

Final Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
 Libby Nix Community Center, Yurok Tribal Office, Weitchpec, CA

Wednesday, September 17, 2014; 9:30 AM

Attending Members

Member	Representative Seat
Brian Person	Bureau of Reclamation, Chair
Bruce Bingham ¹	Fish and Wildlife Service
Mike Orcutt	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Seth Naman ²	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) Joe Polos, alternate for Bruce Bingham sat in on second day, 2) Alternate for Ann Garrett; 3) Alternate for David Myers; 4) non-voting members.

Others that attended: Don Reck, Becky Seivers, Brandee Bruce (Bureau of Reclamation); Joe Polos (US Fish and Wildlife Service); Ernie Clarke, D.J. Bandrowski (Trinity River Restoration Program); Tim Hayden, Aaron Martin, Andreas Krause (Yurok Tribe); George Kautsky, Sean Ledwin, Robert Franklin (Hoopa Valley Tribe); Wes Smith (NMFS); Justin Day (Redding Electric); Wade Sinnen (CDFW); David Myers, Teresa McClung (Forest Service); Ed Duggan (Willow Creek Comm Serv District).

Notes: Kim Mattson (ENW)

List of Motions Made during the Meeting

Judy Pflueger made a motion to accept the June 2014 minutes as edited.

Bill Brock seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Judy Pflueger made a motion that the TMC support the program's effort to streamline the watershed restoration award application process.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the TMC recommends that construction work planning in the Lewiston reach be suspended pending action by the TRH

MOA Governance Board regarding their recommendation for hatchery management action or future habitat development. The TMC further recommends that gravel placement not be interrupted, but that injection point be at, or downstream, of the area known as Weir Hole. This motion shall be revisited within four years.

Judy Pflueger seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mike Orcutt made a motion to accept the report and accept the Design Team's recommendations for designs.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mike Orcutt made a motion to approve a letter to Mid-Pacific Region of Reclamation calling for completion of studies of alternatives and options identified in *Temperature Management Intermediate Technical Memorandum* (Reclamation 2012). Such studies are required to identify an effective approach to Trinity River temperature management problems in the face of climate change and increasing water demand in California's Central Valley, and to move toward construction of the preferred design.

Bill Brock seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 7 yes votes and 0 no votes. Reclamation abstained.

Other Decisions

Regular Business:

1. Introductions and Welcome

Brian Person, chair of the Trinity Management Council (TMC) opened the meeting and asked the members and attendees to introduce themselves.

Approval of Agenda

Person introduced the topics listed on the agenda. He commented on the process of finalizing the agenda and the need to have the agenda finalized in a timely manner. He asked for comments on and approval of the agenda.

Approval of June 2014 Minutes

Several edits were made to the June minutes.

Judy Pflueger made a motion to accept the June 2014 minutes as edited.

Bill Brock seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Open Forum

Ed Duggan asked that the TMC agendaize the topic of including Humboldt County as a member of the TMC for the December meeting.

Brian Person provided some past history of this topic. The TMC considered this at a past meeting in Arcata. Unlike motions requiring a super majority to pass, adding a new member requires a unanimous vote according to the bylaws. The motion failed with one “no” vote. It was brought up at a second meeting, but it was pointed out at that time, that Robert’s Rules of Order did not allow reconsideration of an issue that had already been voted on. Following more discussion, it was decided that the issue could be reconsidered. It was asked that Humboldt County prepare a letter requesting the issue. Ed Duggan said he would follow up on this.

2. Report from Trinity Management Council Chair

Brian Person gave his report on several items.

Federal/Regional Updates

Person noted the continuing severe drought and that more aspects in the Mid-Pacific Region Bureau of Reclamation office and operations are being driven by the drought. It appears that no Federal budget will be enacted by the beginning of the next fiscal year and instead there will be a Continuing Resolution extending through December 11. Person noted that the proportion of the fiscal year from October 1 to December 11 is 19% of a full year and this is the percent of the budget to which the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP or Program) and all programs will have access to. During this time, there are to be no new “starts.” But starting on a new restoration site is not a “new start.” Estevan Lopez, the nominee for Commissioner, is still awaiting Senate confirmation.

Water Outlook

Person next gave storage statistics for the Trinity and Shasta reservoirs. Expressed as a percentage of the 15-year average, Trinity is at 42% and Shasta is at 49%. Trinity currently holds about 662,000 acre-feet and Shasta holds 1.2 million acre-feet. The distance from the top of active conservation (normal full pool) to the current water surface at Shasta is 151 feet and is expected to drop another 22 feet to about 183 feet. This is not as low as the level it dropped in 1977, which was 234 feet. Trinity water level is 128 feet below the top of active conservation and they expect another 13 feet of drop. The exports to Sacramento basin are about 290 cubic feet per second (cfs). One unit at Trinity Power plant is out of service for replacement of the runner. They are no longer meeting Sacramento River temperature requirements. The Trinity pool over a 30-day period had an 18-foot drawdown.

Mike Orcutt asked about the inflow volumes, the supplemental releases, and CVP deliveries and how the emergency releases affected the reservoir.

Person said inflow to Trinity this water year was 361,000 acre-feet. The ratio of releases projected to end of September, were 596,000 acre-feet of exports through Carr Tunnel and 369,000 acre-feet released to river per the ROD. Emergency augmentation releases of 2500 cfs plus the doubling brought the total release for lower Klamath River fish protection to about 64,000 acre-feet. Approximately 60% of the total water volume released from Trinity Reservoir

this water year was exported to the Sacramento River Basin. He contrasted that to 2011 when the exports were about 25%.

Orcutt asked about the consultations that occurred regarding dropping below 600 acre-feet. Person said they did consult over the emergency releases, and acknowledged the statement in the current Biological Opinion addressing a drawdown below 600,000 acre-feet.

Supplemental Flows

Supplemental flows were initiated on August 23 and these consumed 27,800 acre-feet. On Friday Reclamation got word that of 26 fish examined, 11 showed conditions of disease, 6 were severe (at least 30 gill parasites per gill arch). Messages were sent out to various groups and flows began ramping up from 450 cfs at 10 AM Tuesday. Incremental ramping up occurs in steps of 250 cfs.

Mike Orcutt asked what the intentions were for water year 2015 during October to April. Person reported they will have the minimum releases of 450 and 300 cfs. They need to meet minimum releases, but they will conserve every drop of water they can through the “fill season.” He noted that Shasta filled in one year after 1977.

Dave Hillemeier noted that, if there had been no supplemental flows, they would likely be in the middle of a fish kill right now. The Yurok are very appreciative of Reclamation’s releases. Person noted that, of the five years in which they have done augmentation, this is the first year it exceeded 50,000 acre-feet.

Orcutt noted that a court decision is imminent and that the Department is “hanging its hat” on 50,000. A temporary restraining order (TRO) was filed to enjoin Reclamation from making the emergency releases but was denied. Person noted that in that decision, the judge said Reclamation will need to think carefully about emergency releases being overused, and if challenged next year, the discussion may be different. Orcutt said that the court recognizes that 50,000 acre-feet exists, but it this is not “well described” by Reclamation.

TAMWG Update

Brian Person noted a new letter from TAMWG in the TMC members’ packets. He deferred to Tom Stokely to report on the TAMWG meeting.

3. Report from TAMWG Chair

Tom Stokely, Vice Chair of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG) reported on their last meeting. He noted that several TAMWG members commented that the past joint meeting with TMC was “one of the best they have had.” Tom Stokely referred to the letter in the TMC members’ packet and read the four motions made by the TAMWG. These were to streamline the watershed grants program, perform no restoration or gravel additions at Hatchery Reach, accept the restoration sites as recommended, and approve the communication process.

Mike Orcutt asked about the list of restoration sites in the TAMWG letter and if they were different from the list D.J. Bandrowski handed out to the TMC. Bandrowski said that the recommendations have been revised since the TAMWG meeting based on a more recent meeting of the Design Team.

Person said that each of the TAMWG recommendations can be addressed at this TMC meeting.

Mike Orcutt asked about decisions about repayment. Stokely said it was discussed that litigation has been initiated about overpayments being made by the power users.

4. Report from Executive Director

Robin Schrock directed the council to her letter in the packet and led the TMC members through the items. She recommended TMC members visit the Lower Junction City site now that it is restored. She noted web links in her letter that provide information on supplemental flow releases. She said that several fishing guides noted that they had cancelled their client's fishing reservations due to the drought and they also expressed appreciation of the emergency releases. A new physical scientist has been hired and will be in the office September 23. Rod Wittler has returned from his assignment and has new ideas. Jim Peterson has assigned a new post-doctoral scientist to assist with the Decision Support System. A fish biologist position is being advertised and the Grants and Agreements technician announcement will appear soon. Both will be listed on USAjobs. Work is ongoing on the fish production model. Lower Junction City restoration was completed ahead of schedule. The 2013 report is now out and it looks good. The website has newly produced reports. A workshop is planned for the Program. She encouraged TMC members to sign up for the monthly coordination email.

Brian Person said he had heard of the good reports on the Yurok Tribe's work along with their subcontractor on the Lower Junction City site. Mike Orcutt asked about dollars set aside in 2014 for work next year. He also noted that the HVT hosted a day at the hatchery and they had positive response. Person agreed that it was peaceful and respectful and he was asked to say a few impromptu words and these were met with mixed response.

5. Communication Process

Justin Day of the Redding Electric Power gave a Powerpoint presentation on the Communication Process of the TAMWG and TMC. The purpose of this presentation was to give clarification about roles and responsibilities and help define how collaborators and partners can participate. He showed a set of flow charts of interactions of the TMC, TAMWG, and the Technical Workgroups. These flowcharts mapped out how each entity works. He explained the process of administrative calls, setting up agendas, meetings, minutes, and how communication should occur.

The TMC had questions about the need for approval of the Communication Process. Mike Orcutt noted that there are bylaws and science workgroup protocols that also overlays this. He thought that if this process is mainly descriptive in nature it doesn't need to be formally approved by TMC. He was not sure what the effect would be if approved or not. Day responded that approval would be mostly acceptance of a "general framework of the intention" of the Program. He called it a "living document" and suggested that the flow chart be followed for the December meeting. Orcutt noted that the workgroups do not always meet their schedules for a variety of reasons. Judy Pflueger commented that it was a good outline but she didn't want to be obligated to a "sheet of paper" and have someone coming back and pointing out they did not do "X" on a certain day. She noted there are political constraints and that people are doing the best they can. Tom Stokely said this guidance can be useful and said that holding a TAMWG meeting without the TMC minutes was awkward.

Seth Naman noted that since this is the first time that the TMC had seen this document, they may want some additional time to edit it. Person agreed and said they could take this up at the December meeting.

Orcutt asked for more clarification and perhaps coordination with the communication item that was discussed at the joint meeting. Person clarified that he and Robin Schrock can forward comments to Day.

Mike Orcutt asked about the public outreach that was discussed at the joint meeting. Person said the TRRP had formed a joint subcommittee that recommended one or more workshops, with the public invited, to discuss an issue such as gravel injections. This would be intended to initiate a dialog. The TAMWG asked that they hold a joint meeting between TAMWG and TMC first to discuss this. But no decisions were made at the joint meeting. Orcutt wanted to know if there were “next steps.”

Information/Decision Items

6. Science Update

Ernie Clarke touched on a number of science items as part of his update.

TRRP Program Workshop Synopsis

Clarke noted a memo in the TMC member’s packet that proposed a workshop on the TRRP Program. The workshop was requested during the earlier TMC meeting. Clarke read through the synopsis. The purpose of the workshop would be to review broad-scale scientific findings since the 2000 Record of Decision. This would build common understanding among partners about the current condition of the river.

The concept of the workshop raised a series of questions and suggestions. Dave Hillemeier asked if the purpose could be more focused on the restoration strategies and what lessons they have learned. Bruce Bingham agreed with Hillemeier and noted the need for a more clear statement of what they would want to get out of the workshop. He also commented that this could lead to a series of workshops.

Mike Orcutt had several thoughts on this and he expressed his concerns over the direction of the Program. He opined this did not have anything to do with the “post” joint meeting. He thought the foundation of the program got a review but he thought there has been little discussion of how to modify future construction and a review of sites. The IDT team has not “rolled up their sleeves” to address the Phase I review. The DSS may do this but it is a long ways off. He said, “They haven’t had a real sit down, though at one point we talked that at Phase II we would discuss about foundational changes.” He also expressed concerns about a drift in basic concepts such as removal of vegetation.

Person noted that the Phase I outcome was to “dovetail” with DSS. Clarke thought this workshop process may be the way to start program review over the next weeks.

Dave Hillemeier commented that the themes of the workshop are ambitious but he didn’t want to drop any. The workshop may be a good opportunity to discuss what they have learned since the flow study. Robin Schrock noted the TAMWG participation and that the TAMWG said, after the joint meeting, that they didn’t understand what the program was doing or what was the science.

Person asked Clarke to refine the purpose statement. He noted that the SAB Phase I be the top priority. What SAB had to say about the next highest priority topics could lead to other workshops.

Seth Naman agreed with Person and made several comments. He noted that the SAB has talked about restoration strategy that has changed over time. This change is embedded in the description, but it needs to be “called out” more clearly. He noted that this has been a source of friction with public—“the flow evaluation said one thing, but we are now doing another.” The Program has not done a good job explaining why the first designs failed and why they have changed to a new strategy.

Mike Orcutt suggested they cover the ROD first so people have it fresh in their minds. Person agreed to start with ROD.

Robert Franklin noted that the program is complex. The flow study and ROD said flows from dam would change the river and the optimal temperature regime would grow bigger and better Chinook. The Program has not documented what has actually happened.

Clarke was asked to refine the purpose and define the outcomes and present it again tomorrow.

The next day, Clarke projected a modified purpose statement for the TMC to consider. He added in the idea of holding a series of workshops. These would be to review the scientific findings acquired since the ROD. The purpose will focus on what has been learned and how that would influence future management and restoration. He listed desired outcomes and the focus.

The TMC discussed this and much of the discussion focused on how extensive the symposium may be and how much they might cover in a single meeting. The TMC offered ideas and language about the desired outcomes and focus. Eventually the desired outcomes and focus were deleted. The themes were considered and suggestions were made for ways to organize them so as to feed back to the basic questions of guiding strategy. Several themes were discarded. Gravel was specifically considered and they discussed the differences between the augmentation program and the question of how sediment routes through sites.

Brian Person noted that, given it would be a joint meeting with TAMWG and the public would also be invited, they were running the risk of the meeting not being the “most inspiring” from the public’s perspective. But this was not considered to be a major problem.

The symposium was scheduled for October 30 and 31 at the Weaverville Library.

Lunch

Workgroup Updates

Clarke continued his set of Science presentations. He noted that the workgroup updates were in the TMC members’ packets and Clarke reviewed tasks and meetings dates of the workgroups.

The Flow Workgroup had met June 25. They considered hydrographs and analyses. The next meeting will be October 15.

The Fish Workgroup is seeking new coordinator. Last meeting was July 16 and main issues were the hatchery reach, rotary screw trap data, and review of hatchery goals.

Gravel Augmentation Workgroup was working on the permit renewal for long-term gravel augmentation, a long-term strategy, and additional analyses.

Wildlife/Riparian did not meet last quarter but is working on plant maintenance and regulatory reporting.

Interdisciplinary Team normally meets the last Thursday of each month. They are focusing on the 2DHBLM decision model presented by D.J. Bandrowski.

The Design Team update was reviewed by D.J. Bandrowski. He noted that Dutch Cr, Limekiln, Bucktail are slated for completed designs by November and should be implemented next season. Bucktail is coupled with the Bucktail Bridge and funding is not yet secure. Design is also working on large woody debris, revegetation, and maintenance.

Watershed Workgroup met yesterday and on June 23. They have provided recommendations for FY2015 projects, and are summarizing watershed projects in the Trinity basin since 2008.

Clarke gave additional details on the Gravel Augmentation Workgroup and listed the long-term strategy elements: routing model, creating a plan, refining objectives, monitoring, assemble data, and clarify decision making. A subgroup is scheduled to meet soon.

The Gravel Augmentation stimulated an extended discussion among TMC members. Mike Orcutt asked if they will be ready with permits and analysis. He hoped there would be no debate on what the amount of gravel will be added once we get closer to the water year.

Andreas Krause, the new coordinator of the Gravel Augmentation Workgroup, gave his views. They have largely finished providing information for the permit and are now working on their long-term strategy. They have decided to downscale to a reach approach and they have tools to do this. They are going to identify areas where the river is depositing, transporting, and where the sources are. They have good ideas of the habitat and what the fish needs are. This will allow them to develop reach-specific objectives. A subgroup has formed to flesh this out and will bring ideas back to the group. The next meeting is November 5.

Mike Orcutt expressed some doubts. He noted a discussion in 2007 and a plan at that time. He noted that now a new person is coming in, and according to Reclamation, they were to have a product in October. He expressed his uncertainty whether progress is being made and the pace of progress on the permit. Robin Schrock said that the Regional Water Quality Control Board went over all the items they need to get their permit. Clarke said they should have flexibility within the permit to adjust to any water year.

Brian Person asked how they “sit” with the guides if they have an extremely wet water year. Clarke said the guides still believe that the holes are shallowing. Robert Franklin reflected, as past coordinator of the Gravel Workgroup, that there were “some” that did not want to go forward with a long-range strategy. He predicted that they may get only an ad-hoc process. He said there is “wide separation” between the extremes of the views of “not adding much gravel to prevent filling” and “going forward to promote changes.” Clarke asked if the TMC would entertain any budget requests to perform additional gravel analyses of up to \$50,000. Schrock thought they may be able to find those funds. Krause said these funds could be used to keep McBain and Associates working on the analyses.

Person summarized that they should go ahead with the November meeting and report back in December on the types of analyses and costs; they may know better about the budget by then.

Orcutt thought they are now closer than where they were two years ago. He said he understood the need for technical support, but it is not real clear what exactly would happen with it. He lacked confidence in that progress would be made. Clarke thought that Gravel Workgroup has made progress, but agreed with Franklin that they have gotten “high-centered” on objectives. Aaron Martin thought the Gravel Workgroup has made progress and it is a now multi-disciplinary. Schrock reiterated that the Workgroup will be defining objectives and will be deciding whether they have the analyses and data to support their development of recommendations.

Trinity Basin Watershed Efforts

Ernie Clarke explained that there are two different processes, an agreement process, and a clarification of the program. He explained a new process where they would solicit proposals through Grants.gov. Robin Schrock reported that she just found out that their current watershed projects purchase request was rejected by the finance office. The funding was currently being subcontracted through the RCD and one of the RCD’s subcontractors did not submit proper documentation during the negotiation of the agreement with the finance offices. This resulted in the \$790K loss of the entire project. There is a process to appeal to use these funds next year.

The new process, using Grants.gov would not link all the projects together so each would stand on its own. Dave Hillemeier asked if the funds may be used next year if they wrote a letter. Person thought no.

Clarke went over a potential timeline for the solicitation process. He noted that they could solicit projects for multiple years. This would help to clarify the program about the types of projects and the geographic scope, and eligibility of contractors.

Judy Pflueger made a motion that the TMC support the program's effort to streamline the watershed restoration award application process.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Hillemeier noted his frustration with contracting not being able to facilitate the funding and that this could be voiced in a letter. Pflueger agreed. Mike Orcutt noted these are regulations and they can be changed between years. We need to make our views known about how these are being interpreted. Person said this administration has made an effort for greater scrutiny of acquisition processes.

Schrock said the finance office felt there was a problem with the budget justifications for materials. The subcontractors felt they had been doing this work for a number of years and they knew how to budget this and were resistant to providing excessive detail. Clarke and Bandrowski felt that the level of detail being requested was extreme.

TMC Watershed Discussion

This item was discussed at the end of Day 2.

Ernie Clarke reviewed that he was asked to summarize all the watershed efforts that had occurred in the Trinity Basin since 2008. He had assembled a list with mapped locations of activities. Clarke projected a timeline of steps and development of the watershed efforts. He next projected a list of all the watershed projects initiated since 2008. He also listed ways that the TAMWG participates in watershed efforts.

There was a discussion of the various watershed groups that work in the Trinity Basin. Clarke noted that they have their distinctive and complementary missions, though it may not be a comprehensive mission. The RCD has prepared a map showing their RAC projects in the basin. This synthesis work is continuing.

The TMC considered ways to provide small monetary support for the groups to continue to summarize this effort. Robin Schrock noted the extra time, budget and labor that are being committed by the TRRP office to take this effort on. She also noted that some members of watershed council had earlier claimed these summaries were already done. Brian Person commented that he was very pleased to see this information being summarized but agreed that he was surprised by how large of a chore this has become. Mike Orcutt thought it may be better to keep the support limited and allow Schrock to use her discretion. Person thanked Clarke for his efforts.

7. Future Restoration Actions near Trinity River Hatchery

Seth Naman noted that he had discussed this issue at the last June meeting in Hoopa Valley and that a memo describing it was included in the TMC member's packets. He reviewed that the restoration site at the hatchery had been in the early stages when some program partners raised

an issue. It was pointed out that gravel augmentation and restoration at the hatchery would encourage hatchery fish mixing with natural fish. Three experts were consulted; two experts thought changes at the hatchery should occur first to reduce hatchery mixing with natural fish before restoration; the third thought mixing of the hatchery and natural fish was not so much of a problem and that it would take care of itself.

Teresa Connor noted that the TMC discussed this last June and she recalled they were going to wait until the hatchery co-management team was able to provide input. Brian Person said that the co-management team has not yet met. Wade Sinnen noted that a PNI goal that guides the level of genetic mixing that is acceptable still needs to be established.

Naman restated the question before the TMC: until the PNI goals are established, what are their recommendations for management of the hatchery reach? He suggested that although the TAMWG recommended the no action alternative, the TMC recommend keeping one or more of the lower sites in this reach as having gravel augmentation.

Mike Orcutt said he hoped the PNI decision takes place outside of this group. He proposed a motion to wait on restoration hybridization issue but continue to introduce gravel per the recommendations of the Gravel Augmentation Workgroup.

Dave Hillemeier noted that it is not a good thing to give up on restoring sections of the river. He appreciated the genetic concerns and thought they should address hatchery management. Until this, he thought they should not be adding gravel. He hoped they will improve hatchery practices. If they preclude restoration at the hatchery there needs to be a time limit on it. He said he would not have a problem with the Cableway or the weir.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the TMC recommends that construction work planning in the Lewiston reach be suspended pending action by the TRH MOA Governance Board regarding their recommendation for hatchery management action or future habitat development. The TMC further recommends that gravel placement not be interrupted, but that injection point be at, or downstream, of the area known as Weir Hole. This motion shall be revisited within four years.

Judy Pflueger seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

8. Implementation Update

D.J. Bandrowski gave a PowerPoint presentation on the implementation work and the proposal to adopt a modeling approach (2D-HBLM) to help them prioritize projects to help restore fish. He noted that he would be giving a full presentation at the planned workshop and he could give mostly the results now. However, he was looking to get approval to move forward. Briefly he described that they can utilize their digital description of the river and model flows at varying levels. This can be then used to develop a habitat description (depth, velocity, shear stress, water topography). Their results are output in 200-m “panels” for the river. This data is then put into a logic model to choose the best places to do restoration. They modeled habitat as weighted usable area, at 300 cfs (with tributary accretion of 0.5) and 1500 cfs. They essentially looked for panels with low habitat, presence of redds within 3 panels, and low complexity. They then looked for clusters of 3 panels. These were good areas for restoration.

Bandrowski showed the chosen clusters best for restoration in the 40-mile Trinity River. They chose Evans Bar, Chapman Ranch, Soldier Creek, and Oregon Gulch. These recommendations were slightly modified from that recommended at the TAMWG meeting.

The SAB recommends that the fish production model needs to be incorporated before they use the 2D-HBLM to choose sites. There are plans to add the fish production model to this selection process, but it will take at least a year. There was discussion about what the fish production model may provide and if the sites chosen for restoration would be any different using it.

Mike Orcutt made a motion to accept the report and accept the Design Team's recommendations for designs.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

9. Public comments

No comments.

Adjourn Day 1 4:47 PM

Day 2, Thursday, September 18, 2014, 9:00 AM

Brian Person called the meeting to order and went over the remaining agenda.

Regular Business:

10. Lewiston Temperature Management Intermediate Technical Memo

Mike Orcutt noted that he wanted to talk about an item that has been mostly in the periphery. An issue that is starting to emerge is storage in the reservoir as affected by climate change. He thinks there will be a real problem controlling temperature and he wanted to advocate the BOR to move to the next level of management of temperature as it moves down the Trinity River.

Robert Franklin next gave a PowerPoint presentation detailing the concerns with Lewiston Reservoir and management of cold water. He noted the model efforts by Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) and ways to understand water temperature behavior. With climate change, they expect more rain-dominated precipitation and quick runoff as opposed to slower snow melt. He listed the temperature issues as low carry-over water in the reservoir; this will likely be exacerbated with climate change and population growth. Heating of water in Lewiston requires diversion to the Carr Tunnel to get rid of the warmer water. Without good precipitation this winter, there will be problems next year. He showed a graph of Trinity Reservoir storage forecasts for next year that indicate that Trinity Reservoir will drop below 600,000 acre-feet by July and this will create high temperatures. Carry-over recommendations for Trinity Reservoir range between 750,000 and 1 million acre-feet. Recent studies produced four options for management of water. These were removal of Lewiston Dam, conveyance around Lewiston Reservoir, dredging of Lewiston Reservoir, and a selective withdrawal structure at Trinity Dam. Franklin showed slides of the dry reservoir bottom of upper Trinity Reservoir. He estimated that less than 100 cubic feet per second (cfs) is coming into Trinity and the storage is currently 658,000 acre-feet. There is danger for 2015 of insufficient cold water for ROD releases. The

BDCP modeling indicates a decrease in carryover storage in all years, increase in 4-6 F in air temperature over the coming 60 years.

Franklin proposed a motion that the TMC write a letter to the Mid-Pacific Region of Reclamation to complete the studies of alternatives in operations that were identified by Bender and others.

There was general agreement among the TMC members with Franklin's characterization and concerns. The TMC discussed the idea of the pipeline to carry water from Trinity Reservoir around Lewiston Reservoir to the Trinity River. Brian Person noted a pipeline would help to keep water cool especially in the fall when diversions are reduced via the Carr Tunnel. Reduced diversions through Carr allow water in Lewiston to reside for longer periods and this make is more susceptible to heating. Person asked if the pipeline would help in July when the water is predicted by BDCP to begin to heat next summer. Franklin did not know and said that completion of Bender studies would help. Tom Stokely thought a pipeline would help power generation, particularly when reservoir storages were low, as the pipeline would help to allow the power generation to continue and avoid the use of auxiliary release system. A pipeline would help most when diversions were not occurring via the Carr Tunnel. There are two temperature curtains in Lewiston, but these are less effective as Lewiston is relatively shallow.

Discussion next focused on whether a letter to Reclamation would be the most effective step. Person noted that they funded these two studies and asked if it seemed reasonable that the TMC ask the Mid-Pacific Region for more studies. Mike Orcutt thought the letter was needed as there were other sources of funds outside the Program. Ernie Clarke thought they spent about \$100,000 on the studies. Reclamation planning personnel had cautioned that TMC needed to be careful in asking for these funds and Reclamation may be able to do it better. Stokely noted it requires Congressional authorization to do a feasibility study.

Mike Orcutt made a motion to approve a letter to Mid-Pacific Region of Reclamation calling for completion of studies of alternatives and options identified in *Temperature Management Intermediate Technical Memorandum* (Reclamation 2012). Such studies are required to identify an effective approach to Trinity River temperature management problems in the face of climate change and increasing water demand in California's Central Valley, and to move toward construction of the preferred design.

Bill Brock seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 7 yes votes and 0 no votes. Reclamation abstained.

Before the meeting adjourned Brian Person asked Ernie Clarke to provide updates on two more items. Clarke finished his watershed summarization that was part of his Science update. That presentation is described under Item 6 above. After that, he gave a brief update on the objectives workshop.

Objectives Workshop Report

Clarke projected a timeline as a way to provide a review work on objectives development. He noted that in 2009, the IAP addressed objectives. The SAB recommended refinement of these objectives at the Science Symposium. In May 2013, an objectives workshop was held. AT this workshop, definitions of objectives were developed and they identified an over-arching goal, a fundamental objective, and a means objective. Clarke went over how these were being used to

organize and communicate the mission and goals of the TRRP. He projected a chart to show relationships among objectives. He led the TMC through a chart showing how means objectives (such as create complex channels) fed to fundamental objectives (such as restore the alluvial river) that in turn fed to the over-arching goal of restoration of fisheries.

Mike Orcutt asked what does this mean and where does it fit in? Clarke said this will help to evaluate the progress and will help to integrate the program and will fit into the DSS. He reminded Orcutt that the SAB recommended they focus on the over-arching goal and try not to get mired in details. George Kautsky noted he liked the over-arching goal as stated, but he still challenged the TMC to focus on the goal and make sure they think it is still appropriate. He thought that Clarke's chart may be helpful in focusing discussion at the upcoming workshop.

Person asked for any final thoughts before going to public comment at the end of the meeting. Clarke referred to a comment made yesterday that the SAB didn't answer all of the questions posed. Clarke clarified that the SAB had explained that they could not answer certain questions given the information they were provided. However, they said they could answer these questions if there was restructuring of some program approaches.

11. Public Forum

No comments at this time.

Adjourn Day 2 11:50 AM

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**Draft Agenda**

Libby Nix Community Center, Yurok Tribal Office

Weitchpec, CA

September 17-18, 2014

Wednesday, September 17, 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: ▪ Approval of Agenda ▪ Approval of June 2014 Minutes ▪ Dinner Plans	Brian Person, Chair
9:45	Open Forum: Comments from the public	Brian Person
10:00	Report from TMC Chair ▪ Federal/Regional updates ▪ Water outlook ▪ Supplemental Flows ▪ TAMWG update	Brian Person
10:45	Report from TAMWG Chair	Tom Stokely
11:15	Report from Executive Director ▪ Action Tracker ▪ 2015 Overview ▪ TRRP Outreach	Robin Schrock
11:45	Communication Process	Justin Day
12:15	Lunch – provided by our hosts the Yurok Tribe	

Information / Decision Items:

1:00	Science Update ▪ TRRP Program Workshop ▪ Workgroup Updates ▪ Trinity Basin Watershed Efforts ▪ TMC Watershed discussion	Ernie Clarke
2:00	Future Restoration Actions near Trinity River Hatchery ▪ Memorandum ▪ TMC deliberation	Seth Naman
3:00	Implementation Update ▪ Implementation /Design Update for 2014/2015 ▪ Phase II Rehabilitation Project Prioritization 2016 ▪ TMC 2016 project prioritization deliberation	DJ Bandrowski
4:30	Public comments	
4:45	Adjourn	

Thursday, September 18, 2014

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic, Purpose and/or Decision to be Made</u>	<u>Discussion Leader</u>
<i>Regular Business:</i>		
9:00	Lewiston Temperature Mngmnt Intermediate Tech. Memo.	Mike Orcutt
10:30	Public Forum	Brian Person
11:00	Adjourn	