

Final Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
Tsewendaldin Inn Conference Room, Hoopa, CA (625-4294)
June 18-19, 2014

Day 1, Wednesday, June 18, 2014; 9:30 AM

Attending Members

Member	Representative Seat
Brian Person	Bureau of Reclamation, Chair
Joe Polos ¹	Fish and Wildlife Service
Mike Orcutt ²	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Ann Garrett	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Adm. Fisheries, Vice-Chair
Bill Brock ³	Forest Service
Dave Hillemeier	Yurok Tribe
Teresa Connor	California Natural Resources Agency
Judy Pflueger	Trinity County
Tom Stokely ⁴	Trinity Adaptive Management Work Group
Robin Schrock ⁴	Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director

1) Alternate for Bruce Bingham; 2) Replaced by George Kautsky on Day 2; 3) Alternate for David Myers; 4) non-voting members.

Others that attended: Don Reck (Bureau of Reclamation); Ernie Clarke, (Trinity River Restoration Program); Tim Hayden and Andreas Krause (Yurok Tribe); Danielle Vigil Masten, George Kautsky, Sean Ledwin, and Robert Franklin (Hoopa Valley Tribe); Seth Naman and Wes Smith (NMFS); Justin Day (Redding Electric); Tony LaBanca (Ca DFW); Andrea Collins McBroom (Forest Service).

Attended via teleconference: Wade Sinnen, Andrew Orahoske, and Jeff Morris.

Notes: K. Mattson (ENW)

List of Motions Made during the Meeting

Dave Hillemeier made a motion that the TMC understands that the Office of the Solicitor considers some types of stream restoration involving construction activities is beyond the authority of the Trinity River Restoration Program.

Bill Brock seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Ann Garrett made a motion that the Interior agencies proceed with the hiring of the two positions of fisheries biologist and physical scientist

Teresa Connor seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 7 yes votes and the Hoopa Valley Tribe voting no.

George Kautsky made a motion that the TMC advise the TRH Governance Board of its intention to implement restoration actions in the Lewiston Dam reach. The TMC encourages the Board to provide insights as to the impact of TMC anticipated actions upon TRH mitigation responsibilities. The TMC welcomes Governance Board recommendations of complementary hatchery management actions.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Ann Garrett made a motion that the TMC approve the development of a large wood management strategy.

Judy Pflueger seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Joe Polos made a motion to approve the Watershed Groups proposal for 2015 up to the \$500,000 level, but to remove Lower Sydney Gulch and include the remainder of the projects.

Judy Pflueger seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

George Kautsky made a motion the TMC recommend design and construction of an alternative facility at Trinity River Diversion to prepare for climate shifts. The next steps would be to engage with appropriate staff and partner agencies. Immediate actions are included in technical memorandum 5.0

The motion failed for lack of a second.

George Kautsky made a motion that the TMC is aware that we are facing severe drought conditions in the Klamath-Trinity Basin, and there exists a high likelihood that supplemental releases into the Lower Klamath River may be needed to protect against a fish kill such as occurred in 2002. We request that Reclamation engage with our scientists to commence planning for releases in accordance with criteria developed in recent years through joint efforts in KBAO and NCAO.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 6 yes votes.

Abstaining was Reclamation and Fish and Wildlife.**Other Decisions****Regular Business:****1. Introductions and Welcome**

Brian Person, chair of the Trinity Management Council (TMC) opened the meeting. He thanked the Hoopa Valley Tribe for hosting the meeting.

Approval of Agenda

Person asked for comments on and approval of the agenda. Mike Orcutt noted he would like to entertain motions on supplemental flows, the budget, sediment management, cold water pool discussion. Person then declared the agenda acceptable.

Approval of March 2014 Minutes

Dave Hillemeier asked to review the March 2014 minutes tomorrow. Brian Person noted that approval of the minutes has been slow and the TAMWG had asked for an opportunity to view the TMC minutes before their TAMWG quarterly meetings. Teresa Connor noted that the TMC may be able to approve the minutes at their conference calls. She commented that it would be good for the TMC members to have the minutes a week before the teleconference.

The minutes were taken up on Day 2. Edits were offered. Mike Orcutt was absent but had some additions. It was decided that approval would be delayed until the July conference call and Orcutt's additions could be made.

2. Open Forum

Danielle Vigil Masten, Chair of the Hoopa Valley Tribe, welcomed the TMC to the Hoopa Valley.

Tom Stokely noted his advocacy work had no ill-will toward any individuals and he appreciated their individual efforts.

3. Report from Trinity Management Council Chair

Brian Person began by giving a brief update on several items of the TMC. Regarding Federal and regional updates, he commented on the challenges of the recent drought. He noted Estevan Lopez has been nominated as the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and confirmation hearings in the Senate have not yet been scheduled. Mike Orcutt asked if the agency will be taking positions on any upcoming legislation on drought or the appropriation bill. Person said the agency does often give testimony but he has not heard of Reclamation's specific position on these bills.

Regarding the water outlook update, Person noted that operationally, Trinity Reservoir is coupled with the Shasta Reservoir. He cited a series of facts about the state of water. The Shasta Reservoir storage is at 2 million acre-feet compared to 4.45 million acre-feet when filled. This is about 15 % of the 15- year average volume on this date. The Trinity Reservoir is at 1.22 million acre-feet and this is about 50 % of total capacity. Trinity volume is 56 % of the 15-year average for this date. Inflows to the reservoirs as a percent of the 15-year average are 31 % for Trinity and 47 % for Shasta. The most recent model outputs at the 50 % exceedance level predict that Trinity Reservoir will be at 658 thousand acre-feet at the end of September and will be 601 at

the end of November. Shasta storage after September is predicted to be 1 million acre-feet. This would be a pool elevation of 893 feet and will be the lowest since 1977. The Delta salinity standard is the current operational challenge and has required an increase in the Keswick Dam release rate.

Mike Orcutt asked about the “regulatory sideboards” that may protect the Trinity. Person said these are likely cold water preservation, carryover, and meeting next year’s ROD flows.

Robert Franklin commented that the local streams, such as Coffee Creek, are running below the lowest recorded flows. Bill Brock noted that people are swimming at Canyon Creek already.

Person next gave his update on the TAMWG meeting. Person noted that Mr. Wellock made comments at the TAMWG meeting that TRRP flow and coarse sediment introduction had caused problems to his diversion for agriculture. Person reviewed that the TMC had passed a motion to not include agriculture wells as part of the domestic well assistance program. A Tort Claim was submitted by Mr. Wellock, but there was no negligence by the Program (not a tortious act). Person described an option that had been used on the San Joaquin River that may provide relief to Mr. Wellock and this option is being explored. Mike Orcutt asked when this would end and if there may be other claims. Person said they had looked into this and of the six possible similar sites, only one was close to a restoration site project. The TMC should consider this issue resolved as far as they are concerned.

Person next addressed the Action Tracker items. The TAMWG revised their motion regarding the request to the Science Advisory Board (SAB) and the role of tributaries in fishery restoration. He noted the letter supporting BLM land purchases. There will essentially be no gravel augmentation due to the critically dry year. A joint meeting was held, which complies with the TAMWG request. A letter to Department of Interior regarding fall flows has not been sent but will be discussed today.

Regarding supplemental flows and a long-term plan, Person explained that Reclamation agreed to release a draft for review last year. There was interest in a collaborative workshop and this delayed the release of the draft until January of this year. Litigation over the drought has further delayed the release. Recently, the Regional Director informed Person and the Hoopa Valley Tribe that consideration of fall flows this year will overtake timing of the release of the draft plan.

Mike Orcutt asked if the TMC needs to be on record on the actions that Reclamation may or may not take this year. The Hoopa Valley Tribe had concerns over storage and the TMC’s position. The TMC motion from December was read. Orcutt said the Hoopa Valley Tribe’s concern is that the drought has immediate effects on their fisheries. It is important the TMC be on record advising the Secretary to direct resources toward planning for supplemental releases.

Dave Hillemeier asked if Orcutt wants a release or simply more storage. Orcutt said he wants a release. Hillemeier asked that any motion be delayed until tomorrow so he could confer with his contacts at the Yurok Tribe. Judy Pflueger commented that she is concerned over the balance in the lake. Person noted that balance is important and that the running average of releases to the Trinity River versus exports to the Sacramento Basin has been converged on a 50:50 ratio since the ROD. He noted that this year, many smaller agricultural operations are getting zero water and municipal contracts are getting 50 % of their 3-year unconstrained average, refuges and most senior contractors are at 75 %. Mike Orcutt noted the Department is already in litigation about the first priority of the management of Trinity water. Orcutt said the first priority is for fish and any discussion over drought are in direct opposition. This must be reconciled.

Regarding the Trinity River Hatchery, Person noted the EPIC lawsuit on operation of the hatchery required a Hatchery Genetic Management Plan (HGMP). A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) over a governance structure for management of the hatchery is being routed and two of the six parties have signed.

4. Report from TAMWG Chair

Tom Stokely, Vice Chair of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG) reported on their last meeting. He noted Mr. Wellock's concerns. He went over the motions made to support the budget and another to make a distinction between watersheds and tributaries in the SAB letter in its consideration of the role of watersheds and tributaries in restoration of fisheries.

Mike Orcutt noted an issue of whether they can do construction at the Douglas City site this year. Stokely said they were given an update on the forced meander but the TAMWG did not take a position nor did they decide on the start date of the construction. Person said this would be taken up during discussion later today.

Dave Hillemeier asked about the modification to the SAB letter. Person noted the joint meeting had consensus that we stop pursuing the authority issues with the Solicitor regarding watershed work. Stokely noted the difference between watersheds and tributaries in that tributary work would be more focused on increasing fish survival via habitat work and management of flows.

Discussion of this modification was taken up on Day 2. Tom Stokely explained TAMWG's second recommendation listed in their letter to TMC dated June 16, 2014. The TAMWG recommended that the TMC ask the SAB to include tributary actions to the watershed work as work needed to meet the goals of the Program. Stokely noted that tributary work included in-channel work, habitat, water diversions, and fish passage.

Judy Pflueger noted that this request was an expansion of the watershed work. Stokely agreed that it was and that was the intent of the recommendation. Person clarified that if the answer is "yes" that tributary work is valuable and needed, it would go further afield of the direct nexus of addressing fishery degradation caused by the TRD dams. Stokely said yes. Dave Hillemeier asked if this is any different from what we have talked about before. Person clarified it was the same discussion but broadened the scope of what would be included in watershed restoration. There was discussion of whether to ask the SAB a question that has an obvious answer. George Kautsky noted there was a shift in scale that would press the resources of the SAB. Ernie Clarke said it was self-evident but the SAB could say to assess this via the DSS.

Dave Hillemeier recommended replying to the TAMWG that tributary restoration is important but it is the BOR's interpretation that it is limited by legislation/authorization. There was discussion that fish passage work may be performed such as contributing boulders and logs or culvert replacement, but building a concrete fish ladder is not allowed.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion that the TMC understands that the Office of the Solicitor considers some types of stream restoration involving construction activities is beyond the authority of the Trinity River Restoration Program.

Bill Brock seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

At this point, the agenda for Day 2 was resumed at Item 14.

5. Joint Meeting

Brian Person reviewed the joint meeting between the TMC and the TAMWG. He said he was encouraged by what he heard at the meeting. But the most striking thing was the disconnect that still exists in the perceptions of the goals of the Program, particularly in the channel morphology and how it relates to fish restoration. Regarding the goals, Orcutt thought that while individuals may have opinions, the goals are clearly defined by Congress. Person noted some think a more realistic numeric goal of fish restoration may be helpful, but he opined that, regardless of goal numbers, the implementation actions, at least in the near term, would likely be unchanged.

Person asked what others thought of the report prepared by the facilitator. This generated many comments. Mike Orcutt thought the report did not capture “all the flavor” of the discussions. Joe Polos commented on the need to focus on the strategy to reach the goals and that there is a lot of new information since the flow study. The DSS may be a way to help. Polos also noted that Rich Lorenz had commented that the TAMWG list of issues may not have been completely addressed. Dave Hillemeier noted the need to deal with the fish restoration philosophy and how that will guide future restoration efforts. He opined that the TMC needs to spend time conferring with their technical experts and the TMC should host a special meeting to discuss the goals. Tom Stokely noted that Mike Merigliano cannot say for certain that the restoration will work. Some of the public is not happy with the changes. As an adaptive management program, perhaps the program would focus on the tributaries or lower portions of the river. Person asked what the guides would have the Program do. Stokely said the guides would want them to go into the tributaries and work on sediment. Teresa Connor thought some of the projects have evolved to meet some of the guides concerns. The Program should be able to show by modeling that habitat is being increased and she thought this should be shown to the public. Bill Brock supported Hillemeier’s suggestion to have a full-day discussion on this topic. Jeff Morris suggested they host free raft trips for the public on the Trinity with TMC or TAMWG members along. Wes Smith said that all the work that has gone on in the watershed is phenomenal and that this could be displayed on a map. Robin Schrock said this is being done as an overall assessment of all watershed activities that have occurred in the basin. Orcutt disagreed that the watershed analysis is not being funded. Schrock said that Alex Cousins has been tasked with pulling together the watershed activities of the Watershed Council and those through TRRP funding. Tony LaBanca said he queried the database on projects performed since 1981 and Bill Brock is summarizing the Forest Service efforts. Brock said the map does show work, but he asked “Why aren’t fish responding?” The Forest Service’s efforts are largely focused on slowing the ongoing deterioration. Dave Hillemeier noted that recovery takes decades to have effect.

Person said he and Schrock would agendaize this for the next meeting.

Person clarified with Stokely a comment made by Rich Lorenz about the problem as not being with the public but the problem is with the TAMWG. Stokely disagreed and opined that the public is interested and concerned. Ernie Clarke noted that many of the items on the TAMWG list to be covered in the joint meeting are readily covered by normal program procedures.

6. Report from Executive Director

Robin Schrock directed the council to her letter in the packet. She noted that she has an open office and she hears a very different story (more positive) than that portrayed by Tom Stokely. She went over her memo that had been provided to the TMC members that constituted her report. She noted the Phase I review and how to access it from the TRRP website. She noted other public outreach activities. She noted a \$40K shortfall in the 2015 proposed budget compared to this year. As far as organizational updates, Rod Wittler is being detailed to the San Joaquin for

45 days. Forest Service is offering their TEAMS enterprise staff through funding by the TRRP to work on restoration projects being designed on Forest Service lands. The BLM and TRRP held a Lorenz Gulch River Access Area dedication on June 7. Judy Pflueger noted that her husband was favorably impressed with what he saw at Lorenz Gulch. There was some disappointment with the TAMWG, TMC and public turnout, given the level of post cards, letters and advertisement that went out.

Seth Naman gave an update on the Fish Workgroup and he noted that they reviewed some of the goals and sought direction whether the goals are realistic and should be reviewed. They discussed some discrepancies in the run size estimates between the weir, redds, and carcass surveys. They discussed the hatchery and whether a project near the hatchery may be benefiting hatchery fish and not natural fish. Mike Orcutt noted the revisiting of the goals has been dealt with in the IAP process and they have received written responses. As such, Orcutt did not think they need to spend a lot of time on that. He asked when they do have reviews, whether the recommendations are implemented (e.g., the Hankin and Bradford review). Naman said the Hankin and Bradford recommendations are being considered in the data discrepancies. He noted their discussion is mostly about use of data to evaluate goals.

Lunch

7. Science/Implementation Update

Before Ernie Clarke presented on this topic, Brian Person announced that they cannot award the Douglas City construction work in time for the work to occur within the in-river work period this year. The project is a Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business set aside as part of the 8(a) program. There was a protest, and the contract is in the process of being awarded to the other contractor. There also have been some design changes that have caused delays. Thus on the present course, the award will obligate this year's funds but will not start until next year. He noted that the TAMWG had asked to delay this site until the Phase I review and until comments from the public could be resolved.

George Kautsky asked if the design changes were significant. Person had not personally reviewed them, but noted that the contracting officer wanted to inform the contractor of the changes prior to award and this required more time for the contractor to have this information. Sean Ledwin said they thought the design changes were minor and would never have done them had they realized it would have resulted in a delay. Ledwin noted that the Hoopa Valley Tribe would be able to manage the contract as an annual funding agreement (AFA) if that would help to get it going. Dave Hillemeier said it was disappointing that the contract was delayed and that they would support an AFA with the Hoopa Valley Tribe if that would help to have it performed on schedule. Tom Stokely asked if the July 1 neighborhood meeting is still going to happen and if additional NEPA work is required. Robin Schrock said the meeting has not been announced yet and it normally includes the contractor. She also noted they will likely do a supplemental information report.

Ernie Clarke took over the presentation on the Implementation update. He read over the written update for the Design Team in the Technical Workgroup Summary that was included in the TMC member's packets. These were status reports on the various construction sites.

Clarke next went over the Science Update by commenting on the Science Workplan Summary which was also part of the TMC member's packet. Several specific items in the summary were going to be discussed later in the meeting.

Mike Orcutt asked if the SAB review of the Science Workplan would affect the prioritization in the budget. Clarke said it could and they will be going over the budget tomorrow. Orcutt asked about the review of the rotary screw trap, and when that may end and how recommendations get implemented. Clarke gave details about how the reviews normally occur and how they are used. He noted the adult review by Bradford and Hankin had a list of recommendations. Specific comments had to be responded to in report or investigation plan development. SAB recommended that field methods be reviewed every three years.

Clarke noted that the job announcement for the fish biologist closed yesterday and they had received dozens of applications. They have also conducted interviews for the physical scientist position. The physical scientist interview questions were changed to address modeling and use of the decision support system.

The topic of new hires stimulated much discussion and with much centered on the need for positions and Hoopa Valley Tribe asking for a delay in hiring. Mike Orcutt said the Hoopa Valley Tribe had sent a letter requesting a consultation with the Regional Director over program changes and that this should delay moving forward on the new positions. Person asked if Orcutt would share some of their proposed changes to the program that was part of the letter. Orcutt said he would share it via email. He said they are proposing a co-management structure with the tribes. He also complained of a communication breakdown that the tribe was not notified of the changes in the physical scientist position. Robin Schrock noted that Dave Gaeuman has had his annual leave cancelled in order to meet program objectives, and that the position is needed. If these positions are not filled, work will not be done. Person noted that the Hoopa Valley Tribe proposed changes are sweeping and if such changes are implemented, everyone would be impacted. If the two positions are filled, they also would be impacted. Teresa Connor said she thought it best to go forward with the positions since she has not reviewed the Hoopa Valley Tribe documents and therefore could not respond to it. Robin Schrock also argued for going ahead with filling the positions as they are needed to help complete their work. Judy Pflueger said they should go forward, especially if they are ready for interviews. Orcutt said their proposal to freeze the positions was actually written May 7. He further explained that last year, they submitted a letter to the Regional Director about SAB report Phase I review and how they are going to implement the future program and they requested a consultation. They had asked to hold on filling of vacancies before this discussion occurred. Mike Orcutt said the document would not be provided TMC members and would be taken up with the Department of Interior.

Ann Garrett made a motion that the interior agencies proceed with the hiring of the two positions of fisheries biologist and physical scientist

Teresa Connor seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 7 yes votes and Hoopa Valley Tribe voting no.

During the discussion of the motion, there was more discussion about the long time periods now required to fill government positions. Orcutt said he is not against the positions but they wanted a consultation where they would be stepping back to take a look at things. He noted that the Hoopa Valley Tribe would never sign an agreement where they would "sit back and trust the Federal Government to do the right thing." Dave Hillemeier said the Yurok would also prefer to be a co-manager in deciding positions and responsibilities. He said the program has good

momentum in restoring the river and they have good folks working for us. He sees there is a need for the physical scientist and therefore would vote for the motion. Orcutt said they will take their issues up in their consultations.

Information / Decision Items

8. Phase 1 Review—TMC Recommendations

Robin Schrock noted that the Phase I review could be downloaded from the TRRP website. She noted some specific sections that could be read. She noted Figure 14 and it identified program needs, more on the DSS, and the technical needs of the program.

At this point, the TMC took up the 3:00 PM item, DSS implementation, Item 10 and then returned to discussion of Item 8. It was thought that covering Item 10 would help discussions of Items 8 and 9.

Person introduced the discussion of the Phase I Review and asked for comments. Dave Hillemeier said it would be good to have a meeting with the technical staff about how restoration philosophy will guide future design with the Phase I Review as an overlay. Other participants would be the TAMWG and the public.

Robin Schrock noted some specific recommendations about use of data and integrating models and integrating workgroup activities. Person noted the SAB comments to use DSS, response times, and using many small projects versus going to big projects. Seth Naman noted that the DSS may not be able to provide the needed or desired resolution in providing answers and this needs to be made clear to the public as it is rolled out.

Person said he liked Hillemeier's idea for a workshop and he asked if any TMC member did not agree and who would get it going. Judy Pflueger agreed that it was a great idea. Hillemeier thought it may be the IDT to get this going. Person asked if a September or October meeting may be good as it would be good for the public to see that Phase I is informing Phase II. Joe Polos said the IDT would be a good group but they would need some time to get it going. Person said they would acknowledge the gaps in Phase I and how this would guide Phase II. Hillemeier said it would be good to get on the same page. Robert Franklin said they should be moving toward hypothesis testing in Phase II. Hillemeier said he hoped it would be a day of stating what we have found out so far.

9. TMC Recommendations for DSS

Brian Person noted that the TMC has already voted in favor of adopting and funding a fish production model. Ernie Clarke said the fish production model is on track. Joe Polos said the SHR 2D model will help the fish production model. Clarke also noted that they are acquiring LiDAR bathymetry given the dry water year.

10. DSS implementation/Phase II Planning

Ernie Clarke noted they are still refining objectives. The fish production model is in its first year of a two-year project. Modelers have identified gaps such as substrate mapping data and they are working on that. RBM 10 is a temperature model that is being developed to be used. SHR 2D is another model being used.

Tim Hayden commented that an appreciation letter to the SAB for their work should be sent.

11. Hatchery Reach – Channel Rehab Project

Seth Naman described an issue that had arisen over the channel construction planning in the hatchery reach. Concerns over hatchery fish mixing with natural fish arose during the planning and he was seeking guidance on how to proceed. Naman showed slides of the proposed hatchery reach construction project and the issues with hatchery versus natural fish. He noted the long history of restoration in this reach including mainly gravel augmentation since 1972 and some spawning riffle development and channel work. He showed results of studies from other areas suggesting that hatchery fish are less fit (less productive) than natural fish. Lack of mate selection in the hatchery may be one explanation.

Design work for construction in the hatchery reach started in January 2014 but concerns were raised and discussions led to a delay in design. A memo was sent to three hatchery experts (Hankin, Kinsinger and Garza) seeking guidance. Two experts recommended changes in hatchery practices before going forward; Garza recommended going forward with monitoring or testing of some presumptions over hatchery and natural fish.

Naman concluded that the solution lies mainly in hatchery management and less in TRRP gravel augmentation. Some ideas presented were tagging 100 % of hatchery Chinook, installing a segregation weir, or incorporating more natural original brood stock in the hatchery. These would take several years. In the near-term, TRRP should attempt to reach consensus on the metric that will be used to determine when restoration in the hatchery reach should proceed.

Discussion touched on several issues including hatchery management versus river management. Person asked how hard it would be to increase natural brood stock in the hatchery. Wade Sinnen said they may need to trap natural fish as they may not enter the hatchery in sufficient numbers. Dave Hillemeier said, from the tribal perspective, they don't want to write off areas available for restoration, but his mind is not made up. He noted that they are going to have spawning there anyway. Andreas Kraus explained that the solution is with hatchery operation but these are several years down the road. The question for the TMC to consider is should we proceed with construction in the Hatchery Reach and at what level of construction (e.g., what are the objectives)?

George Kautsky reviewed that the river restoration was to recover natural fish production lost due to the project, whereas the hatchery was to replace production lost above the dams. But the two projects have now become inter-related, particularly in the vicinity of the hatchery. He began to draft a motion that the TMC ask the governance board for input. Hillemeier said he is reluctant to put this before the hatchery governance board. He thought the TMC should provide the guidance. Person noted that the hatchery governance board is largely in this room. Joe Polos offered that the fish workgroup could convene with the experts to see if they could provide a more cohesive recommendation but this would create a delay in waiting for an answer. Follow more discussion, the motion was agreed on.

George Kautsky made a motion that the TMC advise the TRH Governance Board of its intention to implement restoration actions in the Lewiston Dam reach. The TMC encourages the Board to provide insights as to the impact of TMC anticipated actions upon TRH mitigation responsibilities. The TMC welcomes Governance Board recommendations of complementary hatchery management actions.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

12. Large Wood Management Plan

Wes Smith gave a PowerPoint on large wood management. A subgroup of the Design Team drafted an outline for wood management. The Design Team has reviewed the outline and recommended developing a large wood management plan. Smith gave an overview of some of the reasons for lack of large wood in the Trinity (dams, mining, and logging). Major components of the plan would be a short-term augmentation program and management plan for maintaining wood. The next steps are to identify collaborating individuals.

During discussion, concerns were raised about liabilities of adding wood, but there was support for it. Teresa Connor asked if this would be a new, fourth component to be added to the restoration. Smith thought possibly, yes. Connor noted that adding wood outside of construction of a restoration site could be a hard sell. Person noted that if this was not contemplated in the ROD, it may not have NEPA compliance issues. Sean Ledwin thought it may be framed in the adaptive management context. Dave Hillemeier thought it is a great idea to come up with a plan on how to incorporate wood into restoration. Andreas Krause said the plan would not pre-determination to add large wood, but would be an evaluation of large wood budgets and rates of supply that would guide future management decisions. Ann Garrett suggested changing the words from “plan” to “strategy.”

Ann Garrett made a motion that the TMC approve the development of a large wood management strategy.

Judy Pflueger seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

13. Public comments

No comments.

Adjourn Day 1, 5:35 PM

Day 2, Thursday, June 19, 2014, 9:08 AM

Brian Person brought the meeting to order. Two items were returned to before continuing with Day 2 agenda items. The TMC took up discussion of the minutes (Item 1) and the TAMWG recommendation of modifying the SAB letter on watersheds (Item 4).

14. TMC Guidance on Watersheds

Sean Ledwin gave a PowerPoint presentation on watershed project priorities. The two main priorities that have been identified are fine sediment reduction and fish habitat connectivity. He noted they may need a more clear definition of fish connectivity and he offered a definition of longitudinal, lateral, and vertical. There was more discussion about watershed work and restoration. It was pointed out that the Program authorizations limit funding of some projects but additional funding can be sought elsewhere. Dave Hillemeier said some group could identify things to do and funding opportunities. Robin Schrock said this is being done at least by the Program staff. Ledwin opined that limiting work to sediment reduction and fish passage is not strategic but this can be done if that is the determination. The question is whether fish passage

includes flood plain connectivity was discussed. Dave Hillemeier thought they need to give clear guidance on the limits of fish passage so proposal preparers know what can be funded.

Person clarified the Solicitor has said they can do monitoring, and can replace culverts, but cannot do “brick and mortar” construction such as building a fish ladder in tributaries. Robin Schrock said that habitat connectivity is understood by the Solicitor as allowable. She said longitudinal connections are being done and they are providing material for the Weaver Creek project. Dave Hillemeier noted that lateral and vertical connectivity are important but these would entail a large amount of work such as installing log jams or lowering floodplains. Joe Polos thought they may need to take this up at the next meeting where they can bring in more information (such as the matrix) on funding and potential projects.

Sean Ledwin clarified that the interim guidance is to stay within the 40-mile restoration reach.

Ledwin next went over the FY2015 watershed project selection process. He showed a map of Lower Sydney Gulch near Lee Fong Park in Weaverville that would include floodplain work and wood additions. He listed the three projects they are proposing to fund (Grass Valley, Valdor Gulch, and Lower Sydney Gulch). The TMC still has to approve these, but the \$500,000 of funding has been earmarked for these projects. Person said he would need to confer with the Solicitor about Lower Sydney Gulch and whether it is brick and mortar. Schrock believed it would not pass the solicitor due to the location. Two attempts were made at a motion, the first motion was to include approval of Lower Sydney Gulch, but the motion was changed to reject the project as it was thought it was brick and mortar and would not be accepted by the solicitor during review. Tom Stokely noted that he liked the first motion more but supported the second.

Joe Polos made a motion to approve the Watershed Groups proposal for 2015 up to the \$500,000 level, but to remove Lower Sydney Gulch and include the remainder of the projects.

Judy Pflueger seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

15. Long Term Gravel Augmentation Plan

Discussion of this item was postponed to the conference call as it was expected to be largely informational. George Kautsky noted that action has been proposed in a former motion and that the Hoopa Valley Tribe wanted to bring that point up.

16. Trinity Reservoir Cold Water Pool and By Pass Feasibility

Robert Franklin gave a PowerPoint on challenges to water temperature (low storage and climate change). He noted that diversions through Carr Tunnel are used to reduce warming in Lewiston and that results in the Trinity Reservoir being drawn down. Climate change predictions leads to a prediction of a 17 % reduction in reservoir storage. There were some attempts to estimate the amount of water being exported to maintain temperature, but precise numbers were not available. Person noted the concept of piping around the Lewiston and he noted the 47:53 percent split of water for the Trinity River versus exports. If the pipe were built, Rod Wittler opined that would not by itself decrease exports, and may even increase them. There were more discussions of temperature control and Tom Stokely cited a study that said that a minimum storage level of 900 acre-feet or would have no impact on reclamation yield.

George Kautsky made a motion the TMC recommend design and construction of an alternative facility at Trinity River Diversion to prepare for climate shifts. The next steps would be to engage with appropriate staff and partner agencies. Immediate actions are included in technical memorandum 5.0

The motion failed for lack of a second.

During the discussion of the motion, Rod Wittler read Technical Memorandum 5.0. He said construction includes about 6 alternatives. The next steps would be to evaluate them for temperature. Person said a feasibility study requires authority from Congress and this work would need to be called a reconnaissance or special study.

Judy Pflueger said she has not read the report and could not support it until she has. She also wanted to know how it would affect electricity production at Lewiston. This could not be answered at this time. Dave Hillemeier said he also needed time to study the report. But he may be able to support it at the next meeting. Person said Reclamation would need to follow certain requirements to get to design and construction. Tom Stokely said the California Water Caucus had suggested the same thing. Andreas Krause said the motion may not want to limit itself to Lewiston but to also include Trinity Reservoir.

17. TRRP FY2015 Budget

Robin Schrock referred to the TRRP Program Budget sheet for FY 2015 that was part of the handouts. The budget totaled \$15.7 million with administration at \$2.9 million (18 %), implementation at \$7.6 million (49 %), and science at \$5.2 million (33 %).

George Kautsky asked a set of questions about the costs, calculations, and changes. Dave Hillemeier asked about personnel costs and whether they are part of the administration costs. Tom Stokely noted that the TAMWG costs were missing. Joe Polos noted that it normally has been listed as a separate line item and this may be a \$20,000 shortfall. Teresa Connor noted that DWR's TMC cost is captured twice (once in the Admin budget and once in the RIG budget). Kautsky asked about the funding for the outmigration and about the herpetological monitoring. Kautsky said the Hoopa Valley Tribe sees that fisheries other than fall Chinook are not being adequately addressed. Dave Hillemeier asked Kautsky about costs for 100 % marking at the hatchery. Hillemeier asked about the costs of \$797,930 for compliance. Schrock said this is a contract and will fund the work for the four years.

18. Fall Flows Insertion by the Hoopa Valley Tribe

Hoopa Valley Tribe asked to insert this item for discussion and possible motion. Robert Franklin noted the need for supplemental fall flows to be released to help with possible problems that may develop. Person said their own initial examinations of this suggested accretions and flows in the Lower Klamath would be higher than the 1977 for the first part of the spawning run but could trail off in the later part. Don Reck agreed that accretions will be close to 1977. Person noted the Fall Flows subgroup recommendations, recommendations by Josh Strange, litigations that is ongoing, and Trinity Reservoir is heading toward 600,000 acre-feet.

George Kautsky made a motion the TMC is aware that we are facing severe drought conditions in the Klamath-Trinity Basin, and there exists a high likelihood that supplemental releases into the Lower Klamath River may be needed to protect against a fish kill such as occurred in 2002. We request that Reclamation engage with our scientists to commence planning for releases in

accordance with criteria developed in recent years through joint efforts in KBAO and NCAO.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 6 yes votes.

Abstaining was Reclamation and Fish and Wildlife.

During discussion of the motion, Joe Polos commented that he was concerned that the motion would be constraining them too much. Kautsky said they recognized the levels of the reservoir and the consequences. HVT had alerted BOR in December of the impending crisis and then asked that exports of Trinity water and Klamath deliveries be scaled accordingly. Don Reck said he was unclear about the recommendations and he noted that there were handfuls of recommendations about the reservoir releases. Are there any fish or other thresholds? Ernie Clarke suggested the insertion of NCAO. Judy Pflueger suggested using “may” instead of “will.” Robert Franklin said the words in the motion were chosen to seek engagement among groups. Don Reck thought this has been done in the last three years and did not think it would yield much more than speculation.

19. Meeting Summary

Brian Person noted that the TMC and TAMWG can be tough groups to move forward. He noted the importance of moving linearly toward a solution and he is trying to get the group to make decisions and give guidance as needed. He said he is never trying to limit conversation but wants to avoid circular discussions that can be confusing. He is working on this as he comes close to his turning the Chair position over to Ann Garrett.

20. Open Forum Comments from the public

No comments at this time.

Adjourn Day 2, 12:10 PM

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**Tsewendaldin Inn Conference Room, Hoopa, CA (625-4294)**

June 18-19, 2014

Wednesday, June 18, 2014

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic, Purpose and/or Decision to be Made</u>	<u>Discussion Leader</u>
<i>Regular Business:</i>		
9:30	Introductions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Approval of Agenda ▪ Approval of April 2014 Minutes ▪ Dinner Plans 	Brian Person, Chair
9:45	Open Forum: Comments from the public	Brian Person
10:00	Report from TMC Chair <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Federal/Regional updates ▪ Water outlook update ▪ TAMWG update ▪ Supplemental Flows – BOR long term plan ▪ Trinity River Hatchery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ HGMP ○ MOA 	Brian Person
10:45	Report from TAMWG Chair	Tom Stokely
11:15	Joint Meeting	Brian Person
11:45	Report from Executive Director <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action Tracker ▪ 2015 Budget Overview ▪ Workgroup update (handout) Q&A 	Robin Schrock
12:00	Break	
1:00	Science /Implementation Update	Ernie Clarke
<i>Information / Decision Items:</i>		
1:30	Phase 1 Review –TMC Recommendations	Brian Person
2:30	TMC Recommendations for DSS	Brian Person
3:00	DSS implementation/Phase II Planning	Ernie Clarke
3:30	Hatchery Reach – Channel Rehab Project	Seth Naman
4:00	Large Wood Management Plan	Wes Smith

4:45 **Public comments**

5:00 **Adjourn**

Lunch suggestions

- 1) Valley restaurant located just down road from Motel.
- 2) Joe's deli located just across street from Motel.
- 3) Rays food place has deli as well located within walking distance of Motel.

Dinner Plans TBD

Thursday, June 19, 2014

Information / Decision Items:

Time	Topic, Purpose, and/or Decision to be Made	Discussion Leader
9:00	TMC Guidance on Watersheds	Brian Person
9:30	Long Term Gravel Augmentation Plan	Gravel WG
10:15	Trinity Reservoir Cold Water Pool and By Pass Feasibility	Mike Orcutt
11:00	TRRP FY2015 Budget	Robin Schrock
11:30	Meeting Summary	Brian Person
11:45	Open Forum: Comments from the public	Brian Person
12:00	Adjourn	