

Final Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
 Indian Creek Lodge, 59741 Hwy 299 West, Douglas City, CA
 Wednesday, December 11, 2013

Wednesday, December 11, 2013; 9:15 AM

Attending Members

Member	Representative Seat
Brian Person	Bureau of Reclamation, Chair
Bruce Bingham	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

¹Alternate for David Myers; ² non-voting members.

Others that attended: Don Reck (Bureau of Reclamation); D.J. Bandrowski, Ernie Clarke, Eric Peterson, Robin Schrock (Trinity River Restoration Program); Andreas Krause, Tim Hayden (Yurok Tribe); George Kautsky (Hoopa Valley Tribe); Teresa Connor (Department of Water Resources); Kelli Gant (Trinity Lake Revitalization Alliance); Seth Naman (NOAA Fisheries); Tom Stokely (California Water Impact Network); Matt Brown; Jeff Morris.

List of Motions that Passed during the Meeting

Judy Pflueger made a motion to approve the September minutes

Ann Garrett seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the TMC delay in directing the Flow Workgroup to plan for the fall flow augmentation within the ROD volume because the matter is in litigation and will be resolved by the courts. And further the TMC has spoken in past motions that the supplemental flow volumes are not part of the ROD and this was concurred with by the Department of the Interior in 2005.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously with the BOR abstaining.

Other Decisions

Curtis Milliron nominated Ann Garrett and Brian Person for the chairmanship.

Both nominees received the same number of votes.

It was decided to split the two-year term with Brian Person serving the first year and Ann Garrett serving the second.

Regular Business:

1. Introductions and Approval of Agenda

Brian Person, chair of the Trinity Management Council (TMC) opened the meeting and asked for introductions for the benefit of the new US Fish and Wildlife Service TMC member, Bruce Bingham. Person then reviewed the process for development and review of the agenda. Barring limits imposed by weather or funding limitations, the agenda and meeting duration (whether one or two days) are driven by items needed to be covered. Person asked for the members to comment on whether or not they see this protocol differently. Mike Orcutt stated some concern about having time for discussion. Robin Schrock suggested that at the preceding monthly phone call, the group set items for the agenda with space allowed for new additions.

2. Approval of September 2013 Minutes

Brian Person asked the group for any remaining edits to the September 2013 minutes. Ann Garrett and Dave Hillemeier had some minor spelling and sentence structure edits.

Judy Pflueger made a motion to approve the September minutes.

Ann Garrett seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

3. Open Forum

Tom Stokely (CA Water Impact Network) asked to make a comment. Stokely brought up the TAMWG's recommendation that the TMC ask the SAB if there is a causal linkage between the restoration work in the Trinity River and the watersheds. Stokely reviewed some of the history of projects in the watersheds and the solicitor's opinions. Stokely asked that it be considered as a scientific issue so that the program can be as successful as possible with a basin-wide approach. He cited the 1.2 %- to-1.5 %- per-year gain in juvenile salmonid habitat that according to the SAB, signals that it is time for the program to reassess. Stokely mentioned that smaller watershed projects are more easily attainable for local contractors, and reviewed the impacts to the public from the larger projects. Stokely discussed the success of the 5C's Salmonid Conservation efforts rescuing 1,000 juvenile fish from a small ditch on a very minor tributary as a great example of the possible impacts that can be made. Stokely thanked the group for listening and asked for any questions. Person then directed the group to the motion from the TAMWG.

4. Report from Trinity Management Council Chair

Brian Person began by stating that Robin Schrock will present the budget details during her segment. The Federal government remains on a Continuing Resolution that extends through

January 15. The sequestration-driven reduction of 5.22 % across the board cuts are still in effect. Congress is working on a tentative budget agreement that might be for two years. With regards to the EPIC lawsuit, Person stated only that an agreement in principal has been developed between the plaintiff and defendants that will settle all issues aspects of the litigation. Because the litigation technically remains active, he could not state more at that time.

On Flow Augmentation, the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) is committed to developing a long-term plan. The target is that the plan be in place in time for implementation next year, if necessary, which means the initial draft must be completed by the end of this calendar year. It was suggested that a collaborative meeting be held where all parties can come together to share ideas. The BOR will have a “workshop” to discuss and explore solutions on December 19 at the Red Lion Inn in Redding from 10:00 AM to 3:00 PM. Person then stated that the plan for the workshop has shifted to open the attendance of the workshop to any concerned parties. Judy Pflueger asked that Paul Hauser (Trinity PUD) be made aware of this meeting. Elizabeth Hadley will be in contact with him. Mike Orcutt and Brian Person discussed extending the invitation to the Klamath Basin constituencies so that they can have enough representation. Person stated that the meeting will involve the BOR describing their history and thinking, then opening it up for listening.

Person attended the first day of the TAMWG meeting and provided an update and mentioned his curiosity about items covered the second day.

Person then began the process for election of chair and vice-chair positions. Person and Ann Garrett expressed their willingness to serve. Elizabeth Hadley was asked to manage the election. Hadley asked for any other nominations.

Curtis Milliron nominated Ann Garrett and Brian Person for the chairmanship.

Both nominees received the same number of votes.

It was decided to split the two-year term with Brian Person serving the first year and Ann Garrett serving the second.

5. Report from TAMWG Chair

Elizabeth Hadley, Chair of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG) reported on their last meeting, December 9 and 10. The TAMWG made three motions. The first motion, described by Tom Stokely, was that the SAB find out if there is a causal linkage between the watersheds and the restoration efforts.

For the second motion, the TAMWG made a recommendation that the TMC make funding available for noxious weed management. Schrock responded to Person that the Trinity County Weed Management Area (TCWMA) presentation had been a surprise. Schrock stated that the program had not been contacted prior. Dave Hillemeier asked if there is a noxious weed problem. Schrock stated that it is a county-wide problem and that she is going to ask the Wildlife Riparian Workgroup to respond. Hadley stated that there are two parts to the recommendation: funding and to insure that the TRRP staff is engaging with the TCWMA. Schrock responded that the program and partners had not been contacted by them but will be attending their meetings. Hillemeier asked for clarification from Schrock if the funded partners are going to do assessments and incorporate weed control into their efforts. Schrock is still reviewing the agreements and the potential costs. There was surprise that the issue was brought first to the TAMWG and not through the technical workgroups. Judy Pflueger asked whether the

program is already doing noxious invasive weed management. Schrock stated the program has been. Pflueger stated that it sounds like a communication issue. Hillemeier asked to add the issue to the March meeting. Schrock directed the group to the handout from James Lee in their packets detailing TRRP actions.

The third TAMWG motion was to recommend that the TMC direct the Flow Workgroup to include a reserve amongst the ROD water for fall flows during normal, dry, and critically dry years. She noted that there were members that voted no to avoid implying consent for fall flows in a way that would impact pending litigation. There was clarification that during wet years, the flow augmentation is not generally necessary.

Mike Orcutt stated that they will need to digest the motions from the TAMWG and that it might be pre-mature given pending litigation and that the process has been vetted and needs to be reviewed. Hadley responded that time is of the essence to get ahead of the process.

Person clarified the responses that must be made by the council. Person asked for clarification on funding costs that would be needed for weed management. Schrock stated that she is asking the Forest Service to give her some cost estimates based on their projects. Bruce Bingham asked if there are annual reports, Schrock stated that there is reporting on rehabilitation but not specifically noxious weeds. They discussed planning monitoring into a program. Person asked for more information in January.

Person stated that the TAMWG recommended that the Flow Work Group reserve from the ROD volume enough water to provide for lower Klamath River flow augmentation later in the year, in the event fall flow augmentation is required. Person discussed the potential for the court decision being rendered in the middle of the ROD flow period and the need to make plans for either way the litigation determines. Schrock stated that the Flow Workgroup is making a portfolio of hydrograph proposals, several for each water year type with the exception of extremely wet and critically dry water years, and their time is already heavily invested.

Person stated that he could not imagine that this group would truncate flows if the court decision came in the middle of the spring/summer flows. Orcutt stated that there was discussion of looking at it again. There was a sub-group working on it. Orcutt stated that he does not think they have ever worked on speculation. Hillemeier stated that he agrees with Orcutt's statement. Person asked the group if anyone was ready to make a motion to respond to the TAMWG.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the TMC delay in directing the Flow Workgroup to plan for the fall flow augmentation within the ROD volume because the matter is in litigation and will be resolved by the courts. And further the TMC has spoken in past motions that the supplemental flow volumes are not part of the ROD and this was concurred with by the Department of the Interior in 2005.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously with the BOR abstaining.

Judy Pflueger asked about the timing of the court decision. It was stated that the timeline given was too broad to make any plans on.

The group decided that the rest of the TAMWG motions will be addressed in January.

6. Report from Executive Director

Robin Schrock directed the council to her letter in the packet. She touched on several items.

Federal/Regional updates

Schrock noted that there have been no Federal budget changes; the program is still on the same Continuing Resolution since June. Orcutt asked about the TMC having made a “provisional” approval of a budget, but that there are items they have concerns with. Schrock stated that, according to agreements, partner funding is based on availability of funds. Orcutt raised concerns about funding for the DSS and watersheds that was approved at prior meetings. Person clarified that “provisional” was his term, and that the group is trying to commit to a year of funding when there is only a short-term Continuing Resolution. Pflueger felt that they needed numbers to move forward with the understanding that things could change. Person clarified that there was \$177,000 was allocated for the first two-year installment of the Fish Production Model.

Workgroup updates

Schrock deferred further workgroup reports to the later presentations by workgroup coordinators. She mentioned that there were concerns at the TAMWG meeting about shallowing of the river creating temperature problems that were not supported by recent reports or monitoring. Schrock reviewed the bullet points from the Fish Workgroup. Schrock complimented the workgroups on coordinating with the Design Team. During development of the hydrograph proposals, the other workgroups have been reviewing the impacts of the different options presented. Schrock reviewed highlights from the other workgroups.

The Inter-Disciplinary Team (IDT) is still holding monthly conference calls for answering questions between the workgroups. D.J. Bandrowski will give his presentation at 11:30 and Schrock directed members to his handout from the Design Team. Schrock stated that she has been acting Watershed Workgroup coordinator. They received eight pre-proposals and the workgroup asked for and got full proposals for all eight. The pre-proposals are included in the packet.

New Workgroup Coordinators

Schrock listed off the new workgroup coordinators.

Public Participation: TRRP Calendar and Coordination Email

Schrock noted that there was an issue with seeing updates on the calendar. People were directed to clear their browser cache. She asked that people sign up for and disperse the coordination email so that everyone is getting the latest information.

The new workgroups are working well and the partners have provided their members. The IDT is still defining how they will function. Schrock stated that Andreas Krause left the TRRP and went to the Yurok Tribal Fisheries.

The TAMWG is going to assemble their comments on the SAB Phase I Review and will be submitting them to the TMC by January 17.

The TRRP Overview video has been amended with input from the partners and the final version is being produced. Copies will be available to everyone.

The Native Species of Trinity County brochure has been made. Schrock stated that there are roughly 64,000 images of the programs that are available to the members. The photos are available to partners by contacting Eric Peterson.

The TRRP had two public open-houses. The first in Junction City was a small event. The Lewiston presentation was very well attended with guides and some out of town landowners. There was concern about BLM plans to move the Bucktail boat launch close to private homes. The road plans were well received. Person and Schrock discussed the public concerns about

braiding the stream and radiant heating. Schrock stated that Rod Wittler responded that there is not a detectable overall effect on the river.

Schrock reviewed upcoming events from her handout. On December 17, there is a public meeting for CEQA/NEPA documents at the Trinity County Library in Weaverville. There will be a 30-day review period after the Draft EIS is issued.

The last week of January will have a presentation of a complete DSS that was used on the Yakima River and a river in Delaware, among others. They are looking to have the meeting held at Shasta College for better availability of computers.

Ernie Clarke asked if there were any questions about the Wildlife Riparian Workgroup while James Lee is present. Person asked Lee about the sudden appearance of the noxious weed issue. Lee responded that when working on the rehabilitation sites, the best approach is to establish native plants before the noxious weeds can gain a foothold. Lee stated that they will be attending the TCWMA meeting next month and looking to further cooperation. Kelli Gant stated in defense of the TCWMA that they had been told incorrectly that the TAMWG is the way to start discussions with the program. Hillemeier asked about the process of monitoring. Lee stated that he is mostly concerned about new threats like arundo and salt cedar. He said that the rehabilitation period is a time where weeds are addressed in the areas of revegetation. There was discussion of there being a problem that needs to be caught early. Pflueger volunteered that she will attend the next TCWMA meeting.

7. Phase 1 Review

Ernie Clarke gave the group a three-page handout. The SAB Phase I review was released in mid-November. The SAB is only looking for comments on the main report; the appendices are still awaiting technical review. Comments are asked for from each partner.

8. Fish Production Model

Clarke stated that there was a two-year plan for the fish production model funded in September with \$177,000. The agreements need to be modified with this work. The Fish Workgroup's highest priority is supporting development of this model and they are planning meetings to build upon the workshop scheduled in January. George Kautsky raised concern about the two-year process being well into the Phase II implementation, implying that tangible metrics will be available too late. There was discussion about the timing.

Clarke clarified that the modeling team from the USGS based the timing off of availability. Orcutt voiced his frustration at the prolonged process and understanding that you do half the projects and then review results. Schrock stated that the draft report has criticisms, compliments, and recommendations. She does not see anywhere that they tell the program to stop doing what they are doing. Person stated that the message coming from the SAB is an immediate need for a DSS. Person interpreted the SAB response as a tune-up not a sea-change. Judy Pflueger spoke to a perception that things move slowly and a need to do better, quicker, while headed in the right direction.

9. 2015 Science Workplan

Ernie Clarke reviewed the plan from last year and the timing of deliverables throughout the year. He pointed to a list of monitoring projects. Clarke asked if the FY 2015 plan might be better

spent focusing on the DSS and report writing and whether to move the FY2014 plan into FY2015 with some minor modifications.

Person asked for comments. Pflueger voiced her support. Orcutt asked about whether any on the list were subject to review. Clarke responded that they have all been reviewed in the last two years. There are reviews that have not been incorporated yet because of their late arrival. Orcutt asked about the temperature monitoring. Polos responded that it will use staff time to put temperature monitors in. Tim Hayden asked whether minor changes would be handled at the workgroup level. Clarke responded affirmatively. Clarke iterated that juvenile density and habitat are changed each year.

10. Science Accomplishments for 2013

Clarke stated that the reports show that members of the program have done quite a bit of work this last year. Clarke voiced that there is interest in the sharing of information across disciplines that will be incorporated into the DSS. Schrock pointed out that it took the SAB a long time to go through the information available because it was not collected in an integrated manner. Clarke brought up the Gravel Augmentation workgroup, how the group is struggling with the amount of work needed to be done. Clarke stated that there is a need to focus efforts to do them well and added that workgroup realignment itself is an accomplishment itself.

Information / Decision Items:

11. Implementation Update

D.J. Bandrowski presented the design update via conference call. The Bucktail and Lower Junction City channel rehabilitation designs are 80 % complete. The Dutch Creek project design work is 30 % completed with a 2015 implementation potential. The Hatchery Reach design work is just starting and will be completed with the 2015 design cycle. In 2014, Upper Douglas City above the 299 bridge and the Lower Junction City will be implemented. The existing environmental document will cover the Bucktail and the Lower Junction City projects.

On December 17th at 6-8pm there will be a public meeting to solicit comments from the public for NEPA compliance, which will start a 30-day comment period. The document will go live to the public early next week. Bandrowski asked for any questions there were none.

Bandrowski went into the TRRP Phase II Implementation Planning and Analysis handout. He detailed questions about revisiting prior sites and how they have tried to take a quantitative approach to planning projects with an overall view. The hope is to have better prioritization and pre-project monitoring already in place. Bandrowski introduced his flow chart, TRRP Phase II Strategic Planning Process – Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) Prioritization. Bandrowski described the “data frame” and the intent to build analyses upon it. There is a full 40-mile model and the data frame will feed into a logic model. A statistical model will look at key metrics to help categorize data into a framework upon which statistics can be performed. They will get inputs from the workgroups and all that information will be put into a report and prioritized, after which the TMC and TAMWG will be able to review.

George Kautsky asked about the guidance from the Phase I Review. He asked what part is giving guidance in particular. Bandrowski responded that the process is an effort to organize the information to be in a way that can be used. That alone has pointed them into the position to do some of the analyses planned, thus making it easier to incorporate new information outside the existing data. Bandrowski stated that the SAB has stated a need for more predictive modelling

and structured decision-making. Kautsky asked about the time-frame for the flow chart presented. Bandrowski expects the model to be completed by May of 2014. The 2-D model and logic model are essentially built. The expectation is to have this in place by the 2015 design cycle. The 2014 projects have already been decided and are moving. Bandrowski recommended not moving forward on any other design projects beyond those two. The analysis and prioritized recommendations will be a launching point for 2015 designs and the future. This will help inform the budget and science monitoring for future projects.

Bandrowski briefly went over the larger flow chart for Phase II Strategic Planning/Analysis. He noted that this kind of planning was not able to be done before because the parts were not there yet and they were lacking data and computing power. Bandrowski explained the Data-Frame GRTS Panel System and how the data will be combined into the logic model. The hope is to use statistics to determine relationships or links between data. Geospatial data will be included and related to environmental site limits. Bandrowski made some examples of using the model to prioritize one location over another.

Dave Hillemeier asked about Bandrowski's conjecture of reducing the number of sites based on the model. He asked what would help determine that. Bandrowski said he believed the model will help guide what type, size, or location to build upon. Bandrowski gave Poker Bar as an example with three project sites that might be determined to be less optimal than efforts elsewhere.

George Kautsky asked about how landowners will be incorporated as a variable or parameter within the logic model, and what kinds of outputs will be coming from the model. Bandrowski described that the landownership is to be used to identify opportunities and weight decisions. Kautsky expressed concern that landownership not preclude a long-term realization of program objectives and should be a variable in model reconing. Bandrowski gave an example where the model could help quantify the value of sites and potentially steer work away from sites that have difficult access issues and low return.

Lunch

12. Implementation Update

Flow Workgroup Update

Rod Wittler began his presentation for the Flow Workgroup. Person covered the previous discussion about the litigation and the fall flows. He asked how long it would take for the Flow Workgroup to adjust the hydrograph during the flow in response to a court decision. Wittler stated that given the current analysis being done, they would be able to most likely make adjustments within a couple of weeks.

Wittler reviewed the current drought situation. He said that they are in a "D3" rating. He showed the history of the drought index and drought cycle. The three month outlook shows an equal chance of getting above- or below-normal precipitation. It is still early for the snowpack; but it is "meager." The forecasted annual estimate for inflow to the Trinity Reservoir is dropping. Under the TMC and Program Director's suggestion, the Flow Workgroup has changed their scheduling process. They started on June 12 to define, met again on August 30, and had a November 13 deadline for proposals. Currently, proposals are being analyzed. They will meet January 14 and make changes based on analysis. They will produce a decision tree based on water year available shortly after February 27 to be available for the TMC to make decisions.

Eric Peterson has put together a summary document made up of a portfolio of past studies and decisions. Wittler showed how they are evaluating proposals for different potential hydrographs. The Critical Dry water year has no proposals beyond the ROD. Mike Orcutt asked whether the TRRP has validated the ROD hydrographs. Wittler stated that they have validated some things and invalidated others. Temperature-wise, it is validated. For sediment transport, they have found the transport is less than what the ROD predicted, invalidating the original hypotheses. During Dry years, they have two proposals. One is to have a quick steep peak with a higher discharge. The other is a set of smaller peaks to mimic nature's multiple peaks during the runoff. During Normal years, there is a proposal with an early bench on the ascending limb for food production and rearing on the lower surfaces. It has the same, quick-tall peak or an option of multiple peaks. Wittler explained that the new descending limbs have a less than 0.1ft/day recessions to improve root propagation. Wittler and Kautsky began a discussion on experimenting with the bench and whether or not the slow descending limb is permanently beneficial or temporary. Curtis Milliron asked for clarification on the foothill yellow-legged frog and the breeding delay hoped for in the ascending limb. Wittler detailed proposals for Wet years that were similar to the proposals for Normal years.

The potential analyses include temperature compliance, sediment transport, high flow gravel augmentation, habitat, riparian initiation and recruitment, outmigrant timing, construction coordination, monitoring coordination, and some other items. Orcutt asked about the concept of variable flows during the late summer. Wittler responded that it is not on the table for 2014 but is something they are going to be discussing for 2015 and beyond. The variations would cause quite a bit of change with how they do their research. Wittler then reviewed the timing of the Flow Workgroups deliverables.

Person asked if there has been any analysis of prior years indicating abnormally dry conditions through the end of the calendar year with a substantial recovery later in the water year. Schrock stated that they have been reviewed since 2000. Bill Brock stated that it is likely unprecedented to have a full-year of drought and still make a come-back. Wittler stated that the lake is at 50 % and unlikely to be fully filled. Orcutt asked about temperature. Wittler stated that once the lake reaches roughly 1.1 million acre-feet, temperature becomes a concern. The rules for Trinity require that a certain amount of space be available by a certain date as its normal operating procedure. There was some discussion of Safety of Dams and export capacity. The group requested that Wittler return next time with better news.

Gravel Augmentation Work Group Update

Ernie Clarke began the Gravel Augmentation Workgroup by reviewing its purpose statement. The group has had one meeting and one phone meeting. The Gravel Augmentation workgroup is inter-disciplinary with a focus on putting in the gravel and monitoring the effect. They are working on three primary things: 2014 augmentation recommendation, permit renewal, and a long-term sediment management plan. Clarke reviewed that these are targeted to be completed by March, June, and October of 2014. Brandt Gutermuth is working on permit renewal for gravel augmentation. Clarke listed the items that the workgroup will have to assemble for him. In the long-term, the group is building a long-term sediment management plan that includes a sediment routing model, long-term operational plan, refined objectives, updated physical monitoring plan, assembled data, and a clarified decision-making process.

At the December 3 meeting, the workgroup reviewed historical augmentation including the locations, amounts, and justifications. They reviewed studies done, the Fish Workgroup inputs,

and agreed on criteria for 2014 sites. Candidate sites for 2014 include the Weir Hole (high flow injection), Lewiston Cableway (low-flow placement), Upper Lowden Meadows (both), and Grass Valley Creek Delta (both). High flow injections are contingent on the water year. Kautsky asked about the low-flow placement in regards to those stated versus those done during projects. Kautsky asked if this list is exhaustive. Clarke gave an example that work done at Bucktail would include low-flow placement as part of the work. The workgroup will analyze sites through a process as they refine the objectives. They plan to do field visits to see where good habitat is located to determine what is working.

Person asked about the groups' interaction in regards to responsiveness to the fishing guides. There was some discussion about the concerns at the TAMWG meeting. Schrock and Hadley concurred that Robert Franklin's responses addressed their concerns. Schrock spoke of getting out information from reports showing deepening or no overall effect from the gravel, except a few in locations clearly identified in the report. Mike Orcutt mentioned that there were a couple of instances where there were disputes. Joe Polos responded that there was an earlier motion to make sure that they are developing a longer term plan.

The group then reviewed another item from the TAMWG. Robin Schrock brought up a memorandum that was meant for earlier in the meeting. Schrock stated that the Watershed Workgroup is requesting guidance from the TMC in regards to their objectives. She asked if the TMC agreed that their objectives are fine sediment reduction and fish habitat connectivity. Person stated that he assumed the fine-sediment reduction is self-evident. Curtis Milliron asked if they are limited to only those objectives. Dave Hillemeier said that his understanding is support for fish passage and sediment reduction but that habitat improvement would help the goal of increasing fish production. Mike Orcutt stated that he assumed that the geographic location of the watershed was that draining into the 40-mile restoration section from above North Fork Trinity River to Lewiston Dam. Person asked for clarification from Milliron beyond the sediment and connectivity. Milliron discussed the need to go beyond the constraint of the 40-miles of the river, and the opportunities in the watershed to reach toward the larger goal. Person asked Don Reck about the history of this question and the statutory authority. Don Reck stated that the original acts were designed to build a hatchery to maintain fish production. The later acts were created to mitigate the effects downstream for natural fish production. Milliron asked if they were mitigating because of the dam or because of the effect on the fish. He noted that if the goal is to restore the fish, then the fish are also in the tributaries. Person stated that the solicitor's office clarified that the program will not develop "brick and mortar" projects in the tributaries. Reck stated that while BOR might not fund tributary work, it is included in the ROD that the other partners can contribute to the watersheds. Milliron asked if there is a written opinion about the TRRP limiting work to the 40-mile stretch. Person stated that there is not. Milliron stated that they should ask for it. Person pointed out Tom Stokely's request for SAB review of the relationship between the tributaries and fish production. Mike Orcutt voiced his opinion that the outcome of asking on an opinion depends on how the question is asked, and so he is cautious about what could happen. He noted that the South Fork could have a large effect on the prioritization of projects and that there is also a litany of laws involved.

Person asked if the group could respond to the Watershed Workgroup before the January meeting. Hillemeier stated that he does not think they are ready to respond today, but that restoring the watershed is large. The need in the South Fork is huge, and the wild spring Chinook salmon population is hanging on by a thread and might not be there anymore if the group waits too long.

Schrock stated that the fine-sediment reduction has been largely successful and a recent report discussed the sediment budget. The group is conflicted and that all the proposals are worthy. Judy Pflueger clarified that none of the proposals are in the South Fork Trinity. Schrock stated that the group has not submitted any. The Watershed Workgroup saw culvert replacement as beneficial for sediment reduction and fish connectivity. Teresa Conner asked if there is a list of potential projects that fall outside the purview or could be proposed. Schrock directed her to the proposals in the packet. The item was agreed to be added to the agenda for the next meeting.

13. Scheduling

The group then discussed scheduling of the 2014 meetings.

- January 29, 9 AM – 12 PM. Conference Call
- February 28, 10 AM – 12 PM. Conference Call
- March 26, 27 – Quarterly Meeting (Redding)
- April 14 – 10 AM. Conference Call
- May 22nd, 10 AM - 12 PM. Conference call to set the agenda for the June meeting.
- June 18, 19 - Quarterly Meeting (Hoopa)
- July 17 – 10 AM. - 12 PM. Conference Call
- August 21 – Conference Call
- September 17, 18 – Quarterly Meeting (Weitchpec)
- October 16 – Conference Call
- November 20 - Conference Call
- December 17,18 – Quarterly Meeting (Weaverville)

Robin Schrock will send out the schedule to members.

14. Open Forum

No comments at this time.

Adjourn of meeting 2:10 PM

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

Firehall (623-6156), 100 Bremer Street, Weaverville, CA

Draft Agenda for September 18, 2013

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

Indian Creek Lodge (530)-623-6294

59741 Hwy 299 West, Douglas City, CA 96024

Draft Agenda for December 11, 2013

Wednesday, December 11, 2013

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic, Purpose and/or Decision to be Made</u>	<u>Discussion Leader</u>
	<i>Regular Business:</i>	
9:00	Introductions: ▪ Welcome ▪ Approval of Agenda ▪ Approval of September 2013 Minutes	Brian Person, Chair
9:15	Open Forum: Comments from the public	Brian Person
9:30	Report from TMC Chair ▪ Federal/Regional updates ○ TMC action items ○ TAMWG items ○ Supplemental flows ▪ Chair/Vice-chair election	Brian Person
10:30	Report from TAMWG Chair	Elizabeth Hadley
11:00	Report from Executive Director ▪ Federal budget update - TRRP budget strategy ▪ Work Group updates ○ Partner Participant assignments ○ New WG Coordinators ○ Work Group roles	Robin Schrock

- Public participation – TRRP calendar and coordination email
- Work Group updates
 - Quarterly summery (handout)
 - TRRP Invasive Plant Management Actions

11:30 **Implementation Update** DJ Bandrowski

- 2013 Rehabilitation projects updates
- 2014/2015 Rehabilitation projects updates
- Phase 2 Strategic planning

12:00 **Lunch**

Information / Decision Items:

1:00 **Science Update** Ernie Clarke

- Phase 1 Review
- 2013 Science Accomplishments
- Fish production model progress
- 2015 AWP timeline

2:00 **Gravel Augmentation Work Group Update** Ernest Clarke

3:00 **Flow Work Group Update** Rod Wittler

4:00 **2014 quarterly meeting scheduling** Brian Person

4:45 **Open Forum** Brian Person

5:00 **Adjourn**

Lunch menu: http://www.trinideli.com/Lunch_menu.html

Please have exact change if you plan to order lunch. We will have it delivered to Indian Creek around 12 noon.

Meeting access information:

Topic: TMC Meeting

Date: Wednesday, December 11, 2013

Time: 9:00 am, Pacific Standard Time

Meeting Number: 578 962 121

Meeting Password: Abc123!!

To join the online meeting

Go

to <https://trrp.webex.com/trrp/j.php?ED=248306012&UID=487141902&PW=NNDU4MTFINjEz&RT=MiMO>

Audio conference information

Call-in toll number (US/Canada): 1-408-792-6300

Access code:578 962 121

For assistance

1. Go to <https://trrp.webex.com/trrp/mc>

2. On the left navigation bar, click "Support".

To add this meeting to your calendar program (for example Microsoft Outlook), click this link:

<https://trrp.webex.com/trrp/j.php?ED=248306012&UID=487141902&ICS=MS&LD=1&RD=2&ST=1&SHA2=AAAAAtQqVI8gs-RrzQKvpsJwrAbs3oo8kXDjYUK9dMWbpbKA>

To check whether you have the appropriate players installed for UCF (Universal Communications Format) rich media files, go to <https://trrp.webex.com/trrp/systemdiagnosis.php>