

Final Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
 Humboldt Aquatic Center, Eureka, CA
 Tuesday and Wednesday, October 23-24, 2012

Tuesday, October 23, 2012; 12:00 PM

Attending Members

Member	Representative Seat
Don Reck ¹	Bureau of Reclamation
Nancy Finley	Fish and Wildlife Service, Vice-Chair (acting Chair)
Dave Hillemeier	Yurok Tribe
Mike Orcutt	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Ann Garrett	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Fisheries
Bill Brock ²	Forest Service
Teresa Connor ³	California Natural Resources Agency
Judy Pflueger ⁴	Trinity County
Elizabeth Hadley ⁵	Trinity Adaptive Management Work Group
Robin Schrock ⁵	Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director

1) Alternate for Brian Person; 2) alternate for Sharon Heywood; 3) alternate for Curtis Milliron 4); alternate for Roger Jaegel 5) non-voting members.

Others that attended: D.J. Bandrowski, (Trinity River Restoration Program); George Kautsky and Sean Ledwin, (Hoopa Valley Tribe); Wade Sinnen (California Department of Fish and Game); Mark Smelser (California Department of Water Resources); Russ Bennett (Redding Electric Utility); Jim Smith and Dan Dickerson (landowners near Indian Creek); Aaron Martin (Yurok Tribe); Joe Polos and Vina Frye (Fish and Wildlife Service); Wes Smith (National Marine Fisheries Service); Andrea Collins (Forest Service).

List of Motions that Passed during the Meeting

Judy Pflueger made a motion to approve the TMC October 23-24 meeting agenda as amended.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Bill Brock made a motion to accept the June 2012 TMC meeting minutes.

Ann Garrett seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mike Orcutt made a motion to accept the Design Team recommendation for the Bucktail Bridge, to support the County in seeking funding, and to tie the project to the Dark Gulch feasibility study opportunities.

The motion was seconded by Dave Hillemeier

The motion passed unanimously.

Action Items Derived during the Meeting

Robin Schrock will speak with Jeff Morris regarding posting notices for TMC meetings in local newspapers.

Robin Schrock will seek permission to the release the letter from the law firm representing Jim Smith and Dan Dickerson regarding the Indian Creek bank naturalization site and her response after forwarding the letter to the Solicitor. The Design Team will identify analyses that could help to resolve erosion questions at the Indian Creek site and will provide more information to the TMC at the December 2012 meeting.

Regular Business:

1. Introductions and Approval of Agenda

Nancy Finley opened the Trinity Management Council (TMC) meeting and noted that Brian Person will not be attending. She addressed the agenda and noted that Jennifer Mata would not be presenting and that Rod Wittler's presentation on temperature would be moved forward. Mike Orcutt asked if they will make a recommendation on the 2013 budget and Robin Schrock noted that this was listed under decision items, but cautioned that Congress had not passed a budget for FY2013.

Approval of Agenda

Judy Pflueger made a motion to approve the TMC October 23-24 meeting agenda as amended.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of June 2012 Minutes

Bill Brock made a motion to accept the June 2012 TMC meeting minutes.

Ann Garrett seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Open Forum

There were no comments from the public at this time. Mike Orcutt suggested they should advertise TMC meetings in the newspapers. Robin Schrock noted they have the online calendar and that they send out notices on electronic list servers. Schrock noted they could do notices through the outlets used by the outreach coordinator and she said she would talk Jeff Morris.

Action item: Robin Schrock will speak with Jeff Morris regarding posting notices for TMC meetings in local newspapers.

3. Report from Trinity Management Council Co-Chair

Nancy Finley asked Don Reck to provide a report of activities by the TMC on behalf of Brian Person. Reck addressed a set of items.

Continuing Resolution Effects on 2013 budget

Reck noted that they are operating under a continuing resolution that will likely last until March. He noted that last Friday, the OMB said the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) budget will be based on the 2013 request instead of 2012, and that 2013 from Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) is \$16.1 million and is over \$2 million more than the 2012 budget. Finley noted that the FWS contribution to the TRRP will be based on the 2012 budget and is currently \$1.9 million. Mike Orcutt clarified that the original request for funding for FY2013 was about \$18 and the recent notifications indicate that the budget is about the same as what was requested. But Robin Schrock cautioned that the final budget cannot be known currently as it depends on Congress passing a budget.

Landowner issues

Reck summarized Mr. Wellock's request for financial reimbursement for changes he needed to make to his irrigation system on his property to extend his irrigation line. Reck noted that the BOR discussed some options to build an infiltration galley tied to a cistern and that this system would be moved back from the channel and would constitute a new well system. Since the well grant program did not cover irrigation systems and the Solicitor determined that it was not a "tortious act" (i.e., no tort claim), Wellock's initial request for restitution payment had been denied. The Solicitor is looking into a previous 1915 decision on the San Joaquin River that may open the way to provide a settlement of a single lump sum payment of approximately \$8500 based on a quote would be made with Wellock subject to no further claims against the government.

Judy Pflueger asked if this payment to Wellock would set a precedent. Reck agreed that it could be viewed that way, but he is not aware of other landowners that have come forth for damages for irrigation withdrawals. Funding for the payment would be sourced from the program. Mike Orcutt expressed some concern that "a door may be opened" and asked if BOR can pay for it with other, non-TRRP payments. Pflueger asked how many other agricultural diversions are on the river; Schrock thought under a dozen but wanted information from the state about the difference between claims and licenses. Teresa Connor commented that water rights should also be reviewed. Reck noted that he will bring up these concerns to Person. Dave Hillemeier thought it would be good to know the extent of water withdrawals along the river and Schrock said that information had already been provided to Brian Person.

Watershed Reference Summary for TAMWG

Robin Schrock reported that she had provided the requested summary to TAMWG regarding watershed references in foundational documents and TMC minutes and she included the TMC members on the recipient list. Mike Orcutt said he was willing to engage in a watershed discussion.

DOI Acquisition Procedures Presentation

The presentation for the TMC meeting about DOI Acquisition Procedures was cancelled because the scheduled presenter unfortunately left Reclamation for a new job and they will need to reschedule the presentation.

4. Report from TAMWG Chair

Elizabeth Hadley referred to her letter constituting her report that was included in the TMC information packet and touched on a few items. She noted that the TAMWG appreciated the recent joint meeting with the TMC. She also noted the value of the response matrix that was being put together. She commented that it was valuable to have the TMC Chair at TAMWG meetings to explain the TMC responses to TAMWG recommendations—particularly those that the TMC cannot act on. She noted three recommendations of the TAMWG in the letter: 1) if funding is available to add \$500,000 to the watershed assessment; 2) to have the SAB review efficacy of river sport harvest surveys; and 3) approve the 2013 budget in light of the two previous recommendations. She noted there were two dissenting opinions by TAMWG members and she included letters from the dissenting members as part of her written report.

Bill Brock commented on road maintenance as part of watershed work. He noted that he re-read the foundational documents regarding the ideas and projected spending levels anticipated at that time for the maintenance of roads. He commented how the funding situation has changed since then and that the Forest Service can barely fund their road maintenance now.

5. Report from Executive Director

Robin Schrock noted her written report from the TRRP as part of the TMC information packet and touched on her main points. The flow release summaries from Lewiston Dam are provided monthly by Rod Wittler and real time information is also provided to the public via postings on the website. The implementation update will be provided by D.J. Bandrowski later in this meeting. The well grant program was going very well with 22 new accepted applicants. On the science update, she noted the two temperature reports were completed and that Rod Wittler would be presenting more on this tomorrow. She noted ongoing work on riparian and wildlife issues. The pool scour evaluation draft report will be available in December. External peer review is continuing of all submitted draft reports. She guided the TMC to see the TRRP website as a source of more information on channel rehabilitation, well assistance, and flow. She noted an upcoming meeting of the Design Team with the public on 2013 channel rehabilitation design plans and the Science Symposium in January 7th where the SAB will make a presentation on the Phase I review. She referred the TMC to the list of 2012 TRRP accomplishments and a list of the new Technical Workgroup coordinators.

6. Work Group Updates

Schrock next referred the TMC to another handout in their information packet that described activities of the various Technical Workgroups. She noted that the Flow Workgroup has worked on flow management recommendations to Reclamation help protect the large run of Chinook this year. Temperature and Design Workgroups will be covered later by Rod Wittler and D.J. Bandrowski. Tim Hayden and Joe Polos commented on the Fish Workgroup activities. Schrock noted that Andreas Krause is the new Physical Workgroup lead and that group is working on several assessments: geomorphology, cross sections,

bathymetry, and channel classification. The Wildlife Workgroup toured revegetation sites, and provided technical input to several projects. The Interdisciplinary Team holds monthly teleconferences and is working on the Big Questions. The Watershed Workgroup has several projects. She noted the process of the Watershed Assessment and that they received three proposals and one was chosen by the technical review team, but the TMC decided not to move forward on the assessment.

Break

Information / Decision Items:

7. Implementation/ Design Team Update

D.J. Bandrowski gave a Powerpoint presentation on the Implementation and Design Team updates where he covered a series of sub-items listed below.

2012 Design Season

Bandrowski first commented on the 2012 work season by noting that the revegetation work is nearly complete at the Upper Junction City and Lower Steiner Flat sites. The contractors are using rooted stocks and irrigation and this appears to be working well. They are doing a test of rooted versus dormant cuttings to measure the differences in establishment. He noted success of the construction projects at Upper Junction City and Lower Steiner Flat. The projects generally came in on budget except for Upper Junction City did go over by \$250,000 as a result of the proactive high-flow releases.

2013 Design Process

The 2013 design plans will be reviewed by the SAB and reliant on the results of the Phase I review which is in final preparation. But to get the projects going such as NEPA/CEQA and contracts, they have started the design process already. The chosen sites for 2013 are Lorenz Gulch and Douglas City. The Hoopa Valley Tribe will design Douglas City and the Yurok and Federal team will do the Lorenz Gulch. He noted that these two sites had been 100 % designed in 2011, but the Design Team will start over using the new design process and knowledge gained from recent projects, and prepare three alternatives for each site.

Bill Brock asked how the SAB may view the new design process. Bandrowski said they have conferred with the SAB to ensure that they are coordinating with each other.

Bandrowski explained their decision to try the Stream Project approach to develop designs that incorporate multiple perspectives of stakeholders in a transparent process. Using the Stream Project they will be presenting design alternatives to stakeholders at a November 14 facilitated meeting with the plan of selecting preferred alternatives for SAB review. Final designs will be completed by end of December.

Responding to a question from Mike Orcutt, Bandrowski thought both construction projects may not get implemented if the budget comes in lower than expected. Bandrowski also pointed out that the Douglas City will be very visible to the public.

Wade Sinnen asked about some of the goals and objectives that are being considered for the 2013 designs. Bandrowski listed some of the goals: habitat enhancement goals for fish and wildlife, promotion of fluvial processes, enhance public lands, protect infrastructure, and cost efficiency. There was more discussion about work with guides, whether they are

protecting existing habitat, the collaborative nature of the effort, and that this process will provide desired documentation about how a design was arrived at.

Mike Orcutt asked if they are considering lamprey. Bandrowski noted that Hamilton Ponds have shown to be a spot used by lamprey. Aaron Martin noted that lamprey has not been listed on the objectives yet but he is interested in lamprey and is studying it further. He agreed that this discussion needs to come up soon.

Bucktail Bridge Cost-Benefit Analysis

Bandrowski described the process of analyzing construction of a replacement bridge at the Bucktail site (on Browns Mountain Road). He summarized the long-term plan as to have CH2MHill to move forward with the preferred design and that Trinity County will seek funding from the State of California to begin construction in 2014.

Bandrowski went over the details of the project and the recommended design. He noted that the Trinity County bridge is threatened by high flows and will likely not pass a 100-year flood event. During the 2011 peak flows of 11,800 cfs, the flow was within 1.5 feet of the bottom of the bridge. This is dangerous to the bridge and to rafters floating the river. If the upstream levee had failed, it would have likely caused a failure of the box culvert on the river right side channel. A series of alternatives were considered. Alternative 5 is to build a longer, single-span bridge and remove the overflow structure and dike. Alternative 6 is similar but to build the bridge as a two-span structure. The Design Team recommends a hybrid between 5 and 6 with no secondary pier at a cost of \$2.2 million. The TRRP portion of the cost will be \$200,000 for the design and environmental documentation. The design must be completed for the County to seek construction funding.

The TMC had several questions. Mike Orcutt asked how the bridge project relates to the Dark Gulch feasibility study. Bandrowski listed some of the constraints and noted that the hydraulic constraints of the bridge were being resolved by the bridge project. Judy Pflueger noted Trinity County's appreciation for this work. Bill Brock asked if they considered leaving the bridge and replacing the culvert with a larger one. Bandrowski said that it was considered and there were concerns about filling in the Bucktail hole.

Bandrowski asked the TMC to consider whether they wanted to provide their approval for the project.

Mike Orcutt made a motion to accept the Design Team recommendation for the Bucktail Bridge, to support the County in seeking funding, and to tie the project to the Dark Gulch feasibility study opportunities.

The motion was seconded by Dave Hillemeier

The motion passed unanimously.

Indian Creek Naturalization Project

Bandrowski provided an update on the Indian Creek Naturalization project. He noted the presence at this meeting of Mr. Smith and Mr. Dickerson, two landowners at the Indian Creek site. Bandrowski noted that rehabilitation project at Indian Creek was implemented in 2007. An in-channel excavation of a mid-channel bar (R-5) originally planned for the site was removed from the final design. The landowners wanted the removal of the bar. In 2008, 2010, and 2011 bank erosion occurred on river left near Mr. Smith's property. The landowners requested assistance in 2011. The TRRP staff designed a bank naturalization

project and brought this to the Design Team. The design included a set of riparian plantings, bank feathering and an engineered log jam. The Design Team could not reach consensus as to whether the project should be implemented. The concerns included: the bank stabilization may not work, the project was not part of the original environmental permit (FONSI), the project did not follow the formal design process, and the possibility of setting precedent to address other property loss by erosion in the floodplain. The landowner's attorney has submitted a letter to the TRRP but the details could not be discussed at this meeting.

This issue stimulated discussion. Teresa Connor noted the State's concerns were that this project may be "opening a door" to providing stabilization to other landowners and they were not convinced that the design would prevent erosion due to the fact that the designs do not address the gravel bar (which could be causing the erosion) within the proposed project area.

Jim Smith commented that if greater erosion occurs there will be a greater problem. He also noted that the "door is already opened" in that at the Upper Junction City site the TRRP has been doing work on private property. He said without the TRRP help, the landowners may be forced to install some undesirable rip-rap. Nancy Finley noted that the uncertainty over the site is an issue and they need to know how to "fix it right." Smith noted that the river is no longer a natural river, and that Cardno-Entrix did an on-site analysis, implying that information on the erosiveness should be available. Connor thought that it was not clear if the level of erosion is tied to the TRRP restoration activities and "they do not know the geomorphic processes there." Robin Schrock noted that the erosion that has occurred is within the floodplain.

Finley asked if Bandrowski can wait until they find out more information (e.g., from the Solicitor and better information on erosion). Robin Schrock said she would seek permission to share the letter from the landowner's attorney and her response after forwarding the letter to the Solicitor. Elizabeth Hadley said the TAMWG would like to weigh in on this issue. Mike Orcutt noted they need to be cautious as "one person's erosion is another person's bank meandering." Finley proposed the TMC table any decision until they get more clarification from the legal and technical support. She suggested the Design Team do any technical analyses and be able to provide information at the December TMC meeting. Bandrowski thought they could do some 2-D modeling or geotechnical investigations. Connor thought the Design Team needs to put aside any policy questions and focus on whether the design would slow down bank erosion.

Action item: Robin Schrock will seek permission to release the landowner's attorney letter to her regarding the Indian Creek bank naturalization site and their recommendation for moving forward, and her response after forwarding the letter to the Solicitor.

Action item: The Design Team will identify analyses that could help to resolve erosion questions at the Indian Creek site and will provide more information to the TMC at the December 2012 meeting.

Potable Well and Septic Grant Program

Bandrowski noted that the program has been successful and has \$150,000 budgeted. He noted that up to this point, the well grant program had reached about half the landowners and was successful. New interest had arisen since the 2011 high flow event.

FEMA 100-year Floodplain Study

Bandrowski reviewed that Trinity County asked for a new floodplain determination from Lewiston to the North Fork Trinity River. The analysis is being based on 2009 LiDAR data. It is ready for rollout in about 3 weeks. The DWR out of Red Bluff is working with FEMA and the County and they have a consultant helping too. The inundation extents will change and this will change private landowners that need flood insurance. This could result in added insurance costs of several thousand dollars for some landowners. Bandrowski predicted that the TRRP would be blamed for and that landowners will be upset. The new determinations can also affect the design process. Currently there is an allowable 1-foot change that can be made to the extent of the 100-year floodplain due to designs. Under the new determination there will be no allowable changes to the 100-year floodplain without approval from FEMA.

8. Phase 1 Review

D.J. Bandrowski reported that the Phase 1 Review is moving forward and that he expects a very thorough product from the SAB. He referred to a memo from the SAB in the TMC information packet. He also referred them to a timeline on the back page that indicated a draft report will be delivered to the TRRP by December 7, 2012 for technical review. He projected a final report will be available by January 2013.

Dave Hillemeier referred to the review panel comments on the Science Workplan and he said that the Program Partners will be taking on more responsibility in reviewing their program.

Bandrowski asked the TMC to advise their technical personnel to be ready for the December 7 comment period.

9. Science Update and External Peer Review of Science/SAB Recommendations

Robin Schrock gave the update on the Science program and referred the TMC to the Peer Review Report of the 2013 Science Program prepared by a panel of three experts in river studies. The panel reviewed the suite of proposed activities for 2013 and whether the projects would meet the goals of the TRRP. Table 1 of their report included specific comments by projects and noted areas where the project objectives were not specific or where projects could be integrated with each other or where project prioritization could be adjusted.

Bill Brock asked how far the TRRP would go to adopt SAB recommendations. Schrock said this would go through the TMC. The reviewer's recommendations of combining of certain projects (e.g., gravel monitoring) allowed some cost savings and allowed some unfunded projects to be funded. Mike Orcutt asked about the need for going out for peer review and how the decision was made. Schrock said it was planned that the SAB would look at the work plans, it was the SAB that recommended they use an outside panel, and the SAB recommended the panel members. Nancy Finley said using expert review panels comes from some of the foundation documents. George Kautsky noted some disparity in the recommendation such as site monitoring. Dave Hillemeier noted the comments about the need for more integration. The group was advised to take a closer look at the report that evening and be prepared to discuss it during the budget discussion tomorrow.

Meeting Adjourned 5:30 PM

Wednesday October 24, 2012 8:30 AM

Nancy Finley opened the meeting for day 2.

10. FY2013 Annual Work Plan

Robin Schrock reviewed the 2013 Science work plan and referred the TMC to the Table 1 of the Peer Review Report Trinity River Restoration Program Preliminary Fiscal Year 2013 Science Workplan and to the page 3 of the FY2013 Proposed TRRP Program Budget (list of the science projects and their funding amounts). This topic was an introduction to the next discussion of the budget.

11. FY2013 Budget

Robin Schrock introduced a discussion of the 2013 budget. The discussion was separated in to three sub items: science, implementation or RIG, and administration. A major complication in the discussion was the uncertainty and continuing changes to the predicted final funding that the TRRP would receive. The TRRP first assembled their requested budget. More recently they received information from their supervisory offices that due to the continuing resolution in Washington DC that they may likely only be funded at the 2012 levels—at least for the first half of the FY2013. On top of that, sequestration could cut another 20 % if it is not resolved by Congress at the end of this year. As of last Friday, as explained by Don Reck in item 2 of this agenda, they were told that OMB had indicated TRRP should plan close to their requested levels. Before they heard this latest news, they had re-worked the budgets based on a worst-case scenario of lower funding.

Schrock introduced the science work plan projects and referred the TMC to page three of the four page handout “FY2013 Proposed TRRP Program Budget.” Page 3 listed science program projects and their respective funding levels. There were two columns of budgeted amounts, one was “Requested” based on full funding and one was “Proposed” based on a worst-case scenario and based on recommendations of the Peer Review panel.

There was discussion and questions about the reduced funding of various projects under the worst-case scenario. Wade Sinner asked about the large reduction of funding to the spring and fall salmonid run-size estimation and the zeroing out of the Lower Klamath River creel surveys. Schrock explained that in the Department of Fish and Game’s case, part of their funding could be covered by funds remaining in their existing agreement. It was pointed out that projects that were reduced or zeroed out did not mean that these project will not be funded but that they would be re-visited once the continuing resolution was resolved next spring. Those projects that had to get done during the first two quarters were funded under the worst-case scenarios.

Bill Brock clarified that the reduction in funding for science projects under the worst-case scenario during the first two quarters of FY2013 was not more than about \$500,000. Nancy Finley further added if sequestration takes effect at the end of this year, there could be an additional 20 % reduction. Wade Sinnen and George Kautsky both expressed some concerns of not exactly knowing what will be funded. It was suggested that the budget table include more footnotes on specific projects and their importance for this fiscal year and how they may be funded if full funding is not received.

Nancy Finley suggested that they go forward with the budget today, that the TMC add their notes, and that they wait until next month's TMC telephone call to get better clarification on the budget.

D.J. Bandrowski next presented the RIG budget and referred the TMC to page 4 of the budget. The two columns were the same as that for the Science Program: 2013 Requested (full funding) and Proposed (under continuing resolution). He noted two items that he zeroed out under the proposed budget: Biological Opinion and Douglas City construction. He also reduced the TSC construction management.

Mike Orcutt asked about riparian bird monitoring, the biological opinion, and the watershed work. He wanted to make clear what the Hoopa concerns were. They wanted the watershed project to come "into line with the rest of the program." He also asked that the Watershed Workgroup develop their objectives so their project is driven by need and not by what amount of funding may be available. Robin Schrock said there is a Watershed Workgroup with a coordinator and members and that the group operates similar to other workgroups. George Kautsky noted he attended the last Watershed Workgroup meeting and reported that they are working on "synchronization with the program" and this is needed in order to coordinate with Flow Workgroup and other parts of the program. In particular, it is expected that the Flow Workgroup will now be providing details on project proposals for 2014 in the spring of 2013 to enable TMC to critically evaluate and prioritize proposed work in relationship to meeting TRRP objectives for watersheds.

Orcutt also asked if the budget reflects any gravel injections. Bandrowski noted that gravel was funded in 2012 but not implemented and those funds are sitting in the Yurok AFA and could still be used. Orcutt asked how the SAB may review gravel. Bandrowski said the SAB would not advise whether or not to inject gravel but would advise how well the gravel program meets individual site restoration goals as part of the Phase I review. The Physical Workgroup would provide the recommendation on gravel to the TMC. Dave Hillemeier also noted that new data on gravel effects is being supplied by Graham Matthews.

Elizabeth Hadley asked what the TMC thought about the TAMWG recommendation to add another \$500,000 to watersheds. Nancy Finley thought that given the budget uncertainties and the possible cutting of a construction project, increased funding to watershed would likely be a lower priority. Finley clarified that it could be more carefully considered if they had a prioritized list of watershed activities available for funding. Hadley asked that the TMC would consider it in a future conference call. Mike Orcutt asked that the request be prioritized and it be in the "right reach of the river," but that construction projects be funded first. George Kautsky suggested the watershed project follow the same rigorous process the other projects follow in their requests. Schrock commented that the 2012 watershed projects had been reviewed by the watershed workgroup. Finley asked if Hadley needed a motion and Hadley thought she had enough information for now.

Robin Schrock next addressed the Administration portion of the 2013 budget and noted the same two columns of Requested and Proposed. She went over increases in the budget over the last four years of federal salary freezes that were not met last year, such as step increases in employee pay, and a new server if the requested funding was received. She noted some decreases in administration that represented moving some of the efforts into RIG and Science as appropriate.

Wade Sinnen asked if Mike Orcutt could comment on the issue of funding of the Lower Trinity River Sport Creel surveys. Orcutt noted that the TAMWG did ask about this and

since the first of the year, the Hoopa Valley Tribe has posted signs for trespass on the reservation. Most recently the Tribe attorneys have started a review of the action. The Tribal Council rejected the recent proposal to permit commercial guides access to Tribal lands. The next steps have not yet been developed. The Tribe recognizes the need to monitor fish harvest. This is supported in the SAB's recommendation to integrate data for all adult fish monitoring within TRRP. Wade Sinnen clarified that access is denied to non-Tribal members on reservation lands. Orcutt said Tish Tang campground could be accessed and there are non-tribal lands that may allow access within the reservation boundary via boat.

Elizabeth Hadley thanked Orcutt for clarification and they recognized the Tribes right to control access on their lands. She clarified that the TAMWG's question was whether the surveys are still effective given the limited access by sport fisherman. Orcutt noted irrespective of recent action to post tribal lands, the Tribe's Fisheries program has tallied 4,700 angler hours resulting in a catch of 400 salmon and 800 steelhead to date. George Kautsky noted the Hoopa sport creel surveys cover more than just the reservation boundary. Sinnen said the idea would not drop the surveys of non-tribal lands, but perhaps consider if the funding is still appropriate. Kautsky noted that folks accessing the river at Tish Tang or those that float through without stopping are still fishing in that reach and that the sampling effort remains the same irrespective of change in angler access given that the survey footprint includes lands above and below Hoopa Reservation. Orcutt commented that access to the river on Hoopa Reservation and has been largely unimpeded for many years. The Tribe simply posted signs based on an existing conservation and trespass ordinance.

Nancy Finley summarized that the Hoopa Tribe will be working to clarify their policy on access and that the TMC would be looking at the issue of surveys in light of integration of program surveys.

Break

12. Klamath Trinity Flows and Fish Update

Joe Polos gave a Powerpoint presentation on the Klamath Trinity flow releases and a fish update. He reviewed that a large fish kill occurred to salmon in 2002 and a large run of adult Chinook were predicted for this year. This prediction prompted the development of a Preventative flow release (to prevent a fish kill from developing) and an Emergency flow release (in case a fish kill appears imminent). The preventative flow criteria was to maintain 3,200 cfs at the Lower Klamath gage from August 15 to September 21 and to maintain the flow longer if temperatures were still high (e.g., over 23 C). The flow was intended to disrupt the disease process not necessarily to reduce temperature. The criteria for the emergency flow was if there was evidence for an imminent fish kill and this would push flows up to 6,400 cfs for up to 7 days.

Polos described some of the observations to date. He reported that 39,000 acre-feet were released from Lewiston Dam as a preventative flow from August 13 to September 20. He showed they met their flow objectives and that these were associated with declining river temperatures. Data from fish monitoring from Yurok and Hoopa harvests indicated good returns. Hoopa data suggests that the fall Chinook may have been shifted one week earlier but the Willow Creek weir showed possibly the peak a week later. There was some discussion about whether the preventative flow may have induced an earlier run of fall Chinook and possibly spawning with the spring run of Chinook. When asked by Judy

Pflueger, Polos thought they may not meet the original projections of 380,000 fall adults and Wade Sinnen said they will definitely meet their escapement goals. Polos showed several more graphs of fish returns that all show good returns (Shasta, Trinity, and Trinity Hatchery). He noted that no instances of Ich disease were found in initial sampling.

Polos noted some of the potential negative effects of the flow releases as premature emigration of lamprey, dewatering of redds, increased hybridization of spring and fall Chinook, and unknown effects on amphibians.

Polos discussed some of the errors in the predictions. It was noted that perhaps many of the three-year old Chinook stayed in the ocean one more year and may return as four-year-old and larger, fish next year. Bill Brock asked if the model is being refined. Polos said it is updated with new data but the main parts of the model are not being changed. Mike Orcutt asked if the Klamath Fish Health Assessment Team (KFHAT) was well coordinated with the BOR and assessment of triggers. Wade Sinnen said they were not normally tied into the triggers discussion but fed information from the field.

George Kautsky commented that it is true that the Trinity River is no longer a natural basin and wanted to bring up the consideration of what unintended consequences may be introduced by the temperature effects (reductions) of the releases. He suggested they continued to think about the ecological consequences of such releases. He noted the shifts in temperatures that he thinks may have dropped by as much as 10 F in the Hoopa reach. He asked what monitoring is being done even though these are not ROD actions. He noted his work on temperature effects on outmigrants. He asked that perhaps the Fish Workgroup may wish to consider these unintended effects.

Nancy Finley asked if the group wanted to think about if changes are needed in their approach to the flow releases. Don Reck noted that the BOR is interested in considering the fall flow releases and that they liked the process used in 2003 and 2004 where they tried to match release criteria at Lewiston Dam instead of trying to match flows in the lower river.

Lunch

13. BLM and the Trinity River

This item was canceled.

14. 2012 Temperature Workgroup Products

Rod Wittler gave a detailed PowerPoint presentation of projects completed by the Temperature Workgroup in 2012. Most of the projects concern management and use of flows from the reservoirs to manage in-river temperature targets. He described several projects he has been working on with various collaborators. He described using Calsim temperature model and showed graphs of actual temperatures and flows. One result of their management is that while they may withdraw more water from the reservoir it always refills. He noted the impacts of climate change and noted the Trinity Lake needs to be filled with cold water. More specifically they need 750,000 acre-feet at the end of September to meet downstream temperature needs. He also noted the need to begin consideration of multi-year droughts.

Wittler described Lewiston Special Study to modify Lewiston Dam to achieve temperature management. He noted a completed report that is now available on-line. The study looked at several alternatives such as removal of Lewiston Dam, selective dredging in Lewiston

Reservoir, pipeline or tunnel in the reservoir, and raising the dam. He noted two options: to modify the power plant at Lewiston and a selective withdrawal structure. Wittler showed some of the projected costs for the alternatives developed by MP200. Costs ranged from \$1million to hundreds of millions. He said the next steps are to enter a planning process, establish objectives, discuss ideas with Trinity Public Utility District and coordinate with Sacramento River Temperature Task Group (SRTTG).

Wittler next described Inflow and Temperature Tracking of Trinity Reservoir. This project looked at data on inflow and outflows to Trinity Reservoir. He showed this year, the actual inflows did come in as a Normal water year as predicted in April. He also showed that the May predictions were closer to the actual inflows (higher than April predictions). The actual inflows varied somewhat from either April or May prediction due to this year's runoff coming more from rainfall than snowmelt. He showed the 2012 B2 forecast (where B2 refers to 3408 (b) (2) of the CVPIA). He noted that Trinity Reservoir is now at 1.8 million acre-feet. The larger storage is because they were expecting dryer conditions this year and they held back on exports over the hill. Wittler next showed a graph of releases this spring made as an attempt to match needs for riparian plant establishment (rooting needs) and he commented that the releases were right on target. The temperature tracking graph showed that they met all of their temperature targets. He commented that the Lewiston Model did not work well this year, but this may have been due to the re-location of the Lewiston flow and temperature recorders. On a graph of temperatures versus time, he pointed a sharp drop in Trinity River temperature during mid-August at Douglas City and the North Fork. This was caused by a drop in air temperatures and by the managed releases from Lewiston.

Wittler next explained that Real-time Summer Temperature Management was tried as a paper exercise using a model to use cold water to get cooler summer temperatures. They tried to model an inter-year water banking exercise using two alternatives. They modeled these alternatives and used the water temperatures from years 2003 and 2005. He noted that adding 50 cfs at a time reduces the number of days of temperature exceedances. One thing they observed was that they needed to find a source of cool water to use for their exercise and they took the water out of the 2000 cfs spring "bench." The concept shows some promise but needs more work.

Wittler finally described Historical Temperature Target Performances for 1993-2011 at Douglas City and the North Fork. He broke the time period into 3 periods: pre-Rod, partial ROD and full ROD. He noted over the full time period, that 90 % of the days with temperature exceedances still were exceeding the targets by less than 1.75 F at Douglas City and the North Fork. He summarized that since full ROD, they have met the temperature targets 94 % of the time. He judged this to be very good.

Mike Orcutt asked about the percentage of water diverted to the Central Valley. Wittler thought that this year 51 % of water was diverted over the hill, and long term diversion have been very close to 53 % (as what was said in the ROD). Orcutt also asked about carry over storage and when it may be instituted. Wittler said the cold water 2012 analysis showed that nothing has changed since the flow study. Things may get tense in the third year of droughts. Wittler said that, "Once we exhaust the cold water supply, Shasta will be exhausted too and everyone will be in a drought." He noted by the time the forecast indicates the end of September storage approaching 1 million acre-feet in the first year of drought or 750 thousand acre-feet in Trinity Reservoir in the 2nd or later years of a drought, CVO and the TMC should September they start thinking about using the cold water auxiliary outlet. Once the forecast indicates 600 thousand acre-feet Reclamation must

consult with NMFS about management options. Wittler finished his presentation by noting many of these projects are on the TRRP on-line data portal.

15. Open Forum

Wade Sinnen noted that a bill signed into law by Governor Brown that will rename the DFG as the Fish and Wildlife Service, effective January 1, and it will institute new scientific taking permits that require a CESA for coho take. Mark Wheatley will be the state contact.

16. Calendar – Upcoming meetings

The TMC teleconference is scheduled for November 15, 10 AM to noon.

The next TMC meeting is currently scheduled for Weitchpec December 12-13 (but this may be changed to the week of January 7).

During the week of Jan 7th will be the Science Symposium.

Nancy Finley asked about the schedule for the TMC December meeting and if they wanted to wait for the SAB report. She suggested they reschedule December to the week of the January 7th so the staff has had time to review the SAB recommendations. They will discuss this at the November 15 telephone call.

Teresa Connor brought up the predictions for water years and use of the April forecast and whether to have a written response to the TAMWG. Nancy Finley said she would draft something up.

Dave Hillemeier brought up whether they wanted to use the IDT more to perform prioritizations of projects. Nancy Finley said the plan was to have the IDT do the integration among workgroups, but this has not come to the forefront yet. She thought there may be value in having a discussion to empower this group, but not to assign new tasks such as budgeting. She thought the IDT role may be a good topic to take up after the SAB recommendations.

Joe Polos commented on some of the problems of prioritizing projects and said part of the problem is one of time. Rod Wittler thought the interdisciplinary work is occurring such as the work he presented today—which represented interaction among workgroups. If the workgroups see the rewards for doing interdisciplinary work they will begin to do more. Tim Hayden agreed the IDT has a valid role. He noted there was some confusion of what they were doing. Understanding their role better will help. Teresa Connor reiterated that the prioritizing the workplan was problematic if most of the participants had an interest in funding their own project.

Dave Hillemeier noted that the original plan was to have the IDT working on next year's workplan about this time. Finley noted the value of waiting for the SAB review based on her reading of the "hand-writing on the wall" from the Peer Review that already recommended more integration.

Adjourn 2:30 PM

Final Agenda
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
Humboldt Bay Aquatic Center, Eureka, CA
October 23-24, 2012

Tuesday, October 23, 2012

<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 June 2012 Minutes (handout)	Nancy Finley, Chair
12:30	Open Forum: Comments from the public	Nancy Finley
1:00	Report from TMC Chair alternate Continuing Resolution Effects on 2013 budget ▪ Landowner issues ▪ Action items update ○ Watershed Summary for TAMWG ○ DOI Acquisition Procedures Presentation - cancelled	Don Reck
2:00	Report from TAMWG Chair	Elizabeth Hadley
2:30	Report from Executive Director (handout)	Robin Schrock
2:45	Work Group Updates (handout)	Robin Schrock and WG members
<i>Information / Decision Items:</i>		
3:30	Implementation/ Design Team Update	DJ Bandrowski
4:45	Phase 1 Review (handout)	DJ Bandrowski
5:00	Science Update External Peer Review of Science/SAB Recommendations (2 handouts)	Robin Schrock
5:30	Adjourn	

TMC Wednesday October 24, 2012

8:30	FY2013 Annual Work Plan External Peer Review of Science/SAB Recommendations	Robin Schrock
9:30	FY2013 Budget (4 page handout)	Robin Schrock
10:30	Break	
11:00	Klamath Trinity Flows and Fish Update	USFWS
12:00	Lunch	
	BLM and the Trinity River - cancelled Jennifer Mata	
1:00	2012 Temperature Workgroup Products (handout)	Rod Wittler
2:30	Open Forum	
3:30	Calendar – Upcoming meetings	
4:00	Adjourn	