

Final Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
 County Library, Weaverville, CA
 Wednesday, April 3, 2013

Wednesday, April 3, 2013; 9:30 AM

Attending Members

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

1) Alternate for Sharon Heywood; 2) non-voting members.

Others that attended: D.J. Bandrowski, Andreas Krause, Ernie Clarke, Rod Wittler and Eric Peterson (Trinity River Restoration Program); George Kautsky and Robert Franklin, (Hoopa Valley Tribe); Teresa Connor (California Department of Water Resources); Tim Hayden (Yurok Tribe); Don Reck (Bureau of Reclamation). Sam Chilcote, Andy Collins, Penelope Del Bene (Forest Service), Alex Cousins (Trinity County Resource Conservation District), Seth Naman, Wes Smith (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Fisheries); Don Reck (Bureau of Reclamation); Rebecca Carr (Bureau of Land Management via Webex)

Members of the Public: Jim Smith, Daniel Dickerson, Leslie Hubbard, Judy Curtis, Kelli Gant (Trinity Lake Revitalization Group), Gene Goodyear

List of Motions that Passed during the Meeting

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

Curtis Milliron seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the Chair write a letter to the Department of the Interior (DOI) urging them to consider concerns for fall flows in the Lower Klamath anticipating a projected large size run in 2013 and secondly that the DOI engage the appropriate technical staffs to begin looking at last year's recommendation in light of this year's hydrologic conditions.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to request the Flow Temperature Workgroup conduct analysis in regards to the two-day versus the five-day peak flow and associated geomorphic response, in addition to a technical analysis regarding the habitat benefits and temperature benefits for fry and juveniles from the 2,000 cfs bench relative to the dry ROD hydrograph.

Judy Pflueger seconded the motion.

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

Abstained: Hoopa Valley Tribe.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the TMC accept and implement the \$15.36 M budget with a note to the Regional Director that the program can implement the entire \$18 M amount that was proposed in the President's requested budget.

Bill Brock seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Ann Garrett made a motion to continue with developing a DSS, in accordance with the path forward presented by Ernie Clarke's Powerpoint presentation on DSS (Workshop to link objectives with management actions; Assign DSS Roles and Responsibilities; select models to include in initial DSS; and plan for long-term implementation). The first step being to hold a workshop to link objectives with management actions.

Judy Pflueger seconded.

The motion passed with 7 “Ayes” and 1 “Nay”

Hoopa Valley Tribe opposed the motion.

Action Items created during the Meeting

Brian Person will draft a letter concerning the need for fall flows based off of last year's letter and will make it available to the TMC for review.

Regular Business:

1. Introductions and Approval of Agenda

Brian Person, chair of the Trinity Management Council (TMC) opened the meeting by extending a welcome to everyone and thanked them for compressing the meeting into a single day. He then asked the TMC members to review the agenda.

Approval of Agenda

Dave Hillemeier raised concern about only having a half hour for the Flow Schedule discussion. Brian Person accepted the agenda for April 3.

The minutes were then discussed. Person suggested that during lunch, people review the minutes so that they can be approved after lunch. Person asked the group if they were able to approve the January meetings or not.

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

Curtis Milliron seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Open Forum

No public comments at this time.

3. Report from Trinity Management Council Chair

Federal Budget

Brian Person then reviewed the impacts of “sequestration.” There are gaps in how the TRRP is to carry out the budget impacts. The budget ceiling creates a 5.2% reduction across the board, the primary appropriation of \$14.1M is expected to be reduced to \$13.4M from Bureau of Reclamations (BOR) appropriations.

The 2012 appropriation was \$10.5M. During the first half of the year, the Continuing Resolution was unique in that the budget reduction was based off of the President's budget request versus the lesser of the prior year or the President's budget. It is still not clear whether or not there will be another 1 % reduction from the President's budget based on 2013. The Bureau of Reclamation's Regional Program Director has some inter-program latitude but is facing a challenging budget year.

There is only mission-critical travel allowed at this time. There is also a hiring freeze within the Bureau of Reclamation. Person stated that the group will have to make the best of the situation.

Mike Orcutt asked for a date when it will be clear about whether or not projects can move forward. Person responded to check back in a week. Orcutt suggested during the budget part of the meeting that a resolution or letter be considered. There was discussion of considering a resolution later in the agenda.

Fall Flows

Brian Person stated that the Regional Director wants a plan in place by July for the fall flows. Person stated that the processes and input used last year will inform this year's decisions as well. The program will need to do NEPA compliance again for this year. Person recommended creating a long-term plan for incorporating fall flows.

Last year, Person signed a finding of no significant impact for the drawdown from Trinity Reservoir. Person made an argument to the CVO that the 39,000 acre-feet used in the fall flows would have been included in the December drawdown had it not been released in the fall. There is still a reconciliation going on for that water.

Mike Orcutt asked if there was any need for the TMC to engage with the “technical and biology people.” Person then asked if the TMC would like him to write a letter to the Secretary of the Interior or the Regional Director to advocate for the fall flows and to

reiterate the concern and need to re-engage the technical experts as necessary. Ernie Clarke stated that the Fall Flow sub-group can be a focus of the TRRP but will draw resources from other parts of the TRRP's mandate.

Elizabeth Hadley asked what would be the latest date that the TAMWG could give input given the impact of fall flows on stakeholders. It was discussed that a plan must be together by July. Hadley asked that any decision allow for the TAMWG to meet.

Person asked for two decisions:

- Advocacy for Fall Flows
- Engagement from the Northern California Area Office (NCAO) and whatever they need from the Fall Flow sub-group.

Dave Hillemeier iterated that he would like to see a recommendation made to the Regional Director or the Secretary and that it involve coordination with the Klamath. There was a review of calendar timing issues.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the Chair write a letter to the Department of the Interior (DOI) urging them to consider concerns for fall flows in the Lower Klamath anticipating a projected large size run in 2013 and secondly that the DOI engage the appropriate technical staffs to begin looking at last year's recommendation in light of this year's hydrologic conditions.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

In discussion, Judy Pflueger asked for a copy of last year's letter for comparison when reviewing this new letter. It was stated that in 2012, projections were made for 44,800 acre-feet and 39,000 acre-feet was actually used. There was no provision to retain the water in the reservoir.

Orcutt asked that the Department of the Interior keep them abreast of the long term planning.

Action Item: Brian Person will draft a letter concerning the need for fall flows based off of last year's letter and will make it available to the TMC for review.

Landowner Concerns

Brian Person began by stating that the TMC made a motion at the last meeting to table Mr. Wellock's claim until Interior had taken further action. It would be a new act of authority from the existing mandates. A new Directive and Standard would have to be created to accommodate compensating Mr. Wellock for his claim. It is going to be a very lengthy process 377B provision. The decision is up to the Regional Director and must be in coordination with the office in Denver. Person reviewed the prior TMC motion to not amend the well reimbursement program.

Person then discussed the reconsideration of the workgroup constructs.

With regards to the Decision Support System, Person stated that the Science Advisory Board is very strongly recommending the creation of the DSS.

Person noted that the group needs to be thinking about the elections coming up in December. The chair and vice-chair is required to be a Federal employee.

Mike Orcutt reminded the group that the DSS is part of the Phase I review and he would like to see a “larger view picture” including the recommendations contained in the final report.

4. Report from TAMWG Chair

Elizabeth Hadley, Chair of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG) reviewed their meeting on Monday, April 1. They were able to successfully incorporate Web casting into the meeting due to the travel restrictions. They did hear the 2013 flow recommendation from the Flow Workgroup and a dissenting opinion from members of the Physical Workgroup based on possible changes to geomorphic objectives of the ROD. After much discussion, the TAMWG made a motion to recommend the ROD hydrograph with the addition of descending monitoring benches. The differences will be covered later in the agenda during the discussion of the flow recommendations.

In light of the expectation of a dry water year, the TAMWG recommends Dave Gaeuman's recommendation for injecting gravel only at the diversion pool.

The TAMWG reviewed the Decision Support System (DSS) and recommends that the TMC continue further with its adoption.

The TAMWG had elections and Hadley was reelected as Chair with Tom Stokely as the Vice-Chair.

Mike Orcutt asked about private landowner concerns; Hadley stated that there were no issues raised at their last meeting.

5. Report from Executive Director

Robin Schrock led the TMC through her written report that was also given to the TAMWG members. Her document includes budget actuals and areas of cost-savings in the program. The environmental documents for 2013 projects include budget contingencies.

The TRRP is encouraging landowners to get their applications to the Well Grant Program in now because of an upcoming change to a new budget management system and changing of fiscal year close out dates due to the Continuing Resolution.

Schrock covered the bullet points of her document concerning Public Outreach actions taken. There was a public meeting in Douglas City for landowners and stakeholders. There was a Science Symposium that was coordinated by Jeff Morris (Outreach Coordinator) and broadcast publicly. There is an evidentiary video being produced with the Trinity County Resource Conservation District (TCRCD) for a Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Administrative Law Judge. This video will be used as a foundation for a full video describing the status of the TRRP rehabilitation and restoration activities. There were two visiting international sedimentologists who visited the Trinity River, TRRP, and provided a public seminar.

Mike Orcutt asked for clarification on the video production funding. Schrock responded that the video was so far along that just the addition of juvenile fish footage was need to complete it for TRRP purposes.

Workgroup Summaries

Schrock related that the TAMWG asked that the workgroups add the actual decisions made, not just stating that a recommendation was made and that request will be transmitted to the TRRP workgroup coordinators.

Tim Hayden gave highlights of the Fish Workgroup. A workshop on the development of a fish production model for the Trinity was held. The draft of the Fish Production Model document with the three levels of development will be distributed later in the month. The group provided technical feedback to other workgroups and commented on the original proposed flow schedule. The Fish Workgroup recommendation to the Design team suggested that adult holding habitat is a consideration but not as large a concern as rearing habitat.

The Physical Workgroup was provided input on proposals from the Flow Workgroup.

Klamath Bird Observatory provided four reports, two are ready to post and two are being peer reviewed.

James Lee gave a short presentation on revegetation work.

The current year Watershed Workgroup projects were approved by the TMC last year, current year projects have been submitted to contractors. The Watershed Workgroup is working on getting the project process synchronized with the rest of the workgroups. Some of the projects were phased across multiple fiscal years. The Watershed Workgroup project criteria are being updated to mimic the other workgroups.

Brian Person stated that the bullet points are very helpful in keeping track of the workgroup actions.

Mike Orcutt asked that the workgroup coordinators include memos. Ernie Clarke gave an update on the memo from the Physical Workgroup.

Information / Decision Items:

6. Flow Scheduling

Brian Person stated that January, February, and March was the driest or second driest quarter on record.

Rod Wittler of the TRRP reported on the outcome of the Flow Workgroup meeting on March 28 for the 2013 flow release schedule. The workgroup developed two dry and one normal year hydrographs for consideration. The official water year determination is expected on April 9. Current conditions are very dry with the entire state of California in some stage of drought. The snowmelt is currently well underway. The reservoir has 2,091 thousand acre-ft. At the hatchery, rainfall total is 20.6 inches which is 75 % of the 15 year average. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) is now providing daily average annual inflow forecasts; these used to only be provided on a monthly basis. The dry-year range is from 650 to 1,025 thousand acre-feet (TAF).

The operations forecast from the BOR for the Carr Tunnel calls for just less than 100 TAF per month during the summer months at the 50 % exceedance. If there is less water available in the Central Valley, more water will be transported through the tunnel.

There were two dry water year proposals; these were identical except offset by a week.

Wittler pointed out that water coming out of the reservoir is a couple of degrees cooler than normal due to a cooler winter. Person checked this point to clarify that the overall likelihood of temperature compliance is very good, which was affirmed by Wittler.

Wittler then went over the Consensus Hydrograph developed by the Flow Workgroup. This includes an 8-day, 2000 cfs bench on the ascending limb, a two-day peak of 4,500 cfs, and monitoring benches on the descending limb. The ascending limb is intended to help with water temperatures and providing good habitat for the down-migrating juveniles was a high priority. The descending limb was made to mimic the dry ROD hydrograph with monitoring benches added.

There was some discussion of the hydrograph, after which Ernie Clarke asked that the group be aware that the program is working constantly on improving process. Clarke and Robin Schrock clarified that the Workgroup can revisit the recommendation and that it needs to be further vetted by the internal experts. Andreas Krause was asked to provide the perspective of the Physical Workgroup. He stated that there was an assumption made based on a Graham Mathews and Associates 2012 report that a two-day peak flow would transport the same sediment as a five-day peak. Krause gave some background on the process and discussions. Krause stated that the data supporting the conclusion is not consistent from year-to-year or site-to-site, and is too simplistic for insuring that the geomorphic objectives are met.

Schrock clarified that the Physical Workgroup recommended using the dry ROD hydrograph until analysis can be done, and that there is a week available for further analysis before the hydrograph must be finalized. Person noted the need to notify and get approval from the Regional Director for the flow release before it is implemented.

The group discussed the hydrographs of the ROD versus the Alternative recommended by the Flow Workgroup.

Wittler clarified that there are competing objectives of the rearing (bench) versus the geomorphic (peak). Wittler has not seen any analysis on the rearing benefit.

Person discussed that allowing an extra week for the decision would require the organization to meet dates in a shorter timeframe, and reviewed the history that the hydrograph has not been a contentious issue in the past.

Mike Orcutt proposed approving the ROD hydrograph unless compelling information to change it becomes available in the analysis.

Person asked whether the TAMWG's recommendation would be significantly different from the ROD and require extra analysis; Clarke's response was that it would not. Dave Hillemeier suggested that the number of fry dictates a priority for rearing but that without analysis the decision is not based on the best information.

Bill Brock asked for confirmation that the process can be done with the decision being made in the conference call on April 12. Wittler stated that the CVO needs a "go-no-go" by April 18. Curtis Milliron shared concern about the precedence of not meeting the physical objectives. He asked whether the extra three days would provide enough energy to do the work to benefit the restoration.

Robert Franklin stated that the geomorphic objectives during a dry year are modest and it is considered a year off for the river. The extra week of analysis will require the program scientists to drop everything else and will have opportunity costs. Clarke added that

Andreas Krause and Dave Gaeuman have done their analysis and that most of the work will need to be in trade-off analysis.

Tim Hayden added that the Consensus Hydrograph was seen as an attempt at a “win-win” but that the two-day peak will probably not meet the transport objectives. Hayden asked for the TMC to provide some guidance on which priorities to focus.

Krause added that the proposed hydrograph does not balance the objectives without a clear statement provided by the TMC. He noted that whatever recommendation the TMC makes that the supporting documentation should be available.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to request the Flow Temperature Workgroup conduct analysis in regards to the two-day versus the five-day peak flow and associated geomorphic response, in addition to a technical analysis regarding the habitat benefits and temperature benefits for fry and juveniles from the 2,000 cfs bench relative to the dry ROD hydrograph.

Judy Pflueger seconded the motion.

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

Abstained: Hoopa Valley Tribe.

During discussion of the motion, Elizabeth Hadley asked about the assumption of the TMC having a meeting to use that information. There was clarification that the TMC does not need to make motions for their own meeting or actions, just for those being directed. Rod Wittler asked for clarification on his tasks: submit request for analysis from experts, document the consensus hydrograph.

Person stated that the TMC is requesting a briefing document that adds the habitat benefits for fry for the Consensus and dry ROD hydrographs.

Person then requested members to lend staff effort to support the workgroups in their work and that the TMC take this issue up at 11 AM on Friday April 12.

Joe Polos encouraged the workgroups to coordinate with their members to provide information to the Flow Workgroup.

Lunch Break

7. TRRP Budget Status (handout)

Brian Person handed off the meeting to Robin Schrock who went over her handout. The TRRP Budget was projected at \$15.36 M with the expectation of full funding from all sources. The TRRP has made cuts to travel, printing, and other administrative costs which amounted to about \$350,000.

There is a vacancy in staff that is adding partially to the reduction. This vacancy was not fully realized in that money is set aside for relocation when the position is eventually filled. The staff has been asked to not use personal vehicles. While Public Outreach funding appears to have increased, it was through a multi-year agreement and the money has already been spent. All the partners have been asked to extend the adjustments to their multi-year agreements. The Rehabilitation Implementation (RIG) budget had some small saving from prior year savings. The biological opinion has been deferred. The 2014 Site Design is a

2013 savings through the Yurok tribe. The Lower Steiner Flat implementation had some savings that were realized.

The implementation budget was difficult to affect much savings. If there are further cuts required, an additional \$500,000 would have to be saved from deferring the Douglas City project.

Ernie Clarke went through the Science Plan portion of the budget. The TMC members reviewed the budget and then presented questions on particular lines. George Kautsky and Wade Sinnen asked about items where requested amounts were showing Actual amounts, Clarke's response was that items still happened but were funded by carry-over from multiple year agreements with outside agencies.

Mike Orcutt brought up the uncertainty of funds that will be available and his request for an action-tracker report of what has been spent or approved to spend. Dave Hillemeier asked for a copy of the budget presented.

There was a discussion of Water Related Resources and worst-case scenarios and whether or not to commit actions before there is an approved Federal Budget

8. 2013 Projects for TMC Approval

D.J. Bandrowski then began a presentation on 2013 projects.

Douglas City and Lorenz Gulch Channel Rehabilitation Sites (motion)

Bandrowski went over the Lorenz Gulch Site aerial view with adjustments that were made based on responses from workgroups and stakeholders. One point was adjustments at the Goat Hole. Brian Person asked if the concerns raised about the Goat Hole have been adequately addressed. Bandrowski responded that the Design Team has reached consensus with the latest changes that have been made. There was a question about addressing a memo from the Fish Workgroup about holding areas for more rearing. Bandrowski stated that the design was created concurrently with the information from that memo.

The Douglas City project spans the Hwy 299 Bridge. The funding is available to complete the Lorenz Gulch project in summer 2013. There is an optional line item within the budget to look at implementing the lower Douglas City Project (below 299) if those funds are available. The environmental document is out for a 30-day period ending on April 12. The designs are at the 95 % completion percentage, pending comments. The TRRP is seeking the TMC's approval to continue with the lower portion of Douglas City and the Lorenz Gulch projects.

Judy Pflueger asked how the general stakeholders responded to the public meeting. Bandrowski described concerns of the fishing guides and landowners concerning a forced meander. The infiltration gallery modification did not elicit much concern from stakeholders.

Contingent on environmental compliance and contractor bids, Bandrowski clarified that he is asking for approval from the TMC to continue with designs and the awarding of the contract. Douglas City would be delayed if funds were not available.

Judy Pflueger made a motion to approve the Rehabilitation Implementation Group (RIG) budget in entirety with latitude to transfer funding between Douglas City and Lorenz Gulch as necessary.

Bill Brock seconded the motion.

Pfleuger's motion was withdrawn, Bill Brock withdrew his second.

During discussion of the motion, Mike Orcutt stated that the actuals could be approved as presented assuming awards are within the budgeted amounts. An amendment was discussed to approve a larger portion. Robin Schrock asked if that means that Lorenz Gulch and Douglas City would be immune from future cuts versus reductions in the rest of the program. It was clarified that the RIG budget is the same as all items and subject to the availability of funds. Dave Hillemeier asked for clarification as to where the budget is for 2013. There was a discussion of whether to approve all three budgets or piece-meal. Person stated that the understanding is that the TRRP Director has lee-way up to \$100,000 per item. Orcutt suggested the TMC approving the \$18 M budget based off the President's budget with contingencies to pro-actively send a message to the Regional Director.

There was a discussion on where to take the motion.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the TMC will accept and implement the \$15.36 M budget, contingent on the availability of funds, with a note to the Regional Director that the program can implement the \$18 M amount that was proposed in the President's requested budget.

Bill Brock seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Design Team Process – Goals/Objectives

D.J. Bandrowski reviewed a motion made at a previous meeting by the TMC to create goals and objectives for the workgroups. Taking the input from the Fish Workgroup and the TMC motion, a hierarchy of goals and objectives were made. The hierarchy is made up of programmatic goals and fundamental objectives, followed by Means Objectives, Metrics, and more.

Bucktail Bridge Re-Design Project

Bandrowski reviewed the schedule for implementation of the Bucktail Bridge in 2014 or 2015 depending on CalTrans funding. He showed a plan view of how the bridge will appear. The CH2M/Hill is the designer of a single span bridge. In response to a question, Bandrowski reviewed the rationale of replacing the bridge and noted that the 11,000 cfs made it clear that the channel was too narrow. Bandrowski noted that the bridge replacement will change the constraints that existed in the Bucktail/Dark Gulch project.

Upcoming 2014/2015 Projects (Design Schedule)

Bandrowski presented the three projects that are scheduled for the Design Workgroup: Lower Junction City in 2014, Bucktail/Dark Gulch Redesign in 2014, and Dutch Creek in 2015. The Hatchery Gravel Augmentation/Channel Rehabilitation Project design process will begin in January 2014 with proposed implementation in 2015. Over the next calendar year, the design team will review and come up with an overall Phase II plan, but currently there is no phase II plan. The design group is working to keep a pipeline of projects available as funding is made available.

Indian Creek Bank Naturalization Project

Bandrowski began by reviewing the memo that he wrote dated March 29, 2013 concerning the Indian Creek Bank Naturalization Project. There was a discussion of when concerns about the size of the property were observed. Person then asked what is it that the landowners see in habitat gain that the Design Team does not.

Ann Garrett asked for clarification as to what the TRRP has spent on the design to date and what the total cost of the project would include. Bandrowski's estimate was that the project would cost around \$200,000 with the potential to be less due to scour potential. Bandrowski showed some landscape architect mock-up images of the viewscape before and after the bank naturalization project. In response to a question, Bandrowski reviewed the work done in the Indian Creek project in 2007.

Person asked for input from Mr. Jim Smith and Mr. Daniel Dickerson (landowners) on their perspectives. Mr. Smith discussed the role of plant rehabilitation on providing habitat and the silt that has eroded into the river from his and Mr. Dickerson's property. He and Mr. Dickerson have irrigation ready that can be provided to the project. He believes that the success of the smaller area would be greater because of the access and stewardship.

Person then asked Bandrowski if those factors were included in the Design Team's deliberation. Bandrowski responded that they were looking at an entire host of aspects until the last meeting where the habitat came up very strongly.

Dave Hillemeier asked for clarification if the project was too small to get a "bang for the buck" or if it was too small because the TRRP does not take on projects of that size? Bandrowski reviewed concerns about the future of the plants or bank given private property being involved. Person asked whether or not if there was an encumbrance where the work is done, would that have changed the design team's decision? The Design Team did think in terms of potential long term issues.

Person then summarized that the Design Team has reached the end of its process and needs guidance from the TMC on next steps.

Currently the project has no time constraints. Person then asked about revisiting scalability, conservation easement, or joint payments from the landowners with the Design Team. The environmental compliance permits will have a five-year window once the permits are issued. In response to Ann Garrett, Bandrowski stated that focusing the project only on the private land would reduce the cost by one-half or more with a subsequent reduction in benefit.

Person then asked whether Mr. Smith and Mr. Dickerson would be willing to meet with Bandrowski to further discuss options for funding, easements, encumbrances, and stream bank stabilization to help make the project more amenable to program directives. Mr. Smith and Mr. Dickerson responded affirmatively.

Person repeated that he does not want to create any false hope about this project but also does not wish to dismiss the landowners concerns prematurely. Curtis Milliron stated that the state Wildlife Conservation Board might be one avenue for the landowners to pursue.

9. Science Update

Phase 1 Review/2014 Investigation Plan Priorities

Ernie Clarke began by reviewing the schedule for the Science Advisory Board (SAB). Clarke stated that the SAB has not committed to a schedule for the entire Phase I review, but

evaluating the FY14 workplan review in June will not be a problem because the Phase I review will be behind them.

Clarke stated that the workgroup leads asked that others check what other workgroups were thinking before submitting their final recommendations. The Fish Workgroup was not able to come up with a consensus on making any changes to the assessments being recommended for FY14.

There was discussion of the adult review integrating monitoring projects and monitoring projects spanning across multiple fiscal years. Clarke stated that there will be a comprehensive Fall Chinook assessment, not just a combined bundle of multiple species. Tim Hayden added that the Fish Workgroup is going to meet on April 5 to attempt to meet a consensus agreement building on the response from the SAB.

Wade Sinnen clarified that focusing on the Fall Chinook was in relation to the cohort analysis. He believes the program should not lose interest in tracking other species, rather that the Fall Chinook was standing out because it is more readily available.

Robin Schrock stated that Fish Workgroup were not able to reach agreement due to sidebar discussions versus focusing on a single species metric.

10. Decision Support System (DSS) Implementation Options

Ernie Clarke followed up on Jim Peterson's presentation to the TMC in January about the implementation of a Decision Support System (DSS). They reviewed case studies and came up with three scenarios for implementing a DSS. They then prioritized a path forward. This project was begun in response to recommendations of the SAB's recommendation for the need of a DSS.

The SAB and others recommended case studies for review, plus a book on structured decision making. There were a limited number of DSS's that matched the criteria, those implemented were not particularly complex, and had fewer management actions. Three case studies interviewed were Horseshoe Crab-Red Knot Management, Tallapoosa River (AL) Flow Management, and Wetland Flow Management (Australia). Clarke is preparing a summary report of findings. The Horseshoe Crab-Red Knot Management DSS links population models for two species to inform horseshoe crab management decisions. This example only had a single management action to consider. Professional facilitators were used; the process was contentious and took five years to develop.

The Tallapoosa River Flow Management used adaptive management to allow for adjustments based on learning. There is a public utility on the river and multiple flow regime objectives: hydropower production, recreational boater weekends, and protection of ecological resources (spawning windows). The implementation is now done by the utility in making day to day flow decisions.

The Australian Wetland Flow Management DSS links hydrologic and ecological models to determine the ecological impact of potential environmental flows. There was not time to include stakeholders and it was completed in two years. It is currently being used, but they did not have a long-term plan for maintaining the DSS.

Some the lessons learned from eight interviews done in the process of reviewing DSS's were then reviewed. Stakeholder engagement is very important and increases confidence in the model output, and brings parties together to objectively compare alternatives. Simple design is better, start with a small prototype, utilize existing models and update over time, and do

not oversell with graphics. Fancy graphics can make the model seem able to do more than it actually does. Identify specific questions to be addressed. Examples took from 3 to 5 years to develop and implement. Monitoring is critical to the success of the DSS and informs future priorities by identifying data gaps. There needs to be a long term plan and a team for implementation and maintenance. There needs to be a strong leader/champion to coordinate the effort.

Clarke went over the components for a TRRP DSS and what parts are available.

The Fish Workgroup had the Klamath Fish Production Model participants meet for a workshop on developing three scenarios for developing the Fish production model for the DSS. In discussion of a water management model, Clarke stated that Ann Parker from the Klamath had suggested that the model on the Trinity side would be very simple given limited inputs. Clarke then presented a decision tree of what a continue motion would involve. He reiterated that the DSS was the biggest recommendation of the Phase I review and the basis of "Adaptive Management."

Mike Orcutt asked for clarification on Clarke's adaptive management statement. Clarke reviewed that the SAB's request was to link actions to fish production outcomes. Orcutt raised concerns about the precision of the metrics that are needed for this kind of approach. Person stated that the skepticism at the January meeting lead to the scoping document presented by Clarke. In the past, there was not a linkage between actions and meeting fundamental objectives. Person asked about the high cost given that many of the parts of the DSS have already been created. Schrock stated that the biggest cost is the fish population model. Some of the cost is within habitat model, documenting, and peer review. Person asked about any compatibility issues between the Klamath module and a Trinity DSS. Dave Hillemeier noted that a DSS should be used to help guide decisions as a tool, but he has skepticism in that models on top of models can multiply errors.

Person said that in January, there were concerns about a DSS despite the SAB recommendations. There was a motion in January to scope the DSS, Clarke did this and now there is a request for a decision whether to continue or not. Schrock added that a workshop to link objectives to management actions is a requirement with or without a DSS.

Ann Garrett made a motion to continue with developing a DSS, in accordance with the path forward presented by Ernie Clarke's Powerpoint presentation on DSS (Workshop to link objectives with management actions; Assign DSS Roles and Responsibilities; Select models to include in initial DSS; and Plan for long-term implementation). The first step being to create a workshop to link objectives with management actions.

Judy Pflueger seconded.

The motion passed with 7 "Ayes" and 1 "Nay"

Hoopa Valley Tribe opposed the motion.

During the discussion, Orcutt asked for a discussion of scenarios, process, and outcomes. He then pointed out that a lot of this is contingent on staff. There used to be a Technical Modeling and Analysis Group (TMAG) that does not exist anymore. He wanted the TMC to get a deeper understanding of staff capabilities. Schrock responded that the program has

the expertise and capabilities available that would be identified within the model. The bulk of the budget amount is for 2014, the cost is opportunity cost of personnel,

With regards to who to include in the DSS creation, Clarke stated that the SAB has encouraged everyone that wants to be included. Person noted that it would be difficult to draw a line where to exclude stakeholders from the process. There was discussion about participants needing to prepare for the meetings, that the public would be strained to maintain interest in the process, and the importance of managing the expectations of stakeholders. Joe Polos and Robin Schrock added that there is a lot of conceptual work that has already been invested into this process and a need for those involved to be prepared. Robert Franklin added that in Appendix H of the SAB recommendations there were suggestions for including stakeholders as much as possible.

11. Open Forum

Bill Brock introduced Penelope Del Bene, the Forest Service Tribal Relations/Heritage Program Manager from his office in the Forest Service.

Judy Pflueger stated that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) will be releasing to the public flood maps from Lewiston Dam downriver 38 miles with photos going back to 1981.

Robert Franklin discussed an appealing idea from discussions with the visiting Japanese sedimentologists. In other parts of the world, they mark where the river is during flood events to improve public awareness of the river.

Adjourn of meeting 4:50 PM