

Final Minutes  
**TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**  
US Forest Service, 3644 Avtech Parkway, Redding, CA  
Wednesday and Thursday, December 14 and 15, 2011

**Day 1, Wednesday, December 14. Start of meeting 12:00 PM**

Attending Members:

Brian Person	<i>Bureau of Reclamation, Chair</i>
Nancy Finley	<i>Fish and Wildlife Service, Vice-Chair</i>
Dave Hillemeier	<i>Yurok Tribe</i>
Mike Orcutt	<i>Hoopa Valley Tribe</i>
Ann Garret	<i>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Fisheries</i>
Bill Brock <sup>1</sup>	<i>Forest Service</i>
Teresa Connor <sup>2</sup>	<i>California Natural Resources Agency</i>
Roger Jaegel <sup>3</sup>	<i>Trinity County</i>
Arnold Whitridge <sup>4</sup>	<i>Trinity Adaptive Management Work Group</i>
Robin Schrock <sup>4</sup>	<i>Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director</i>

1) Alternate for Sharon Heywood, 2) alternate for Curtis Milliron, 3) replaced by Judy Pflueger on day 2, 4) non-voting members.

Others that attended: Joe Polos, Fish and Wildlife Service; Ernie Clarke, Trinity River Restoration Program; George Kautsky and Andrea Hilton, Hoopa Valley Tribe; Kelli Gant, Dana Hord, Dave Steinhauser, and Ed Duggan, Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group; Don Reck, Bureau of Reclamation; Alex Cousins Trinity Resource Conservation District; Samantha Chilcote, US Forest Service; Elizabeth Hadley City of Redding Electric Utility Department; Seth Naman, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; Tim Hayden, Yurok Tribe; Travis Michel, Trinity River Guides Association; Dave Maurer, Congressman Herger's office; Mike Raranci, Redding Fly Shop; Sam Smith, Trinity riverside resident; Tom Stokely, California Water Impact Network; several other members of Trinity River Guides Association.

**List of Motions Made during the Meeting**

**Dave Hillemeier made a motion to accept the April minutes as amended.**

**Roger Jaegel seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Dave Hillemeier made a motion that the Program proceed with 2012 projects in the mainstem (Upper Junction City and Lower Steiner Flat) after consultation with concerned stakeholders. If necessary, TMC shall reconvene on January 4 to determine final plans of action for 2012.**

**Teresa Connor seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

## **List of Action Items Derived during the Meeting**

- Draft insertion to the TMC bylaws to address what issues can be addressed in monthly conference calls.**
- Post meeting handouts and agendas and on the website for downloading prior to TMC meetings.**
- Set up a meeting of the Design Team and stakeholders regarding 2012 channel designs.**
- Watershed Workgroup to review the Watershed Analysis plan scope and budget and report back to TMC at January 4 meeting.**
- Revise April TMC minutes as suggested and resubmit to TMC for another review.**
- TMC members to provide comments to Chair as he drafts comments to both Guides' letters.**
- TMC respond to TAMWG request for Solicitor's opinion on woody debris and public safety.**
- Provide Solicitor's white page on woody debris TMC for January 4 meeting.**

### **Regular Business:**

#### **1. Introductions**

Brian Person opened the Trinity Management Council (TMC) meeting. Person recognized Dave Maurer with Congressman's Herger's office who attended the first part of the day. The current members and members of the audience introduced themselves for Maurer's benefit. The agenda for the meeting was reviewed. They decided to review the September minutes tomorrow.

Person noted that Tom Stokely had asked via emails that the TMC delay any decision on the 2012 Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP or Program) channel implementation until tomorrow so the public can comment on it before a vote by the TMC.

#### **Review of April Minutes**

April minutes were reviewed and Teresa Connor and Joe Polos offered edits.

**Dave Hillemeier made a motion to accept the April minutes as amended.**

**Roger Jaegel seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

#### **2. Open Forum**

No public comments.

#### **3. Report from Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group Chair**

Arnold Whitridge, chair of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG), had these items to report from their meeting held last Friday:

- The TAMWG had a long discussion on whether approve ongoing channel construction or to request a moratorium to allow the Phase I review of past work to occur first. The Trinity River Guides Association (TRGA or Guides) and the California Water Impact Network (CWIN) had requested such a moratorium in a letter and this had been elevated to media releases and to threats of requesting Congress to withhold funding. Generally, the TAMWG was in favor of

continuing channel work. Though there was also support for allowing the review to occur first and the need to respond to public's requests. The TAMWG eventually decided to request a meeting of the stakeholders and the channel design team, but the TAMWG would not impose any design changes.

- Large wood was also discussed and the dangers it poses to the public.
- TAMWG requests that the TMC provide a statement of when they are going to respond to requests for action or information.

Whitridge announced to the TMC that this is his last meeting as a TAMWG chair. He noted he is leaving with "dissatisfactions." He said the Program has proven its power to help the river and this shows it is on the road to success. However, one danger is the public perception problems. His experience suggests that it would be a "really good idea that we not have people mad." The basics for this Program should be discussing recommendations and complaints in public and in a timely manner and not waiting months or years. Secondly, Whitridge commented that a response or explanation of "how the TMC feels" is needed and this needs to come from the TMC. He suggested the TMC engage in discussion and openness.

The TMC then publicly acknowledged Whitridge's contributions to the Program and commented on the current situation with public relations. Roger Jaegel said Trinity County would like to thank Arnold for his many, many years of effort and support. He also noted his dismay over the TAMWG's discussion of a moratorium and even worse are the possible requests to Congress to hold funding for the TRRP. Robin Schrock thanked Arnold for his useful information and noted how he had been a source of support for the Program. Schrock cited how Whitridge handled a difficult TAMWG meeting and that he allowed the TRRP to present their side of the picture on the design planning. Bill Brock echoed Schrock's compliments and noted many years ago when the Program was starting out and Arnold's important role. Responding to Brock's question, Whitridge said no new TAMWG chair has been selected yet. Whitridge explained that the TAMWG still needs to be reauthorized by next month before they can hold another meeting.

Dave Hillemeier further echoed the compliments for Whitridge and said he enjoyed Arnold's "sermons" and said that many were "deserved." Hillemeier noted the importance of holding another joint TMC-TAMWG meeting. Hillemeier further commented that the TMC was criticized for not responding to the Guide's letter. He noted that the letter was addressed to the TAMWG and it was then forwarded to the TMC. So there was some confusion over who was the correct party to respond. He suggested TMC go forward and develop their response. Person responded that efforts had been made to respond but "conversations had taken place" with the Guides and this changed the nature of the response. As a result, several different drafts had been written but not sent. Person noted that in fact, designs have changed as a result of those discussions. Person said he now realized that a response was needed earlier. Person next commented that the thoughtful and constructed criticism is needed and Arnold has been very good at serving as "a good conscience" for the TMC. Teresa Connor next acknowledged Whitridge. Mike Orcutt noted his appreciation for Whitridge's commitment and that "he speaks the truth." Orcutt also commented on the threat to the Program's funding and that the Hoopa Valley Tribe has always sought to secure funding for the Program. He thought that there are innovative ways to fund the Program but it also needs to be cognizant of the public's needs.

#### **4. Report from Trinity Management Council Chair**

Brian Person, chair of the Trinity Management Council (TMC) noted that he could not participate in the last TAMWG meeting and noted his regret given the discussions regarding the Guide's letter. Person noted several items to report as TMC Chair:

- The TMC response letter to the TAMWG did not go as well as hoped. It took longer than thought. A draft was sent out. He noted the mega-letter as a way to clean up of several issues. They need to do better.
- The 50,000 acre-foot water contract between BOR and Humboldt County is being considered at the USBR Commissioner and Interior Secretarial level. It is part of larger discussion of water rights that is ongoing.
- The overall budget outlook is that the continuing resolution is ongoing and does not appear to be resolved, but something may happen in the next two days. Regarding the budget for the period beyond, it is an increasingly challenging time. Agencies are being asked to make reductions (administrative, travel, pay freezes).
- Regarding the Guide's letter, the Program needs to find and communicate meaningful indicators of success. To challenge the viability of the Program in these challenging times is concerning. We should work harder to reach compromise.

Person next took care of some business issues. He noted the value of holding a dinner the first night of these two day meetings and took time out to organize plans for a dinner at a local restaurant.

Person next announced that it was time to consider the chairmanship of the TMC. The charter allows a Federal representative serves as chair for a two year term and Person's term was now up. Person first queried the four Federal representatives for their willingness to serve as chair. Brock and Garrett both said they thought it was not in the best interests to have either of them to serve as chair. Nancy Finley and Person both stated their willingness but also noted that they did not necessarily have a particularly desire. Whitridge then agreed to serve as the arbiter of a voting process by paper ballots.

Roger Jaegel nominated Nancy Finley for chair and Brian Person for vice chair. Teresa Connor nominated Person as chair and Finley as vice chair. It was decided that the eight TMC members would vote on their slip of paper for one candidate and the candidate with the most votes would serve as chair and the other would serve as vice chair. Brian Person was re-elected as chair and Nancy Finely was re-elected as vice chair.

Person next addressed the monthly telephone conference calls. He recounted that monthly check-in calls had been adopted and this has been followed, except in a few instances. He noted that there was the intent that calls should be mostly check-ins or updates of progress and were not for significant decisions. Mike Orcutt asked for clarification on the distinction of check-ins and issues and asked if the bylaws could address this with some sort of insertion allowing some discussion of important issues. Brock asked that this insertion for teleconference issues be limited to certain areas such as flow or budget. Dave Hillemeier thought the phone calls were useful when guidance to staff was needed in a timely manner.

**Action item: Draft insertion to the TMC bylaws to address what issues can be addressed in monthly conference calls.**

##### **5. Report from Trinity River Restoration Program Executive Director**

Robin Schrock, Executive Director of the Trinity River Restoration Program, passed out a number of handouts that related to TRRP activities. She noted the following activities:

- The issues raised by the Guides and CWIN are being brought back to the TRRP staff. There is a joint meeting planned with the design team and the stakeholders.

- A series of Workgroups have been formed to help with guidance for the Program. The Interdisciplinary Team is guiding the Workgroup by prioritizing tasks and seeking synthesis among Workgroups. A set of standardized procedures has been established for charters, calendars, agendas, and summaries.
- The 2012 budget remains unchanged; there is likely to be a full year of continuing resolution. They will need to re-allocate funds if cuts arrive.
- Phase I review is underway. Mike Merigliano of the SAB will be at the TMC meeting tomorrow. SAB will be reviewing several aspects of the Program.
- Compliance meetings will be held in January.
- Five watershed projects are being selected.
- The Science 2012 work plan is being implemented. Notable points are the adult monitoring review, the sampling design workshop, Big Questions, Performance measures, the 2013 work plan is underway, and reports have undergone peer review.

Ed Duggan asked if the standardized procedures will be available for TAMWG. Ernie Clarke said the agendas and summaries will be posted online. Dave Hillemeier asked that the TMC receive their handouts ahead of the meeting and asked if they might be downloaded off the website.

**Action item: Post meeting handouts and agendas and on the website for downloading prior to TMC meetings.**

Travis Michel, introduced himself as a Trinity County resident and President of the Guides Association, and commented on the Guide's letter. He said the letter did not ask for a cut in funding but asked for a halt of channel work until the Phase I review was completed. He noted that it was a "last resort" to ask for a cut in funding and they do not want to go there. Roger Jaegel noted he has received calls from people are very concerned over this "last resort." He re-iterated that there are many good projects that should be funded, even if channel work is halted. Person repeated his earlier comments that three drafts had been prepared as a response to the Guide's letter and, in retrospect, these should have been sent to the Guides. Mike Orcutt asked who is asking for cut in funding and noted that Schrock's report suggests it was the Guides and CWIN and now it is not clear. Responding to another question by Orcutt, Schrock noted \$500,000 is slated for watersheds.

### **Information/Decision Items:**

#### **6. Science Updates**

Ernie Clarke noted that he and Joe Polos will be presenting on the next set of seven items that constitute the Science Updates. He referred the members to a four-page handout that contained the main points of his presentation: Fiscal Year 2012 Work Planning / Prioritized List.

#### **7. 2012 Projects, 2013 Planning**

Clarke referred to the first page of his handout and noted that it was a list of projects prioritized for the Science Implementation Program. He noted several black arrows and he made several points. The cold-water-pool analysis is due tomorrow and there were several wildlife projects that were of concern if the budget were reduced. Roger Jaegel noted the value of the cold-water-pool volume analysis and that he had stopped in to visit and observe the recent IDT meeting. He opined that the IDT is a very valuable piece of the integration.

Clarke noted the second page of his four-page document that contained the flow chart for work planning. He noted three black arrows as areas where they were not able to follow the flow chart

or dates in entirety (Big Questions and SAB reviews). Dave Hillemeier noted that having the budgeted amounts for each Science project would be helpful during these reviews.

## **8. Sampling Design Workshop**

Clarke related how a consultant from ESSA hosted a workshop in November that focused on design of system-scale assessments and assessments of channel rehabilitation sites.

George Kautsky wanted to “memorialize” that the second arrow in Clarke’s flow chart (SAB review and assessment of program) had been highlighted as unfinished for three years now. As he heard Clarke say that the Program will not be able to “close this loop,” he wanted to express his concerns. He hoped that the loop would be closed by 2014.

## **Break**

## **9. Adult Review Workshop**

Joe Polos gave a PowerPoint presentation entitled Adult Salmonid Monitoring Evaluation. This was a review of all the Program’s monitoring activities of adult fish (e.g., returns, spawning, and disease). The review is being conducted by Mike Bradford of Simon Frazer University of British Columbia and Dave Hankin of Humboldt State University, California. Polos went over some the organizing documents of the program and performance measures being collected. He described a workshop that was held where project leaders of fish assessments presented their work (run size, harvests, coded wire tagging, age composition, spawning, and health) to the reviewers. These presentations are available for review on the TRRP website. A report by the reviewers is due out March 15, 2012.

Roger Jaegel asked if the review will address pool filling and holding water, but acknowledged that it may be too soon to assess if the Program has met objectives for adult habitat and juvenile habitat. Jaegel stated that the public wants to know the reason for putting gravel initially and whether there are problems with side channels failing. The “real question” is whether we may be harming the fish and these sorts of question should be answered. Polos said this assessment is mainly looking at the fish and not so much the habitat. But Polos also noted that the physical assessment can help to answer whether the holding habitat is being harmed or helped. Ed Duggan asked if we can assess whether we need to continue to inject gravel and said that he thinks this is a problem. Polos said, again this is an area that the Physical Workgroup is handling. As they get better data on spawning they can begin to better assess this question. Andrea Hilton commented that the injections are in the very upper river and these only travel one mile per year. So problems seen further downstream are more likely the result of projects performed downstream.

## **10. “Big Questions” for TRRP integration**

Clarke noted that they are looking for TMC guidance on the Big Questions. He provided some background that the Big Questions were suggested by restoration specialists from the Platte River, Nebraska. Clarke provided a summary of the IDT’s review of the Big Questions. He noted the issues that the IDT identified issues with Questions 7, 5 and 10. The IDT noted that in Question 7, individual management actions should be parsed out (separate flow and sediment management). However, it also made sense to consider these two together since flow relates to sediment movement. Clarke said the IDT also raised concerns over Question 5, the consideration of out-of-basin factors. It was pointed out that out-of-basin factors could simply be considered but not necessarily as a Big Question.

Question 5 on out-of-basin factors prompted much discussion by the TMC. Roger Jaegel asked it would help to define what factors may be out of the Program’s control. Bill Brock asked if the

marine environment may be considered in Bradford's and Hankin's review. Polos responded that it may be in the age-cohort reconstruction, but no assessment of ocean upwelling would be assessed. Dave Hillemeier said Jaegel brought up a good point that, despite lack of control, it may be good to assess the effects of other factors. Hillemeier noted it may be good to assess the role of tributaries as providing habitat and fish passage. Clarke pressed the TMC to give him guidance if Question 5 belongs on the list or be tracked elsewhere, should Question 7 be parsed out, and if Question 10 (overall Program effectiveness) belongs on the list.

Brian Person queried the TMC about what it thinks about Question 5 and if out-of-basin factors should be considered. This sparked a long discussion. Arnold Whitridge said he originally suggested this question to ESSA as he thought it is important to integration and prioritization and it is important to allow public and Congress to "size up the program." Whitridge stated his opinion was that Questions 5 and 10 need to be considered, citing that, if the Program cannot tell whether or not it is effectively implementing results per Question 10, it would appear to be off course. Roger Jaegel agreed with Whitridge that the best result of answering Questions 5 and 10 is that it will help to address questions by the public. Person agreed that Question 10 is inextricably linked to the Program but Question 5 may be different. Nancy Finley said 5 and 10 are applicable to the other questions and making sure they are addressed in the other questions may be sufficient. Jaegel said he is asked by the public, "Why is the Program working in the river if 99 % of the effects of fish occur in the ocean?" He cited these question as the reason the Program should address Question 5.

Other members gave their opinions. Robin Schrock said the Program needs to demonstrate adaptive management. Mike Orcutt said he could not see the connection between the Big Questions and the IAP or other assessments. He said the Hoopa Valley Tribe is very concerned with the scope of Question 5, citing that the Solicitor spoke to the hatchery issue. Clarke said that the IAP and assessments will likely address several Big Questions and that the IAP and the Big Questions are related, though the Big Questions may be a higher-level look than the IAP. Teresa Connor thought that Question 5 may open up the need for more projects and their "plate is full." Schrock said it is important to describe other factors, especially if they may affect the outcome of that Project. Finley, Person and Schrock all opined that Question 5 would not lead to new special studies or new projects. Jaegel suggested Clarke leave the questions the way they are, but allow each question to be addressed in their own way.

One area of difference emerged as Schrock directed the TMC to the additional page that provided more narratives and rationale for each question. She noted that Question 5 be considered during analysis of individual project results. George Kautsky asked the TMC to "consider otherwise." He said this Program should focus on its main goal of evaluating the implementing an adaptive-management, science-based program. Question 5 is extraneous and important to evaluate but is not a Big Question for this program. Schrock emphasized the need to address uncertainties, even those that are uncontrollable. There is value in characterizing and acknowledging them but there is no need to draw program resources.

As a solution, Connor suggested they acknowledge these factors up front but not list them as Big Questions with the others. Orcutt again asked whether they need the Big Questions. Hillemeier thought that it perhaps should not be listed along side the other questions. Person agreed and summarized the TMC feeling that Question 5 be somehow listed apart from the other questions.

## **11. IDT Update**

Clarke provided the concept of the Interdisciplinary Team (IDT). He referred to a meeting in October where Robin Schrock noted that many projects are focused on separate issues and that the IDT should try to integrate and look across projects and activities. Schrock also stressed the

importance of prioritizing projects and to look to where the program needs to go in the future. She had pointed out that staff and partners are over-committed and the IDT may help to make the Program more efficient. Clarke said the IDT is just starting to take on these tasks and the IDT members may have different ideas of exactly the role of the IDT. Roger Jaegel noted that he had attended a few hours of the IDT meeting and thought that prioritization may need to be performed by the Program leadership instead of the IDT. He thought there was lobbying for specific programs by the members of the IDT.

Regarding a review of Workgroup procedures, a standard set of agendas, summaries, and an Action Tracker has been established. Tim Hayden added that sub-program reviews were approved and the adult review was the first review and has been started.

## **12. 2012 Calendar**

Clarke projected on the overhead screen a yearly calendar where all activities are scheduled. Robin Schrock thought the calendar may help to schedule fewer meetings and possibly allow the scheduling of joint meetings.

As there was extra time before adjourning for the day, the items 22 (hatchery) and 25 (future meetings) were addressed (see those sections for the discussion).

### **Adjourn for the day at 5:00 PM**

### **Day 2, Thursday, December 15, 8:40 AM**

Brian Person opened the meeting and went over the agenda and the plan for the day. He noted that two items (22 and 25) on today's agenda were covered yesterday.

### **Implementation Updates**

D.J. Bandrowski of the TRRP introduced himself as the newly appointed Implementation Branch Chief. He made a combined presentation for the next four agenda items concerning channel work. He passed out and projected a large table describing the Phase II process and timeline for the years 2010 and 2011. This table showed a variety of steps taken and milestones/accomplishments. He described a float trip that the TRRP design team made with the Trinity River Guides Association. As a result of these interactions and concerns raised, the design at Lower Steiner Flat was modified by abandoning much of the planned work along the entire left bank, specifically gravel placements and side channels. The Program also decided to hold off on most of the channel work until the Phase I review is completed.

## **13. CWIN/TRGA Recommendations**

D.J. Bandrowski referred to the Guide's and CWIN's letter that had asked for a halt to channel projects until the Phase I review was completed. He stated that the Guide's and CWIN had some very valid concerns and he expressed his desire to compromise with the stakeholders. Brian Person commented that the TMC is ill-equipped to address highly technical issues. The TMC focus is policy and they look for input from TAMWG and staff. He said he would expect the staff to engage with stakeholders. He acknowledged the attendance of the Guides in the audience today. He asked rhetorically, "Where do we go now?" He said he was still concerned about the existing "gap," and that the Program is "anxious" for the Phase I review. About the two sites planned for work in 2012, he noted that these are less intense and have modified plans.

At this time, Travis Michel of the Trinity Guides Association spoke up and said the modifications to the 2012 sites are still "not enough." He said the Guides are also "curious" about the scientific

review and they would like to be a part of it. Person clarified and asked the Guides "...if the 50 to 80 % gravel reductions are not enough?" Michel said, "No, it is not enough." He said the guides are "pretty much unanimous that the river is putting enough gravel in on its own." Person asked Bandrowski if the design can go forward with no gravel additions. Bandrowski said he could not answer for the design team, but it could be considered and he felt confident a compromise could be reached.

Elizabeth Hadley asked Arnold Whitridge to read the TAMWG motion. Whitridge read it and paraphrased it as "The TAMWG recommended the TMC to proceed with the 2012 projects, but after consultation with stakeholders. No prescriptions on gravel or design were given."

Tom Stokely added his comments regarding the Guide's and CWIN's letter. He prefaced his comments by noting that he had been "happy" to resign from the Trinity County and the TRRP program. He further noted that currently his mission was to carry on Byron Leydecker's request that the TMC respond to the TAMWG and other letters. Stokely said that he did not accept the explanations given by Person for not answering the letter. He said CWIN does not want to stop funding but they may ask Congress to redirect funding away from the main channel. He cited what he saw as problems with the programs, (e.g., planning, communication with public, side channels, voting rules, failure to follow adaptive management, lack of watershed work). He noted the CWIN website as a source of written analysis of the program. He closed by acknowledging D.J. Bandrowski's willingness to reach out.

Brian Person responded to Stokely's statements regarding the lack of response to the Guide's letter. He noted that there had been discussions and responses developed that lead to three different drafts. Thought regrettably, the drafts were not sent out and Person took responsibility for this. There is a new draft to both letters and there will be a reply.

Perhaps as a way to vent some of the built up tension, Mike Orcutt recalled other contentious meetings such as one on mining effects he had attended years ago. He noted that, while there are no media cameras at today's meeting, but the room is filled because of an issue of importance to stakeholders. He went on to note the Hoopa Valley Tribe's position on three core issues. First, the Hoopa Valley Tribe has worked for maintaining funding. Second, the Tribe signed essentially a treaty regarding the ROD, and the Program has failed to meet full funding. He said the trust relationship between the Tribe and the Federal Government is still undefined. Third, the Tribe is concerned about water management issue and specifically the 50,000 acre-feet for Humboldt County. He noted the restructuring plans and the retreats, but the only action is the restructuring of the field office.

Judy Pflueger, alternative for Roger Jaegel, noted the lack of communication and interaction that leads to meetings such as this one. She thought they need to integrate the Guides and update their policy. They need to talk to the people that have been there for years. It is "appalling" that the letter was not properly addressed or at least acknowledged that it could not be addressed immediately. She does not want to see a moratorium and loss of funding as she predicts it would "not come back and would be the death of the program." From what she heard today, she thought it could be worked out and she likes the idea of holding meetings. She wants to ask the Guides to come to meetings as they are advertised as this is their responsibility

Dave Hillemeier commented on his concerns over the tone of the Guide's the letter and related some thoughts by Troy Fletcher. He noted that, originally, the Yurok Tribe had asked that dam removal to be considered as part of the earlier structuring of solutions to the Trinity River, but Trinity County, whom Tom Stokely represented at the time, and other EIS leads did not want to consider it. He expressed his concern that the letter and Stokely's comments were "not very compromising" (i.e. Stokely's comments seemed to infer that things needed to be "his way or no

way”) and that such an approach makes it difficult to be successful in a Program when there are so many divergent views among the partners and stakeholders. Success of the Program is further compromised when the threat to publicly oppose long-sought-after funding is used as leverage to guide the Program, especially in the difficult budget environment that we face today.

Jim Smith, landowner and sport-fisherman, spoke in support of the Guides and noted that the Guides are a particularly concerned stakeholder and if the channel work is not successful, the Guides in the upper river stand to lose their livelihoods. Mike Raranci, manager of the Fly Shop in Redding, said the loss of angling will have a major economic impact and reported that anglers that come into the shop are “all angry with loss of fishing habitat.”

#### **14. Proposed 2012 Channel Rehabilitation Projects**

As part of this continuing open discussion, Dave Gaeuman of the TRRP was asked to describe the design for Upper Junction City. Gaeuman projected overhead maps of the planned construction and explained the design objectives. He noted that this design is new and is not like anything seen before. Split channels and off-channel pools will increase habitat for juveniles. He noted the use of wood jams to maintain the split channels or side channels. He showed modeled results of flow velocity at 450, 2500, and 7500 cfs flows. He showed that slow-flow refugia are maintained at higher flows and scour is created in pools under higher flows. He contrasted 8,000 cfs under no construction with the construction plans and this showed that the construction will cause no additional bed aggradation. One guide expressed some skepticism over the model and that Poker Bar pool appears to be filling in more than Gaeuman realizes. The guide cited a change in pool depth from 30-feet deep several years ago to 23-feet deep now.

Brian Person proposed that the meeting be setup as soon as possible and it should be inclusive as the Design Team can make it. Person said that any stakeholders with interests in increased or accelerated channel work should also be allowed to attend.

#### **Action item: Set up a meeting of the Design Team and stakeholders regarding 2012 channel designs.**

Bandrowski closed his presentation by referencing his second handout which was a time line of implementation of Phase II. He noted that they have scaled back to two projects and this is a pause in itself.

Arnold Whitridge stated he does not understand what the Guide’s and CWIN’s concerns are with the Upper Junction City, but that he does not want to debate it here. He suggested it would help for them to articulate specifics and it doesn’t work to say “they don’t like the Program.” He asked that they think about how to address specifics at the meeting. Wade Sinnen noted that the ROD was originally focused on juvenile habitat and the adult holding was not “well considered.” He noted that fish returns recently have been “good” and he has not seen conditions of health as particularly bad.

#### **15. 2012 Gravel Augmentation and Revegetation**

The issue of gravel augmentation was addressed in this combined discussion. It was noted during these discussions, that most gravel injections at high flow occur in the upper-most reaches near Lewiston. Gravel additions down river are mainly in support of construction of specific structures such as bars or log jams.

#### **16. Large Woody Debris and Public Safety**

Bandrowski explained that their ideas have evolved to incorporation of more wood and larger wood. They had a workshop in October and they have sought outside perspectives.

## **Break**

During the break, the Design Team members held a discussion with the Guides to plan their meeting.

### **17. TMC Recommendations/Motion on 2012 Projects**

Brian Person opened this topic and asked for the TMC members to weigh in. Mike Orcutt thought they may wish to modify the motion made by the TAMWG. He noted that there are budget implications for watershed work. Dave Hillemeier was ready to make a motion on the 2012 action and that would be to follow very much what the TAMWG recommended. Person asked when Bandrowski could report back on the results of the meeting with the stakeholders. Bandrowski said that a meeting is planned for next week and a report could be available by early January. Travis Michel said they are supportive of watershed work and looking at past projects. They are now seeing progress in working with the Program and do not want to cut funding. Bandrowski said that regarding past channel constructions sites, there is a “window of opportunity” to go back and do reparations on parts that are viewed as non-functioning. This may be a way to divert funds but the program staff would need authorization.

**Dave Hillemeier made a motion that the Program proceed with 2012 projects in the mainstem (Upper Junction City and Lower Steiner Flat) after consultation with concerned stakeholders. If necessary, TMC shall reconvene on January 4 to determine final plans of action for 2012.**

**Teresa Connor seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

Before the vote on the motion, Mike Orcutt stated his general support, but also expressed he views that it was a bit vague. He asked about sidebars to this action (e.g., “where might we be if the original intent of the project is lost?”). He stressed the need for the TMC to plan to reconvene in January. As a result, Hillemeier revised his motion accordingly. Brian Person thought it important that the Design Team determine if the design can go forward and still incorporate the recommendations of the Guides. George Kautsky asked for clarification on who was the Design Team. Bandrowski said the overall Design Team is the same as the Design Workgroup and all Workgroup meetings are open to the public.

### **18. SAB Phase 1 Scope Review**

Mike Merigliano, member of the Science Advisory Board (SAB), gave an update on the progress of the Phase I review. He gave some background on the SAB noting there are three fisheries scientists, one geomorphologist, and himself, a wildlife and riparian specialist. He listed several tasks that they had been requested to do: review of the Integrated Assessment Plan (IAP) which directs how the Program will be monitored, assess the efficacy of the channel rehabilitation since 2005 and to provide recommendations, to look at gravel augmentation and flow management. He said the SAB is concerned with the short timeline of their task. They will focus on the response of the individual channel projects and not necessarily the entire 40-mile reach.

The SAB review plan is to examine individual projects, evaluate physical changes, vegetation, actual fish habitat as monitored, and then translate these effects into fish production via modeling. Merigliano showed a flow chart of the review process. Arnold Whitridge noted that there had been concerns that the chart suggested that the TMC will approve steps taken by the SAB and that this implied that the review was not actually independent. Bandrowski said this has been removed. Tom Stokely asked if there would be a public review of the drafts and final as requested in the Guide’s letter. Merigliano said that they could and it sounds like a good idea, but so far, the

SAB has been largely focused on the technical issues and public outreach is somewhat outside his expertise.

The review will mainly develop project summaries, and review the projects based on the data provided by the TRRP. A draft will be reviewed by another expert panel before a final report is prepared. The primary evaluation criteria will be fish habitat and possibly fish production.

Mike Orcutt asked about the type of data that the review may use and whether they may use Program Partners reports and evaluations. Merigliano said they are particularly interested in the fish habitat data and data of the Fish and Wildlife Service. He thinks they may be using SALMOD as the fish production model. Orcutt noted that there may be some bureaucratic elements of the contracts that may impinge on the SAB's complete independence. Responding to a question by Stokely if Merigliano thought a pause in the Program is a good idea, Merigliano thought the Phase I review is important to guiding new projects and it made some sense to have a pause in the program, but he did not feel he could answer definitively until the review was completed. About whether the review will cover an adequate portion of the river, it was noted that some area upstream and downstream of each project will be considered, and there is an ongoing USGS study on the channel changes.

### **Lunch break**

#### **19. 2012 Watershed: Projects/Assessment**

Robin Schrock introduced this topic and noted there are five watershed projects selected. Dave Gaeuman is heading up the watershed projects and he described two implementation projects: the Trinity RCD is performing a roads repair project and there is some channel restoration at Weaver creek. He cited three other projects in the planning stages: the reinforced channel at Sidney Gulch at the Forest Service compound, Connor Creek fish passage, and acquisition of LiDAR tributary data at Indian Creek and East Weaver Creek. These five projects cost \$496,000 in TRRP funding and have \$115,000 in matching funds. Not funded was a West Weaver Creek tailing piles and a fish passage issue in a creek above the Forest Service compound. Responding to Mike Orcutt, it was noted that the watershed Group is now a Workgroup of the TRRP. Orcutt noted the need for coordination of projects as the County removed some material that is now being put back in. Gaeuman said they could do \$1 million in work but it is his understanding that they are limited to the Middle Trinity River. Another issue is the costs for applicants to develop proposals. Tom Stokely suggested a programmatic NEPA/CEQA permit.

#### **20. TMC Recommendation/Motion on Watershed Assessment**

Robin Schrock described the plans for a watershed assessment and referred to a handout. The level of funding proposed was \$500,000 and would be limited to the area between Lewiston Dam and the North Fork Trinity River. The IDT and Program partners wish this initial project be limited, but Schrock's hope that the project would be expanded over time.

Mike Orcutt expressed his concerns. He cited two issues: 1) overlap with other ownerships and other studies or analyses that have already been performed throughout the basin and 2) he did not know what the budget actually would be. Schrock responded that this analysis would be different from the other studies or analyses in the basin in that it would create a geo-spatial database that will help watershed planning. Market analysis suggests that a "Cadillac version" of the geo-data base would cost about \$250,000. Dave Hillemeier asked if the current Program data base development could contribute to this geo-data base. Schrock said that Program data would be used along with other available sets and that main focus would be to create the data as layers for

GIS. Hillemeier surmised that this effort would produce plans for future work but he did not see exactly how this would occur.

Given the questions on budget and some of Orcutt's concerns, Person did not think the TMC was ready to make a motion on this item. Person asked Schrock to have the Watershed Workgroup review the scope of work and re-write as needed. The budget should be refined if possible. The hope was to have a re-written plan for the planned January 4 TMC meeting.

**Action Item: Watershed Workgroup to review the Watershed Analysis plan scope and budget and report back to TMC at January 4 meeting.**

## **21. Outreach**

Jeff Morris introduced himself as the newly contracted outreach specialist for the TRRP. He is contracting through the Trinity RCD. He explained his start up steps he has taken over the past two months. He attended a wood outreach meeting presented for the public in October. He said the Program is complex and the public cannot easily grasp it all. He has met with TRRP staff and noted the IDT gave him good comments. The IDT also asked him not to address technical issues in public meetings. He said they had their first public meeting in Junction City and 25 people attended. A broad spectrum of issues came up and Morris summarized them into three areas: 1) the public wants accurate and understandable information, 2) the public has a level of dissatisfaction with the Program, 3) the public has a real desire to be involved but they don't know how. Morris explained that regarding many questions, the outreach team did not offer answers, but instead wrote them down so appropriate technical people could address them. Brian Person asked "Why don't people simply stop by the office in Weaverville to ask questions?" Morris listed 3 reasons: 1) culture and an impression that they would not get an answer, 2) they may not take responsibility or do not have the time, 3) they have a lack of trust. Alex Cousin says that the communication doesn't work for all people and the outreach team doesn't exactly know why. Mike Orcutt asked if there are written products and that he would like to see them. He thought it would good for the outreach to be really proactive and promote a positive image. Morris noted they will have a separate web page (TinityRiver.org), they will make better intra-river connections, they have planned a series of community meetings, and they have a set of information brochures planned. Dave Hillemeier suggested Morris bring an expert to future meetings to help answer technical questions, that Morris bring the results back to the Program, and that Morris address river safety.

Judy Pflueger said this outreach is a very good idea. She cited her background from a political arena and that the public sees the Program with misperceptions. Travis Michel commented on why the public holds distrust, mainly because of fire policy; he cited that his childhood home was burned by a BLM controlled burn that got out of control. Those that are not employed by the government are particularly distrustful. The next item, Hatchery Issue was discussed yesterday and the discussion moved onto item 23.

## **22. Hatchery Issue – Update on Hatchery Review**

This item was addressed at the end of Day 1. Arnold Whitridge reviewed that TAMWG had forwarded to the TMC a recommendation that they consider the advantages of marking of 100 % of the fall Chinook juveniles at the hatchery before release to the river. The TAMWG recognized that the hatchery review is not yet complete, but he wasn't certain if the review would address this or not. He said the TMC response letter said the TMC is "looking forward" to the hatchery review.

Curtis Milliron commented that he was informed that they are expecting the review in February but there is no set timeline on this. He thought the review would address hatchery marking and

production but did not know how specific it would address Trinity River hatchery issues. He noted that, historically, manual marking was slow and for that reason limited marking was done. The automated procedure works well but it will still be expensive to purchase the millions of tags needed to mark all juveniles. He estimated there are not really “economies of scale” and it could be still four fold higher costs to mark all fish instead of only 25 %. Costs of tags are about \$76 to \$95 per 1000 tags. Whitridge stated that the TAMWG does not have a position, but they simply would like to know the rationale for the decision of whether to mark or not. Milliron also noted that an additional cost is the stress on the fish. George Kautsky wanted to know exactly what the question is. He thought Ed Duggan wanted 100 % marking to save money. Kautsky said that in some cases, it is valuable to mark all fish, but it depends on the objective. Kautsky said they mark 25 % of 4.3 million fall Chinook at \$70 per 1000 and there has been cost savings using the automated trailer. But he confirmed Milliron’s estimate that there would be a linear cost increase to mark 100 %. Don Reck commented that a total cost could be developed but that a specific number for cost (such as \$700,000) may not be that interpretable for the TAMWG and it could lead to more questions. Whitridge responded that a simple answer would still be valuable. Person asked Whitridge if this answer—via this discussion—was good enough for the TAMWG. Whitridge said that perhaps they can wait for the February report. Milliron said that a simple answer of it just costs four-times too much may not be enough as the TAMWG may refer to it and it may not be complete enough and that more questions may follow on it. Wade Sinnen commented that there are other ways to mark fish, coded wire tags (as used for fall Chinook) may not be needed on all fish. Roger Jaegel commented that what the public is looking for is the simplest and best answer you can provide; it is okay to put a couple of bullets of qualifiers. Whitridge thought it would be okay for Milliron to state that they are happy with the current marking. Milliron said he could write such a simple answer with a few qualifiers. But Whitridge said it was okay to wait a few months for the review.

### **23. TMC discussion of TRRP roles/responsibilities**

The April minutes were addressed at this point. Several changes and questions were brought up by Hillemeier, Orcutt others. The edits were noted and Person asked that these be addressed and a re-edited version be emailed to the TMC for consideration at their planned January meeting.

**Action Item: Revise April TMC minutes as suggested and resubmit to TMC for another review.**

### **Regular Business:**

### **24. Open Forum: Comments from the Public**

A member of the public and interested fisherman asked for a briefing on the outcome of the hatchery review. Curtis Milliron explained that the discussion on this topic yesterday was that there is a cost for increased marking but not so much of an increased benefit. The costs are several hundred thousand dollars of tag costs. Additional recovery costs would be for the surveyors to collect the coded wire tags and surveyors can only process 100 fish per day. The additional tagging of the juveniles has a loss factor as stress to the fish. Additional marking could be a burden for analysis. Mike Orcutt also noted that the idea of additional marking may be addressed in the hatchery review.

Tom Stokely asked that the TMC post the agenda and minutes in a timely manner for the public. Robin Schrock said the agenda could be put out a month before the meeting. Stokely next thanked the TMC for listening to their issues. He asked the TMC to authorize the staff to go back and fix some projects where there is general agreement that the projects failed to meet the performance standards. Brian Person said they are considering this. D.J. Bandrowski said the Design Team

will be meeting with the Guides on Monday Public PUD building in Weaverville from noon to 5 PM. The Design Team will actually be starting their meeting at 8:30 AM and the public is welcome to attend that too. They hope to have Webex or at least a conference call so others can participate.

Robin Schrock noted there will be new job positions within the TRRP advertised next week.

Mike Orcutt noted the past minutes of TMC meetings; some of the follow up on motions and decisions is not well described. He asked that this be addressed.

Dave Hillemeier noted that the TAMWG asked for a response to guides letter and a Solicitor's opinion on large wood. He cautioned the TMC to not forget to respond to the TAMWG or the Guides and CWIN. Person thanked Hillemeier and said they will comment on both letters, but it has not yet been drafted so Hillemeier can send him comments. Schrock noted that the TRRP have already provided responses for the TMC letter.

**Action Item: TMC members to provide comments to Chair as he drafts comments to both Guides' letters.**

**Action Item: TMC respond to TAMWG request for Solicitor's opinion on woody debris and public safety.**

Hillemeier asked about the response to the Solicitor's opinion on woody debris. Orcutt referred to the goals statement on IAP and that they don't always like the answer by the Solicitor. He wanted to consider it more carefully. Bandrowski has an informal white paper by the Solicitor on the issue of woody debris. Hillemeier said this could be brought to the January 4 meeting. This would give a basis for how the TMC should respond. Orcutt clarified that the Solicitor's opinion on the South Fork is verbal and not official.

**Action Item: provide Solicitor's white page on woody debris TMC for January 4 meeting.**

Tom Stokely stated that he is hopeful a compromise can be reached on the progress of channel work for 2012. If not, CWIN will continue to provide public comments and raise questions. He noted that if CWIN does not make public comments first, they cannot litigate later, if needed. It was clarified by D.J. Bandrowski that any negative comments made by CWIN on the EIS documents would be conditional on the Program's failure to follow on compromises made and that they only apply to if the planned projects failed to meet the intended compromise. Person expressed his concern over the threat of litigation and he and Stokely both hoped a compromised could be reached on Monday's meeting.

## **25. Calendars: Confirm Next Meeting Dates and Locations**

This item was discussed at the end of Day 1. The next regular meeting is scheduled for March 28 and 29<sup>th</sup> in Weaverville and a special meeting is scheduled for January 4. Future meetings were tentatively set for June 20 and 21 at Hoopa Valley, September 19 and 20 on the Coast, and December 12 and 13 in Weitchpec. Conference calls were set for 10 AM to noon on January 19, February 16, April 19, and May 17.

Curtis Milliron noted with Larry Hanson's retirement, Wade Sinnen has been promoted to supervisor over the CDFG Trinity River Program.

**Meeting Adjourned 4:00 PM.**