

**Final Minutes**  
**TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**  
September 17, 2015  
Trinity County Library, Weaverville, CA

**Thursday, September 17, 2015; 9:00 AM**

**Attending Members**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Representative Seat</b>
Seth Naman	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Adm. Fisheries, Chair
Federico Barajas	Bureau of Reclamation, Vice-chair
Bruce Bingham	Fish and Wildlife Service
George Kautsky <sup>1</sup>	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Terri Simon-Jackson <sup>2</sup>	Forest Service
Dave Hillemeier	Yurok Tribe
Teresa Connor	California Natural Resources Agency
Keith Groves	Trinity County
Elizabeth Hadley <sup>3</sup>	Trinity Adaptive Management Work Group
Robin Schrock <sup>3</sup>	Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director

<sup>1</sup> Alternate for Mike Orcutt; <sup>2</sup> Bill Brock alternate sat in for Item 1 and after Item5; <sup>3</sup> Non-voting members.

Others that attended: Brandt Gutermuth, Dave Gaeuman, Robert Stewart (TRRP); Robert Franklin (Hoopa Valley Tribe); Shiloe Braxton (Trinity County RCD); Tony LaBanca (Ca DFW); Joe Polos, (US FWS); Andreas Krause (Yurok Tribe); Kristi Bevard (Lewiston resident); Paul Hauser (Trinity PUD).

Attended by phone: Tom Stokely (CWIN).

Notes: Kim Mattson (ENW).

**List of Motions made during the Meeting**

**Keith Groves made a motion to approve the agenda.**

**Teresa Connor seconded the motion**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Dave Hillemeier made a motion that in an effort to expedite mainstem restoration and to improve upon adaptive management the following are changes to the 9/14/2015 proposed budget for FY 2016 budget: \$30K go to TSC Design Services, watershed be funded at same level as last year at \$500K, an addition \$100K be used for channel construction, and \$120K be placed in science line item for the IDT to provide recommendations regarding the river corridor plan and in support of DSS. The TRRP shall find a mechanism to allocate watershed funding to federal agencies.**

**Teresa Connor seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed with one abstention.**

**Hoopa Valley Tribe abstained.**

### **Other Decisions or Action Items made during the Meeting**

**Action item: Seth Naman will contact his agency's outreach specialists in Portland and report back at December meeting about their participation.**

**Action item: Robin Schrock will send out information to the TMC members about the current outreach agreement.**

**Action item: Robin Schrock will work with Joe Polos on a new protocol/schedule for the 2017 budget process to be presented at the next conference call.**

### **Regular Business**

#### **1. Introductions and Welcome**

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

#### **Approval of Agenda**

George Kautsky asked to add an item to the budget discussion to discuss the 2017 process.

**Keith Groves made a motion to approve the agenda.**

**Teresa Connor seconded the motion**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

#### **2. Open Forum and Comments from the Public**

Tom Stokely commented via phone about the Lessons Learned Sediment Workshop. He felt it was very good. He reviewed they reported gravel inputs are too high and they need to revise the inputs. Fine sediment was a good presentation about reductions, but he pointed out that the North Fork and South Fork are still listed for fine sediment under 303-d of the Clean Water Act and there needs to be more work there. He suggested that more funding go toward monitoring bulk sediment for fines to help understand watershed inputs. He noted that the Yurok are seeking Proposition 1 funding for South Fork and matching funds would help their case. He hoped the TMC takes the TAMWG recommendations seriously. He hoped Federico Barajas and the BOR can work things out with Mr. Wellock as TRRP actions did act to fill his pools. Finally, he noted that some members of the public are upset with the Program and they really should listen to the TAMWG.

Seth Naman responded to a few of Stokely's items. He did not believe Dave Gaeuman had recommended not to add any more gravel but to use a lower volume (average of 1900 cubic yards per year). Andreas Krause's presentation reported that they do not know what the correct level of fine sediment is. He acknowledged that the Program needs to get the updated

information out in a timely manner. About the public discord, he acknowledged disagreements with TAMWG he asked Stokely to be more specific.

Stokely mentioned filling of pools and the Douglas City project. One the local fisherman said they are upset about the stumps and logs sticking out of the water. The Executive Director's response is not positive to the public. Schrock responded that the public who visit the program office are positive and complimentary, and if not they are by the time they leave the office. Stokely continued and reported that some members of the public have said that the Program is "wrecking the river and it should go away." He said he could help to put Naman in touch with some of these public critics.

Federico Barajas responded regarding progress with Mr. Wellock. He said he is pursuing the plan for a settlement and compensation and to ensure it doesn't happen again.

Paul Hauser said he would like to echo Stokely's comments. He agreed that people are angry. He cited that there are fewer fish post-ROD than pre-ROD. The 62,000 Chinook goal is perverse and turning the upper river into a giant spawning area and this is less natural. He said the Program is going to release a normal amount of water this year in an extreme drought where people are conserving their use of water. He said, "We need realistic goals that don't push us into perverse actions."

Seth Naman responded that during yesterday's workshop, the Program scientists showed that while some pools filled (these were due to floodplain lowering and not gravel augmentation), most pools stayed the same or got deeper.

Paul Hauser said the public doesn't follow these sorts of details but they think there are fewer fish. Naman cited a guide that reported that fishing was quite good. Hauser said guides need to report good fishing, but the local fisherman think fishing has gotten worse. Dave Hillemeier said we need to go on science not hear-say; we do have this information and we need to get this information out. Hauser said they need better technology for monitoring to help understand fish numbers. George Kautsky responded to Hauser's comment that the releases were consistent with a Dry Water year designation not a Normal year release. Hauser said the additional releases added to the planned releases begin to add up to a Normal year. The Boat Dance and pulse flows reduce reservoir storage. Kautsky responded that the other releases are not the providence of TRRP and are provided under different authorities. Hauser noted the public will not recognize that, as "water down the river is water down the river."

Robert Franklin commented the public in his community wants the program to follow the basic goals. He complimented Kim Mattson, the note taker for the meetings, for doing a good job and following up on details.

Kristi Brevard wanted to recognize Zeke Grader who passed away last week.

### **3. Report from TAMWG**

Elizabeth Hadley, Chair of the TAMWG, reported on the TAMWG meeting two days ago.

She said the TAMWG wanted to participate on the Efficiencies Subcommittee and have these meetings open to the public. They had wanted to review the basic goals and objectives of the Program but had to delay discussion until December until more members were present.

The next TAMWG meeting is scheduled for December 10 and 11, the week before the TMC meeting.

She asked how the TMC thought the joint meeting with the TAMWG went. Dave Hillemeier thought the meeting was frustrating as there were some attacks on the Program with non-factual

information. Bruce Bingham had similar feelings but noted it is their responsibility to get the facts out in a way that the public can understand it. He said that the Program has huge amounts of data but has not communicated it. Robin Schrock said that yesterday's meeting did communicate. Bingham disagreed that yesterday's meeting was not for the public but was for the Program.

Hadley said to have a more constructive meeting next time they will need help from the Program partners in getting the information and material together. Bingham said if they have specific concerns from the public in advance, they can prepare their responses and structure the meetings better. Keith Groves said one concern from the public is when they express a concern they are often told why they are wrong. Bingham agreed, they should not be telling the public they are wrong. Seth Naman said he was disappointed he saw no fisherman present. Can they schedule a meeting to get more attendance? Bingham said when they have public meetings they can put the concerns right in the announcements to let the public know this will be discussed. He commented that he saw no agenda for the Sediment Workshop until this week.

Shiloe Braxton asked about tours for the public, budgeting for outreach, if they can survey fisherman, and if there is a representative for just the public with no other affiliation. Naman and Schrock cited the raft trips and others events. Schrock said there is a budget item for outreach in the Administration line. There are no surveys with the fisherman but Tony LaBanca said the State conducts creel surveys on the Lower Klamath and they could expand the surveys to the Trinity River. Elizabeth Hadley said the TAMWG has a representative from the public though most representatives are affiliated with constituent groups.

### **Information/Decision Items**

#### **4. 2016 Budget**

Seth Naman reviewed that the budget has been discussed and there have been several modifications to date. He wanted to open up the discussion for comments at this time. Issues remaining were watershed, costs of shovel ready projects for 2016, and increases in the geophysical support contract. Naman stated his hope to pass the budget today. He asked for specific ideas from the TMC on this. Federico Barajas suggested they focus on those remaining issues of watershed, funding of construction, and the geophysical contract.

This led to an extended discussion about items that the various TMC members wanted to include. Terri Simon Jackson suggested an increase in the \$114K line item for outreach and that an outside audit may be needed given the last hour's discussion. This prompted discussion on outreach. George Kautsky cited Alex Cousin's work while at the RCD. Bruce Bingham suggested a State of the River report directed at the public. Dave Hillemeier agreed. Joe Polos cited the performance measures efforts.

**Action item: Seth Naman will contact his agency's outreach specialists in Portland and report back at December meeting about their participation.**

On other items were mentioned for increased funding. Hillemeier suggested that DSS, the River Corridor project and the SHR2D modeling needs to be funded to move these efforts forward.

George Kautsky noted they are adding costs to a balanced budget. He suggested they take the funding from the fish production model and specifically the planned development of that model to include lower Trinity basin. Joe Polos responded that they want to extend the model to the Lower Trinity River (to Klamath River confluence) to evaluate flow effects on fish passing through the lower Trinity. The proposal submitted for FY16 funding is to support the model

developers (USGS, USFWS and Thom Hardy) and for data collection (Yurok Tribe, Hoopa Valley Tribe and USFWS) to collect habitat and fish use data for extending the model from the North Fork Trinity to the confluence with the Klamath..

George Kautsky questioned where the funds would come to fund Hillemeier's suggestion. Terri Simon-Jackson asked if they would have had this line by line discussion at the end of the year. Seth Naman explained that at the June meeting, they received several versions of the budget, all of which have changed substantially. He has not had confidence what has been presented to the TMC. Thus they need to "dig into" the budget. Dave Hillemeier noted the Program is short by two positions and this may have contributed to the delays. Jackson said she would like to discuss the 6 items.

The discussion shifted to the outreach contract and if the funding could be easily increased. Robin Schrock explained that the outreach contract is in the last year of a four-year agreement and they would need to change the scope of the agreement. Barajas asked if Schrock can send out the details of the current contract.

**Action item: Robin Schrock will send out information to the TMC members about the current outreach agreement.**

Keith Groves suggested they stick with the current outreach contract and have the ad-hoc group take a look at it and try a new tact in 2017. Simon-Jackson questioned whether the subcommittee has the expertise to fix it.

Naman moved the discussion to the Implementation budget. The discussion focused on the level for watershed work and if funds could be used elsewhere. Kautsky noted that Hoopa have asked that this line be held at \$500K for the entire watershed work for 2016. The cut funds could go to Hillemeier's request for modeling or to construction. Hillemeier said he would support keeping the level at \$500 K and that the Program seek other funds to support watershed work such as Proposition 1. Keith Grove asked if the funding was going to the Forest Service. Naman said the call for proposals is not yet out. Groves said with the fires, they are facing increased erosion and it may be wise to have extra funding for watershed work. Jackson-Simon said there were five fires in Trinity County. They will likely focus on the high intensity areas first but they expect a lot of sediment entering the rivers. However, the TMC funding focuses only on the 40 miles along the mainstem and there were no fires there.

The discussion moved to how the Forest Service would fare on a competitive proposal for \$250K and how workgroups recommend funding. Kautsky noted that this is the first time a separate entity is identified as a line item to receive watershed funding. He opined that watershed projects should be vetted through the Watershed Workgroup. He said that the funding can go to the Forest Service if prioritized so by the workgroup. Teresa Connor agreed and said the issue is whether they should fund the project but they should let the Watershed Workgroup decide on the recommendations for which projects get funded.

Elizabeth Hadley said reduction to \$500K for watersheds is the opposite direction we may need to go. Keith Groves asked is this \$250K they were talking about better for fish by doing work in the watershed or doing work the mainstem. He noted that "TAMWG says watershed and Tribes say mainstem." Naman cited a paper by Roni et al. that concluded that work in mainstem near the fish habitat would more likely immediately benefit fish than watershed erosion. Federico Barajas said in the absence of a list of specific watershed projects he would support a lower level funding (e.g., same level as the previous year). Bingham pointed out that watershed funding decrease from \$720K in 2014 to \$500K in 2015. Schrock explained that a formal watershed workgroup was formed at the request of the TMC to replace the ad hoc process followed by the

Watershed Council; this workgroup prioritized the projects and the TMC approved the increased funding. Kautsky added they had extra funding in 2014. Simon-Jackson noted the Forest Service is planning for a multi-year project that would cost \$250K annually and using NEPA CE. Any NEAP EA/EIS work they do is litigated and this slows their process and adds to costs.

## **Lunch**

After lunch, Naman reopened the discussion on the budget. He summarized that they seemed to be close to reducing the watershed by \$250 to \$500K. This could be used to fund DSS and the rest toward in-channel work.

There was more discussion about watershed funding and Bingham, Groves, and Barajas expressed uncertainty about the appropriate level between \$500K and \$750K given that they did not have any additional information about the details of this project. But there was a general feeling it was important to make a decision based on what they know today.

The discussion moved to the geophysical support services line item. Kautsky had questions about funding levels and how they were arrived at. Schrock explained the funding was based on the occurrence of an extremely wet water year given an El Nino is expected this winter. If the water year is not extremely wet some of the funds can be reallocated or rolled over to the next year. Kautsky questions about whether El Nino will occur in Northern California that maybe it only has a 50:50 chance; he asked whether they needed to allocate the extra funds now. Barajas supported full funding saying he did not want to be in a crisis management mode if El Nino did arrive. There were questions about the \$682,000 for the topography surveys. Dave Hillemeier asked that this funding be looked at by the Program technical staff. The plan would be to descope the project if there were left-over funds. The continual roll over of funds would need to be watched as the project comes to a close to avoid losing it if not descoped.

Naman summarized the status of the budget the TMC was moving toward: move \$250K from watershed to in-channel and to Hillemeier's suggestion of DSS, river corridor and modeling. Hillemeier suggested \$120K to possibly hire a contractor to help with DSS, the river corridor plan, and working with the IDT. There were questions of whether DSS needs an outside contractor given it is not yet ready. Teresa Connor asked if Tyrell DeWeber could to present his progress on the DSS. Elizabeth Hadley said she had concerns if they were taking funding away from watersheds for something that is not ready.

Joe Polos supported the river corridor concept saying Dave Gaeuman is heading up a pilot effort and this is important for the Program. He noted the TMC did appoint the IDT as the lead for the DSS though they have not moved far on this yet. He hopes to put more effort into the DSS at next month's IDT meeting. Teresa Connor asked if the IDT can handle the DSS leadership. Polos thought that they should be able to but perhaps once they meet in October they may decide otherwise. Hillemeier said if they do not fund it, the IDT may not put as much effort into it. Hadley pointed out if funding did not go to watersheds, the TAMWG may be supportive of funding for DSS per one of their recommendations in 2013.

The TMC was ready for a motion but several felt that their specific changes to the budget would need to be spelled out. Kautsky wanted to discuss specifically how the extra funding for construction spending would be allocated.

A motion was crafted to pass the 2016 budget with the specific changes. Amendments were added to include the input of the IDT and to find a mechanism to allow the Forest Service or other federal agencies to compete for the watershed funding.

**Dave Hillemeier made a motion that in an effort to expedite mainstem restoration and to improve upon adaptive management the following are changes to the 9/14/2015 proposed budget for FY 2016 budget: \$30K go to TSC Design Services, watershed be funded at same level as last year at \$500K, an addition \$100K be used for channel construction, and \$120K be placed in science line item for the IDT to provide recommendations regarding the river corridor plan and in support of DSS. The TRRP shall find a mechanism to allocate watershed funding to federal agencies.**

**Teresa Connor seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed with one abstention.**

**Hoopa Valley Tribe abstained.**

George Kautsky cited his inability to support the motion as there was no language about how the \$100K would be allocated among construction projects.

#### **5. TRRP Efficiencies Subcommittee**

Dave Hillemeier reviewed that there was interest in putting more funding in construction. Permitting and compliance appeared to be costly and outside funding may be an additional source of funding. He thought a subcommittee may help to expedite construction projects.

Yurok, TAMWG, Forest Service, California State, and Hoopa Valley Tribe volunteered to be on the subcommittee. Trinity County and Forest Service expressed interest.

Tasks would focus on efficient use of funds to expedite construction, but may also include permitting, outside sources of funding, and outreach.

#### **6. Sediment Lesson Learned Workshop**

Robert Stewart and Dave Gaeuman of the TRRP described the recently held sediment workshop. Seth Naman thought the workshop was a success. But he would have liked more of a wrap up and an opportunity for the scientists to get into it. He appreciated Andreas Krause's presentation on fine sediment and Gaeuman's presentation on changes in pool depth. He asked Gaeuman if the pool depths would need resurveys over time. Gaeuman said they are planning to go back and do some spot checks. George Kautsky appreciated the work but commented that monitoring pool depths are not central to the objectives of the Program. Naman agreed that it would be good to wrap this effort more into adaptive management, but it was particularly important to address TAMWG and the public's interest in this issue.

Dave Hillemeier liked the workshop. He would have liked more technical discussions either following the presentation or in a panel discussion.

Naman asked about a summary. Stewart described a set of questions each presenter was asked to answer (original assumptions, findings, lessons learned, and management implications). Naman and Bingham asked for a written summary.

#### **River Corridor Map**

Dave Gaeuman explained that they are working on a map as a way to quantify channel complexity. They plan to presentation their work to the IDT at their October 1st meeting. The effort would describe what is out there and what needs to be changed.

The TMC took up Item 8 at this time, while Brandt Gutermuth set up a projector for his presentation of Item 7.

## **7. Implementation Update**

Following Item 8, Brandt Gutermuth gave a PowerPoint on the Compliance and Implementation Update. He noted the value of having information on pool depth changes for the NEPA process if the public comment that the changes in pool depths will affect their livelihoods.

He projected a slide describing the compliance status on three project sites. There have been substantial changes in Bucktail since 2013. They produced a new Environmental Assessment (EA) that will be ready for 30-day public review fall 2015. He said they can do the entire Bucktail project without bridge replacement. Lower Dutch Creek scoping was completed in July 2015 and EA/IS is planned for 30-day public review late fall 2015. Deep Gulch EA/IS is planned for 30-day public review spring 2016.

Other compliance items include the WQCB water quality certifications that were completed. Programmatic updates for terrestrial and aquatic biological assessments are being prepared with a biological opinion expected in 2016. On the cultural side, they are being required to address mining areas. For recreation they have recognized that a river access assessment is needed. The TRRP Revegetation Strategy and methods is in final review. The TRRP Section 10 Scientific take permit is in review with NOAA Fisheries.

Regarding 2015 Implementation, Gutermuth said that Hocker Flat / Lower Junction City are going well with its revegetation work. They have had some problems with the irrigation on the floodplain. At Upper Douglas City the in-channel work was finished on August 18 with revegetation work still ongoing. They had to put an extra meander in the side channel to slow the velocity of flow down for juvenile fish. They had to move fish out of an existing side channel. Volunteers from BLM, Ca Fish and Wildlife and Forest Service helped. The most numerous fish in the side channel was German brown trout. There were also steelhead and lamprey. The Limekiln Gulch was constructed by the Yurok Tribe. This was a remote and challenging site. It had archeological, old mining sites. There were nesting birds that had to be avoided until August 15. The site was tight and posed problems for potential fire hazards.

At this end of Gutermuth's presentation, Dave Hillemeier presented Gutermuth with a plaque of appreciation from the Yurok Tribe.

Teresa Connor asked if some members of the public are not happy with Douglas City. Gutermuth acknowledged that the steelhead run was slowed down last year. There were also concerns with the size of the rock. He said the river rock was round and it will look better in a few years.

## **8. Report from Acting Science Coordinator**

Joe Polos reviewed items on his handout Workgroup Summary. He noted the Fish Workgroup is meeting to work on developing a fish and fish habitat synthesis report and to review where the TRRP partners that implement adult monitoring activities are at with the recommendations made by the Bradford and Hankin, the SAB, and NMFS on these projects. Gravel Workgroup just held their workshop. Riparian had a meeting with the riparian modeler last week to start their modeling efforts. The IDT has been holding conference calls about once a month and is holding a meeting on October 1st. They will discuss the river corridor plan, re-examine performance metrics and big questions, and discuss the development of the DSS. They did receive the causal linkage document from the Watershed Workgroup and provided comments to Sean Ledwin (watershed WG coordinator).

Kyle DeJulio reported that the Watershed Workgroup discussed the causal linkage effort. They will amend the document based on the comments from the IDT/partners.

## **9. Report from Executive Director**

Robin Schrock went over her written report she also provided to the members. She noted they had already worked through the budget, but her memo memorialized some of her recommendations. She noted some of the Joint Meeting action items that were completed (larger ads, formatted goals and objectives, and website). She noted new hire Jeanne McSloy. She noted a list of outreach activities, publications, and upcoming science symposium March 31-April 1.

The watershed FOA is moving forward.

A graph of the current SAB terms was provided and Jordan and Buffington were renewed this year, and Peterson and Merigliano are up for renewal next year. She received 18 of nominations for the new SAB member but has not had time to go through them yet.

## **10. Public Forum**

Kristi Bevard commented that the Forest Service reports that erosion may impact the river following the fires. She expressed concerns placing a ceiling on the watershed budget.

## **11. Wrap Up and Action Items**

At this time, Seth Naman asked to spend some time on the 2017 budget process. Robin Schrock said they may need to accelerate the 2017 budget process by 3 to 6 months. Joe Polos expressed concerns of being able to get the science proposal process completed with the new potential deadline. The Science Investigation Plan process that has been used for many years was scheduled to provide a recommendation for a science workplan to be available by the June TMC meeting. Any changes to this "due date" would require modifications to the current schedule that has been used. George Kautsky expressed concern and asked if this was definitive. Bruce Bingham said he was perplexed why this program doesn't have a fixed schedule. In programs he managed, they would routinely have administrative reports showing how groups actually spent the funds for the past year and then have the proposals prepared by January 1st for the coming fiscal year. Seth Naman asked if Schrock and Polos would take the lead for writing a new protocol.

**Action item: Robin Schrock will work with Joe Polos on a new protocol/schedule for the 2017 budget process to be presented at the next conference call.**

Federico Barajas said this coming year they are very likely to be working under a continuing resolution and this slows the process. This is greater reason to have some sort of documentation. Andreas Krause suggested they have a long-term plan instead of a one-year plan. He suggested they identify priorities for each year.

Seth Naman next asked if George Kautsky would like to make a motion regarding restoration at Bucktail as a priority. He noted that Gutermuth said Bucktail is ready to go. Kautsky made motion to prioritize the Bucktail construction work. Dave Hillemeier did not see the need to make those decisions today. They could address these in next year. Teresa Connor agreed. Brandt Gutermuth said the reason they have three projects is that Bucktail may not be so simple. Federico Barajas said they have sent a message based on their budget decisions that construction is a priority.

**George Kautsky moved to recognize the priority status of Bucktail phase II and III for construction in 2016.**

**Keith Groves seconded the motion.**

**After discussion, Kautsky withdrew the motion.**

**Adjourn 5:00 PM**

# TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

Trinity County Library

Weaverville, CA

Agenda for September 17, 2015

Call in number: 866-721-5952

Passcode: 4702048

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic, Purpose and/or Decision to be Made</u>	<u>Discussion Leader</u>
<i>Regular Business:</i>		
9:00	<b>Introductions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Welcome</li> <li>▪ Approval of Agenda</li> </ul>	Seth Naman, Chair
9:15	<b>Open Forum:</b> Comments from the public	Seth Naman
9:30	<b>Report from TAMWG</b>	Elizabeth Hadley
<i>Decision Items:</i>		
9:45	<b>2016 Budget</b>	Seth Naman/TMC
10:30	<b>Break</b>	All
10:45	<b>2016 Budget Cont.</b>	Seth Naman/TMC
12:00	<b>Lunch</b>	All
1:00	<b>2016 Budget Cont.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Decision-approval of 2016 budget</li> </ul>	Seth Naman/TMC
<i>Information / Decision Items:</i>		
2:30	<b>TRRP Efficiencies Subcommittee</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Membership</li> <li>▪ Tasks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permitting efficiencies</li> <li>• Outside sources of funding</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Dave Hillemeier
3:00	<b>Sediment Lesson Learned Workshop</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ TAMWG perspective <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Trends in pool depth</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ TMC Reps perspective</li> <li>▪ Future gravel augmentation volumes</li> <li>▪ Changes to future TRRP restoration strategies</li> <li>▪ River corridor map</li> <li>▪ Conclusions, action items and next steps</li> </ul>	Robert Stewart/TMC
3:30	<b>Implementation Update</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 2015 Rehabilitation projects updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upper Douglas City</li> <li>• Limekiln</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Permitting-TRRP Biological Assessment update</li> </ul>	Brandt Gutermuth
4:00	<b>Report from Acting Science Coordinator</b>	Joe Polos

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Work Group updates</li><li>▪ Fish production model status</li><li>▪ Temperature model status</li></ul>	
4:15	<b>Report from Executive Director</b>	Robin Schrock
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Watershed FOA status</li><li>▪ SAB nominations</li></ul>	
4:30	<b>Public forum</b>	Seth Naman
4:45	<b>Wrap up and action items</b>	Seth Naman
5:00	<b>Adjourn</b>	