Draft Meeting Notes

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

June 15-16, 2020
WebEx Video Conference

Day 1, June 15, 2022 12:30pm

TMC Members

Primary	Representative Seat
Justin Ly	NOAA Fisheries, Chair
Don Bader	Bureau of Reclamation, Vice Chair
Michael Dixon	Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director
Tanya Sommer[1]	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Mike Orcutt	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Brett Kormos	California Department of Water Resources/Fish & Wildlife
Tim Hayden	Yurok Tribe
Keli McElroy	U.S. Forest Service
Liam Gogan	Trinity County

Others in attendance: James Lee, Chad Abel, Brandt Gutermuth, Todd Buxton (TRRP) Wade Sinnen, Ken Lindke (CDFW), Radley Ott (CDWR), Justin Alvarez, Karl Seitz (Hoopa Valley Tribe), Nick Som, Bill Pinnix (USFWS), Elizabeth Hadley (Reclamation), Seth Naman, Roman Pittman (NOAA Fisheries), Kyle De Juilio, Chris Laskodi (Yurok Tribe), Chad Smith (Headwaters), Darcy Pickard (ESSA), Emily Thorn, Jason St. Pierre (Ironwood Consulting), Tom Stokely, Russ Giuntini

Notes: Sabrina Kleinman (EPP)

[1]Som served as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife representative for Day 2.

List of Motions

Liam Gogan moved to approve the June TMC Quarterly Meeting agenda as posted to the website.
Tanya Sommer seconded the motion.
Motion passed unanimously

Tim Hayden moved to approve the March TMC Meeting Notes.
Liam Gogan seconded the motion.
Motion passed unanimously

Tim Hayden moved for the TRRP to participate in the upcoming NCRWQCB Triennial Basin Plan review of the Trinity River water temperature objectives *in order to recommend Reclamation adopt appropriate temperature standards*.
Brett Kormos seconded the motion.
Michael Orcutt offered a friendly amendment (in italics).
Tim Hayden and Brett Kormos approved the amendment.
Keith Groves made a competing motion for the TRRP to participate in the upcoming NCRWQCB Triennial Basin Plan Review of the Trinity River water temperature objectives.
Ly seconded the competing motion.
The competing motion passed with six votes in favor and two abstentions. Reclamation and Hoopa Valley abstained.

Kyle DeJuilio moved that TMC support the inclusion of the objectives presented by the Fish Work Group in the Science Plan and that TMC members vet the targets with their technical staff prior to that Science Plan being presented.

Motions (cont.)

Nick Som seconded the motion.
Motion passed with seven votes in favor and one opposed. Hoopa Valley voted against.

Nick Som moved that TMC support the inclusion of the objectives presented by the Flow Work Group in the Science Plan and that TMC members vet the targets with their technical staff prior to that Science Plan being presented.
Don Bader seconded the motion.
Motion passed unanimously.

Kyle De Juilio moved that TMC support the inclusion of the objectives presented by the Physical Work Group in the Science Plan and that TMC members vet the targets with their technical staff prior to that Science Plan being presented.
Don Bader seconded the motion.
Motion passed unanimously.

Nick Som moved that TMC support the inclusion of the objectives presented by the Riparian and Aquatic Ecology Work Group in the Science Plan and that TMC members vet the targets with their technical staff prior to that Science Plan being presented.
Brett Kormos seconded the motion.
Motion passed unanimously

Liam Gogan moved to increase the budget for Trinity County by $89k in FY23 to result in a total of $186,313.
Michael Orcutt seconded the motion and offered a friendly amendment *to add funding for the Lower Trinity and Lower Klamath creel Surveys for $200,000. The funding offset by a reduction in the $500,000 proposed for the Science RFP in the draft budget.*
Liam Gogan accepted the amendment.
Tim Hayden made a competing motion to fund Trinity County's additional $89,000 in FY23 and fund the Lower Klamath and Lower Trinity creel surveys for $200,000 with funds coming from the bed surface grain mapping project, but the project could and should be considered in the FY23 RFP process, and the balance coming from the watershed restoration grant program.
Brett Kormos seconded the competing motion.
Liam Gogan made a friendly amendment to the competing motion to drop the reduction in watershed funding in favor of reducing the construction budget accordingly. Brett Kormos and Tim Hayden accepted the friendly amendment.
The competing motion passed unanimously.

Action Items

- Lee will identify which synthesis reports have not been presented to the TMC.
- Alvarez will organize a site visit to Supply Creek for the September TMC Meeting.
- Hayden will coordinate the in-person meeting at Weitchpec for September.

Welcome and Introductions

Ly opened the meeting with instructions for participation and role call of all participants. He noted the meeting was abbreviated due to a Refinements meeting scheduled the day before and morning of the first day of the June TMC Quarterly meeting.

Approval of Agenda

Gogan moved to approve the June TMC Meeting agenda as posted.

Sommer seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Approval of March TMC Meeting Minutes

Hayden moved to approve the March TMC Meeting notes.

Gogan seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Non-Agenda Comments

Public Forum

No comments submitted.

TMC Entities

No comments submitted.

Program Updates

Executive Director's Report

Organizational Updates

Veronica Yates started as the riparian ecologist with the Hoopa Valley Tribe. She will transition to the Weaverville office next month. The Program was unsuccessful in recruiting the civil engineering tech as both candidates withdrew from consideration citing wildfire risks and cost of living concerns. The vacancy will affect construction monitoring over the summer as the Program will need to cover the task with existing staff, which will affect other workloads. The Program has also been unsuccessful in recruiting for the Program secretary position. They had two candidates for consideration, but neither accepted. The position was readvertised, and the Program is pursuing an offer with a new candidate. The Outreach Specialist position has not been advertised as it is further down the hiring queue for Reclamation.

Budget

New Interagency agreements have been finalized for USFS, California Dept. of Water Resources, and NOAA Fisheries and the Program is still negotiating its agreement with Trinity County. Their grant expires at the end of June. The Program is working on AFAs for tribal entities, which are hung up on both sides. On the Program side, there is currently a vacancy for the Self-Determination Specialist role in Sacramento. This could affect the AFAs, which have $2.5 million in construction funding waiting to be finalized and approved for the season.

Gogan noted there is a new person managing the negotiations for the County and Gogan will meet with him soon to get the concerns addressed. Dixon noted that the county had submitted a budget which would increase in their request by almost double to support a county employee who would be assigned to the program. TMC would need to approve the increase. Dixon will present on the full proposed FY23 budget on Day 2.

Watershed Grants

The pre-proposal solicitation closed in April and the grant committee received 5 submissions. Four were invited to submit full proposals. The application review committee met on Monday to review the proposals and three were selected for award. The entities will be notified shortly. The grant program will award close to $820,000 in grant support, with over $100,000 left over. The committee funded projects that met the highest priority needs on the Trinity River. The remaining funds will be rolled over for future grants.

Phase II Review Contract

The Program awarded the contract to Inter-Fluve for the Phase II Implementation Review. Their proposal came in just below the government's estimate. Inter-Fluve does a lot of work in the Pacific Northwest, Midwest, and Northeast on stream restoration and project evaluation. The IDT and ancillary staff from the Work Groups are scheduled to meet with Inter-Fluve on June 28-29 to review the project timeline and outline deliverables. The team will then conduct roadside and floating site visits. The Program may need some additional support for the float visits from Program partners. Inter-Fluve is also lining-up interviews and visits with other partners and entities in August. The target for the final report is May 2023, which may be overly aggressive so Dixon anticipates a no cost time extension.

Implementation Update

Abel reported the Hoopa Valley Design Team finished the 30% design for Upper Connor Creek, which is under review by the Design Work Group. There are still some contracting issues with Oregon Gulch, but Abel was confident the funds will be available by the end of the fiscal year. All permits are in place, including the floodplain development permit with conditions from the County and permit access along Highway 299 from Sky Ranch to Eagle Rock.

The team is developing the EA for new proposed gravel augmentation sites. Public scoping was completed on April 17. Currently they are developing descriptions of the new proposed sites above Indian Creek as part of Chapter 2. They are also working on a programmatic EA for watershed projects. Dixon decided to pursue the programmatic document based on a similar EA developed for the Six Rivers by the USFS. They are aiming to conduct scoping by July 8. The approach would assist potential watershed grant applications who may be required to have an EA in place for any work done on federal lands. Currently 77-78% of the Trinity Watershed is owned by BLM and the USFS. The EA would be completed in a year once formally started.

Outreach

The TRRP Facebook page is up and running. Dixon and Peterson have been creating posts.

The Program held its Day at the Wetlands on May 19. A number of staff attended and ran 6-7 learning stations. Students from Lewiston Schools attended. RCD coordinated an invasive plant clean up on March 19, with several staff attending. RCD and TRRP hosted a River Day event on June 6 at Coffee Creek School with similar activities as the Day at the Wetlands.

Science on Tap has been a popular event with a slight decline last month due to conflicting events. The event is held every fourth Wednesday at 6 pm at the Trinity County Brewing Company. Dr. Eric Knapp is scheduled to present later this month.

Gutermuth organized meetings with the Ironwood consultants and BLM archaeologists to visit the new proposed gravel augmentation sites on May 16. Only one landowner did not attend.

Upcoming events include the Trinity River Clean-up on June 25 in Douglas City. The RCD's Facebook page has registration information. There are three river excursions planned in July with Weaverville Summer Camp. The Public Float is scheduled for July 30, from Indian Creek to Lorenz Gulch. Space is first come first served. The Program is planning for 8 rafts, which will accommodate 40 people from the public. There will be one TRRP staff on each raft and Abel is looking for one volunteer from a partner agency to assist.

Science Update

Three reports completed peer review in the last quarter and are now in final edits. (1) The synthesis report on Trinity River water temperatures, (2) the synthesis report on juvenile salmonid habitats and (3) a draft report on temperature regimes and juvenile chinook salmon growth. Lee noted Buxton should be noted as a co-author for the temperature synthesis report. Reports currently in peer review include (1) a tracer rock report for gravel augmentation monitoring and (2) streambed disturbance and redd scour risks, and (3) the synthesis report on coarse sediment storage. The synthesis report on juvenile chinook abundance is also in final edits along with Peterson's report on periphyton monitoring, which will be the first study characterizing periphyton in the Trinity River.

Other reports to note are the 30% design report for Upper Connor Creek, the final design report for Dutch Creek, and the Objectives and Targets report from the Work Groups. The Objectives and Targets report will be reviewed later in the meeting for TMC approval of the objectives for the Science Plan.

Work Group Briefings

Fish – Lee – The group met in early May to discuss their objectives and targets and made a few recommendations to the IDT. They recommend (1) removing the Weitchpec water temperature target and (2) developing targets for Lewiston Dam for adult salmon during holding, spawning, and egg incubation periods. They submitted a memo to the IDT for consideration.

Design – Lee – The group has worked on updates to the Upper Connor Creek design and cost estimates and timelines for Oregon Gulch with final costs for FY22 completed soon. They are also working on a 60% design for Sawmill. The Sky Ranch design is on pause as they wait on a land transfer between BLM and USFS. Dixon noted Congress legislated the USFS would divest a parcel near the Trinity County Jail to the Public Utilities District, and the Public Utilities District would divest a parcel near Sky Ranch to the BLM. The transfer is delayed due to requirements for each agency.

A preliminary concept designed was developed for Evans Barr and a post implementation report for Chapman Ranch Phase B is being developed as they work on irrigation and vegetation maintenance. The Design Work Group has meetings scheduled for July 13 and October 5.

Watershed – Abel – did not meet formally but did gather as part of the review committee for the watershed grants. They have a meeting scheduled for July 27 to discuss the grant review process and the Watershed programmatic EA. They are also seeking presentation from the current watershed grantees.

No meetings were conducted for Flow, Physical, or the Riparian and Aquatic Ecology Work Groups.

IDT – Lee – met twice the prior week to discuss the objectives and targets report and the FY23 Science Plan. The Science Plan Document Committee (SPDC) has identified several science priorities, which overlap with the IDT's priorities. They are incorporating them in the current plan to use for the upcoming year.

Lee updated the synthesis report schedule. The synthesis report on juvenile chinook from USFWS was finalized recently. The cohort reconstruction report is in progress as Lindke works on updating a model to analyze the data. The final date for the channel complexity and fine sediment reports are uncertain. The channel complexity report is close but needed to be reorganized. The fine sediment report has been delayed by staff turnover, with Hoopa Valley and McBain Associates recently taking a more active role. The large wood management report is still a few months from completion with peer review planned for later in the calendar year. The flow synthesis report is also still in progress. Lee noted all finished reports are posted to the TRRP data port and a separate site specifically for the synthesis reports.

Agency Comments

Ly asked which synthesis reports had not been presented to the TMC. Lee explained all the reports were presented as part of the science symposium, but he would check which ones had not been presented to the TMC.

Hayden asked for the estimated completion date for the flow synthesis report. Lee explained the authors have not provided one yet but have been unable due to busy schedules. Hayden requested a status update at the next TMC meeting.

CVP Operations

Bader reported on the CVP operations for the last quarter. The end of March were the worst conditions seen since the dams were built, with conservative forecasts tracking at 99% to 90%. Reclamation has prepared its projected storage forecast for the Trinity Reservoir and Shasta Lake. April, May, and the first part of June had a good amount of rain and cooler temperatures. Comparing the end of April to end of May elevations, Shasta increased by 20 KAF and Trinity raised 50 KAF for the end of September and October projections. Reclamation is working on the June forecast, which will look a little better.

The forecast still includes the 50 KAF placeholder for flow augmentation releases for the Lower Klamath. Dixon is organizing the initial kick-off meeting with the technical team for mid-July. They are hoping for a good return year without a disease outbreak. Reclamation has dialed back diversions through Carr and is in good shape with its current plan. They will continue discussion on interim measures with NOAA Fisheries for the remainder of the summer and fall to see if there is more use in November and December for coho releases.

Reinitiation of Consultation on CVP

Dave Mooney will lead the reinitiation efforts. Reclamation decided to do separate consultations for the Sacramento and Trinity sides. On the Trinity side, the consultation team will work with all partners and tribes to prepare a proposed action. The proposed action will result in a Biological Assessment for NMFS to review. If NMFS decides jeopardy is avoided, they can meet those needs under the updated operations plan. If not, NMFS will provide a reasonable alternative for consideration, which would be considered in any NEPA review of the proposed action. The commitment is to do a separate consultation, and the proposed action provided in a Biological Assessment will be based on discussion with partners.

TMC/Agency Discussion

Ly noted that if the partners develop a proposed action that changes the 2000 ROD, it should trigger new NEPA as Reclamation would not have an associated NEPA document for the action. Bader was unsure but explained they will determine if the developed action requires a change in the ROD. Ly clarified that a new NEPA document is not based on whether NMFS' BiOp results in a jeopardy or adverse modification conclusion. Bader explained Reclamation was not there yet and they did not want to be pre-decisional on what would be proposed. He suggested having Mooney join for the next meeting for an update. Naman thought it could be unrealistic to not plan on doing NEPA since it had been 22-23 years since the ROD. It is uncommon for a NEPA document to apply for so long, given changes in the environment and how the TRRP does things. He advised against planning on avoiding NEPA, but noted it was a Reclamation decision.

Sinnen asked who would lead the Trinity consultation. Bader said the Delta Bay Office and Dixon would be involved from Reclamation. They are also bringing on several new staff to assist. Sinnen asked if anything would be different from the effort completed a few years ago for reconsultation. Bader explained the last reinitiation was started in 2016 but the new administration put a short timeline on the effort with a decision by DOI to just consult on the Sacramento. For this effort, Reclamation is advocating including the Trinity, with agreement from DOI. Acting Commissioner Polumbo signed the response letter that was sent to those on the call the day before. There is a joint response that does include the declaration for separate consultations and several interim actions for this year's operations.

Ly noted a new action would require a new NEPA document and agreed with Naman that using the existing ROD may not be advisable since the NEPA analysis was old. He advised updating the ROD and NEPA. Sinnen noted the ROD was more specific to flow volumes on the Trinity and asked if it addressed water sent over the hill and whether there may be significant changes.

Such changes could trigger NEPA as the 2000 ROD was not specific to those flows as it was more focused on restoration volumes. Ly explained Reclamation has prepared an NOI for the reinitiation and note the divisions would be encompassed in that process, however, the decision to include Trinity was up to Reclamation.

Sinnen asked if the reinitiation would focus on just restoration flows or overall operations. Bader explained they had not determined that, but he would report back. Mooney emphasized the proposed action would be based on input from all sides and no decision has been made. Ly asked when Reclamation would meet with the partners to develop the action. Sinnen noted there was a kick-off meeting for the Central Valley portion scheduled and the Trinity portion would likely be soon. Dixon added he had a call with the Bay Delta Office on scheduling in the next few days.

Gogan asked for an update on the chillers requested for the hatchery and a budget estimate. Bader reported they installed the chillers at Livingston Stone Hatchery, and he requested funds to install them at Trinity Hatchery too. He was unable to provide an estimate but noted each chiller was around $20,000. They plan to install the same chillers at Trinity and have awarded a major contract for the chillers at around $9 million. They are mobilizing for installation now and plan to have the chillers installed by mid-July as they anticipate similar bad conditions as last year.

Naman asked if Reclamation was planning to provide egg cooling for Chinook and coho. Bader referred Naman to Derek Rupert. Naman explained NMFS was concerned about temperatures for chinook salmon and coho salmon egg viability, noting that recent changes in reservoir elevations, even with the added 50 KAF, could exhaust the cold-water pool where temperatures are less than 50 ºF. Naman will follow-up with Rupert with his concerns for coho and Chinook salmon eggs.

BREAK

FY23 Science Plan

Lee presented an overview of the IDT's proposed FY23 Science Plan. The TRRP has been working on long-term programmatic science planning along with the FY23 Plan. The goal is to bridge science planning between the two efforts moving forward along with an updated FY23 solicitation process for short-term projects. The plan includes the core status and trend monitoring along with other annually funded science activities. Flex funding will be used to address uncertainty-driven investigations, modeling updates, and work group activities.

The Refinements Science Plan is in its final stages and many members on the Science Program Drafting Committee are also on the IDT, which provides an opportunity to use part of the Science Plan to identify science priorities in the annual science planning process. Status and trend monitoring will be the same as in FY21 and FY22, with budgets adjusted for inflation. The Science Plan will also review these activities, which was last done in FY18. The intent is to review them every 5 years. Other monitoring work includes the annual aerial imagery collection included in the Implementation budget, and stream gaging support for USGS.

There are a few model updates proposed for FY23. The hydraulic model update was funded in FY22 but will be completed in FY23. The IDT and the Executive Director also recommended funding a project to develop a bed surface grain size map. The SAB praised this project but recommended funding only after edits were made. The map would provide a roughness layer for the hydraulic model and would be used to predict bed entrainment and bed change analysis. The RBM-10 model is also proposed and was funded in the FY22 Science funding approved in March. Currently, the model limits what flows they can look at as it does not model temperature below 300 cfs. The update would use estimates of tributary flows to estimate mainstem flows to improve temperature predictions at the full range of flows. The historic droughts in recent years have changed tributary conditions, which need to be updated.

The uncertainty driven activities will be based on those identified in the Refinements Science Plan. The IDT is working on an RFP to solicit projects for research and modeling needs to address these key uncertainties with a proposed budget of $500,000. The Refinements Science Plan has a draft solicitation process for future projects, but the process runs for 12-14 months. For FY23, the IDT developed an interim 4-month process to provide short-term funding for the year. The interim process would not be as thorough as the one in the Refinements Science Plan but would still provide quality science.

No projects are proposed for the Design and Watershed Work Groups. The Fish Work Group will develop some RFPs for the status and trend projects and limiting factors analysis, which is a key program priority in the Refinements Science Plan. The Flow Work Group will continue its hydrograph analysis and work on a winter flow variability proposal for FY23. The Physical Work Group will work on corridor delineation and selecting and planning for new gravel augmentation sites. The Riparian and Aquatic Ecology Work Group will do similar work as the Fish Work group by developing ecological and temperature studies. The IDT will work on improving the Objectives and Targets report, addressing some overlaps between disciplines. They will also prioritize uncertainties and develop problem statements for the Science Plan, implement the science planning process for FY24, and participate in the channel rehabilitation review with Inter-Fluve. Finally, the IDT will provide input for the long-term Science Plan, as they work on the annual Science Plan in tandem.

Lee explained funding for science changes annually with some years not having much discretionary funding and the absence of formal process to fund short-term projects. This year, the IDT developed a short-term process. They tried a similar process last year, but found it was a bit too fast as they tried to fund projects as quickly as possible. While the Refinements Science Plan outlines a one-year process, the IDT has developed an accelerated interim process. Topics and research questions will be developed and ranked for the solicitation package. Entities will develop proposal, which the TMC will consider at the September meeting to fund at the start of the fiscal year. The SAB will also review the projects and determine if the studies address the IDT priorities and if the investigation plans meet the study objectives.

Because of the timeline for the process, funding will only go through the TRRP partners due to the difficulties of federal contracting. The one-year process will allow external applicants an opportunity to apply in the future. While funding is proposed for program partners, partners are not restricted from working with outside entities and are encouraged to do so. However, this year's timeline does not offer a pathway for external entities to directly use the allocated funding. The hope is the one-year process could be used in FY24, if the plan is approved by the TMC.

The goal is to fund projects earlier in the year. This last year, funding wasn't approved until March, with some entities not receiving funds until the fourth quarter. They also wanted to minimize conflicts of interest, since that was an important issue. The process addresses the concern by using the SAB as external reviewers to ensure projects address the science priorities while maintaining the TRRP's responsibility in setting research priorities and funding projects.

Hayden asked if the IDT would use the new Objectives and Targets report to set priorities based on key uncertainties. Lee explained the objectives and targets were not the same as the uncertainty priorities. While they are related, they are separate from the science priorities.

Under the interim process:

1. Each IDT member proposes one research topic or question based on an uncertainty in the Refinements Science Plan. (May to June)
2. IDT refines and prioritizes the topics into a ranked list based on their benefit to adaptive management decision-making (June). This step addresses conflicts of interest as the list is ranked on topic rather than entities potentially receiving funding.
3. The Science Coordinator creates the solicitation based on ranked questions and sends it to the TRRP partners (July).
4. IDT receives investigation plans, which are reviewed for completeness. They will work with the PIs to maximize funds (August).
5. SAB reviews the proposals and recommends either to fund, do not fund, or fund with revisions. If there are multiple projects for the same topic, the SAB will recommend the best fit.
6. Funding requests are submitted to the TMC in September based on initial IDT topic rankings and SAB reviews. Only projects the SAB indicates to fund or fund with revisions will be included. Projects will be funded based on IDT rankings. Conditional funding will be provided to those identified by the SAB as fund with revisions.

TMC/Agency Discussion

Sommer asked if funding was limited to TRRP partners due to the lengthy contracting process. Lee agreed and explained the science planning process would be open to external entities under the Refinements Science Plan but would take 13 months. If they tried to apply the process now, they would end up funding projects halfway through the next fiscal year, which may result in cutting funding for projects. The IDT plans to start the FY24 planning process this summer to allow opportunities for external entities. Sommer asked if the SAB was clear on their role in the process and if they were only providing the three potential funding statuses. Lee explained a

project would not be funded if the SAB did not concur with their proposal revisions. The SAB will be gatekeepers so they only fund quality science proposals. The SAB does not want to hold up the Program but they also don't want to approve junk proposals. They are fair and accurate and willing to make those recommendations. Ly asked if the SAB would not be ranking proposals, which resulted in issues this past year. Lee explained only the IDT rank the topics to reduce potential conflicts of interest.

Gogan noted the Browns Creek Revitalization project, which had a steep price tag. Todd Buxton is part of the TRRP and Cindy Buxton is part of that project and there is a perceived conflict of interest, which could apply to some projects here. Dixon explained the project did not relate to this process but that neither Todd nor Cindy were involved in the ranking of proposals, which would be where conflict of interest exists. Lee noted Som's definition of conflict of interest which occurs when a group of people compete for money while also providing input on how that money is distributed. Being part of a project doesn't create the conflict unless they determine how money changes hands.

Sommer noted it would be prudent to start the FY24 funding process soon due to the contracting concern and asked if the overlap with the FY23 funding would make it doable. Lee explained they plan to start the FY24 process in late August to September. There will be an overlap but starting early should help it run smoother in the future. Sommers noted that the highest ranked topic may not have the strongest proposals. Lee agreed and explained having the IDT rank the proposals opens up potential conflicts of interest. The SAB, in turn, is reluctant to rank proposals and make the funding decisions for the TRRP because they do not see that as their role. Having external entities decide their priorities is also not desirable. Lee anticipates, however, it would be rare for a good topic to result in a poor proposal. He anticipated the proposals would likely improve once the process was opened to external entities. He also noted it would be hard to standardize rankings for different topics. Sommers noted that if the entities know which topics are ranked higher, they could propose a mediocre project knowing it would be ranked higher and influencing how projects were funded. Lee expected the SAB would catch such projects in their funding recommendations.

Kormos asked if the rankings would be in the proposal solicitation and if it would be publicly available. He suggested not making the ranking available. Lee explained that as long as the solicitation stays among project partners, the partner's IDT members would know the rankings. The only ones who wouldn't know would be external entities, which gives an advantage to entities with staff on the IDT. Kormos suggested having the IDT members submit their rankings blindly, so they do not know how the rankings are compiled. Dixon and Lee agreed with the approach and recommended adding it into the 13-month process, so the only people who know the project rankings are those on the review committee.

Gogan left the meeting and Groves represented Trinity County for the rest of Day 1.

Letter to Water Board re: Triennial Basin Plan Review

Tom Stokely presented his request to the TMC to draft a letter to the North Coast Regional Water Board (NCRWQCB) for its Triennial Basin Plan Review. Stokely asked the TMC to make a motion to participate in the review, specifically requesting an update to the water quality temperature objectives for the Trinity River.

In the late 1980s, Trinity County was looking for ways to better protect the river. They asked the Water Board to consider temperature objectives for the river. In 1989 and 1990, Trinity County along with other TMC agencies petitioned the Board to adopt Trinity River temperature objectives as part of the Basin Plan. Those objectives were approved and eventually approved by the U.S. EPA in 1992 as part of the CWA standards for the river.

The current objectives establish a 60ºF objective from July to September 15 in Douglas City to protect spring Chinook and a 56ºF from September 15 to October 1 to protect spawning spring Chinook and in the North Fork from October 1 to December 31. The original temperature objectives were based on a laboratory study based on ideal conditions. However, new analyses indicate that the 56ºF standard is not protective enough and should be lowered to 53ºF. It's also been discovered that the standard is also not protective of coho salmon as there is still significant pre-spawn mortality at the hatchery at 56ºF.

Stokely proposed the TMC, and member agencies write to the Water Board noting the current standard not protective of coho or Chinook along with updated standards based on the most recent analyses. This review typically happens every three years but was delayed due to COVID restrictions. Stokely presented his suggested updated chart of temperature objectives with a new lower water temperature of 53.5ºF at Douglas City and North Fork and a second drop to 50ºF from November 1 to December 31 from Lewiston to the North Fork and 55.4ºF from April 1 to June 30 in the same segment. He noted the Flow Work Group is also working on recommendations with a target of 48ºF from January 1 to March 1.

The current temperature objectives were set in 1989 and were originally set as waste discharge standards, which caused issues with Reclamation. As a result, the Board implemented the temperature objectives in the Basin Plan through water rights rather than as waste discharge standards as those standards carry daily fines for releases outside the standard. Currently, WO-95 includes some temperature protections for the Trinity River which run from September 15 to the end of the year at Douglas City or the North Fork, but that is only for temperatures that result from Trinity River operations and does not include the 60ºF objective.

Overall, WO-95 is out of date. The temperature objectives are implemented by those receiving the water rights, but the current objectives are not protective of Chinook and coho. Stokely proposed the TMC and member agencies submit comments supporting a change to the temperature objectives as part of the Basin Plan review. He is proposing this now so stakeholders and the TRRP can develop its recommendation. He thanked Ly for his letter supporting protection of the Trinity River.

TMC/Agency Discussion

Naman thought the Triennial Review would be good to update the temperature objectives through the State's process. He thought the proposed temperatures for the fall were fine but noted the temperature objectives should be at Lewiston and should incorporate temperature, time of year, and flows from Lewiston Dam. The current location of the temperature objectives makes the river a ubiquitous cold stretch with little thermal diversity, no pool stratification, and with flows higher in the summer than the winter and spring, which is out of sync with the goal of restoring form and function of the river. He suggested reviewing the locations and flows closely. For example, spring Chinook are a concern from July to September at Douglas City, but the Program should look at other ways to make the river habitable while keeping the flow releases and temperatures aligned with the goal of restoring form and function. Stokely suggested developing starting temperatures instead of ending temperatures for the objectives.

Hayden asked for a timeline for review process and how the TMC would participate. Stokely explained the Board would receive comments later in the year. For the temperature objectives to get on the priority list, a considerable number of comments should be submitted to make it priority, particularly if they are coming from various agencies. The comment period would be over the next year, opening in the fall and running over the next few months. Changing the temperatures, however, may take some time as the previous standards were started in 1989 and were not finalized by U.S. EPA until 1992. Hayden asked if the new temperatures would be considered for the reconsultation process.

Orcutt requested a presentation at a future TMC meeting to discuss what authority is delegated to the State for Clean Water Act permit compliance. He noted that the Regional Board's objectives don't equate to authority for the CVP temperature standards. A presentation could give the TMC an idea of what Reclamation's responsibilities are as the permittee. He thought having Reclamation petition for the changes would elevate the issue. Overall, the Trinity River is out of compliance according to the law and its important to underscore Trinity River's water quality before it is diverted from the Basin. He pointed to the reservoir levels and the current emergency Plan. The California Salmon Council and the Sportsmen's Alliance submitted an alternative proposal to reduce storage by half, but none have been long-term plans.

Hayden made a motion for the TRRP to participate in the upcoming NCRWQCB Triennial Basin Plan review of the Trinity River temperature objectives.

Kormos seconded the motion.

Sinnen asked how the objectives were enforced versus mandates. Stokely explained that until the objectives are required under a water rights order, they're not required by Reclamation. Ly added that the objectives in the Basin Plan would be a first step before they can be used as a water rights criteria. Stokely asked if they could be enforced by NMFS for species protection. Ly explained their reconsultation's temperature analysis and any associated temperature requirements would be based on the best available science and not on whether the Water Board has approved certain temperature objectives.

Orcutt thought meeting the temperature objectives was Reclamation's responsibility as the permittee. He suggested having the TRRP inform the Reclamation as the permittee to act on the information.

> **Orcutt made a friendly amendment to the end that: *in order to recommend Reclamation adopt appropriate temperature standards.***
>
> **Hayden and Kormos approved the amendment.**

Bader was unsure why TMC was voting on the participation of the TRRP since any entity could participate. He noted he would need to abstain as he could not commit Reclamation to an action. Ly explained Stokely was asking for TRRP participation in the review process based on Work Group recommendations. Stokely explained he would work with the Work Groups on a recommendation to present to the TMC. The TMC could submit the letter based on these recommendations. Other entities could also participate to provide additional support for the request. Ly explained the current request is for the TMC to direct the Work Groups to develop a recommendation on water temperatures. The TMC would then write a letter to the Regional Water Board at a later date. The TMC could vote on the letter then. Dixon explained the TRRP staff are restricted by their respective agencies on what work to do, but the TMC can direct work through motions and directives.

Orcutt thought the amendment was critical as Reclamation would be responsible for meeting the new standards and the TMC should direct the recommendation to the Regional Director. Reclamation should value the product that comes out of the review as it is based on the best available science. Ly thought the amendment spoke more to the proposed letter. Ly asked if Bader would still abstain if the amendment was removed. Bader explained he would be happy to see the TRRP take action on the new temperature objectives but would still have to abstain as it could overstep his bounds as the Reclamation representative. Stokely agreed as the request wasn't for a recommendation to Reclamation. Once the recommendation is made to the Board, the TMC could ask Reclamation to consider it.

> **Groves made a competing motion for the TRRP to participate in the upcoming NCRWQCB Triennial Basin Plan Review of the Trinity River water temperature objectives.**
>
> **Ly seconded the competing motion.**
>
> **The competing motion passed with six votes in favor and two abstentions. Reclamation and Hoopa Valley abstained.**

Fisheries and Spring Chinook Listing Updates

UKTR Spring Chinook Listing and Management Update

In June 2021, the Fish and Game Commission decided to list spring Chinook in the Upper Klamath and Trinity Rivers. The Commission was originally petitioned in 2018, which triggered a CDFW review, which found the claim had merit. In February 2019, CDFW found the listing

may be warranted and conveyed candidate status to the population. It also triggered a status review by the Department. In March 2021, the Department submitted its status review which did not recommend listing under the ESU definition. In the aggregate, CDFW found spring Chinook relatively robust with spring populations listed as ecotypes of the larger Chinook complex. Reductions are due to habitat loss from dams, disease, and river activities. However, the Commission voted to list the UKTR spring Chinook under CESA in June. Their ruling noted the Commission did not need to recognize the federal ESU information and could list individual populations as warranted.

Spring Chinook are a specific homozygous type with only two spring genes in the GREB1L region. This listing is for the only pure spring Chinook population. The formal findings were filed with the Offices of Administrative Law in January 2022 and went into effect January 24, 2022.

When the species was given candidate status, it triggered several actions and protection, including emergency regulations that superseded the printed regulations for fishermen. The protected area was mostly in the Upper Trinity, where adults spawn in October. The actions also cut anglers off from fall Chinook fishing. CDFW conducted outreach to find a compromise to avoid complete fishing closures. Three public meetings were held, where they gathered input and research data to provide opportunities for spring Chinook fishing. The new regulations were adopted by the Commission and allow fishing from July 1 to August 14 on the Lower Klamath and from July 1 to August 31 on the mainstem Trinity for spring Chinook.

On the Klamath, genetic information suggests the fish caught after July are primarily heterozygous and since the Commission is trying to protect pure spring run fish, there are some opportunities to protect the more homozygous spring run. On the Upper Trinity, all types of spring Chinook are present from July through August, but the population is the most robust in the Klamath Basin and is also supplemented by hatchery fish.

The listing is unique as this is one of the only areas in the State where a species a listed by the State but not federally. Beginning in January, actions in UKTR habitat may need California ESA incidental take coverage. If a permit is required, there would be species specific avoidance and mitigation measures to reduce impacts. The CDFW is hoping to use the “Cutting the Green Tape” initiative to reduce the costs and time to permit restoration projects. CDFW is still in internal discussions on how to implement the measures. CDFW is also drafting a document on the geographic extent, time, and area of avoidance for CESA and will also consider how it will address research permits. There is difficulty as it is hard to differentiate spring from fall Chinook based on appearance. There are run time and spawning differences that may go into the minimization or avoidance measures. With juveniles, however, there is no way to determine if a juvenile is spring or fall. Most mitigations will probably look at known spawning, emergent, and rearing times. CDFW is hoping to find an alternative path for permitting the TRRP that doesn’t involve an onerous or time-consuming process. They understand the value of the TRRP for improving habitat and do not want to restrict actions that are beneficial.

There have been some updates on the federal process. If NMFS lists spring Chinook, the listing would return to a dual listing, which would switch permitting to the federal agency. Orcutt asked for NMFS' deadline to respond on the federal listing. Ly explained NMFS was late in their petition response. They did put in a 90-day review stating the petition to list was warranted, but the agency has not made a final decision. Orcutt thought NMFS should respond, as a federal listing for spring run Chinook would affect fishery and hatchery management along with current reintroduction efforts in Oregon on the Upper Klamath. He noted the impacts from the coho listing, where permits were issued for status quo operations and the hatcheries were left feeling the brunt of the avoidance measures. Hayden asked who filed the original petition. Sinnen explained the Karuk Tribe and the Salmon River Restoration Council filed the petition. Craig Tucker, who put the petition through, did note that fishing was not the cause for decline, which was considered when allowing for sport fishing.

Ly noted the Shasta River used to have a strong spring Chinook population and asked if the State would manage the Shasta populations differently. Sinnen explained the CDFW had started minimal summer flows to the Shasta to benefit Chinook, but found the population was no longer spring-run. The area is considered historic habitat and could be considered for repopulation efforts. The populations they are trying to protect are the South Fork and the Salmon River where the remanent populations are purely wild. The Salmon River is in better shape while the South Fork is on life support. The last two counts were less than 26, which means it's functionally extirpated. They are concerned about the population and have implemented sport fish closures on the Lower Trinity and Upper Klamath partially to protection those populations.

Hayden asked if all permits, including collection permits, would go through the TRRP's monitoring program. Sinnen explained some programs have State scientific collection permits. There is also a process for requesting Chinook for rotary screwtrap efficiency tests. He was unsure how the listing would affect hatchery fish. While CDFW did not recommend the listing, the Commission did and has now tasked CDFW with how to address it. Orcutt noted the Iron Gate Hatchery ran into issues with the spring run mitigations and ended up discarding the fish. He noted the State would have some latitude, but it would be restricted with a federal listing. Sinnen explained the hatchery spring chinook at Iron Gate died out after they stopped getting returns due to warm water and no holding areas.

Klamath Basin Sport Fishing Regulations for 2022

Sinnen presented the current allocations and regulations for salmon sport fishing in 2022. Fall adult chinook harvest allocations are based on projected abundance and conservation goals and the Klamath River fall Chinook stock harvest control rules. The total river run of fall Chinook in 2021 was around 54,000 adults with a total run of around 64,000 fish. Natural spawners comprised 30,196 adults. Ocean abundance was estimated at 200,117 for fish aged 3-5 years. The 2022 forecast for natural spawning adults chinook, absent fisheries, is 50,906. With the harvest control rule, which will allow for 25% maximum exploitation, the predicted rate is 38,180 escapement after fisheries. This includes both fall and spring chinook.

Ocean fishing runs from May 1 to August 31 with a limit of 2 fish per day. No commercial fishing is permitting in the Klamath Management Zone. Tribal allocation is 9,434 adults and the recreational allocation is 2,119 adults, which is split between four sub-quota groups. Trinity River will receive 33% of the allocation (or 699) which is split between the Upper and Lower portions. There is a daily bag limit of 2 fish, no more than 1 adult, and possession limits of 6 fish with no more than 3 adults.

Spring Chinook season runs from July 1 to August 31 on the Trinity River. Sport fishing is permitted between the Cedar Flat Bridge and Old Lewiston Bridge. There is a bag limit of 1 fish of any size and possession limit of 2 fish. The Klamath River will run from July 1 to August 14 downstream of Weitchpec and will have the same limits as the Trinity River.

Steelhead limits are for 2 hatchery fish per day. Brown trout fishing is open all year with a daily bag limit of 10 and a possession limit of no more than 20 fish.

There is currently a no take for coho for sport fisheries. The PFMC produced a report on its harvest control, which recommends incorporating a new control rule. The new control rule would apply to the marine and river fisheries and set a new max exploitation rate of 15%, with a 16% rate for the Trinity. This new rule will further constrain ocean fisheries in the Klamath Management Zone.

Adjourn for Day 1 5:00 pm

Day 2, June 16, 2022, 8:00am

Non-Agenda Comments

None submitted by the public or agencies.

TRRP Refinements Update

Smith and Pickard provided updates on the Program Document and Science Plan developments for the TRRP Refinements. The two drafting committees finished two large meetings prior to the TMC meeting. The rough plan is for Headwaters to finish revisions over the summer with a final document delivered in September. At the in-person September TMC meeting, the TMC will vote to approve the Program Document and the Science Plan. The vote will advance the Program Document to the Regional Directors for final approval.

Both documents have taken shape with significant time spent virtually to massage language and getting agreement on them. Smith and Pickard noted that both committees have collaborated well, while working independently and then pulling the two documents together. The Program Document has implementation and science priorities to focus the Program over the next several years. Guidance on process will help items move through the Program with more transparency.

The Program Document has settled on a time frame of 10 years. This will allow time for learning, inform planning, and develop budgeting needs. Smith noted the reconsultation could disrupt the plan. However, the PDDC agrees there is still time and any decisions on the next

phase for the TRRP are up to the TMC. Overall, a new ROD would not dismantle or disrupt the work of the TRRP.

Program Document

The Program Document has shifted from identifying milestones to priorities for the Implementation and Science Programs. Implementation priorities are focused on the ROD and management actions. The science priorities relate to the stated program goals and management actions to focus on learning through implementation.

A key issue for the Program is how items move through the Program and who does what. The Program Document notes realities of how the Program works, the lines of authority, and who reports to whom. The latest version of the organization charts reflects those realities and is as far they could go without completely reorganizing the TRRP. Smith is still ironing out process issues to clarify responsibilities in the TRRP and how to improve the effectiveness of different components. The PDDC is also working on the annual work plan process and how to address conflicts of interest.

There is also discussion on changing the voting procedures in the TMC, which would include amending the bylaws. Some parties recommend addressing as a separate process. There is also the long-standing concern on how to use the SAB and plug them into the Program and make them more useful to the technical arm.

New developments include setting up a new stakeholder advisory committee, which will require establishing a new FACA committee with a new charter. This could take up to a year and the group believes it would provide more useful ways for stakeholders to engage the TMC and comment and learn about the TRRP's activities. The USFWS is also considering its roles as the federal official for the committee and how staff will manage it. There is also some internal work to determine stakeholder roles and the size of the committee.

Lastly, they are working on budget guidance. Currently, the PDDC has landed on a guidance document to look at "colors of money" to illustrate how things show up in the budget and where TRRP funds land. The other concern is where to put money when available by finding the right mix of ongoing partner activities, new activities for science construction, design, and implementation, sole source program activities with the capacity and expertise for certain activities, and available funds for competitive contracting, which could increase access to outside expertise and improve cost efficiency.

Science Plan

Currently the Science Plan is divided into two segments. The first is a retrospective on where the Program has been and what they've learned over the last 20 years. It was important to get this information on paper and see how much has changed since the ROD was enacted to create updated conceptual models of the systems. It was also valuable to acknowledge what the Program built previously. While the IAP was informative, the Science Plan will be shorter and

more focused on high priority issues. The Science Plan will not replace the IAP. While the larger document is really important, the Science Plan will focus on the big takeaways and priorities.

The second part of the plan looks forward to planning the next phase and is organized in three sections. The first focuses on adaptive management in the context of the TRRP. This will focus on flow management as the best opportunity for active adaptive management and learning. The second is science priorities, and the last is an information road map to discuss process. Overall, the document is around 30 pages and a short and focused document that gets at the key issues.

For the science priorities, the SPDC spent time thinking of different ways to organize them and then circled back to the Program goal statement to organize around. Form, function, and fish were key terms used to simplify the priorities. The SPDC defined these terms and then used a matrix to identify the core and ongoing activities of the Program for these three factors. The same was done for the key uncertainties. The SPCD brainstormed uncertainties and identified the biggest ones. This approach was used to get agreement on the top ones. Overall, they identified five key uncertainties related to the three key terms.

Moving forward, the key uncertainties will likely change over time, but they are a starting point. Darcy noted path forward for addressing each uncertainty is not necessarily a 1:1 relationship in terms of steps and process. For example, altering flows could address three of the uncertainties, while others have single actions to address them. The order of the uncertainties also does not indicate priority or rank. The Science Plan does provide proposing timing and sequencies for activities related to the priorities.

The SPDC used a collaborative approach to outline how to address the problems and identify where the Program is now. The USFWS has opted out of participating, but all other partners have contributed. Overall, the SPDC used a holistic approach to focus on the entire document. They have completed a full technical review of the Science Plan and are working with the PDDC to marry it with the Program Document, with meetings scheduled in August to finish and polish both documents.

TMC/Agency Discussion

DeJuilio thanked Pickard for her coordination of the SPDC.

Objectives and Targets

Lee reviewed the Objectives and Targets report developed by the Work Groups. The goal of the Objectives and Targets document is to refine the objectives identified in the IAP. For a long time, the IAP provided science guidance through a series of objectives and related assessments. However, many felt the IAP's objectives were too many, with many redundancies. The Program has since struggled with what to do with the TRRP's objectives. In May 2013, the Program held a workshop to reorganize the objectives. However, they were unable to develop a final product and the task remained on the back burner until 2018. At that point, the IDT reopened the issue and decided to move forward with refining the objectives in the work groups. In early 2021, the IDT organized the updated objectives into a document for review. The current document is fairly

solid with a few loose ends for the Fish and Physical Work Groups to finalize. Both groups have worked over the past year to settle on their final objective lists. The IDT has reviewed the lists and selected the ones to keep and created new ones to reflect updated information since the IAP. The resulting Objectives and Targets report is organized by Work Group with an appendix of all communications supporting the current recommendations.

Each objective and target is defined with context and background on how it works. There are some redundancies that the IDT and the Work Groups will clean up in the next iteration as some may be combined or clarified. There are also a few objectives with unresolved targets that the IDT and the Work Groups will address. The IDT proposes updating the report when relevant information is updated rather than based on periodicity.

The document will provide guidance for Implementation as well and is intended to be part of the Refinements Science Plan. The IDT is seeking TMC approval of the objectives to incorporate into the Science Plan. Lee advised the TMC to focus on the objectives, which will provide rigidity and permanence for the Program while the targets are highly technical, complex, and could change. While the work groups have tried to simplify them, they are highly technical by nature. The IDT will be responsible for keeping the targets updated and organized for the TRRP. However, the objectives are under the TMC's purview.

Fish Work Group

Fish Work Groups' objective relate to the overarching goal to restore the river to naturally functioning system that gets fish back to their natural spawning areas. Pinnix likened the objectives to puzzle pieces of the overall goal. Salmon have evolved to take advantage of varying conditions with a diversity of life history strategies related to varying and differing environmental conditions. Each objective may fit one aspect of their life history but may not fit when environmental conditions change. Additionally, the objectives may address the needs of one species but may not account for other aspects of the ecosystem. Overall, the Fish Work Group tried to design the objectives to be responsive to the system as a whole and anticipate that some may change to better fit the others as they evolve. Pinnix reviewed the 14 objectives proposed by the Fish Work group and the proposed targets to evaluate them in his presentation.

<u>TMC Discussion</u>

Orcutt recommended a discussion on the overlap between the PFMC's fall Chinook management plans and the harvest and escapement goals for the species, especially in light of the recent listing of spring Chinook. He was concerned about the numbers used for the targets as the numbers identified in the EIS for spring Chinook have documentation issues that they have tried to get addressed through the TMC and the PFMC. Pinnix explained early surveys indicated 62,000 before dams and before the distinction was made between spring and fall run populations. Many of the fish documented were likely spring-run based on their life history. The targets are not managed to that number, as a result, but around it. There is also the challenge of aligning the TRRP's goals with the PFMC's as dams are removed and other challenges are noted in the

Klamath system. The Fish Work Group has been in talks with the USFWS on the PFMC to address it, but concrete steps have not been identified.

Kormos asked for a quick synopsis of how the harvest numbers were derived as they appear static and asked how they differ from the escapement calculations. Pinnix explained the appendix explains the fish harvest metrics with estimates of the pre-exploitation population size. Sinnen added that the fall Chinook estimates were within the range of the maximum allowable harvest rate of 67% as set by the PFMC. Ly clarified that the IDT was seeking approval of the objectives only and the TMC should not dissect the targets at this phase. Lee agreed noting that the targets would be worked out by the work groups.

Orcutt noted that temperature and food availability was connected in the original flow study. The fish holding temperatures for each species requirements may overlap and potentially conflict based on their life histories. He was concerned how the different targets and objectives interplay, especially given the hypotheses for winter flow variability, and how food webs, temperature, and life histories affect each other. He did think including lamprey and other tribal species as a good sign. Pinnix agreed the system is complex and taking one action for the benefit of one species could have negative impacts on the others. Lee added that temperature is one dimension the TRRP can focus on. Water is released at one temperature and then uniformly changes as it goes down stream, which is unnatural for rivers. Variation and diversity is needed up and down stream. Leaving the temperature objectives complex leaves room for the Program to grow into them and manage them better.

Orcutt understood the TRRP needed to think outside the box for how a natural river evolves in an area where those functions no longer exist. However, hatchery mitigations are a major function the TRRP doesn't discuss due to legal opinions or decisions. However, integrating the hatchery in the discussion could be valuable. Coho do not exist in isolation and the hatchery work should be integrated into the discussion as it could play a major role in the species' recovery. He requested Reclamation check the record to see how hatchery fish could be integrated into the fish harvests. He noted a review from ten years ago that was intended to assess success. Pinnix noted that integrating the hatchery into the TRRP's goals should be discussed with Derek Rupert to understand how to best utilize them and align them together. Orcutt wanted a full review of the items and was not comfortable with the individual items.

De Juilio explained the TMC was asked to look at the objectives, which should not be controversial. Most have been around for a while, with maybe one or two new ones. The targets, however, are technical assessments on how to achieve the objectives. They are not regulatory or binding and are not meant to be fixed as they can change as new information comes in. The document also provides information to support how they were developed, which everyone is invited to vet and discuss with the appropriate work group.

DeJuilio made a motion that the TMC support the inclusion of the objectives presented by the Fish Work Group in the Science Plan and that TMC members vet the targets with their technical staff prior to the Science Plan being presented.

Som seconded the motion.

Gogan asked if the TMC was splitting the voting between the objectives and targets as the agenda indicated they would be adopting both. De Juilio noted Lee asked the TMC to focus on the objectives as there has been some hesitation on the targets and the IDT wanted to provide guidance to the SPDC so they can move forward with their timeline. Dixon explained the mention of targets in the agenda was an error on his part. He reviewed the agenda with Ly and USFWS a few days before the meeting, noted the error, and removed it from the most recent agenda. Orcutt did not believe there was a strong rationale for approving the objectives and targets now, noting he still had several questions and there were other items to adopt in September. He did not think the objectives and targets were adequately vetted, citing issues with terminology and vocabulary and was not convinced they were ready. He thought there were major items for discussion and opposed the motion as a result. Dixon explained the Objectives and Targets document was sent in advance of the meeting with the request the TMC review it before the meeting. It was a stated decision item in the agenda. If members did not have time to review the objectives with their staff, Dixon recommended they abstain from voting. Gogan noted Trinity County's staff is newly hired and the County is still negotiating their contract. Since the agenda came out late and Flynn has just started, they do not expect him to be fully briefed on the topics.

De Juilio explained that Table 1 in the Objectives and Targets report has a list of the objectives for consideration based on their review of the IAP objectives. Orcutt noted the IAP was never adopted by the TMC. Gogan noted there had been a few changes to the agenda since it came out. He suggested it may be helpful to vet the agenda before posting. Ly suggested giving the TMC another month to review document to provide more time. De Juilio explained the process started in 2018 and drafts were sent to TMC in June and September. Table 1 has been sent and presented to the TMC several times and should be included as a meaningful part of the Science Plan for September. Naman agreed noting the objectives and targets discussion has been ongoing for years and is critical for meeting program goals. He was frustrated to hear people were unprepared as the TRRP has worked hard to complete the document and put a lot of time, thought, and energy into the discussion. The Objectives and Targets report is a living document that can change as the needs of the program change. To have their progress stymied is disheartening and frustrating. He urged the TMC to keep moving forward by implementing and codifying the objectives. The objectives should not be controversial as they are in the IAP and/or the flow evaluation study. De Juilio added the effort was done at the request of the TMC. Groves noted that only TMC primaries should be involved in the discussion once a motion was made.

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

Flow Work Group

The Flow Work Group proposed four objectives as outlined in their presentation given by Lindke. The first relate to management of flows to protect wildlife and adhere to the ROD

volumes. The final objective provides flows that inundate the ephemeral habitats and floodplains, with ephemeral habitat inundated from January to May and floodplains inundated from May to June. Lindke noted that the last target is about providing flows for juvenile fish. Research out of UC Davis indicate fish grow more and do better if they can rear on floodplains where there is more food and higher productivity. The TRRP has never been able to meet the first component as flows are limited to 300 cfs in the winter and underscores why the TRRP is trying to approve winter flow releases. The second component is often met depending on the water year.

TMC Discussion

Ly noted previous discussions on providing diurnal fluctuations to flows and asked why they were not included in the objectives. Naman explained it could be considered as part of a regular review of the objectives. Ly noted the consideration was largely based on whether it was feasible with the current infrastructure.

Som made a motion that the TMC support the inclusion of the objectives presented by the Flow Work Group in the Science Plan and that TMC members vet the targets with their technical staff prior to the Science Plan being presented.

Bader seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously

Physical Work Group

Buxton presented the seven proposed objectives from the Physical Work Group. The objectives are all addressed through a combination of flow releases, channel rehabilitation, gravel augmentation, and riparian planting for channel migration. Buxton reviewed the targets for each of the seven proposed objectives, along with the justification, tools to evaluate, and frequency of evaluation.

TMC Discussion

Orcutt noted Buxton's comment that the goal is for normal alluvial river function. However, the river does not have access to major parts of the Basin that produce sediment, requiring augmentation or supplementation to make up for the lack of sediment, which has been controversial. He asked how the issue was addressed in the objectives. Buxton explained sediment transport is spatially and temporally variable. Currently sediment is added based on flows and recently measured transfer rates to determine effectiveness. Flows largely influence transport and are balanced by inputs through unnatural means such as bulldozers and dump trucks. There is no such thing as bad sediment, rather it is viewed as the proper quantity of different grain sizes in the channel. These are addressed in the objective on fine sediment transport.

Orcutt asked whether there were objectives related to woody debris augmentation. Buxton explained there are currently no targets related to woody debris, but they are being considered. Lee explained the Program funds large wood management and will look at a strategy later in the year. The hope is that reports would provide the basis for new targets and would drive changes to

the Objectives and Targets report. Orcutt noted that some of the actions appear to be related to riparian work group activities. Buxton explained they are mentioned because riparian plants are the only way they can reduce or influence meander. Ly noted that a woody debris objective may be incorporated in the future along with the variability objective for flow. Lee explained the IDT discussed such changes but did not want to open the objectives up for changes regularly, only when information was available to justify changes. Such recommendations should go to the work groups and IDT before proposing them to the IDT. The TMC discussion could elevate their priority in the IDT. He noted that some of these items may be better suited for consideration at the target level rather than as objectives.

DeJuilio made a motion that the TMC support the inclusion of the objectives presented by the Physical Work Group in the Science Plan and that TMC members vet the targets with their technical staff prior to the Science Plan being presented.

Bader seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Riparian and Aquatic Ecology Work Group

Laskodi presented the four objectives proposed by the Riparian and Aquatic Ecology Work Group. The proposed objectives were considered ecologically relevant, had cascading effects on flora and fauna in the system, and could be evaluated using existing data and models. The four proposed objectives were refined from the IAP. Most of the proposed targets are also adapted from the IAP, except for a target on water temperature diversity, which was newly developed.

Orcutt asked why there were no targets for specific wildlife or plant species, compared to the Fish Work Group's targets and whether it was due to a lack of information. Laskodi explained there was a lack of information for some of the wildlife and plant species, but the objectives, overall, aim to promote native species. However, the objectives do not preclude specific targets for various wildlife and riparian plant species, and they could be added. Orcutt noted problems with the pre-dam baselines and regulatory requirements and explained they tried addressing the concerns for some components through monitoring efforts. Laskodi noted the regulatory requirements are a separate issue from the objectives.

Som made a motion that the TMC support the inclusion of the objectives presented by the Riparian and Aquatic Ecology Work Group in the Science Plan and that TMC members vet the targets with their technical staff prior to the Science Plan being presented.

Kormos seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

LUNCH

WY22 Retrospective and Winter Flow Scenario Analysis

Lindke presented the retrospective winter flow modeling analysis to evaluate potential impacts of the proposed winter flow releases. The analysis focused on the most relevant EA analyses and addressed concerns and questions raised by the TMC in December. The analysis was done by the same staff who developed the EA. The analysis used real flow data from water year 2014 and adjusted the daily releases based on the ROD flow schedule and the proposed winter variable flow since the current water year is still going and the analyses extend beyond the current date. Flows from WY14 were used as they mimic real life conditions for a critically dry year.

Using modeling to determine how each flow schedule met the required water temperature objectives, there was little difference between the TMC-approved and the proposed winter variable hydrographs. Lindke noted the difference in meeting the rearing temperature targets, with all hydrographs in the negative. While the number of days above the rearing temperature targets is larger under the TMC and winter flow hydrographs, this is expected under dry and critically dry years. In such years, the aim is to get the fish out of the system earlier to avoid harmful conditions on the Lower Klamath.

The team conducted S3 modeling for juvenile Chinook biomass, which was not included in the EA as the model only showed effects on the North Fork. Since then, the model has been extended to Weitchpec. The results look at the percent difference in biomass and abundance between the winter flow and the TMC approved hydrographs. Modeling indicates larger positive increases in abundance and biomass for 9 out of 14 years with negligible decreases in the remaining years under the winter flow proposal. This translates into larger individuals and higher survival rates.

Due to concerns about reservoir storage, the team also looked at reservoir elevations during the years under winter flow and ROD volumes. Modeling indicates that summer storage remained unchanged and may provide long-term increases as winter flows reduce the needs for dam safety releases, leaving more water in the reservoir for restoration. Overall, exportation to the Central Valley is largely out of the Program's control. Lindke also noted a recent retrospective analysis completed by Eric Peterson that indicates diversions to the Sacramento River account for more than two times the variation at Trinity Reservoir than restoration releases to Trinity River. While restoration releases may provide a reminder of water use and levels, it is harder to see the impacts of export volumes as the levels at Whiskeytown can remain the same, while large volumes of water move through Lewiston.

For the reservoir analysis, they used actual flows from WY17, along with modeled flows for the TMC approved hydrograph and the winter flow variability. Under the winter flow hydrograph, Trinity Center boat ramp would get wet earlier in the season,. Stuart Fork would get wet 9 days earlier in the spring, before the recreational season, and would stay wet 10 days longer. Under WY22 modeling for a dry year, there is no change to boat ramp wetting and only a slight dip in reservoir levels between February and May. Afterwards, there was no effect to reservoir levels

since all scenarios use the same ROD volumes. While there may be slight variations throughout the year, levels would be the same by the end of the year.

Lindke noted the TRRP did prepare a white paper on the winter flow analysis for review by the SAB. This paper was included as an appendix to the EA and the TRRP addressed and adopted the SAB's comments and recommendation into the EA. The SAB noted that the action was great and questioned why winter flow variability had not been adopted earlier. Other critiques of the EA included effectiveness monitoring and monitoring food availability. Effectiveness monitoring was included in the EA but could have been fleshed out more. One recommendation is to use acoustic monitoring to evaluate channel mobilization. Another is to get finer resolution on water temperature monitoring and tying it to reservoir releases. For food availability, monitoring could sample floodplains before and after flow events and conduct macroinvertebrate sampling in inundated areas to compare colonization and productivity to perennially wetted areas. Using the SRH-2D modeling could inform field monitoring work.

Overall, the TRRP knows the status quo will not provide the best habitat. Not using the seasonally appropriate ecology is not making the fish bigger. The Program's understanding of river ecology and fish physiology supports the action. Program scientists believe releases should mimic natural river flows and the number one goal of the program is to restore the form and function of the Trinity River, which is currently disconnected.

TMC/Agency Comments

Buxton noted that while the current ROD was a Frankenstein model, it did meet specific needs for this year, such as a willow scour event. When enough dry years accumulate, those actions are needed to remove the willows and the winter flows would not have accomplished that work. He asked how the Program could meet winter flow needs when other management requirements may be necessary. Lindke noted willow scour is not an objective for critically dry years. It was done this year after three critically dry years in a row. The TRRP is working with a limited amount of water and must consider the costs and benefits of all the objectives, which gets harder under drought conditions. Ideally, the scour should have been done the previous year as part of a five year cycle but was delayed because of limited water. Under those conditions, hard decisions have to be made. Buxton noted that while winter flows may be extremely attractive, an annual flow management scheme could also include summer base flow management to provide water under those conditions. Lindke agreed but noted the TRRP is unable to take a holistic view on flows as it is uncertain if they can manipulate flows throughout the year. He noted that after April 15, scour may still occur at the 2000 cfs bench if leftover water is available.

Som added that when looking at Coffee Creek as natural system indicator, storms create flows that can do the geomorphic work more frequently over time. Lee added that the need to scour willows is due to static summer water levels.

Sinnen asked if there was a seasonality to the exports. DeJuilio noted that the 47/52 split in water exports was over the long-term and not annually based. Some years will have a 250% inflow that heads out of the reservoir and some years its 50%. The exports vary annually and is greater for

diversions than river releases. As there is more inflow, diversions are reduced as other reservoirs are also full. He added that flow regimes have changed over the years. For example, when the Flow Work Group saw that flows weren't moving sediment, they adjusted them. Now they are looking at the winter period and realizing flows provide a lot of ecosystem services and benefits when above base. As the Program gets more information on how the system responds to flows, they can provide more nuance and comprehensive solutions. This is the natural progression of flow management. The work group was tasked with doing it one section at a time and De Juilio hoped the TMC saw that the simple prescriptions provided in the 1990s are being improved upon. The group believes the science has evolved to allow the team to move away from the 2000 cfs bench and the 5-day peak flows. The same is true for the static winter flows.

Lindke finished by noting the EA is currently being converted into a report. This will memorialize the analyses. Abel added the TMC has the authority to make shifts under the existing ROD and the winter flow should not jeopardize the ROD as currently written. The winter flow report should be ready sometime between August 10 and 15 and will provide some context for the WY23 winter flow proposal.

BREAK

FY23 Budget

The FY23 budget is a modest increase from the previous year, does not make up for the FY20 reduction or increased costs. The budget reflects the transition the Program is making under Refinements, which should be finalized this fiscal year. It is also anticipated that the Phase II channel rehabilitation review will be done during this year, which will inform design work. As a result, new design work is limited. Budget for implementation reflects the first of a 3-year implementation for Oregon Gulch and carryover funding will be used for gravel supply projects.

This year's budget is based on a modest increase in Reclamation's allocation plus an additional $454,000 allocated to the Oregon Gulch project from the bipartisan infrastructure legislation (BIL). CVPIA and US FWS funds are estimated at the same level as previous years.

For the Program Administration budget, personnel costs are based on full staffing, however the Program secretary and the Indian self-determination specialist positions are still vacant. Office operation costs were increased as staff return to the office and due to increased costs for gas and travel. The costs for the notetaker is based on the final option year contract. Dixon noted the contract will be completed in FY23 and the TMC will need to decide if it will solicit a new contract. The Public Education and Outreach items are based on the TRRP's contract with the Trinity County RCD, who has done a great job developing new and on-going outreach activities.

The costs for the agency TMC costs have been lumped with each agency's technical assistance funds to avoid confusion. All technical assistance is based on status quo funding. The California agencies, NOAA Fisheries, and US Forest Service funds are based on real estimates scaled based on last years' costs. The costs for Trinity County need to be negotiated as the County has requested an increase in its amount, which will need TMC approval.

For the Implementation budget, salary costs are a non-discretionary estimate to ensure the budget does not get overspent. Two positions are still vacant (civil engineering tech and outreach coordinator), which will likely result in some salary savings. Funds are provided to the Denver TSC to support FEMA compliance and other modeling needs. The contract amount to Ironwood for NEPA consulting is also indicated. No funds are allocated for revegetation materials as Oregon Gulch will be in mass excavation and not require planting. Geophysical funds are provided for the TRRP's annual aerial monitoring work. Funding for Oregon Gulch is indicated as a balancer as it is a multi-year project, and some funds are non-discretionary and earmarked for the project. Funding is also provided to collect wood for next year's work on Oregon Gulch. Dixon noted the estimate may be low but some may be covered by the overall Oregon Gulch budget. Other implementation funds include allocations for a Reclamation required value engineering study and funds for maintenance and irrigation for Chapman Ranch.

For the Science budget, personnel costs are complete as the Science branch is fully staffed. Dixon did note the figure for the Yurok's fish biologist was not accurate as they are in the process of a multi-year audit and the Program does not have a current indirect rate for the Yurok Tribe. The figure is scaled from the previous year. Funds were added for outside peer reviews per a blanket purchase agreement under the DOI for peer reviews. The SAB budget is also a placeholder as the TRRP would like to restaff the SAB as its current members are almost done with their contracts. Costs for the status and trend monitoring reflect either the actual or scaled agreement costs as they have not been negotiated but the Program anticipates the same level of effort as the previous year.

The Science budget also includes funds for the bed grain surface map proposal from the FY22 science proposals and an additional $500,000 for new science projects. Dixon thought it was important as an adaptive management program to fund projects to address key uncertainties and monitor the Program's progress towards its objectives.

TMC/Agency Discussion

Kormos asked if there were any rollover funds allocated for the watershed grants. Dixon explained last year's grant cycle combined two years of funding to allow them to contract with NFWF to manage the grant. This allowed $970,000 in grant funds. The application review committee awarded around $820,000 in grants, with the remaining amount added to the budgeted $500,000 for this year.

Alvarez asked how the pause in new design development could impact the future construction schedule and if new sites would be ready the following year. Dixon explained there would be with some adjustments. Currently design work for Evans Bar and Upper Connor have been funded to the 60% design level, while Sky Ranch is currently at the 60% design, which could be advanced with internal resources but was held up by the land exchange. Designs need to be at the 60% design level to proceed with NEPA and have a shovel ready project for construction.

Ly asked what happened to the funds allocated for the value engineering study in FY22. Dixon explained $33,000 was transferred to the Hoopa Valley Tribe to support their completion (with McBain Associates) of a large wood strategy originally led by a NOAA Fisheries contractor.

Kormos asked how Dixon came up with the funding amount for the science proposal item. Dixon explained it was close to the amount solicited during the previous year, with the assumption that a similar level of requests would be seen this year with some sideboards. De Juilio asked how BIL funding would be issued and whether it would be annual. Dixon anticipated funding for this year but was not sure if it would continue.

TMC Discussion

Gogan explained Trinity County's current agreement was scheduled to end on June 20, 2022. For the County to continue its participation, they requested additional funds for a dedicated staff person. The TMC initially allocated $80,000 with a motion in June 2021. The County's request was then updated to $95,000 annually for an environmental compliance specialist, which accounts for 41-51% of their annual salary. Based on discussions with TRRP and the previous hiring officer, the funds were intended to cover 75% of the position to support the County's participation in the TRRP and various TRRP permitting needs. The remaining salary funds would be supported by the County. The county has revised its request for $136,397 for the first year, $144,916 for the second year, and $146, 305 for years 3 through 5, with a total request of $720,325 over 5 years.

Dixon explained FY22 provided the first year of funding and the Program no longer has those funds this late in the year. Dixon recommended delaying the start of the new agreement until the next fiscal year and starting with the requested amount for year 2. Ly suggested making the County whole at the start of the next fiscal year, allowing the Program to apply the funds with the new agreement using FY23 funds. Dixon explained the Program could fund part now and make up the difference in the next year. Gogan explained they can stick with the $95,000 but would need to make up the $40,000 on top of the requested $144,000 to make up the difference. Orcutt supported the County's request as it would allow them to participate and follow the technical discussions. But budget requests need to identify where the money will come from.

Kormos called attention to a joint report submitted by the Hoopa Valley Tribe and the Department of Fish and Wildlife to restore funding for the Lower Klamath and Lower Trinity creel surveys. These surveys were funded in the past but were defunded when the Program experienced a budget cut in FY20. These assessments are needed to understand the relationship between ocean, freshwater, and escapement populations and their relationship to abundance and cohort reconstruction to evaluate the productivity of specific stocks or origin through time and space. These assessments form the foundation of assessing the effectiveness of habitat restoration, anthropogenic effects on productivity of salmonids, and facilitating fishery planning. The three critical legs of those assessments include ocean harvest, inland harvest, and escapement and are needed to understand overall productivity and the effect of actions.

The TMC has adopted a series of objectives with targets that identify harvest as the weightiest goal for increasing productivity. This highlights the importance of understanding harvest towards achieving those objectives. While juveniles may be the best measure of program effectiveness, the Program's efforts will have an effect on juveniles and how they recruit into fisheries and escape the oceans as adults and the objectives are more aimed at adults than juveniles as a measure of success for consumptive users. Kormos underscored the importance of different harvest components in assessing productivity. Ocean harvest is a big component but is largely paid by a number of contributors such as Reclamation through their mitigation responsibilities. However, those assessments are incomplete without the recreational harvest. Prioritizing age assessments provides an incomplete picture without the recreational harvest and the creel surveys should be prioritized over a number of other analyses, which can be relatively superfluous.

While Kormos understood the reasoning for defunding the surveys, the surveys were never supposed to fall off the radar and the TRRP does not seem to prioritize the surveys for the Program, leaving the Hoopa Valley Tribe and the State to consider how to fund them now. Each survey costs around $1,000, for a sum total of around $200,000 to collect the information.

Som noted the state budget appeared over funded and asked why the state was unable to fund the monitoring work. Kormos explained the Fisheries programs was shrinking annually, and the state budget did not reflect the CDFW budget or the Regional 1 Fisheries Program. There are one-off budgets to address drought, which are valuable, but a lot of the funds are going to cannabis. Over the past 5 to 10 years, the fisheries program has lost several permanent positions in its inland and coastal fisheries programs. Additionally, the coastal fisheries program almost entirely relies on grant funding, which is also shrinking and limiting its application and flexibility. Their reliance on grants for the Lower Klamath creel survey has resulted in a permanent cut for the Eel River watershed and the decommissioning of the Potter Valley project. The TRRP funds were an important source the CDFW cannot reliably replace.

Ly asked how funds from fishing licenses, stamps, and cards contributed to the Department along with USFWS funds for sport fishing. Kormos explained both pots are shrinking over time. While the costs for tags has increased, the number sold is dwindling and is a major reason why the Department has worked on initiatives to increase interest in fishing and hunting. Grant and federal funds are other money sources that are also trending downwards as federal dollars vacillate more than license fees.

Lee explained the Science branch tries to fund activities that assist with decision-making related to gravel augmentation, hydrograph development, channel rehab work, and watershed work. The two projects were prioritized low by the IDT because of belt tightening in the budget. While Lee appreciated Kormos explanation of the value of the harvest surveys, he was unsure what they could tell the Program besides the need to increase outmigrant production. He suggested rescoping the survey proposals for IDT consideration.

Kormos explained the harvest component is based on the maximum allowable harvest rate for Klamath and Trinity Rivers even though most fish come from the ocean. He also noted the

surveys were deprioritized because the cohort reconstruction was not strongly prioritized by the TMC or the TRRP. However, a cohort reconstruction is currently being prepared for the TRRP. Lastly, while recreational harvest isn't highly prioritized, tribal harvests inform the cohort reconstruction and understand abundance. These surveys were the least expensive component and the TRRP does not seem to have a strong appreciation for stock assessment in the Program or among the TMC members.

Dixon note that without the Trinity River Dam the two tribes and CDFW would still be responsible for harvest management and monitoring and asked if the state would need to do the creel surveys in the absence of the dams. Kormos explained it was a public trust responsibility. While the tribes are responsible for managing their own resources, the dams only exacerbate the resource issue. Gogan noted that when the metrics get smaller, the creel counts become important for noting where harvest is happening and how restoration is influencing juvenile outmigration [editor's note: creel surveys do not provide information on juvenile outmigration]. Kormos explained the survey on the Lower Klamath is largely supported by the state, with TRRP funds to hire temporary staff and purchase equipment. The data out of the Klamath is used to develop a stock assessment based on age. This area is a unique place for the survey as it is one of the few places where the most fish are naturally produced.

Orcutt explained the question of whether the tribes monitor the rivers relates back to the goal statement and legislation for restoring and recovering tribal and non-tribal fisheries in the CVPIA. Before the dams went in there was no need to monitor the amount of tribal harvest. When the action was taken, Hoopa Valley pushed hard for a cohort analysis and has been involved in several assessments. The cohort survey is a metric to assess management actions and refine the 62,000 goal, but harvest is a critical component. Hoopa Valley stepped in several years ago to retain the monitoring programs funded by the TRRP. The adult surveys, in contrast to the mark-recapture surveys, provide better scope and accuracy for the Trinity and the Klamath. He also noted how unique it was for the Hoopa Valley Tribe and the State to collectively address a mutual concern for a unique monitoring program.

Ly asked if the CDFW funded the surveys on the Lower Klamath. Kormos explained they contribute staff time. Sinnen added CDFW staff support the scientist at the biologist/scientist level. The TRRP support funds seasonal staff, travel, and equipment since the fishery is large. Dixon estimated the surveys would require around $290,000 based on their previous level.

Kormos suggested a few places they could get the funds in the budget, along with funds to cover the County's request for its technical assistance agreement. The total needed for both requests was around $500,000:

- Rollover FY22 funds from the watershed grant ($140,000 – 150,000)
- Allocate some funds from the $500,000 in science proposal funding
- The 40-mile bed grain size map ($180,000)

Kormos recommended spreading the reallocations across all the budget items so the TRRP could still conduct some of its outlined work.

Orcutt understood the justification for the Science proposal funding but was not convinced the funding was properly justified as the evaluation mechanisms did not always address Program priorities and the funds should reflect better estimates of the need. Orcutt also suggested exploring funds such as the BIL funding. The TRRP also shifted its budget for the coded wire tags to the hatchery and asked Reclamation if there were other resources that could be used outside of TRRP funding.

Hadley noted the BIL funds were still being figured out and could not speak on whether it would be appropriate to explore those funds for the creel survey. Orcutt noted there was a substantial change to the hatchery budget following a review. Hadley noted the hatchery budget is developed three years in advance. Som added the deadline to request BIL through USFWS had passed and recommended using TRRP's line-item budget process to address the need. Ly was hesitant to reduce the funds for the watershed grants as the TAMWG often requested the TMC restore the allocations initially set in the ROD [editor's note: the ROD did not identify a funding level for watershed restoration activities], which have declined. Dixon noted there was never a ranking on the value of the science proposals versus the defunded fisheries monitoring work as they are not on equal footing.

Gogan made a motion to increase the budget for Trinity County by $89,000 in FY23 to result in a total of $186,313.

> **Orcutt seconded with a friendly amendment. The amendment was to add funding for the Lower Trinity and Lower Klamath creel surveys for $200,000 with funding offset by reducing the $500,000 proposed for the Science RFPs in the draft budget.**
>
> **Gogan approved the amendment.**

Ly asked whether the bed grain study was funded and how it was prioritized for FY22 funding. Dixon explained the study was proposed for this year and was the highest ranked project by the SAB but needed revisions. Kormos asked if the study could reduce its cost. Lee explained the initial proposal was for the entire restoration reach to make it consistent with the hydraulic model. However, there were some cost savings if they took the canyon portion out. Dixon explained the project was not inherently scalable, as there were some sections that could be taken out, but it would lower the quality of the final product. Hayden thought there were some other items to consider while recognizing the need to support the cohort reconstruction.

> **Hayden made a competing motion to fund the Trinity County by an additional $89,000 in FY23 and fund the Lower Klamath and Lower Trinity Creel Surveys for $200,000 with funds coming from the bed surface grain map projects, but the project should be considered in the FY23 RFP process, and unused funds from the FY22 watershed grant program.**

Kormos seconded the competing motion.

Hayden explained the funds for the bed surface grain model would be reallocated, but the project would still be eligible for funding under the FY23 RFP process. Dixon explained to use the rollover funds from the watershed grant, the TMC would need to reduce the grant allocation by the same amount to make $500,000 available. Ly asked if the TMC could take the remaining $110,000 from the construction budget. Dixon explained $450,000 of the construction budget was not discretionary and funding for the construction budget was on the cusp of splitting Oregon Gulch between three years or four years. If the FY23 budget is reduced, it could add another year. Orcutt noted the construction budget is often front loaded and thought the costs could be picked up later if not done this year. He agreed with Ly the funds should be taken from the construction budget since they are not related to the surveys.

Gogan made a friendly amendment to drop the reduction in funding to the watershed grant program in favor of reducing the construction budget accordingly.

Kormos and Hayden approved the amendment

The competing motion passed unanimously.

Topics for September TMC Meeting

- Orcutt asked for a discussion to approve the IAP. However, Lee and Dixon noted approval of the objectives earlier replaced the objectives in the IAP. Orcutt thought the move circumvented the approval of the IAP and requested approval of the IAP to formalize its use in the program.
- The Flow Work Group will present its WY23 winter flow variability proposal. Orcutt asked Reclamation to provide a written response on its decision-making process and why Reclamation determined an EA was not needed for the action after several years of solicitors advising the need for an EA for such actions.
- Discussion on the TMC voting structure
- Approval of the Refinements Program Document and Science Plan
- Review of synthesis reports that have not been presented to the TMC
    - USFWS outmigrant synthesis report
- Dixon recommended a site visit to the Supply Creek Watershed restoration site. This project was funded through a watershed grant. Alvarez will organize.
- Ly asked for status and/or progress reports from recent watershed grant projects
- Hayden asked for a construction schedule and update on Oregon Gulch.

The September meeting will be in-person at Weitchpec. Hayden will coordinate organization with Dixon and the Yurok Tribe. Other agenda topics should be sent to Ly and Dixon along with who will present the topic.

Adjourn Day 2 at 4:47 pm.