

Final Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
 US Forest Service, 3644 Avtech Parkway, Redding, CA 96002
 March 26-27, 2014

Day 1, Wednesday, March 26, 2014; 10:00 AM

Attending Members

Member	Representative Seat
Brian Person	Bureau of Reclamation, Chair
Bruce Bingham	Fish and Wildlife Service, Vice-Chair
Mike Orcutt	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Seth Naman ¹	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Fisheries
Bill Brock ²	Forest Service
Dave Hillemeier ³	Yurok Tribe
Teresa Connor	California Natural Resources Agency
Judy Pflueger	Trinity County
Elizabeth Hadley ⁴	Trinity Adaptive Management Work Group
Robin Schrock ⁴	Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director

1) Alternate for Ann Garrett; 2) Alternate for David Myers; 3) replaced by Tim Hayden after discussion of Item 11; 4) non-voting members.

Others that attended: Don Reck, Don Bader (Bureau of Reclamation); D.J. Bandrowski, Ernie Clarke, Brandt Gutermuth, Dan Nordstrom (Trinity River Restoration Program); Tim Hayden (Yurok Tribe); Danny Jordan, Robert Franklin (Hoopa Valley Tribe); Kelli Gant (Trinity Lake Revitalization Alliance); Christy Bevard (member of the public); Joe Polos (US Fish and Wildlife); Tony LaBanca (Ca DFW).

Day 2: Dave Meyers and Terri Simon-Jackson (Shasta Trinity National Forest); Ernie Clarke; Joe Polos; Tony LaBanca; Don Reck, and Tim Hayden.

Attended via teleconference: George Kautsky and Wade Sinnen. Day 2: Rod Wittler and Wade Sinnen.

Notes: K. Mattson (ENW)

List of Motions that Passed during the Meeting

Teresa Connor made a motion to approve the December minutes.

Judy Pflueger seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to ask the SAB to provide their expert opinion whether or not there is a biological, causal linkage between watershed restoration throughout the entire basin below the dams and the and construction and operation of the of the Trinity River Division.

Judy Pflueger seconded the motion

The motion passed with 7 yes votes. The Hoopa Valley Tribe abstained.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the TMC reaffirm their commitment to finalize the implementation of the Douglas City and Lower Junction City rehabilitation projects to fulfill the obligation of the DOI to implement the 2000 Trinity River ROD.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 7 yes votes. The Forest Service abstained.

Mike Orcutt made a motion the TMC support the BLM purchase of land along the Trinity and the recommend BLM continue payments of in-lieu taxes.

Bill Brock seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 7 yes votes. Trinity County opposed.

Seth Naman made a motion the TMC accept the Gravel Augmentation Workgroup recommendation for gravel addition based on either a Critically Dry or Dry year and supports the Workgroup effort to develop a long range plan.

Teresa Connor seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Tim Hayden made a motion that the TMC adopt the consensus recommendations for Critically Dry year and for a Dry year and that Reclamation and CVO look for strategies to optimize carry over storage in Trinity Reservoir.

Teresa Connor seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 7 yes votes. The Hoopa Valley Tribe abstained.

Other Decisions

Person suggested, and the TMC agreed, to hold off on public outreach and will schedule a joint meeting with the TAMWG.

Elizabeth Hadley and Robin Schrock will send out a Doodle Pool on the joint meeting date.

Regular Business:

1. Introductions and Welcome

Brian Person, chair of the Trinity Management Council (TMC) opened the meeting and asked the attendees to introduce themselves. Person thanked Bill Brock and the Forest Service for the use of the Forest Service facilities.

Approval of Agenda

Person asked for comments on and approval of the agenda. Joe Polos noted additional time may be needed for the fish update. Mike Orcutt asked if there would be discussion about watersheds and the flows. Dave Hillemeier thought they should discuss the projected run update.

Person acknowledged these requests could be met and noting no more discussion, declared the agenda acceptable.

Approval of December 2013 Minutes

Brian Person asked the group for any remaining edits to the December 2013 minutes. The draft minutes containing all edits were not yet available to the TMC members. These were to be delivered over lunch and the TMC would discuss approval tomorrow.

Teresa Connor made a motion to approve the December minutes.

Judy Pflueger seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

It was decided that small edits could be still sent via email to Kim Mattson over the next couple of days if needed.

2. Open Forum

Christy Bevard, member of the public, asked for copies of the TMC charter.

3. Report from Trinity Management Council Chair

Brian Person began by giving a brief update on several items. He noted this is the most extreme drought since 1977 and passed out handouts that showed the storage levels in the Trinity and Shasta Reservoirs as compared to average, historical maximum, and historical minimum. He noted former Reclamation Commissioner, Mike Connor, was confirmed as the Deputy Secretary of the Department of Interior and is second in command to Secretary Jewel. His appointment will hopefully continue the Department's strong support of Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP or Program). A new Commissioner has been nominated, with the confirmation hearings not yet scheduled. The Federal budget is approved for FY14 and Reclamation has fared well, but future budgets will be competitive.

Person said he attended Day 1 of the TAMWG meetings last week. He referred to the Coalition letter and explained that he had commented at the meeting that there are inevitably going to be disagreements when you go about something as challenging as restoring the Trinity River. Of key importance is how we go about addressing these disagreements.

Person listed the TAMWG items that the TMC has responded to and specifically mentioned two questions that had been posed to the TMC. First was whether or not there exists a causal linkage between construction, operation and maintenance of the Trinity River Division and impacts to the watershed. Second, the TAMWG also asked that the TMC ask the Science Advisory Board (SAB) to determine if watershed restoration can help to meet the Program goals.

These questions prompted an extended discussion among the TMC members. Mike Orcutt said the TMC has talked about this a number of times and legal department has given their answers. He did not think the SAB would be able to address this type of legal or policy question. Person responded that this is an attempt to separate the biology or science from the legal or policy and if the answer was "yes," this may prompt the Solicitor to look at it differently. Orcutt asked if this would pertain to the river all the way to the estuary. Elizabeth Hadley said that the TAMWG did not consider this aspect. Person thought that based on his discussions with TAMWG members, their request was limited to the Trinity watershed. Judy Pflueger asked how in-depth and how long it would take. Person did not know for certain. Orcutt asked that the SAB first finish the Phase I report. Seth Naman said that NOAA considers the answer to the second question would be "yes," and perhaps the TMC does not need to ask the SAB this question. He thought it is

more important for Reclamation to come out with a written statement about the first question before they ask the SAB. Teresa Connor and Dave Hillemeier agreed with Naman. Bill Brock noted that item 4 of the latest Coalition letter referring to tributary restoration should mean in-channel restoration. Currently the Forest Service does watershed restoration and does not focus only on in-channel work. He estimated the Forest Service has been spending \$1 million per year on culverts and \$0.5 to \$1 million on roads.

Person summarized that the ROD prescribes up to \$2 million for watershed work. He noted that the Office of the Solicitor has advised that “brick and mortar” types of projects within watersheds are beyond the nexus. He noted that the Forest Service is spending up to \$2 million in projects in the watershed and this may be an example of a partner that is completing these tasks.

Mike Orcutt noted there are not that many watersheds between the South Fork and North Fork. If there were more coordination with the State of California, Forest Service and others they may be able to achieve watershed work. The TRRP funds \$60,000 per year to facilitate watershed coordination work. Teresa Connor noted hearing criticism about the \$2 million in watershed that should be coming from TRRP budgets and there is interest in the South Fork. Dave Hillemeier asked if they could come up with a list of all watershed work projects and who has funded them. He said he supports asking SAB what they think the causal linkage may be after they finish the Phase I report. Naman did not think it was necessary for SAB to comment on the first part of the question (causal linkage). He also thought the second part (biological linkage) was not as important as Reclamation to write their own policy position first. Person said the stated policy is only the oral statement (no written statement exists). Person said the SAB may compel the Office of the Solicitor to consider the nexus question differently.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to ask the SAB to provide their expert opinion whether or not there is a biological, causal linkage between watershed restoration throughout the entire basin below the dams and the and construction and operation of the of the Trinity River Division.

Judy Pflueger seconded the motion

The motion passed with 7 yes votes. The Hoopa Valley Tribe abstained.

During discussion of the motion, Mike Orcutt thought they would get an answer from the SAB but this would be quickly overridden by the legal authority question. They will not get the answer the TAMWG wants.

Elizabeth Hadley asked why they do not want to add in the tributary restoration portion. Person thought the TMC thought this answer was obvious. Hadley said it was important to get a decision on this from the TMC and she asked, “What is the harm of including it?”

Orcutt said this can get into barrier removal and placement of logs and there are already programs on this and it can get confusing. Hillemeier thought asking an obvious question would undermine the TMC’s credibility. He offered that the TMC could pass a motion saying they agree that watershed restoration would help to meet Program goals. He thought perhaps it is unanimous and perhaps they do not need a motion. Hillemeier further noted that it is the Solicitor’s opinion (not necessarily the TMC’s) that the TRRP does not have the authority for watershed work.

Person then moved onto a discussion of Program items. He noted the memo from the Watershed Workgroup and their request for guidance on priorities. He asked if the TMC agreed with the workgroup’s objectives on two objectives of fine sediment reduction and fish habitat connectivity. Another directive was about the geographic scope and work in the tributaries. Mike

Orcutt thought this question was deeper than this. Ernie Clarke noted that Sean Ledwin would be discussing this further this afternoon. Judy Pflueger thought there was some ambiguity and this could be addressed this afternoon.

Person next addressed the two TAMWG recommendations deferred during the last meeting. The first issue was whether TMC should make funding available for noxious weeds and that they coordinate with local Trinity County Weed Management groups. Robin Schrock noted they get the Weed Management Council minutes and that the riparian ecologist, James Lee, attends these meetings. Lee will give an explanation of what the Program is doing with invasive plants. Schrock clarified that in addition to coordination, the Program is also funding an effort in invasive plants. Orcutt noted that noxious weeds are not an impediment to fish. Schrock responded that mitigation for invasive species is required in permitting and compliance. Connor responded that weed management is related to vegetation and, in turn, shading.

Person next turned the discussion to the issue of public outreach. The TMC committee on outreach reported on the January call with an outline that defined the problem and had proposed actions. The favored idea was that we would conduct public meetings with panel discussions to address specific issues that would not be a debate but a discussion. However, the TAMWG asked that the TMC defer on public outreach until a joint meeting with TAMWG. Person acknowledged that the TAMWG is the public advisory group and he agreed with the joint meeting approach.

Mike Orcutt said he thought educating the public is something to build off of but he expressed reservations about outreach compared to the main goals of the Program and proper use of funds. He noted that the Program goals should be built off the Phase I review.

Person noted a “disconnect but also a collision” on the approach of the latest suite of designs. He noted that the scopes of some designs are arguably beyond that described in the ROD and the idea to go bigger at the few remaining sites accommodating larger projects doesn’t go well with the public. There are concerns about added gravel that are claimed to cause problems with irrigation lines or filling in pools. Person thought the outreach would help dialog. There is agreement that restoration is good, but many don’t like changes to the river. He asked if the TMC thought it okay to defer the outreach topic to the joint meeting.

Orcutt said they need to be proactive and not wait for the TAMWG. He said the whole question about gravel should have been a top priority for the program and clearly articulated to the public; we are still waiting for the report. Person asked what report Orcutt was referring and noted that Dave Gaeuman has made several presentations that showed some holes filling and others are not. He noted that the Coalition still believes that the river is shallowing. Dave Hillemeier thought the Coalition letter has much misinformation and that they should meet quickly with the TAMWG to address these issues. Seth Naman and Judy Pflueger both agreed with Hillemeier to meet with the TAMWG.

Person suggested there seemed to be consensus they defer the public outreach and they agree to meet with the TAMWG. Orcutt noted having the TAMWG being informed is fine, but there are others not on the TAMWG. Judy Pflueger clarified that the TAMWG meetings are open to the public. Teresa Connor also noted that they had engaged the guides at least two years ago. They need to think about describing their strategies better, for example explain the river shallowing data better so it would be more accepted. Robin Schrock noted that the guides were on the river during construction and placement of boulders.

Person suggested, and the TMC agreed, to hold off on public outreach and will schedule a joint meeting with the TAMWG.

Person next introduced a discussion of the Upper Douglas City site. The Coalition letter had asked the TMC to defer construction of the forced meander at the Upper Douglas City site. D.J. Bandrowski said he would be presenting on the site. Person noted other letters had been written and complaints had appeared in the local newspaper. These negative communications cast a negative impression of the Program's success, and can have negative effects on funding.

There was an extended discussion about whether to delay work at Upper Douglas City or continue with the Program. Judy Pflueger thought it may be okay to wait one year and see what the SAB says. Ernie Clarke said they will be seeing the report in a couple of weeks. Mike Orcutt argued for not delaying citing that the TMC is advisory to two secretaries who are implementing the Program and the foundational documents cannot be ignored. Person noted we have been criticized that the program has diverged from the ROD by affecting a greater portion of the river and stakeholders are concerned. He indicated that Congressman Huffman's office has asked what they can do to help. Seth Naman did not think that the SAB will clarify anything but it would make it official. Teresa Connor asked what to be gained by delaying Douglas City by one year. Person said first, it would be largely symbolic in that Phase I will be "in our hands" even though the SAB may not comment on forced meander. Person noted that second, it will allow more public outreach and to seek agreement with guides.

Mike Orcutt again said he does not support a delay in the program and the Tribe may take that up if needed. The approach of the ROD is to create a functional meandering river and this will affect some property owners. Dave Hillemeier noted that they are in a really challenging situation. They have gotten a wide range of responses and the letter almost seems like blackmail or an ultimatum. He said "let's do what is best for fish" and therefore, the Yurok Tribe supports the project. Person clarified that without any action today, the project will go forward this year. Orcutt suggested they invite the Congressman from this area and the downriver area. Teresa Connor agreed that they should be invited them to get on board.

Person clarified that the guides have been engaged in the design and D.J. Bandrowski said they have received guide's comments on projects. He was unaware that the guides were opposed until the TAMWG and he was surprised by the letter. Bill Brock asked what portion of the entire project is the forced meander. D.J. Bandrowski said it was large and about 30 % of the project. Person asked what more could Bandrowski have done to explain the project. Bandrowski said it would require a face-to-face meeting to explain the technical information. He suggested they move forward with the project but also engage the public in more meetings to explain the technical details. Ernie Clarke noted that the letter noted larger programmatic concerns than the specific meander. It would be helpful to say the TMC did consider the concerns and wanted to do what is best for fish. Seth Naman said NOAA noted the technical report projecting habitat gains and while not everything can be predicted about holes filling, they are ready to move ahead with Upper Douglas City as designed. Person clarified that the forced meander is critical to the design of the project. D.J. Bandrowski said the meander will allow evolution of the project over time.

Person asked how the TMC feels about the biological gain potential of the site. It is a conspicuous site and we have received warnings and ultimatums that proceeding may alienate segments of the public. Bill Brock said he was leaning toward the lesser of the two evils, but he did not want to "kill" the project. Orcutt noted the approach is limited, we need to support the fish, and the Douglas City design will introduce complexity. He is not in support of delaying but that continued outreach is good. He asked to hear public comment. Judy Pflueger asked about TAMWG's input. Elizabeth Hadley said she could address this during her remarks.

During public comments, Robert Franklin argued for continued work by noted that the recent input from public has slowed action. They seem to want more fish but no change to the river at their specific locations. The comments of “highly controversial and highly visible” were made when the program first started. He predicted the project will be highly successful.

Kelli Gant noted that there is a feeling of anti-government overall and the Program is compared to Obama Care and other government programs, and as Judy Pflueger noted, it may be the “closest dog to kick.” She noted that 82 % of the land is controlled by the government and the public feels ignored.

Danny Jordan expressed the Hoopa Valley Tribe’s view of why the Program should continue. He said nobody has paid more for the damage to the Trinity and Klamath Rivers than Hoopa and Yurok Tribes. He cited court and legislative successes the Tribes have achieved that have secured funding for the Program. Any discussion about delays goes against the Tribe’s desire to not want to wait any longer. The courts have said that restoration is unlawfully long overdue.

Christy Bevard said she does not want to make a public comment until she has a chance to review the Phase I. She agreed with Jordan’s comments but noted the importance of restoring all species and aspects of the aquatic system.

Lunch

Upon return from lunch the TMC discussed a motion.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the TMC reaffirm their commitment to finalize the implementation of the Douglas City and Lower Junction City rehabilitation projects to fulfill the obligation of the DOI to implement the 2000 Trinity River ROD.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 7 yes votes. The Forest Service abstained.

4. Report from TAMWG Chair

Elizabeth Hadley, Chair of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG) reported on their last meeting. She walked the TMC through their three motions the TAMWG made.

One motion was the TMC support BLM land acquisition subject to maintaining public access and payment of in-lieu taxes.

This prompted discussion from the TMC. Judy Pflueger expressed her objections of the government purchasing private property unless it can be shown that it is an economic benefit to Trinity County. She noted the loss of property taxes to the County. Person noted that the payment of in-lieu taxes is supposed to address this, but it may not always work as intended. Person noted that he would entertain a motion to draft a letter as recommended by TAMWG. Dave Hillemeier asked if this was urgent or if they might have a presentation in June. It was noted that BLM had made several efforts at presenting to TAMWG. Pflueger asked about the specific properties and Joe Polos described the four parcels being considered by BLM. D.J. Bandrowski noted that three of the parcels listed by Joe Polos are associated with TRRP restoration construction sites. Mike Orcutt said he would support a motion and asked if the TAMWG would address the mining claim issue. That is, if acquired by BLM, someone wouldn’t be able to come in and make a mining claim.

Mike Orcutt made a motion the TMC support the BLM purchase of land along the Trinity and the recommend BLM continue payments of in-lieu taxes.

Bill Brock seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 7 yes votes. Trinity County opposed.

Judy Pflueger said she could not support the motion, except the Douglas City acquisition. Mike Orcutt thought the current TRRP policy on public access would address that issue. Christy Bevard thought it was a conflict of interest for the purchase of lands to make their jobs easier when they could rent or lease the lands.

Hadley continued with the second TAMWG recommendation to not perform gravel injections. The third recommendation was that the TMC adopt the Flow Workgroup's recommendation for flow.

Hadley explained the TAMWG's discussion over holding a joint meeting and deferring outreach until the joint meeting. She drew attention to a list of items for discussion that the TAMWG had proposed for discussion.

Brian Person noted the value of a facilitator and this was discussed. It was thought they would investigate whether they could hire someone as long as it doesn't delay holding the meeting. Jeff Morris and the Center for Environmental Dispute Resolution from Humboldt State University were mentioned. The challenge would be paying for them. Person suggested they consider a one day meeting during the week of April 28.

Elizabeth Hadley and Robin Schrock will send out a Doodle Pool on the joint meeting date.

The TMC took up the issue of TAMWG's recommendation of no gravel additions this year. Person noted that a good presentation was made on the rationale for gravel additions by Dave Gaeuman but the TAMWG still wanted no gravel additions. There was more discussion about the meeting and the paths to go down. Seth Naman asked about the outreach and he asked if a more fundamental discussion is needed with TAMWG and the public about the role of the Program and some of the public issues that Kelli Gant brought up.

5. Report from Executive Director

Robin Schrock directed the council to her letter in the packet. She touched on several items but noted that the Science and Implementation updates would be addressed later. She noted they have addressed the responses on the EA. The Federal budget has been finalized and the Program budget corresponds to that passed by TMC in September. She noted the hiring freeze has been lifted and waivers that were approved were being filled. She noted some of their outreach efforts including website updates, coordination emails, calendar updates, and finding of the Conservation Almanac. They are hosting the DSS demonstration. She noted the monitoring crews are counting juvenile Chinook, coho, and steelhead in high numbers at the Upper Junction City site in the hyporheic channel, off channel pond, and side channel with ponds.

Mike Orcutt asked if Schrock would be able to provide costs of public outreach and additional meetings. He also noted a need for better coordination with regulatory permitting agencies to avoid being vulnerable. Schrock noted that Brandt Gutermuth would be presenting on this later in the meeting.

Information / Decision Items**6. Implementation Update**

D.J. Bandrowski started by first thanking the TMC for their support for the continuing projects and he noted the importance of stakeholder and community support. He agreed that they need outside support for conflict resolution and public education. He noted successes of the Program that need to be made more public. He listed high re-colonization of Lorenz Gulch by juveniles and mussels, the Lorenz Gulch boat launch, placement of boulders, the water intake at Douglas City.

Bandrowski passed out a handout on 2014 and 2015 rehabilitation projects that described the status of steps for seven construction projects. These were for the following project sites: Upper Douglas City, Lower Junction City, Bucktail Rehabilitation, Bucktail Bridge, Dutch Creek, Hatchery, and Limekiln Gulch. He discussed how each project was going on the following three phases: design, environmental compliance, and implementation.

He made it clear that the Bucktail Rehabilitation project and the Bucktail Bridge were coupled together and the rehabilitation cannot go forward without the bridge. Responding to questions, he said they originally thought the bridge was adequate to pass flows if they fixed a bypass culvert. This view was changed after the high flows of 2006 and 2011 leading to the decision to replace the bridge.

Wade Sinnen asked about the design elements for the Hatchery. Bandrowski noted that are using constructions for gravel augmentation to support additional habitat for rearing and spawning. Sinnen noted a concern for adult spawning is the possibility of hatchery fish straying.

7. Regulatory Updates

Items 9 then 8 were addressed before Item 7. Brandt Gutermuth gave a Powerpoint presentation on regulatory updates and permitting for projects. He noted he was glad that the TMC supported Upper Douglas City. He said they had received 23 letters to the Bucktail and Lower Junction City EA/IS. He noted work on the Bucktail Bridge Environmental Assessment/Negative Declaration. They have their permits for gravel augmentation for 2014. The long-term coarse sediment management plan is ongoing and he is working on permitting for this. Finally, he noted the work updating the Biological Assessments and the development of a new Biological Opinion.

Dave Hillemeier thought the regulatory group has done a really great job. Mike Orcutt noted his concerns that the program should be ready with gravel and permits for any type of water year that comes up. Gutermuth agreed and noted they need to keep following the gravel augmentation group as they have the best available science and to share with the Water Board.

8. Watershed Workgroup Update

This item was addressed following Item 9. Sean Ledwin made a Powerpoint presentation on efforts of the Watershed Workgroup. He explained the watershed project priorities were fine sediment reduction and fish habitat connectivity. He showed a review how different restoration actions can contribute to smolt increases. He introduced the watershed project scope as cited in the ROD as being inclusive of the lower Trinity and Klamath Rivers, the highest priority was between the North Fork Trinity and Lewiston Dam.

He was seeking guidance on both the type of work and whether they should solicit projects in the tributaries.

He listed the proposals they received for 2015. They chose three projects: Grass Creek sediment and connectivity (\$49,450), Valdor Roads sediment reduction (\$25,300), and Lower Sidney Gulch urban stream restoration (\$425,250). He asked the TMC if they would approve these projects.

For FY2104 he noted that contracting is being finalized for Sidney Gulch fish passage improvement, Browns Creek Road sediment implementation plan, West Weaver Creek channel and floodplain rehabilitation, and East Weaver Creek Dam removal.

Mike Orcutt asked about the limitations for the in-stream work and whether this is brick and mortar type projects. Person noted that projects above a certain dollar limit are subject to Solicitor Office review and they may have a different view of the projects. He explained that the “brick and mortar” prohibition described earlier comes from the Solicitor’s Office. Robin Schrock noted that logjams and boulder are not necessarily brick and mortar. Person also commented that these projects are reimbursable by the power users and water users and they keep an eye on projects that are perceived to have been caused by logging roads and not by the dam and diversions of water.

Ledwin raised the question whether the TMC agrees that fine sediment reduction and increasing fish habitat connectivity should be the means objectives for the Watershed Workgroup. Seth Naman wanted to know if this question was constrained by the anticipated answer from the Solicitor. Ledwin thought that it was. Naman then said the TMC could not give guidance until the SAB gives their guidance on the biological effects of watershed work and the Solicitor gives their written opinion. Hillemeier thought these answers would take a long time and he suggested the TMC should give interim guidance. Ledwin thought that interim guidance would be helpful.

(Note: It was noted during review of these minutes at the June 19 TMC meeting that interim guidance had been given to proceed with sediment reduction and fish passage projects within the 40-mile restoration reach.)

Ledwin next asked if the Watershed Workgroup should solicit projects occurring within tributaries and their associated watershed between the North Fork Trinity confluence and Lewiston Dam exclusively.

Bill Brock said the focus should include the upper 40 miles. But if there was decision to include more of the watershed, this would include more of the work that is being done by the Forest Service. There was more discussion on watershed work and Ledwin commented on the value of work in the South Fork or whether there was a prohibition on this.

Person asked what the TMC thought about guidance regarding geographic extent for the Watershed Workgroup. Dave Hillemeier thought it best to also make support of this recommendation also interim. Person agreed and noted that this was best until they are informed by the SAB and the Solicitor.

Regarding approving the projects, Ernie Clarke said they could hold off on this until they approve the budget in June. Person agreed and suggested they wait.

9. Gravel Augmentation Workgroup Update

This item was addressed before Item 7. Robert Franklin gave a Powerpoint presentation on the gravel recommendations for 2014 by the Gravel Augmentation Workgroup. He noted the need for a long-term implementation plan instead of reacting to each year. He noted that gravel studies have been done for a long time on the Trinity River and they have pretty good notions of gravel mobility as a function of flows. He noted that they have used this data to help them derive gravel augmentation estimates.

He said the Workgroup recommends no gravel this year, if the water year ends up as a Critically Dry year. He showed a table for gravel augmentations under a Dry Year that consisted of 1400 cubic yards under high flows 670 cubic yards under low flows and only occurring at the Diversion Pool site.

Responding to questions, Franklin said that Dave Gaeuman is working calculating whether the gravel deficits caused by the dam are being reduced. The constructions projects are adding larger sediment as part of their designs but this would not likely be mobile gravel. George Kautsky noted the usefulness of Franklin's chart and the usefulness of how sediment would be transported under different flows and wondered whether this would have affected the TAMWG decision.

Seth Naman made a motion the TMC accept the Gravel Augmentation Workgroup recommendation for gravel addition based on either a Critically Dry or Dry year and supports the Workgroup effort to develop a long range plan.

Teresa Connor seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

10. Open Forum

No comments at this time.

Adjourn Day 1, 5:10 PM

Day 2, Thursday, March 27, 2014, 9:03 AM

Brian Person brought the meeting to order.

11. USGS DSS Demonstration

Chris Holmquist-Johnson and Leanne Hanson of the USGS made a teleconference presentation on the Decision Support System (DSS). Their presentation was titled "Development and application of riverine environmental flow decision support systems (REFDSS) for water management investigations."

Holmquist-Johnson explained their work was focused on decisions for developing flow management and how to balance conflicting values and needs among stakeholders. He listed state variables that they attempt to balance (water, power, habitat etc.). He noted that they quantify conditions for baseline or natural conditions. He showed how flows over time can be converted to habitat area available for the same time period. The habitat areas can then be compared among different flow scenarios for a percent change in habitat. He gave another example where temperature was examined as number of days outside a threshold and how a scenario may change the number of days. He explained that a scenario was as a modification in flow that may affect channel and habitat. He also noted hydrologic scenarios that dictate a water diversion or change in storage in reservoirs. He listed some criteria for evaluating alternatives and emphasized that the stakeholders need to be able to interpret the comparisons (no "black box" results).

He next explained DSS as software that uses information to help make a decision. Attributes of DSS include stakeholders that choose variables and scenarios, comparisons among scenarios,

and a scoring algorithm to summarize effects on state variables. Keys to building a DSS are decision-maker involvement, transparency, and ease of access.

He listed some gaps. DSS provides an index of physical conditions but does not determine survival. The models are seldom validated. The link between water management and population success is lacking.

He summarized that decision support is a process, stakeholder involvement is critical, you must have reasonable expectations, and the devil is in the details (transparency helps).

Brian Person asked how DSS works to help solve social conflicts over scenarios. Leanne Hanson explained their early work in the Delaware River that involved water deliveries to New York City and a trout fishing group downstream. They got groups to meet to draw up a compact, but it was a long, drawn-out process. DSS provided ways to examine alternatives that affected fish production and delivery flows. She said people left very happy. They were able to have copies of DSS and run it themselves. The stakeholders had to put in the time to understand it and how the scenarios played out. They used a Delphi approach to develop the state variables (e.g., which species and life stages).

Mike Orcutt asked how long it would take to get a DSS running. Holmquist-Johnson said it depends on whether the data are readily available. For him to add new data to his DSS would take a couple of months. If new data are needed, it would need to be programmed into the DSS. Orcutt noted that they did not have a water supply in the Delaware. Here in the Trinity they know the water supply. Holmquist-Johnson said you can manage flows and try to predict how the habitat may respond. Or you can analyze how you may modify habitat to take advantage of flows.

Seth Naman noted the SAB advocated the use of DSS to evaluate designs and whether or not to put in a side channel or logjams. Would DSS have the resolution to evaluate this? Holmquist-Johnson said it is not so much a question of the capability of DSS but more the capability of your hydrologic models. If the model could provide information on that scale, it could be brought into DSS.

Wade Sinnen asked how DSS may evaluate short-term or long-term alternatives. Holmquist-Johnson said you want to choose your decision variables such as fish production and total sediment transported throughout the year. You can run DSS for the best fish production and at the same time for a mobile channel that doesn't negatively affect a sensitive life stage.

Holmquist-Johnson gave examples of DSS and habitat modeling. He listed an example of using landscape ecology to mapping the spatial component of habitat. He showed an example of where spawning may not occur at the same overlapping areas as incubation, which would not be very good. He showed a flow diagram to show the development of a DSS where a variety of information inputs are processed using relationships describing how hydraulics produce habitat and population responses to the DSS which produces the state variables in different formats for different stakeholders (habitat areas, water temperature, flows).

Holmquist-Johnson showed the development of their tools for their DSS for evaluating flows in the Delaware River (Delaware RFDSS version 1.1). This is an improvement from the Bovee et. al. 2007 DSS. In 2010 they included the dwarf wedge mussel and needed finer scale information. He showed how DSS was able to display how new flow scenarios compared to the baseline increased habitat by species and life stages. He was able to display his results over time (seasonal or different years) and over various areas (reach, branches, or entire basin). This is a good way to identify "bottle necks."

Mike Orcutt said this was impressive. How much staff time is needed? Holmquist-Johnson said that is a good question. He said it was a work in progress on the first version and this may have taken more time. They have spent the last three years from the Excel component to where it is now, but they did not work full time on it. A large amount of the work is already done, so it could be more quickly adapted. The biggest thing would be getting the data and getting it properly formatted. More time would be required if you want to incorporate new capabilities. But he thought many of the routines would be adaptable and you would not need to completely recreate them. Hanson said that once the DSS is parameterized, you would be able to hand it off and use it on your desktop and it would not take a lot more maintenance.

Holmquist-Johnson showed an example of a way to assess brown trout habitat over a time as the flow changes. He displayed multiple overhead photos of habitat under four different scenarios that changed as he ran his cursor through a seasonal hydrograph. He showed some customizable options that they have introduced. Hanson noted that competing interests are able to re-run the other's scenario and check to verify the conclusions.

Brian Person asked if DSS would be able to display different pool filling events under different scenarios. Holmquist-Johnson said yes, it could display it and it would also be a function of the mobile bed models. Person asked about the software platform and how it is supported. Holmquist-Johnson said it would be installed on your computer, and you would get a manual and the executable file to install it. You would need to have data or could download data from their website. You would need to run it for the first time to get it stored on your computer. Person noted about the mega-table and whether it would be compatible with this system. Holmquist-Johnson said he was not familiar with that data. He said it is a matter getting the right format to read into DSS. Wade Sinnen asked would escapement data be able to be incorporated into the model. Hanson said that would be considered a new life stage and that could be added if you had the criteria to put it into program. Sinnen asked would the fish production model be able to use things like ocean conditions. Holmquist-Johnson said that would be a function of the fish production model and not DSS.

12. Phase 1 Review Implementation

Robin Schrock noted the Phase I review is contingent on getting the SAB report which is nearly complete (hopefully by the end of next month). The SAB covers the 2005 to 2010 data sets provided by the TRRP. The appendices have been revised. The early draft was reviewed internally by the Program. The SAB do not endorse delaying the Program. Schrock remarked they have all the components of the DSS except for the fish production model. Implementation will occur through the workgroups. She suggested that the IDT team may need to be expanded as they will have a large coordination role.

Mike Orcutt asked about how these extra positions would be filled. He suggested they consider the capabilities of the people so they can manage DSS and have modelling skills. He asked if the IDT would pass their recommendations to the TMC.

13. Fish Production Model Update

This item followed Item 11. Joe Polos gave a Powerpoint presentation on the fish production model. The SAB recommended a fish production model from Lewiston to Weitchpec but to first focus on the North Fork to Lewiston. The goal is to construct a fish production model for the Trinity DSS. First meeting was on March 5 and they reviewed an ongoing USFW fish model on the Klamath River and identified data needs.

Polos said the Trinity has very good data sets for a model. The TRRP data includes habitat, outmigrant monitoring, red and carcass monitoring. There are also 2-D physical models for 40 miles of the river and a daily water temperature model. Data needs are substrate, fry utilization, and watershed juvenile production.

Polos described this as a 2-year project. In the near-term, they will be working on incorporating the 2-D physical and biological models.

Brian Person noted that funds are budgeted and TRRP staff are contributing their time and he asked what else the TMC can do to help. Polos said the availability of data sets has been helpful. Tim Hayden said he has high hopes for the model and hopes that it will integrate with the Klamath model.

14. Science Update

Ernie Clarke referred to a handout in the TMC packet on Workgroup summaries and another handout he passed out on the Science update. Regarding the 2015 work plan development, he led the TMC through the general steps of choosing priorities, soliciting plans/proposals, review, and budgeting. He listed the time table where he would have the final projects and budgets for the TAMWG and TMC meetings in June.

Mike Orcutt asked if spring Chinook will be monitored in 2014. Clarke said it was not prioritized high enough to be funded this year. Orcutt asked if they funding too much outreach or other things. Schrock noted that the TMC asked for the outreach. Clarke said the Science budget is not smaller this year. Person said the Science proportion has not been less than 30 %, but some elements have increased in cost. He noted the budget is chosen based on what is the best opportunities.

Tim Hayden asked if there were budget savings from something like gravel monitoring, when would we know so to consider adjustments for projects such as spring Chinook. Clarke said they would need to know the water year to see if gravel would be added. Person said they wouldn't know next year's budget until it is enacted.

Clarke noted the next IDT meeting will be April 7th and listed some of the topics to be covered.

Clarke next touched on some of the activities of the workgroups and referred the TMC to his summary sheet.

Lunch

15. Riparian vegetation approaches/ESA species

James Lee gave a Powerpoint presentation on vegetation management on the Trinity River entitled "Riparian vegetation approaches and ESA species." He listed some reasons why riparian vegetation is important: influence on channel form, habitat, shade, native vegetation is resistant to invasives, and it slows fires. The Program goals are ecological (proper riparian function, and supports fish and wildlife) and regulatory (1:1 replacement of construction-affected vegetation within 10 years). Historically the riparian zone was bare after the gold rush. Since the dam construction in the 1960's riparian vegetation has been increasing in acres of coverage between Lewiston Dam and the North Fork. Much of the area contains more open gaps of invasive species (grasses). He showed a photo of what is a more desired condition of mixed native trees. The tools to help move to a more desired condition are hydrographs, site preparation, planting, and post-planting maintenance.

He showed an example of a hydrograph that would encourage establishment of black cottonwoods. John Bair found only one cottonwood seedling along the Trinity in the 1990's but with the new, slowly receding hydrograph, Lee is finding more seedlings. He showed an aerial photo from Douglas City in the 1944 that showed recent mining activity. By 1965 with flow regulation, he showed some vegetation establishing along the wet margin. These same vegetation patches were getting larger in the 1980's. He noted that the floodplain lowering at Douglas City in 2010 has encouraged very good colonization of black cottonwood.

He described planting strategies where they use poles salvaged from construction sites, and planting using best soils available (sites tend to have poor soils), and using browse protection and irrigation. He showed a planned re-vegetation map for Lorenz Gulch that showed use of upland species on higher terraces.

He noted that they are now doing more post-planting maintenance including irrigation, browse protection, mulching, weed removal, and replacement of mortalities with better adapted species. He showed a photo of the right bank of Lorenz Gulch and the poor surface for planting there.

Tim Hayden expressed concern about the intensity of effort and does this suggest we may be doing something wrong. Lee said he did not think so, some places are better than others, but basically they are working in mine tailings. These are tough sites. He noted that he would see pea-gravel at the bottom of many excavated pits but coarser gravel on top. He said this was caused by the dredgers that sorted and placed pea-gravel in place and put the larger material on top.

Lee next described a few points on endangered species. He noted that they don't have a lot of rare plants on the riparian zone as it is relatively harsh conditions. They have lots of monitoring and steps in the regulatory process to ensure that they are not having negative impacts on listed species.

Brian Person asked about noxious weeds and what steps are being taken to engage other activities and if funding is available. Lee said that we are coordinating with the weed management groups and funding is available for noxious weeds within the Program. He has attended the Trinity County Weed Cooperative meetings and is talking to Program partners and learning about the tools they have. Teresa Connor quoted the Coalition letter that criticized the construction sites as encouraging noxious weed growth. Lee said they are some noxious weeds in the area (e.g., yellow star thistle), but overall they are taking steps to reduce the introduction of new weeds coming into the area. Robin Schrock noted that their mitigation measures have been approved. Lee noted that the two AmeriCorps projects in the Lowden area will be pulling weeds. A landowner claimed that no weeds were present on his property but they have occurred since the Program construction that occurred there and provided a sample. In that case, Lee was able to identify it as cocklebur, a widespread natural weed species found throughout the river.

16. Flow Work Group Update

Rod Wittler gave a Powerpoint presentation via teleconference on flows, entitled "2014 Trinity River hydrograph design." He listed the schedule the Flow Workgroup has used to design the flow scheduling process. He next described the current conditions. Trinity Reservoir storage is at 1,293 in thousands acre feet (TAF) or 71 % of the 15-year average. Shasta Reservoir is 2,092 TAF and 58 % of the 15-year average. The drought conditions are extreme and are expected to worsen for the next 90 days. California snow pack is tracking below the 1976-77 drought years. The forecasts of inflow to Trinity Reservoir are 390 TAF and this corresponds to a Critically Dry year. The March forecast is 546 TAF for Trinity Reservoir for the end of September.

Wittler next explained the development of the hydrograph for 2014. He showed a series of alternative hydrographs for a Critically Dry and a Dry year. He contrasted the ROD hydrographs with alternatives that had been developed to better meet sediment transport. He described how they evaluated the alternative hydrographs in regards to their respective abilities to meet various objectives (temperature, sediment, etc.).

The Workgroup recommends a ROD hydrograph for a Critically Dry year, and a JPR Alt. 2 if it is a Dry year. He said it is very unlikely it will make it to a Dry year.

Mike Orcutt asked about the low storage forecast for Trinity Reservoir and what the exported water will be used for. Person responded the end of season storage in Trinity Reservoir is projected to be 546 TAF (March forecast) but cautioned that they are updated at least monthly. Wittler pointed out that the Biological Opinion says that if the storage goes below 600 TAF, consultation must take place. Person said the CVO is aware of the end of season storage levels and are discussing it. Wittler referred to the very end of year low forecast for Shasta Reservoir. Person noted the various allocations to groups that use the water from Shasta and Trinity and said that all are facing shortfalls; most diversions will go to meet regulatory requirements.

Tim Hayden made a motion that the TMC adopt the consensus recommendations for Critically Dry year and for a Dry year and that Reclamation and CVO look for strategies to optimize carry over storage in Trinity Reservoir.

Teresa Connor seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 7 yes votes. The Hoopa Valley Tribe abstained.

Wittler explained that under the current forecasts, he thinks using the auxiliary outlet works will work fairly well to maintain temperatures at Douglas City.

17. Open Forum

No comments at this time.

18. TMC Chair Meeting Summary of Action Items

Brian Person said there were many action items this meeting and it would generate a large response letter to the TAMWG.

Adjourn Day 2, 2:50 PM

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
US Forest Service, 3644 Avtech Parkway, Redding, CA 96002
Draft Agenda for March 26-27, 2014

Wednesday, March 26, 2014

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic, Purpose and/or Decision to be Made</u>	<u>Discussion Leader</u>
<i>Regular Business:</i>		
10:00	Introductions:	
	▪ Welcome ▪ Approval of Agenda ▪ Approval of December 2013 Minutes	Brian Person, Chair
10:15	Open Forum: Comments from the public	Brian Person
10:45	Report from TMC Chair	Brian Person
	▪ Federal/Regional updates ○ TMC action items ○ TAMWG items ▪ Program discussion	
11:45	Report from TAMWG Chair	Elizabeth Hadley
12:15	Lunch	
1:15	Report from Executive Director	Robin Schrock
	▪ TRRP 2015 budget strategy ▪ Organizational Updates ▪ Work Group updates ○ Quarterly summery (handout)	
<i>Information / Decision Items:</i>		
1:45	Implementation Update	DJ Bandrowski
	▪ 2014 Rehabilitation projects updates ▪ 2014/2015 Rehabilitation projects updates ▪ Phase 2 Strategic planning	
2:45	Regulatory Updates	Brandt Gutermuth
3:15	Watershed Work Group Update	Sean Ledwin
3:45	Gravel Augmentation Work Group Update	Robert Franklin
4:15	Open Forum	Brian Person
4:45	Adjourn	

Thursday, March 27, 2014

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic, Purpose and/or Decision to be Made</u>	<u>Discussion Leader</u>
9:00	USGS DSS Demonstration	Chris Holmquist-Johnson
10:30	Phase 1 Review Implementation	Robin Schrock
10:45	Fish Production Model Update	Joe Polos
11:45	Science Update ▪ 2015 AWP timeline	Ernie Clarke
12:00	Lunch	
1:00	Riparian vegetation approaches/ESA species	James Lee
1:30	Flow Work Group Update	Rod Wittler
2:30	Open Forum	
3:00	TMC Chair Meeting Summary of Action Items	
3:30	Adjourn	