for program administration is just under \$3 million.

The implementation budget covers estimates for FEMA compliance, the River Acres House, and realty acquisitions for landowner agreements. The totals for NEPA compliance and revegetation are currently placeholders as those contracts will end and they will look for a new contractor this year. Other planning support includes support for BLM and summer aerial photography. Design support is currently zeroed depending on whether it will be funded using surplus FY23 funds. Construction is used as the budget balancer and will be used to cover the first year at Upper Conner Creek. If funds are needed to cover other items, it will come from here, while surplus funds will be added. There are other construction related costs also included but no value engineering studies are needed. The total budget for implementation is just under \$5.6 million.

The Science budget covers costs for science personnel who work at the Program office along with funding for peer reviews, full SAB participation, and USFS stream gaging. All current status and trend monitoring projects have been funded. All costs include 3% incremental increases, not negotiated costs. Effectiveness monitoring covers special topics for consideration. Nothing has been approved yet, but members should plan on funding for the limiting factors analysis once the funding is estimated for stage 2. Dixon requested the TMC leave the line item blank to prevent the TMC from limiting the analysis needed for contracting. The total needed for the facies mapping is listed under FY23, but may be shifted if surplus funds are not designated.

Discussion

Orcutt asked how the increases and totals for technical assistance were calculated. Peterson explained some were renegotiated while others were incremental costs increases. Lee added some may reflect existing multi-year agreements.

DeJuilio noted that funds needed for the Upper Conner Creek design team should be resolved soon as delaying them could result in no construction project for FY24. Lee explained closing out the design is a priority. Bader agreed to address it by July.

Orcutt asked why effectiveness monitoring was unallocated in FY24. Peterson explained the projects in the previous year budgets were single year projects. The priority for FY24 is the limiting factors analysis. TMC members should anticipate a cost there, but they do not know the total until the study plan is completed. Additional discussion will occur later in the year. The total will come from the green construction budget along with any other cost savings. Bader would rather use the surplus rather than send it back to Washington and suggested they could also park the funds in the construction budget.

Lee asked if the funds for the River Acres House could also serve as a balancer as they were making progress on the purchase but needed additional funds outside of the budget. The current offer would require an additional \$275,000. They need to work with Realty on the amount. Kormos noted there could be other budget line items that require balancing with TMC decisions.

Kormos moved for the TMC to approve the proposed FY24 budget with the understanding that future decisions may be needed to balance the budget.

Gogan seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Bader asked the TMC to send him topics for the September TMC meeting. He may also reach out about scheduling a special meeting between now and July to discuss how to spend the surplus funds. Currently, the next teleconference meeting is scheduled for July 20 unless members provide an alternative date.

Adjourn Day 2 at 3:30 pm.