

Meeting Summary
GRAVEL AUGMENTATION WORK GROUP (GAWG)
Wednesday July 30, 2014
Arcata USFWS Office, and via Webex

Participants

Arcata: Robert Franklin (coordinator, HVTF), Charlie Chamberlain (USFWS); Andreas Krause (YTF), Conor Shea (USFWS), Scott McBain (McBain & Associates), Wes Smith (NMFS), Wade Sinnen (CADFW), Tereza Sindlarova (McBain & Associates intern).
Webex: Dave Gaeuman per WebEx (BOR), Ernie Clarke (USFWS), DJ Bandrowski (BOR), Aaron Martin (YTF; departed at 9:45), Scott Kennedy (DWR).
Notetaker: Jeanne McSloy (BOR)

Summary of New Action Items

- Hatchery Reach memo - Seth address previous comments and distribute it to the GAWG this week.
- Wes will develop an outline for the Long Range Sediment Management Plan and distribute it to Connor, Scott and Andreas for review and refinement.
- GAWG determine if there is justification to include the Steelbridge site to the 2015-2020 gravel augmentation permit. If so, provide justification to Brandt.

Outstanding Action Items from Previous Meetings

- Charlie will distribute Vision Quest PowerPoint and White Paper for review by GAWG.
- Aaron will re-visit the subgroup augmentation sites exercise to prioritize the list of potential sites.

The start time and agenda (attached) for the meeting were adjusted in advance of the meeting to allow a discussion of the restoration actions in the hatchery reach.

Hatchery Reach

- Andreas briefly reviewed the draft Hatchery Reach Memo shared with work group members in advance of the meeting. The purpose of the discussion was to get input prior to finalizing the memo.
- Group discussed the difference between option A and option B, and recommended changes in the language to make differences in the type of habitat created by each option more clear.
- It was suggested that a simple statement of whether an option includes design, gravel, both or neither would help to clarify.
- There was brief discussion of whether the objective is to reduce spawning habitat in the area, the potential of a sorting weir, and adult holding habitat.
- **Task: Seth address previous comments and distribute revised memo to the GAWG this week**

Introductions; Agenda Review; Action Item Status; Selection of next coordinator

- Agenda was modified as mentioned above.
- Ernie reviewed the meeting guidelines from the work group manual.
- Action Items Status: group updated the status of outstanding tasks. Pertinent tasks are listed above.
- Coordinator Selection: group agrees that incoming physical scientist (Robert Stewart) and Andreas Krause will serve as co-coordinators for the next fiscal year. There were no objections.

Updates

5-year Permit

- The permit renewal is unfolding as depicted in the “FY14 Gravel Augmentation Roadmap”. The renewal will incorporate the latest technical information developed by work group members . Group is reminded that the permit can be amended in future with technical justification.
- Gaueman presented a PowerPoint update, “Analyses to support gravel augmentation recommendations,” briefly explaining its origins and modifications. The analysis is documented in a June 2014 draft report that has been circulated for input. Dave explained that this report answers some questions associated with gravel augmentation, but does not specifically address augmentation to enhance fish habitat in local areas. Dave reviewed new information added to the report since its initial presentation to TAMWG / TMC in March 2014, and recent progress on gravel routing and morphodynamic modeling. Dave is currently addressing reviewer comments on the draft report.
- Ernie shared a table addressing augmentations locations and volumes for discussion. The table including the locations included in the 2010 permit. The group discussed other sites that should be on the list, i.e., Steelbridge.

2014 technical efforts (gravel mapping, bed mobility, Vision Quest, other)

- Scott McBain presented PowerPoint “Summer 2014 active gravel bar storage mapping” and updated the group on his work in 2014. The underlying hypothesis is that fry habitat depends on gravel storage. The group discussed the relationship of this work to site design. It was pointed out that the terminology should be changed; remove “storage” and call it “emergent bar area.” Quantifying the area of emergent bars is a useful way to look at channel complexity,

Long Range Sediment Management Plan

- Multiple elements of the plan are developing as depicted in the “FY14 Gravel Augmentation Roadmap”, with the exception of objective refinement. Several outstanding tasks from the February workgroup meeting had been intended to advance that effort.
- The group discussed whether TMC intended this was meant to be a single document in their April 2013 motion (“Approve placement of 200 yd³ of gravel during high flows this year while the TRRP continue efforts to refine the long-term course sediment management plan to be presented at the December TMC meeting. In addition, the TRRP should pursue efforts to place 1,500 yd³ at the Sawmill site during low flows, per the design presented to the Physical Work Group.”). Ernie stated his understanding that Joe Polos was providing support for the structured decision-making process the physical work group was then undertaking.
- The group discussed creation of a plan and the information needs involved at great length.
- Conor presented a “Work Plan based on a Channel Management Map” and suggested overlaying the work plan on a channel management map.
- WG members thought that incorporation of the data frame into their information base might be helpful.
- The group discussed how to best approach the plan, bringing it together into one framework as a living GIS tool.
- It was suggested that the group should consider what can be done with the information available now; another option included adding a medium-term plan between 5 year and long term.
- The group discussed the need for developing a decision making process.

LUNCH

Long Range Sediment Plan (cont.)

- It was suggested a clearer statement of purpose is needed.
- The group discussed objectives and the potential impact of GAWG recommendations.
- It was pointed out that the Phase II mechanical channel rehabilitation plan has not been developed yet; 2015 designs are set and cannot be changed; 2016 designs can possibly be informed by workgroup recommendations but only after the Phase II plan is complete. However, it is an iterative

process and can be modified annually as more science comes in. Ultimately the GAWG should be advising the Design Team (DT) on the best placement of gravel to achieve habitat goals.

- The group discussed the decision making process and how GAWG protocols might inform the DT. It was suggested that the language not be too restrictive so as not to constrain future goals and objectives at a site.
- The group discussed the need for an outline to answer the critical questions. A timeline was suggested. **TASK: Wes agreed to revise the draft outline and send it to Connor, Scott and Andreas for review and refinement.** Discussion of Rush Creek Management plan.
- DJ reminded the group that any gravel placements at channel rehab sites do not need to be tied to the long term gravel augmentation plan in terms of the 5 year permit. What is needed is the gravel augmentation plan for places on the river that are not project sites, and for high flow gravel injections for the next 5 years. That is **CRITICAL** to be ready for May 2015 permit needs.
- The group agreed to review priorities. They reviewed the list of points needed to update the CSMP developed by Scott McBain. Discussion of sediment. The group reviewed Table 1 and discussed adding Steelbridge. DJ pointed out that it should not be included unless there is a strong justification, since the Program is under public scrutiny and the Water Board will reject any suggestions that do not have sufficient justification. **He asked the group to provide this justification so that Steelbridge can be added in (TASK).**
-

Adjourn 3:30.

GAWG MEETING AGENDA

LOCATION: TBD (ARCATA, AGENCY OFFICE)

DRAFT AGENDA VERSION DATE 15 JULY 2014

July 30, 2014
9:30 AM – 3:00 PM

Conference Call
 WebEx: [web-link](#)

Coordinators:	Robert Franklin	Call-in toll number (US/Canada): xxxx
		Access code: xxxx
Desired Outcomes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish Coordinator for next 12 months • Receive updates on technical work in progress • Agreement regarding roles in developing Long-Range Sediment Plan • Complete objectives exercise 	

Time	Topic	Presenter
9:00	Introductions/Agenda Review/Action Item Status (listed below); selection of Coordinator for next term	Group
9:50	Updates – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5-year Permit • 2014 technical efforts (gravel mapping, bed mobility, Vision Quest, other) 	Gutermuth, Clarke, McBain
10:30	Long-Range Sediment Management Plan – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status • Plan template (outline) • Collaboration between GAWG and TRRP staff • individual assignments 	Clarke, Members
12:00	LUNCH	
12:45	Long-Range Sediment Management Plan (continued)	Clarke, Members
1:15	Objectives refinement	McBain
2:30	Assignments New Tasks / Next meeting:	Franklin
3:00	ADJOURN	

Actions items from last meeting

Refer to meeting summary for May 13, 2014 at - <http://odp.trrp.net/FileDatabase/MeetingAttachments/Meeting%20Summary%20GAWG%20May%2013%2020141.pdf>