

Final Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
 County Library, Weaverville, CA
 Wednesday and Thursday, January 16-17, 2013

Wednesday, January 16, 2013; 12:00 PM

Attending Members

Member	Representative Seat
Brian Person	Bureau of Reclamation, Chair
Nancy Finley	Fish and Wildlife Service, Vice-Chair
Dave Hillemeier	Yurok Tribe
Mike Orcutt	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Seth Naman ¹	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Fisheries
Bill Brock ²	Forest Service
Curtis Milliron	California Natural Resources Agency
Judy Pflueger	Trinity County
Elizabeth Hadley ³	Trinity Adaptive Management Work Group
Robin Schrock ³	Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director

1) Alternate for Ann Garrett; 2) alternate for Sharon Heywood; 3) non-voting members.

Others that attended: D.J. Bandrowski, Andreas Krause, Ernie Clarke, and Dave Gaeuman (Trinity River Restoration Program); George Kautsky and Robert Franklin, (Hoopa Valley Tribe); Teresa Connor (California Department of Water Resources); Kelli Gant (Trinity Lake Revitalization Group); Gene Goodyear (landowner); Tim Hayden (Yurok Tribe); Joe Polos (Fish and Wildlife Service), Don Reck (Bureau of Reclamation).

List of Motions that Passed during the Meeting

Judy Pflueger made a motion to approve the TMC January 16-17 meeting agenda.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Curtis Milliron made a motion the TMC postpone the decision to reconsider the recommendation by the TAMWG regarding the Wellock irrigation system claim until next quarterly meeting to allow alternative process to be resolved.

Bill Brock seconded the motion.

The motion passed with seven “ayes” and zero “nays.”

The Hoopa Tribe abstained.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to adopt the Physical Workgroup recommendation of up to 2,000 cubic yards at Lewiston Weir and up to

1,000 cubic yards at Lowden Ranch based on the two presentations made and based on a gravel deficit in the river.

Seth Naman seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Curtis Milliron made a motion to accept the October 2012 TMC meeting minutes as amended.

Judy Pflueger seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Judy Pflueger made a motion that the TMC approve the recommendation for watershed projects.

Dave Hill seconded the motion.

The motion passed with seven “ayes” zero “nays.”

The Hoopa Valley Tribe abstained.

Nancy Finley made a motion to develop a scoping document for a decision support system for the Program to be implemented in 2014 with options to address commitments and involvement of exiting partners, a timeline, and costs.

Judy Pflueger seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion that the Design Team come up with the site specific goals and objectives based upon science of the Program. These objectives will then be shared with stakeholders at the concept design level to receive comments and advice. Stakeholder comments will be considered to the extent that they do not compromise site specific goals and objectives.

Bill Brock seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Regular Business:

1. Introductions and Approval of Agenda

Brian Person, chair of the Trinity Management Council (TMC) opened the meeting and asked the TMC members to review the agenda.

Approval of Agenda

Judy Pflueger made a motion to approve the TMC January 16-17 meeting agenda.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

The TMC tabled the approval of the October 2012 TMC minutes until tomorrow.

2. Open Forum

No public comments at this time.

3. Report from Trinity Management Council Chair

Brian Person deferred to Nancy Finley for an announcement. Nancy Finley announced that she will be leaving in February for a new position as a Wildlife Refuge Manager in the Florida Keys. Joe Polos will be serving in her position until a new hire is made. Judy Pflueger wished Finley well. Person expressed his appreciation for Finley's work. Finley also expressed her appreciation over working with the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP or Program).

Federal Budget

Brian Person gave a brief update on the Continuing Resolution (CR). The TRRP's budget is based on the President's budget request and this has good funding for the Program for the first half the year but the budget could be impacted in the second half of the year.

Landowner Concerns

Person reviewed the motion passed on the last teleconference that the well program remains limited to domestic wells and any funds to pay the claim submitted by Mr. Wellock come from non-program funds. He noted that the TAMWG has put forward a request that the TMC reconsider Mr. Wellock's as a unique case to and develop a policy to address issues on a case by case basis. Person explained that Reclamation is reviewing the Wellock claim under a statutory authority (short description is 377 b) process that is separate and apart from the TRRP.

On other issues, Person noted that Secretary Salazar will be stepping down in March. Appointment of a new Secretary must be confirmed by the Congress and will not be fast. Person noted his respect for Salazar as energetic and passionate about the environment and that the extra ARRA funds the Program received were the result of Salazar's efforts.

Person noted he has been looking for a common thread from the presentations of the Phase I review and one thread is that the Program is generally headed in the right direction. He noted the Science Advisory Board (SAB) has noted the need for more integration and that there is a need for more sound science to drive the Program. The proposed Decision Support System (DSS) may be easier for the Program to adopt than originally thought, as the SAB emphasizes that most of the recommended elements are already in place. Other issues were the site design objectives and the gravel additions.

Person made a few comments on the issue of flood control for the Trinity Dam. The safety of dams criteria is designed to prevent flows overtopping the Trinity Dam. He cited other

criteria about dates and levels of the Reservoir that are followed. Seth Naman said the concern of NOAA is releases that are too high such as 6,000 cfs that may initiate redd scour and would be harmful to salmonid fry just coming out of the gravel. He noted that a lower but longer release such as 3,000 cfs may be better for emerging fry. Person suggested Naman talk to the biologists and that discussions could be set up. Mike Orcutt asked if Reclamation has made any decision on whether to seek ESA re-consultation for operation of the Trinity River Division (TRD). Person said there have been discussions and they are considering entering into a new consultation. Don Reck further acknowledged that safety of dams releases have occurred in the past including increased flows at Lewiston and that there have been issues with redd scour. Person stated that while releases from Trinity Reservoir have ranged up to nearly 2,000cfs, flows in excess of the required release to the Trinity River have been routed through the Carr Tunnel and into the Sacramento River.

4. Report from TAMWG Chair

Elizabeth Hadley, Chair of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG) led the TMC through the four main points of her letter addressed to the TMC.

First, the TAMWG wanted to be able to have inputs to the Phase I report and Hadley suggested the TAMWG compile the collective comments through her. Robin Schrock noted that the Program review of the Phase I report was intended to be a technical and comments should be limited to technical issues. Mike Orcutt clarified that, so far, only the appendices have been released but not the recommendations. Ernie Clarke noted that also presentations have been made that include some recommendations.

There was an extended discussion over the nature of the review, the technical inputs versus policy implications and that the TAMWG was mainly seeking some access. Curtis Milliron noted that the TAMWG may be able to provide technical review but they may also be asking how the Phase I review may affect them. Ernie Clarke noted that they will be having a discussion on the review and the next steps and that this discussion could be better discussed during tomorrow's presentation. Elizabeth Hadley said she cannot attend tomorrow. There were some thoughts that Hadley consolidating TAMWG comments and passing them to the TMC were valid. Hadley thought the TAMWG wanted mainly to be able to take a look and be involved in the review process. Bill Brock asked how the comments may be handled. The general thought was that the TAMWG comments would be passed directly on the SAB. The TMC decided to take this up during tomorrow's presentation.

Hadley continued with her report moved to the second point of how the TAMWG considered directions to the Design Team as to how the team should incorporate other stakeholders input. The TAMWG did not give specific directions other than to continue to consider outside inputs. Mike Orcutt asked about the level of stakeholder input and how useful the information was to the design team. There were questions about the level of inputs the public gives and whether they affect design objectives. D.J. Bandrowski was to make a presentation on this issue later in the day.

Hadley's third point was that the TAMWG received a presentation on gravel inputs for 2013 with specific recommendations. The TAMWG had concerns over gravel being injected downstream of the Lewiston Weir and they recommended that gravel injections be limited to Lewiston. Person noted that they will be having a presentation on gravel later on in the meeting.

The fourth point was that the TAMWG recommended the TMC approve payment to Wellock and develop a policy for any future claims. This issue prompted an extended discussion. Person noted the recent two-part motion passed by the TMC and asked for more clarification on the TAMWG motion. Nancy Finley had attended the TAMWG meeting and noted the TAMWG's desire to solve Mr. Wellock's problem and to have a general policy to address landowner issues. Person reviewed how he previously had asked Mr. Wellock what he expected regarding his assumption of risk living along the river. Wellock had reasoned that the gravel additions were a consequence of Program actions. Person noted that he is consulting further with the Solicitor. There was discussion about whether the Program can just pay Wellock this one time. Judy Pflueger said maybe wait for the further guidance. There was further discussion if the TAMWG was asking the TMC to reconsider its recent motion to not use Program funds. Pflueger asked if all decisions by TMC need TAMWG input. It was explained that there is no clear policy but the TAMWG sets it meetings just before the TMC and tracks the TMC agenda so as to provide input. Orcutt noted the problems of waiting for the Solicitor's input. Schrock noted that the TAMWG had opportunity to act sooner. Hadley opined that TAMWG was not aware of a need to make a decision as the process appeared to be moving along.

Curtis Milliron thought that if no action were clear by next TMC meeting, they do something. He also noted that there is a low chance of setting a precedent since there are few agricultural wells there and that this was a low cost of about \$1,200 (or perhaps up to \$8,500). He proceeded to make a motion to wait on the decision to reconsider payment as recommended by TAMWG until the next TMC meeting. During the discussion of the motion, Mike Orcutt asked questions about authority to make a decision and time frames for getting additional information. He expressed concern if they fail to get a clear or concise direction, and they may be constrained to make payment. Person clarified that Milliron's motion did not constrain the TMC to accept the requirement to pay Wellock if there were no clarification or guidance. Nancy Finley asked whether they need a motion to "not act" or if this could be easily communicated to the TAMWG that the TMC would wait until the next meeting. Seth Naman suggested they might change the motion to a recommendation that the TMC write a letter to Reclamation to provide guidance on how Wellock's claim under the 1915 Act may be treated. The motion was voted on without changes.

Curtis Milliron made a motion the TMC postpone the decision to reconsider the recommendation by the TAMWG until next quarterly meeting to allow alternative process to be resolved.

Bill Brock seconded the motion.

The motion passed with seven "ayes" and zero "nays."

The Hoopa Tribe abstained.

5. Report from Executive Director

Robin Schrock led the TMC through her written report. She noted several handouts that she provided to the TMC and that there were upcoming presentations by other TRRP scientists. She noted the success of the riparian plantings in Upper Junction City and that they survived the recent 6,000 cfs high flows. An implementation update will be given by D.J. Bandrowski. She noted upcoming meetings that are planned with stakeholders. The design groups are submitting proposals for the upcoming year. Eight proposals for watershed projects were reviewed and Kent Steffens will be presenting on the projects the Workgroup

selected. Those other high priority watershed projects that are yet unfunded were passed on recently during an USDA query about unfunded opportunities in Trinity County. Bucktail Bridge is moving forward. A presentation on gravel will be presented later in the meeting. Public outreach is active and they have used the Stream Decision tool with good public turnout. A new video on the Trinity River was just released showcasing Trinity River fish. Steve Cannata of California Fish and Wildlife did a nice write-up on the Program for the RCD Fall Almanac. She noted the Science Symposium earlier this month and that they have received four appendices so far from the SAB.

Mike Orcutt asked a question about the FY 2013 budget uncertainties, and how the agencies are planning for the second half of the year. Brian Person noted that Reclamation has not made the request to analyze how the budget will look for the second half of the year. There is too much uncertainty and there could be cuts. He contrasted that by noting that under a CR in 2009, the TRRP received an additional \$3 million. Robin Schrock noted they are operating on the 2012 budget levels although they have been told to operate on the President's budget proposal during the CR, because of uncertainties for the second half of the year before Congress acts.

Break

Information / Decision Items:

6. Pool Change Evaluation

Dave Gaeuman of the TRRP presented a set of overhead slides on the preliminary results from the pool change analysis. He reviewed how the Program collected sonar data on the bottom of the river beginning in 2009. The data has been getting better each year and 2011 has wide coverage. He used the data from these three years in "deep areas" that had data for all three years. The year of data refers to the release year and represents the river before the next year's high flows. He showed an example graphical comparison of cumulative depths where all three years of data were displayed to show filling or scour for specific areas. He showed the Wellock Pool that showed no change between 2009 and 2010 but substantial filling in 2011 (30 % of the area is now an emergent bar at baseflow). Curves that were shifted to the left signified filling whereas shifts to the right signified scour.

Gaeuman showed a synthesis graph of changes in depth between 2009 and 2011 as a function of distance downstream from Lewiston Dam. He pointed out several distinct reaches. There was general deepening in the river overall but there were three areas that showed filling. The first reach of filling was in the area of Trinity House Gulch and Wellock Pool. Gaeuman noted these were areas that received substantial floodplain lowering and gravel injections. The next reach downstream showed scour until Indian Creek where there was another area of deposition. Finally, he noted some filling downstream near Junction City that were long distances from any gravel additions and what he thought were adjustments being made by the river. He summarized his views that the fillings that could be associated with Program activities were mostly local near the projects and if these were removed from his analysis, the river has been showing deepening over time.

Travis Michel clarified Gaeuman's conclusion that most filling was associated in local areas near projects and in other places filling was minor. Robert Franklin noted that Indian Creek and Weaver Creek had the most filling and these have large sediment inputs by tributaries.

He thought the other areas showed scour or minor filling and he thought this appeared to be good thing for the juvenile fish. Robin Schrock asked, if they are finding that filling occurs where floodplain lowering occurs on the inside bends, is this being incorporated into the designs. Teresa Connor noted that this data shows that the river is doing what they had wanted. Mike Orcutt took a minor exception to a public statement made by the Program, and made a point about the Regional Board not issuing a permit for gravel placement last year even though the ROD specify it. He said that the Hoopa Tribe thought they missed an opportunity there. He asked about the final status of the report to give guidance on gravel. Dave Hillemeier noted the pool depth may not be a gravel question but a design question of lowering floodplain and widening the river. Travis Michel asked if there was a model of what a large river should have for holding area and pools. Schrock said there was literature for pool –riffles sequences, and she thought Thomas Quinn has published on patterns for natural rivers and would look for it. Michel said they are not so concerned with filling but that the balance is being properly maintained. George Kautsky asked if this was an appropriate demonstration of the river getting deeper since the sites were not randomly selected. Gaeuman acknowledged that these sites were not randomly selected.

7. Physical Workgroup Gravel Recommendation

Andreas Krause made a presentation on the recommendation from the Physical Workgroup on the gravel additions for the coming season. He reviewed the ROD recommendation of an average of 10,300 cubic yards (CY) and more recently Dave Gaeuman did a more detailed analysis and estimated an average of 6,700 CY.

Krause reported the Physical Workgroup recommended high flow addition of to 3,000 CY and low flow additions to be determined at the next meeting. He showed the recommended sites for the high flow additions at Lewiston and at Lowden. The potential low flow addition sites were on existing bars as Lewiston Cableway and Sawmill. He also noted two other areas at Sawmill that could use some modifications to the floodplains. There are still discussions over the amount of gravel to be added and the existing guidance documents. They will be considering the Phase I Review, the pool analysis, and the updated sediment budget.

Mike Orcutt asked how the McBain and Trush study is being used. Krause noted that report did not recommend a specific number for the long term budget. Orcutt asked how Gaeuman arrived at his lower recommendation. Krause said that Gaeuman had significantly more data that had been collected since the ROD study and ran the new data through sediment transport models. Orcutt asked if they were on track to get this year's permits. Schrock said yes. Dave Hillemeier asked about critical pools to protect. Krause noted the Lowden Ranch site was one and the TAMWG recommended the additions be limited only to the Lewiston site since gravel additions from Rush Creek was sufficient amounts. The TAMWG wanted to wait on the low flow additions until there was more assessment by the Physical Workgroup in February. Judy Pflueger asked about the concern of adding too much at the Lewiston Weir. Krause said that 3,000 CY could overload the site.

Brian Person summarized the recommendations and asked if the TMC wanted to consider a motion. Dave Hillemeier made a motion to adopt the Physical Workgroup recommendation. During the discussion of the motion, Judy Pflueger asked how the Lowden site may respond to the gravel additions. Gaeuman discussed that some shallowing could occur requiring guides to drag their boats over a bar. Elizabeth Hadley commented that the TAMWG recommendation to avoid gravel additions at Lowden came essentially from the guides and

landowner concerns over filling. Mike Orcutt supported the motion to adopt the Physical Workgroup recommendation. Brian Person noted that there had been a desire to hear from the SAB and he noted that the SAB had acknowledged the gravel deficit but had not made a specific recommendation about injections. Seth Naman noted that the volumes are somewhat conservative.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to adopt the Physical Workgroup recommendation of up to 2,000 cubic yards at Lewiston Weir and up to 1,000 cubic yards at Lowden Ranch based on the two presentations made and based on a gravel deficit in the river.

Seth Naman seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

8. Design Team Memo

D.J. Bandrowski reviewed the Design Team Memo that that had been sent to the TMC requesting guidance over how much stakeholder input should be used in the design process. He went over a series of 11 goals of the design process. He referenced goal number 2 to increase adult holding habitat. He also noted that goals 8, 9, 10 were designed to prevent negative impacts to infrastructure, reduce uncertainty and increase public benefits; these were not in the ROD but were added in following the public concerns in recent years. He restated that the Design Team was seeking guidance on how the Design Team should be seeking and using inputs from stakeholders.

There was an extended discussion over how much input stakeholders should have in the design goals. The discussion covered a variety of items including whether they may be allowing too much stakeholder input that may usurp the Program basic goals, the need to address stakeholder's perspectives, the need to have demonstrated metrics as a result of channel work, and the value of the Stream Project in addressing these issues.

Bill Brock asked how stakeholder input has affected the Design Team's ability to achieve the goals of the design. Bandrowski said that some of the early input was "hard" but overall, they have heard a lot of good comments and dialog with the stakeholders. Seth Naman, citing an earlier Design Team process memo, thought that stakeholder input was already addressed fairly well. Bandrowski reiterated that they are moving forward with that concept but there were some questions of whether they are using too much stakeholder input or need more. Bandrowski said there were some concerns on the Design Team that this is not the right approach. Dave Hillemeier asked if they try to accomplish each of the 11 goals at every site. Bandrowski said they used the goals in the Stream Project decision tool and the stakeholders are allowed to weight the goals and they are integrated into the process. Bandrowski acknowledged that some goals and objectives are mutually exclusive but the weighting process helps to prioritize the goals.

Robert Franklin thought the guidance given previously by Brian Person that is, "to not compromise the design" has been very useful. Franklin further noted that the Design Team may get into trouble when they consider issues outside of their expertise such as possible litigation. He noted another problem was that they did not have a numeric metric by which to define adult holding habitat. Ernie Clarke noted the need to show the fishery benefits of designs and that these will help to communicate rationales. Judy Pflueger said they must consider the public benefit as that will "make or break us" and they do need to balance

designs against public benefits. Dave Hillemeier thought the guidance given on the phone call was to not deviate from the design but how to set those goals and objectives using public benefits. Andreas Krause said it is clear from adaptive management that one needs to state objectives and they need to be measurable so the site can be evaluated after it is built. The Stream Project helps to set the next round of goals and objectives and allows stakeholder input.

Person noted that objectives have evolved, they have a need to increase juvenile habitat, and as they look at sites they have constraints. D.J. Bandrowski said they now do the process a bit differently. He said before they put pencil to paper, they establish basic goals and objectives using stakeholder input. He said they need goals and objectives with definable metrics. The Stream Project tool is a way to utilize that process. Nancy Finley mentioned the concept known as “value analysis” that identifies stakeholders but does not change the design. Once you have a design that meets your goals you have a “check in” to make sure you are not doing too much damage. She thought they are designing a decision system for that one piece and it should be for the whole program. She was concerned at how they are implementing it. Person further noted that “the timing of the stakeholder input may be off.”

Bandrowski clarified the extent to which stakeholders influence the designs. He said they allow the stakeholder to weight the goals as presented to them and do not allow the stakeholders to choose the goals. Seth Naman agreed with this, noting that they may not want the public to set up the goals for the site. Bandrowski said the weighting by the stakeholders and the Program partners come out pretty similar. Judy Pflueger said she participated in the Stream Project and the weighting and she said it was very favorable in that the results were similar and the Program got “buy in.” George Kautsky said the input is valuable but the weighting of goals seem to be more “juxtaposed” to those of the Program partners and this tends to mediate the combined result. He thought there may be an intermediate step. Person noted that to “minimize uncertainty” would be the most important goal. Kautsky said this goal is where everyone agrees. Dave Hillemeier said they should take this up tomorrow following the SAB discussion.

9. Consensus/Dispute Resolution Guidance

Robin Schrock provided an update on consensus and dispute resolution among partners within the Program. She noted that some contention continues to arise within the technical workgroups over the issues related to policy and not technical issues. The workgroups waste time on policy that they cannot implement. She was seeking to limit word smithing and filibustering. She noted the retreat identified a dispute resolution and noted the value of adopting a generic workgroup charter. She said that this has been done and they will give it to the TMC tomorrow. She said technical disputes that cannot be resolved can be handled by preparing a white paper on the technical issue and if a member dissents they would meet with Schrock to present the technical alternative to the TMC. She warned of the impending workload that will likely come from the Phase I Review and that dispute resolution must be resolved.

Brian Person clarified that this is for larger disputes. Nancy Finley said the TMC may not be best to resolve technical issues but direct how (or by whom) technical issues be resolved. Finley suggested they take the original chart and add in boxes representing Clarke, Schrock or perhaps Bandrowski. Person echoed that the TMC is ill-equipped to resolve most technical issues. Schrock agreed they could add the SAB or an outside reviewer to help with technical issues. Finley acknowledged they talked about this in 2010 but have not

been a good job of implementing it. Clarke noted that Joe Polos did follow the process. Polos thought the issues were not yet resolved (South Fork and Lower Klamath disease issues). They summarized that the issues be resolved at the lowest levels and clarify the technical and policy elements.

Adjourn for day

Thursday January 17, 201; 8:40 AM

Brian Person opened the meeting and noted that the TMC was going to address the October minutes and that they still had a couple of undecided issues. Mike Orcutt had submitted a set of clarifications to the minutes the day before.

Approval of October 2012 Minutes

Curtis Milliron made a motion to accept the October 2012 TMC meeting minutes as amended.

Judy Pflueger seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

10. Implementation Update – 2013 Rehabilitation Projects

D.J. Bandrowski gave a Powerpoint presentation on the 2013 design process and project updates. He also introduced Jeremiah Lewis a recently hired engineering technician that now works at the TRRP office.

Bandrowski started with a description of the design process at Lorenz Gulch and Upper Douglas City. These two projects had been 100 % designed by January of last year, but it was decided to have both projects undergo a completely new re-design. This decision was based on a series of factors including recommendations received by SAB to incorporate more definitive goals and objectives, new information they learned from the 2011 high flows, the desire to incorporate Phase I Review, and the desire to incorporate stakeholder input. He explained how they introduced the Stream Project, a computer-aided decision tool that explicitly incorporates goals and inputs from multiple interests. He showed some output from the Stream Project and the scoring system used to evaluate how well various alternative designs may meet the listed goals.

The TMC asked about the subjectivity of some of the scores, especially the scores for public benefits where scores were a range from 1 to 5 representing poor to good. Bandrowski showed some of the outputs of the Stream Project scores. He explained that both the Program partners and the stakeholders were allowed to weight the various goals and this then produced a final set of weighted scores for the three design alternatives. The output from both the Program partners and the stakeholders both had higher scored for design 2 for Upper Douglas City. He stressed this is not a decision tool where the highest score is chosen but it is used as a way to view trade-offs and even meld two alternatives together to optimized design elements to meet multiple objectives.. He said they could continue to re-run the program as new information and metrics may become available and as the design advances.

Bandrowski next moved to a description of the design at Upper Douglas City and showed an aerial photo with various design elements. He noted an issue of a mining claim on BLM

lands and an upcoming hearing. Because of the scheduled hearing and also because of budget uncertainties, they propose implementing the lower half (below the Highway 299 Bridge) this year and the upper half next year. Bandrowski led the TMC through the design elements of the upper half, noting some of the in-channel work to enhance channel flow and habitat complexity. He noted some enhancements to the existing side channel and wood additions.

Mike Orcutt asked about flooding to private properties and if this was considered in the new designs. Bandrowski acknowledged that the designs do lower the 100-year and the 11,000 cfs floodplain but are restricted to a foot change in the surface elevation; in general, they try not to change the floodplain levels. Brian Person asked about the rationale for working in a site that had received some restoration work in 2007 instead of working at a new site. Bandrowski said that the original design did not “reach the mark” and, with the additional work, it could achieve the goals. He further noted that the original design was associated with a decrease in juvenile habitat and that recreational fishing was diminished.

Bandrowski continued the presentation and described the infiltration gallery of the City of Weaverville that is used during late summer to augment their drinking water supplies. He showed the location just below the 299 Bridge and describes some intended revetment using woody debris to protect the structure from erosion. He described other wood placements, and boulder placements in the lower half of the site to enhance complexity. He showed modeled flood depths under high flows and contrasted existing with design. He showed modeled fish habitat changes with the designs. Spawning area would be reduced but fry rearing, pre-smolt rearing, and adult holding would increase. He cited a projected cost of about \$3.2 million.

Dave Hillemeier thought there appeared to be more work on the upper or Indian Creek portion and less on the lower or main channel portion. Bandrowski noted some private property access issues and Highway 3 on the opposite bank. Teresa Connor asked about how they will address public comments through the developing design. Bandrowski said they will be allowing a 30-day comment period but are not planning meetings as they are under some time constraints. Mike Orcutt thought a consideration should be given to re-visiting sites and noted that Dark Gulch and Vitzum Gulch may also be considered. Bandrowski said the Design Team would welcome direction from the TMC on re-visiting sites. He noted Hocker Flat replanting, the Hatchery site, and floodplain work at Sawmill. Brian Person said the simple answer is to ask “what is the best benefit for the investment of energy.” He noted the Program needs to be able to show milestones of benefit. Bandrowski noted the Poker Bar and its ESLs are entirely on private property.

Bandrowski next presented the Lorenz Gulch site by projecting an aerial photo and walking the TMC through the design elements planned for 2013. Starting at the upstream end, he noted that vehicles currently drive onto a beach to access the river and the BLM has asked that this be managed by building a parking area. Moving downstream he showed a forced meander and how they would engage an existing, but non-functioning, side channel. At the downstream end, he described how they would allow flow to better engage a large floodplain using a side channel and pond.

Responding to questions, Bandrowski showed the location of Goat Hole, a deep pool at the end of the site. He noted, compared to the original design, they are getting more habitat for less cost. There were other questions about the excavation of the pond and the relative location of the project to Lower Steiner Flat or the 40-mile restoration reach. Curtis

Milliron asked that location inserts be used to show him the relative locations of these sites on the river.

Bandrowski next showed the modeled velocities over the design elements less than 450 cfs noting the downstream side channel would also be receiving hyporheic flows. He showed more modeled outputs at progressively higher flows and that the side channels would start to engage surface flows at about 4,500 cfs. At 7,500 and 11,000 cfs flows in the mainstem would reach 10 feet per second while the side channels were much slower and would offer refuge.

Seth Naman said he would like to see the Fish Workgroup assess the pond to see the benefits considering the construction costs. The models suggest large increases in juvenile fish habitat. The projected cost is \$5 million. Robert Franklin asked about the bank enhancement on the lower left bank. Bandrowski said it does not produce very much habitat. There were questions about how the budget may affect the ongoing design and that permits would not be expired. Bandrowski acknowledged that a phased approach in Upper Douglas City would be a bit more costly. The designs are being reviewed by Design Team and will go out for 30-day external review. He said the design will be wrapped up by end of February.

Bandrowski finished his presentation with an update on the Indian Creek bank naturalization. The Design Team has not yet reached consensus but are still assessing the design. Bandrowski suggested the TMC discuss the issues of precedent and the technical issues at the next teleconference or the April meeting. Bandrowski said he could provide any updates to the TMC via Robin Schrock.

Break

11. Watershed Update

Kent Steffens, construction manager and acting Watershed Workgroup lead, passed out a handout and projected slides on the watershed update. He noted the TRRP funding for the various watershed projects for 2012 were funded in 2011 for \$492,300 and they had obtained matching funds of \$627,000. These were road decommissioning, sediment reductions, and fish passage projects. The focus areas were in tributaries to the Trinity River that contribute fine sediment to the mainstem.

Steffens next described the plans for this year. Funding from TRRP is \$496,000 with matching funds of \$115,500. He listed five projects and the implementation agencies, and the funding levels. The projects included fish passage, wildlife habitat, and sediment reduction. The three tributaries were Sidney Gulch, Connor Creek, and Lower East Weaver Creek. The remaining two projects were a road inventory over the mainstem, and LiDAR acquisition. The implementation agencies included the Northwest California Resource and Development Council, the Five C's, and the Trinity County Resource Conservation District (TCRCD). Steffen's handout also included a list of six projects proposed for 2014 anticipating TRRP funding of \$500,000 with a match of \$225,000.

Steffen listed the criteria used to select projects such as matching the Program EIS, having leverage other funds, reducing sediment at the lowest cost, and having sound planning. Brian Person asked about "brick and mortar" construction projects in the tributaries. Robin Schrock said the Watershed Workgroup focuses on sediment sources to the mainstem from tributaries and techniques to reduce this. Mike Orcutt asked about evaluation process noting

that last year the TMC was asked to make recommendation on funding the watershed inventory and they were not allowed to review and evaluate the actual proposals because of federal contracting requirements. Robin Schrock explained how the proposals are evaluated in the Watershed Workgroup. The watershed assessment project was different because it went out nationally for competition and could only be reviewed by Reclamation employees who only reviewed the technical merits of how well the proposals addressed the TMC approved scope of work, and the experience of the proponents. She explained that was a separate process than how projects are normally reviewed by the Watershed Workgroup.

Brian Person asked if the TMC wished to make a motion and noted that the TMC had previously approved \$500,000, that there was a substantial match, and that the TAMWG had suggested more funding if it were available. Judy Pflueger made a motion to approve the watershed projects as presented. Mike Orcutt expressed concern regarding a reduced level of oversight on the watershed projects. He noted that there was not a staff person working on it, the large amount of money being given out, and the lower amount of scrutiny or developed criteria compared to the other parts of the Program. Dave Hillemeier asked who provides the oversight. Schrock explained that the projects are reviewed, ranked and approved by the TRRP Watershed Workgroup and then go through the government contracting as a single package. Steffens said the field inspections are performed by the RCD, a representative from the Program coordinates, and a final report is prepared.

Judy Pflueger made a motion that the TMC approve the recommendation for watershed projects.

Dave Hill seconded the motion.

The motion passed with seven “ayes” zero “nays.”

The Hoopa Valley Tribe abstained.

12. Science Symposium

Ernie Clarke passed out a handout and gave an update on the Science Symposium that focused largely on the Phase I Review. He explained the purpose of the Phase I review to assess Program effectiveness, the use of four spatial scales, and that the Phase I Review report will be composed of a main report and eight appendices. He said the recent SAB presentations are being posted on the TRRP website as PDFs of Powerpoint presentations. The preliminary findings are currently under review by the Program.

Clarke described how the SAB meetings went. There was very high attendance (more than 40 people) at public meetings. Mike Merigliano’s presentation focused on the approach taken by the SAB. Clarke noted that the follow up questions tried to get at the results, but the SAB was sharing little at that time pending their review of the support contractor work. Clarke passed out copies of the questions and summary of the responses. He acknowledged that the public was somewhat disappointed and he thought the public presentations would have benefited by being made later in the week as the information was developing during the week. Clarke noted the SAB and its contractors were working with the large appendices and since the information was new, there still was some uncertainty over consensus interpretations by SAB members. By the time the SAB members left, they expressed that they had gathered much useful information.

Clarke went over the eight SAB provisional recommendations. These included better articulation of goals and objectives, embrace scientific uncertainty, embrace experimental

approach, integrate Workgroups more, embrace internal reviews to get findings and publications out quickly, relate findings to other systems, and use a Decision Support System (DSS).

Clarke said the TRRP partner staff will provide comments to be incorporated into the final report. He also noted that the SAB said the Program should take credit for the tremendous work that has been accomplished in the last decade.

Brian Person asked if the TMC had comments on the eight recommendations. He noted that they heard that the recommendation to adopt the DSS will not change and he thought the second to last (relate findings to other programs) was the least important. Bill Brock noted the recommendation to treat rehabilitation projects as experiments may be a way to reduce uncertainty. Mike Orcutt said his concern is the issue of stakeholder input and this could further complicate their already difficult main priority of restoring fish.

Dave Hillemeier thought the process may have gotten too carried away with independent review and stressed a need for more interaction between the reviewer and those collecting the data. He said he was aware of some errors over the SAB's understanding of the data collection methods. Clarke thought there was no misuse of the data but the SAB may not know everything about the collection. Robin Schrock commented that they have come a long way and the meta-data effort has helped. Person thought the SAB's recommendations are general enough and would not likely change had the SAB known the sources of the data; he was less concerned over the knowledge of the source of the data. Curtis Milliron thought the reviews said overall TRRP is on course. He thought that the statistical assessment of the rate of improvement suggested slower responses (e.g., at the 3 % increases) but that the overall assessment of benefit may be an order of magnitude higher. Milliron also noted the recommendation regarding increased integration of the technical workgroups is one he would whole-heartedly support. Seth Naman noted that it may have been more useful for the Program to do its own review and let the SAB review that instead of doing numeric analyses. He also wanted more information on the DSS and what the cost estimates may be. Person noted the SAB said the Program is quite close to implementing the DSS. Hillemeier said his group is concerned about how much time they have to review the appendices that the SAB have not themselves reviewed. He also asked if there would be added reviews based on new information and analyses that are coming out.

Lunch

13. Phase 1 Review – next steps

Ernie Clarke introduced Jim Peterson who was able to participate by WebEx and make a Powerpoint over WebEx. He explained the values of using the Decision Support System (DSS). He said DSS will better structure Program activities and will help to explain and defend the activities and lends itself to an adaptive management approach. He contrasted it with a traditional decision making as information leading to targets being done by individuals (black box). Two different individuals will make different assumptions and since their models are in their heads cannot easily rectify the differences. Managers can gain expertise but it can be lost when they leave or retire if there is no formal transfer. He described levels of uncertainty, environmental, statistical, and ecological or system uncertainty that makes decisions hard. Dueling models are difficult to resolve and there is what he called linguistic uncertainty. In decision sciences, they link decisions to objectives. He talked more about confusing fundamental and mean objectives. An example he cited

that a hydrologist may only focus on achieving a hydrologic regime with no regard to fish performance. It is important to agree on the fundamental objectives. He said two common problems are that objectives can be dismissed due to perceived conflicts and that values (objectives) can masquerade as facts. He said that true scientific disagreement can be incorporated into DSS. He stressed the need to identify key uncertainties and this can help to structure data collection. He discussed ways adaptive management could test two models with monitoring data in a formal way.

For the TRRP he noted they need explicit objectives, decision alternatives and integrated DSS. He thought most of these already exist. He showed a conceptual model of how the SAB envisions the DSS for the TRRP. DSS will allow the Program to link action to stakeholder's objectives in a transparent manner and identify the most effective actions. He said it would resolve conflict separating values from science and improve management. DSS should refine existing efforts under a common framework and not re-invent the wheel.

Seth Naman asked about costs, and whether DSS has been used previously. Peterson said DSS has been used for harvest management of black duck hunting on the Eastern Seaboard and water management in the Southeastern US. He cited the Harris Dam project in Alabama as using DSS to run hydropower and maximizing objectives of multiple stakeholders. The Harris Dam has a good website on their use of DSS. Brian Person noted that many pieces are in place, but asked whether it would take a full-time person to run it and where that person would situate. Peterson did not think it would take a full-time person. He cited they usually have remotely located scientists that may need a coordinator but not full-time. Models are run and these are linked as part of the process. Mike Orcutt said he was wrestling with a program with Congressional mandates. And now you overlay stakeholder inputs, how do you maintain the Program objectives? Peterson said the law trumps everything, doesn't it? He also noted that it depends on the governing structure as to how a group makes decisions. The governing group has to decide what is or isn't a reasonable objective. There should be rules in place in the charter. Judy Pflueger said the stakeholders cannot be excluded and need to be included to keep public trust and prevent future uprisings. Peterson suggested they consider objectives as being subject to stated constraints. For example, Alabama Power cannot lose money is one constraint. Peterson used another example of the Red Knot (a bird) and the use of Horseshoe Crabs for blood research. The management actions are to harvest Horseshoe Crabs, provide public access to beach, and provide refuges areas that Red Knots use along their migration route. For the TRRP, core objectives are set up such as geomorphology; then you can add societal objectives. Robert Franklin asked if Peterson had any idea of success and failure. Peterson said that at recent AFS meeting panel discussion, they decided they need a champion that says "we need to do this." If you have this, these projects are successful.

At this point the discussion turned to what the TMC thought about the DSS. Nancy Finley thought there will be no major surprises from the Phase I Review and the TMC could make some motion about support for the DSS. She suggested they decide if they want to commit to it this year or not. She suggested they should not "prolong the agony" and it may be good to "bite the bullet" now to adopt the inevitable. She thought they should focus on this for 2014.

After more discussion, Nancy Finley made a motion to adopt the preliminary steps of DSS for next year. During the discussion of the motion, Mike Orcutt said he was not comfortable given the upcoming recommendations contained in the Phase 1 review report and possible program adjustments. He wanted more time to think about it and expressed discomfort with

the recommendation to coordinate with the Klamath. Brian Person reminded Orcutt that the DSS was one of the three constraining recommendations that the SAB will make. Ernie Clarke also added the SAB felt there was a time constraint. Nancy Finley said they do not need to do it but they should at least begin looking at it. Dave Hillemeier expressed his concern for the time requirements given all the other demands at this time. Nancy Finley changed the motion from an implementation plan to a scoping document so as to limit the commitment of effort at this time.

Nancy Finley made a motion to develop a scoping document for a decision support system for the Program to be implemented in 2014 with options to address commitments and involvement of exiting partners, a timeline, and costs.

Judy Pflueger seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

14. Workgroup update

Ernie Clarke referred the TMC to a handout in their packet and commented on the more important points that the Workgroups are doing.

Flow Workgroup has a subgroup looking at winter season river flows. The Flow Workgroup is analyzing how well the flows have been met.

The Temperature Workgroup is modifying temperature criteria. Judy Pflueger complimented Rod Wittler's work.

The Design Team is working with Darcy Pickard on channel effectiveness measures.

The Physical Workgroup is working on 2011 sediment transport data from GMA which is on the TRRP website. Work also continues on the USGS project.

The Wildlife and Riparian Workgroup is working on a desired future conditions document that will be out in February. The re-vegetation strategy has been drafted and comments are expected back from California Department of Fish and Wildlife (formerly Fish and Game) in a month. Limited field work is planned on frogs and turtles and a study plan is being prepared. The riparian bird study is on the website and two other reports are being reviewed. Clarke noted they have streamlined the review process as recommended by the SAB.

The Fish Workgroup has discussed tasks. The juvenile salmonid density project will support a fish production model and handle the Design Team request. The Fish Workgroup is examining the Klamath fish production model to adapt to the Trinity River.

Mike Orcutt asked that the Workgroup report be arrayed to show products and expected due dates such as the gravel report and temperature report.

15. Open Forum

Robert Franklin noted that the Hoopa Tribe has been a proponent of adaptive management since 1996. He said he was in the session mentioned by Jim Peterson where they discussed the role of a champion to determine success. He suggested a multi-group director to make sure the work gets done after the objectives are chosen. He stressed the challenge to all the partners.

16. Calendar – 2013 Meetings

The schedule for teleconferences and meetings were reviewed as follows (all teleconferences run from 10 AM to noon):

February 14 teleconference.

March 14 teleconference.

April 3-4 meeting at Weitchpec (Redding as an alternative)

May 16 teleconference.

June 26-27 meeting in Redding (Weitchpec)

July 18 teleconference.

August 22 teleconference.

September 18-19 meeting at Arcata.

October 17 teleconference.

November 14 teleconference.

December 11-12 meeting in Hoopa.

17. Remaining Items

Brian Person reviewed there were still two remaining issue for the TMC to address.

The first issue was how to manage the Phase I Review and whether to allow the TAMWG to be part of the process. Nancy Finley noted that the TAMWG was seeking inclusiveness, would honor confidentiality, and would limit the review to technical aspects. Person asked if a motion was needed or just a letter of reply. Dave Hillemeier said he was strongly supportive of having TAMWG comment with provision of submitting comments through Elizabeth Hadley to TMC, no sharing, and a limit on the comments to technical issues. Person said he could draft this sentiment in a letter. Ernie Clarke said the TAMWG already had the five appendices and can access the presentations on the TRRP website. Curtis Milliron thought it was important to include the TAMWG and not treat them as “second class” citizens.

The second issue of how to respond to the Design Team Memo regarding guidance to the Design Team for the use of stakeholder input in the development of design goals and objectives. Person reviewed that everyone agrees that stakeholder input is needed, but the issue is how much and at what levels. Person noted that D.J. Bandrowski had opined to him that he thought stakeholder input should come in earlier in the process than Person had thought. Person also noted that the TAMWG is urging it, the stakeholders want it, and the remaining sites are all on private lands. He noted that Mike Orcutt may have some ideas or wish to make a motion. Seth Naman said that he thought development of goals and recommendation at specific sites should be left to the technical partners. They perhaps should solicit stakeholder inputs and consider it, but not be required to use the input. This would allow the stakeholders to be heard and it would allow the Design Team opportunities to learn. D.J. Bandrowski clarified that the stakeholders had not developed goals or objectives, but had been involved during the weighing of the importance of the goals.

The question was how to involve the stakeholder input in the design process. Person thought the timing should be at the 10 to 20 % design and to not compromise the Program

objectives. Dave Hillemeier agreed with this. Mike Orcutt said he wanted to go at it another way and he was not clear about some of the goals on Design Team Memo. He read a motion to recognize the value of the Stream Project but to hold to the goals of the Program. During the discussion of the motion, D.J. Bandrowski said the ROD goals are too broad for the site design to develop monitoring for performance. Ernie Clarke noted that a past goal for a project may have said they were going to “make more habitat.” Person noted the Design Memo goals agree with Orcutt’s motion. Orcutt said he wanted to know if there was a second. Before Hillemeier could offer the second, he asked that the motion be projected so he could read it and offer edits.

As they read the motion and discussed it, Brian Person and Judy Pflueger opined that the motion would not contradict or constrain the requests of the Design Team Memo. There were concerns over Goal 2 of how to maintain adult holding habitat and whether or not flow management is readily meeting this objective. Person stated his concerns over the negative public reaction over possible loss of holding habitat and whether the motion may be construed as mutually exclusive with Goal 2. George Kautsky suggested the public add their views and these be considered, but as a separate process. Pflueger expressed her support for the process Bandrowski has taken and her concern for the importance of avoiding a repeat of last year’s “revolt.”

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the TMC recognize the Stream Project Tool (Wilcock, 2012) has value as a communications tool. It can support effective dialogue between stakeholders and program partners in regards to the design process. However, to promote the scientific aspect of TRRP’s AEAM platform, the TMC moves that the program's fundamental goals as identified in the Flow Evaluation Report, Record of Decision, and AEAM process be recognized as the fundamental determinants of site design.

The motion failed with three “aye” votes, three “nay” votes, with two abstentions.

Nancy Finley said she could have supported the motion except that she did not see the need for it. Dave Hillemeier noted he supported the discussion at the December teleconference and made a motion in that line. It was noted that this motion did not address the goals of the Design Memo.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion that the Design Team come up with the site specific goals and objectives based upon science of the Program. These objectives will then be shared with stakeholders at the concept design level to receive comments and advice. Stakeholder comments will be considered to the extent that they do not compromise site specific goals and objectives.

Bill Brock seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Adjourn of meeting 4:00 PM

Tentative Agenda
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
 Library, Weaverville, CA
 January 16-17, 2013

Wednesday, January 16, 2013

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic, Purpose and/or Decision to be Made</u>	<u>Discussion Leader</u>
<i>Regular Business:</i>		
12:00	Introductions: - Approval of Agenda - Approval of October 2012 Minutes	Brian Person, Chair
12:30	Open Forum: Comments from the public	Brian Person
1:00	Report from TMC Chair ▪ Federal budget ▪ Landowner concerns	Brian Person
1:30	Report from TAMWG Chair	Elizabeth Hadley
2:00	Report from Executive Director	Robin Schrock
<i>Information / Decision Items:</i>		
2:15	Pool Change Evaluation	Dave Gaeuman
2:45	Break	
3:00	Physical Workgroup Gravel Recommendation	Andreas Krause
3:30	Design Team Memo	DJ Bandrowski
4:15	Consensus/dispute resolution guidance	Robin Schrock
5:00	Adjourn	

Thursday, January 17, 2013

8:30	Implementation Update – 2013 Rehabilitation Projects	DJ Bandrowski
10:30	Break	
10:45	Watershed Update	Kent Steffens
11:15	Science Symposium	Ernie Clarke
12:00	Lunch	
1:00	Phase 1 Review – next steps	Ernie Clarke
1:30	Workgroup update	TRRP
2:00	Open Forum	
2:30	Calendar – 2013 Meetings	Brian Person
3:00	Adjourn	