

Final Minutes TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

December 17-18, 2014

Trinity Public Utilities District, December 17

Trinity County Library, December 18

Wednesday, December 17, 2014; 9:00 AM; Trinity PUC

Attending Members

Member	Representative Seat
Brian Person ¹	Bureau of Reclamation, Chair
Bruce Bingham	Fish and Wildlife Service
Mike Orcutt ²	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Seth Naman ³	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Adm. Fisheries, Vice-Chair
Terri Simon-Jackson	Forest Service
Dave Hillemeier	Yurok Tribe
Teresa Connor	California Natural Resources Agency
Judy Pflueger ⁴	Trinity County
Elizabeth Hadley ⁵	Trinity Adaptive Management Work Group
Robin Schrock ⁵	Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director

1) Left at the start of Day 2 and returned near the end of Item 11; 2) Replaced by Sean Ledwin on Day 2;

3) Alternate for Ann Garrett; 4) Left during discussion of Item 2 and returned during discussion of Item 5;

5) Non-voting members.

Others that attended: Federico Barajas, Paul Zedonis (Bureau of Reclamation); Ernie Clarke, D.J. Bandrowski, Logan Negherbon, Brandt Gutermuth, Robert Stewart, Michele Gallagher (Trinity River Restoration Program); Tim Hayden, Andreas Krause, Mike Belchik (Yurok Tribe); George Kautsky, Seth Ledwin (Hoopa Valley Tribe); Justin Day (Redding Electric); Tony LaBanca (Ca DFW); Bill Brock (Forest Service); Seth Lawrence (Dept of Water Res); Ed Duggan (Willow Creek Comm Serv District); Roger Jaegel, Arnold Whitridge (community residents and former TAMWG members); Kristi Bevard (Lewiston resident).

Via telephone: Tom Stokely (Ca Water Impact Network);

Notes: Kim Mattson (ENW)

List of Motions Made during the Meeting

Dave Hillemeier made a motion for the TMC to submit a letter of support for Trinity County grant proposal for the Bucktail Bridge project.

Mike Orcutt seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Judy Pflueger made a motion that the TMC accept the design guidelines as presented.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Judy Pflueger made a motion that Seth Naman will serve as TMC chair for the year 2015 as long as Seth Naman is NOAA's selected representative. Federico Barajas will serve as vice chair.

The motion was seconded by Dave Hillemeier.

The motion passed unanimously. Seth Naman abstained.

Other Decision

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.

Acknowledgements TMC members

This acknowledgement occurred during the discussion of Item 3 as Person had skipped over it. However, Dave Hillemeier noted this omission and asked that the TMC return to it. Hillemeier then acknowledged the retirement of Brian Person and presented to Person a plaque. Hillemeier thanked Person for his commitment to the program and the TMC and attendees applauded Person. Judy Pflueger noted the help of Person and his patience and tolerance especially when people were upset about water. Roger Jaegel noted that Person's dedication has helped the fish. Robin Schrock presented Person with a jersey and hat with the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) logos. Mike Orcutt acknowledged Person's commitment and despite being on different sides of some issues, he appreciated Person's efforts for the resources.

Person commented that he was very grateful for his experience here, and restated his belief in the program. He stated he wished he could have done more. He hoped that others find the work equally rewarding as he has. About his employment with the Bureau of Reclamation, Person told a story of his college graduation ceremony, receiving notification of a job offer and filling out a credit card application all in the same day. When asked for his place and length of employment, he said he was observed to state with some pride, "Engineer with the Bureau of Reclamation—for four hours."

2. Open Forum

Tom Stokely encouraged the TMC to accept Humboldt County as a member of the TMC. He requested they switch their decision making from a super majority to a simple majority. He also asked that they post more meeting materials and information on the website.

3. Report from Trinity Management Council Chair

Brian Person, TMC Chair, gave his report on several items. He announced that Estevan Lopez was confirmed as Commissioner of Bureau of Reclamation. Federico Barajas has been selected as Person's replacement as Northern California Area Manager for the Bureau of Reclamation.

Robin Schrock reviewed that Trinity County is seeking federal land access and coordination with the BLM at the Bucktail bridge site. The County is seeking a TMC letter of support for the grant to offset a 40% funding match. Schrock said she would distribute a support letter by email and that the grant deadline was January 15.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion for the TMC to submit a letter of support for Trinity County grant proposal for the Bucktail Bridge project.

Mike Orcutt seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Federal/Regional Updates

Person noted the signing of the federal budget. He also noted a draft letter to Regional Director regarding Trinity River temperatures that needs to be approved. The Hoopa Valley Tribe asked to review it further and perhaps add some strengthening language.

Person commented on the recent increases in storage by the reservoirs. Trinity Reservoir has come up to 35% capacity with the recent rains. On the Shasta side, on September 11, they received 6 inches of rain and this added an additional 411 acre-feet to Shasta Reservoir and raised the levels 33 feet to 32% capacity.

Long-term Flow Augmentation Plan for the Lower Klamath

Person reported that a draft document regarding flow augmentation for Lower Klamath fish health is planned for release for comments by the end of the year. A final document is planned for implementation by 2015 if fish protection measures are necessary.

Mike Orcutt asked that they have an update on what happened last year. He said he understood that the Humboldt County 50,000 acre-feet may be a part of the plan. Person said the Solicitor and Reclamation upper management continue to discuss this and whether this would be administered separately or continued to be subsumed in the existing plan. Orcutt also asked if 16,000 acre-feet of Klamath Water from Pacific Corp is a part of the water described in the draft document. Person noted that these releases are for fish health in the upper river.

Trinity River Hatchery Update

Person noted a new state-of-the-art juvenile marking shed has been delivered. The governance board for hatchery operations met this week and is taking on several issues such as genetics, and the EPIC lawsuit. The Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) contract for maintenance for one year with optional extensions for four more years has been signed by Reclamation and CDFW. Tom Stokely asked if coho or steelhead will be marked. Person clarified that only Chinook will be marked with then new tagging shed. TRH steelhead and coho will continue to be marked but not with the new shed.

BLM Land Acquisition—Trinity River Priority

Robin Schrock noted a letter to BLM was sent in July stating TMC support for federal acquisition and that some acquisitions have occurred. Judy Pflueger noted land acquisitions helped with their water intake system.

Humboldt County Membership Request and TMC By-laws

Ed Duggan asked that this request be tabled at this time. He noted that the decision has to be a unanimous vote for changing their membership. Mike Orcutt noted they should follow up with the County to verify. Person asked Duggan to ask Humboldt County to send an email today or tomorrow simply to close the loop.

Trinity Adaptive Management Work Group Recommendations

Elizabeth Hadley reviewed that she and Justin Day developed a communications process and this document has been endorsed by the TAMWG. The TMC had seen an earlier version of this during the September meeting. Person asked if the TMC is ready to discuss it. Hadley noted a key change of “process” to “guidelines” and she noted several timing adjustments. Teresa Connor asked if this was for new members, the public, or more an internal guideline. Hadley noted that the guidelines are for internal use to help them understand the steps to communicate and produce minutes and are not necessarily for the public. Dave Hillemeier noted he was more supportive with the term “guidelines” as opposed to “process.” Mike Orcutt noted the concerns over having “another rule book,” but if it is subject to revisions and is only a guideline, he did not see a problem with it. It was decided to wait until Judy Pflueger returned after lunch as she had expressed some concerns over the process imposing too many constraints.

The TMC returned to this issue following the lunch break. Judy Pflueger said she was now comfortable with the guidelines.

Judy Pflueger made a motion that the TMC accept the design guidelines as presented.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

4. Report from TAMWG Chair

Elizabeth Hadley, Chair of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG), reported on their last meeting. She described the discussion over accepting Humboldt County as a member of TMC as split between those promoting membership and those noting it had been voted on before and that Humboldt County was no longer participating on the TAMWG. The vote ended up as a tie and therefore did not pass.

5. Implementation Update

D.J. Bandrowski made a lengthy presentation on the implementation plans for 2015 and 2016 and presented a new proposal for the design process. He noted the presence of several pieces of information in the TMC member packets from which he would be referring. Before he started, he acknowledged new Design Team members, Logan Negherbon and Seth Lawrence.

Bandrowski started by reviewing that the Phase II planning was approved at the Weitchpec TMC meeting and that the Design Team has been moving forward on this. Three projects are being finalized and should be ready for permitting and then implementation in 2015: Limekiln Gulch, Bucktail, and Dutch Creek. The Hatchery site has been tabled. The Bucktail project does not include the bridge portion but is “coupled” with it. Bandrowski explained they are attempting to

move forward with the channel work and to work around the hydraulic connections to the bridge as these parts may need to be delayed awaiting approval of the bridge. Bandrowski noted that another round of comments needs to be addressed for Bucktail.

This prompted discussion by the TMC regarding the phasing of funding, permits, and avoiding work near the bridge. Bandrowski explained that the desire was to keep forward progress and take advantage of funding, but perhaps they would need to mobilize more than once. The Bucktail project is estimated to be \$2 million but the first phase will be about \$1 million. Limekiln Gulch is just under \$1 million.

New Design Process

Bandrowski switched his presentation to a spreadsheet describing the 2015 newly proposed design process. Bandrowski noted the amount of effort to do design has increased, but the annual schedules for delivery are the same, and this has caused some “friction.” To address this, the Design Team has proposed they modify their process from each design group from handling an entire project to sharing of projects and each group focusing on their expertise.

Person noted the different approaches and perspectives of the each design group and asked if this new collaborative approach will work. Bandrowski said that each design group will be able to retain their own design philosophies but the predictive analyses will be farmed out to one of the other design groups. Mike Orcutt asked who will have the final design decision. Bandrowski said this has not changed, the design group after receiving comments, will make the decisions about the design. However, the entire Design Team can overrule the design group.

Bandrowski said the TMC can formalize this new design process and it can be incorporated into the Design Guide. Teresa Connor recommended Bandrowski add a box in his spreadsheet listing a design objective. Bruce Bingham noted it would be helpful to have a flowchart showing the current process so to better understand the changes.

There was more discussion about how to resolve a disagreement via modeling. Bandrowski described a disagreement over the design at Dutch Creek and how the river might respond. There was concern that the State design group’s proposal would not produce the amount of habitat given the funding level. They decided to split the project into a lower 1/3 where there is greater Design Team support and an upstream portion that would receive more re-analysis. The lower portion could go forward with permitting and implementation. Teresa Connor said the State geomorphologist believes their design is the best, but the State is willing to consider alternative designs if any are presented.

Bandrowski said in helping to resolved differences, they need to go back to older designs and study how the river has responded. Mike Orcutt noted that it would be great to do that, but the Design Team has schedules to meet and has to continue moving forward. Dave Hillemeier asked if they can do hind-casting with their models as a way to validate their design decisions. Bandrowski acknowledged this is a critical step that they are not doing. He said they are not checking to see if the designs are meeting their objectives in more than a quantitative way. He noted they do not have the resources to do this.

The decision has been made not to do the work at Evans Bar at Dutch Creek in the designs for 2015. Terri Simon-Jackson asked about the changes to drop Evans Bar and how this would affect the scoping for the public in the NEPA process. Her concern was to not spend the money on the analysis if it was to going to be redesigned. Brandt Gutermuth noted that the environmental study limit would not change.

Design/Implementation Update for 2015/2016

Bandrowski drew the attention to the second bullet of the Workgroup update on page 3. This provided a summary of the status of the six projects. Upper Douglas City is approved; Limekiln Gulch is pending environmental compliance, Upper Portion of Bucktail will be done with 2015 dollars as available; Lower Bucktail, Dutch Creek, and Bucktail Bridge are on hold for funding and environmental. So in summary, projects available for 2015 funding are Limekiln and Upper Bucktail, pending environmental. Douglas City is already paid for with 2014 dollars.

Limiting factors no longer seem to be turbidity standards as these have been managed better and there is now a new and more manageable standard. The new limiting factors seem to have shifted to funding the more expensive and complex projects, permitting, and landowner permissions.

Ernie Clarke and Brandt Gutermuth commented that staff of participating partners need to juggle their time between their regular obligations and requests of the project design by the program. They commended Forest Service working on upcoming sites and BLM staff working on mining withdrawals in the river.

Brian Person noted that the TMC may not need to provide formal approval to the proposed new design process. But it was acknowledged by TMC that they will give support to their respective staff to participate in the proposed modifications. Simon-Jackson noted that if Dutch Creek is slowed down, Forest Service staff currently helping with the project may be switched off to other projects and may not be able to turn back on quickly without proper notification.

Lunch**Information/Decision Items****6. Science Update/Workgroup Updates****Wildlife and Riparian**

James Lee provided an update on the Wildlife and Riparian Workgroup. He talked about some modifications to their work and streamlined reporting. He noted the Riparian Monitoring and Mitigation Plan that is in internal review. He noted efforts on replanting monitoring and particularly woody stem recruitment and song sparrow habitat use. They are also working on revegetation designs for Lower Junction City/Hocker Flat, Limekiln Gulch, and Dutch Creek.

George Kautsky asked about the PITAs 1 and 2. Lee acknowledged that they have stalled out on the quantitative measures of effectiveness and estimates of issues such as scour are difficult. Regarding the risk of riparian encroachment, they are addressing this as they have had some drier years that have allowed narrow-leaf willows to re-colonize. But so far, willow establishment is not detrimental. They are not seeing that deep scour that was originally hypothesized.

Gravel Augmentation Workgroup

Andreas Krause presented on the Gravel Augmentation Workgroups. He clarified some ideas on the October deadline for the long-term plan. He said the Workgroup was focused on providing support for the five-year permits and only recently have they shifted their attention to the long-term plan. They have first focused on scoping what the plan would cover. A wide variety of ideas were proposed and a sub-group consolidated these into a report and analysis outline. The Workgroup recommended a more simple process that focused on existing augmentation sites and

refinements after the fish and morpho-dynamic models come on-line. They recommended the terminology of “Sediment Management Plan.”

The delivery of the long-term plan stimulated much discussion by the TMC. Mike Orcutt expressed concern over the delays in delivery of the gravel augmentation plan, especially if now it is being linked to models that may take years to come on line. Krause noted the need to discuss the nature and purpose of the plan and acknowledged these tasks have been difficult. Orcutt emphasized that issues that are not being addressed regarding gravel. He listed the issue of gravel cut off by the dam and how long it may take for additions to come into equilibrium. He noted that he cannot give guidance to his staff without a plan.

Krause said they are making progress regarding the existing sites, but they may not be clear on the amounts to be added. He noted there are still internal disagreements over Gaeuman’s report and they will have to work through these. They will need to connect habitat response to gravel additions. Teresa Connor asked if a facilitator may help to work through some issues. Krause said no, they need to work through the objectives and they need to try this within the group. Krause explained the Record of Decision directed to add gravel until they overcome the deficit and add at the rate that the river can transport it. Gaeuman’s report and recommendations have focused on this. However, there are disagreements over the extent of change anticipated among all river restoration actions and that the river has not produced as much change as expected. Therefore, some suggest they need to overload the river until they get higher flows. This basic objective needs to be decided. In a second phase, they would incorporate findings from the fish and morpho-dynamic models.

Watershed Workgroup

Sean Ledwin noted processes and activities in funding issues. They have drafted a new contracting process for 2016 that should help to clear up issues of defining the types of projects. Robin Schrock reviewed a meeting with Solicitors. She said that last year, projects were held up based on description of fisheries and habitat connectivity work. But watershed sediment work was perceived to relate directly to mainstem fisheries and thus was fundable. An effort is underway to have earlier review of proposals to help alleviate these problems. Dave Hillemeier asked how they can make the direct links of tributary work to mainstem fisheries.

Flow Workgroup

Robert Stewart of the TRRP gave a Powerpoint update on flows and temperatures. He noted they did not have any major temperature exceedances in water year 2014. He showed that they matched prescribed flows at Lewiston quite well. For water year 2015 there were a few temperature exceedances early on; these were eliminated with the recent rains.

As of recently, storage in Trinity Reservoir is 700,000 acre-feet in Trinity Reservoir which is 45% of the long-term average. The drought conditions appear to be improving in Northern California.

Cold Water Pool Analysis

This was a separately scheduled as Item 9 on Day 2, but was presented here to accommodate the presenter’s schedule.

Paul Zedonis of Bureau of Reclamation gave a Powerpoint on the cold-water management of the Trinity Reservoir. He reviewed order WR 90-5 that directs cold water temperature management in the river. He described the Sacramento River Temperature Task Group as a multi-agency

group formed to manage water temperature. An annual operations plan is developed and submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board.

Zedonis described a conceptual study to improve knowledge of the cold water pool in the Trinity Reservoir. They want to better understand the formation of the cold water pool and how it relates to climate and discharges. The study is not planned but is something they could initiate.

Zedonis next described climate change and water operations and noted a Sacramento and San Joaquin basin assessment that includes the Trinity basin. The final document addresses a number of resource areas such as water deliveries, fisheries, and quality.

Fish Workgroup

Ernie Clarke gave an update on the Fish Workgroup. He noted Steve Cannata is the new coordinator. He noted some planned reports. Seth Naman is heading up an effort to provide the history of the fisheries restoration goals. The Workgroup have provided their top three lessons learned from channel rehabilitation to the Interdisciplinary Workgroup.

Clarke said he would cover the DSS tomorrow.

Clarke brought up the earlier discussion regarding the delay in the Gravel Augmentation Long-term Plan. He acknowledged the frustration over the delay. He said they are doing the work using the staff of their offices and the idea of an outside contractor to help has been discussed. He noted that part of the wood debris plan is being done by a contractor. Andreas Krause said it was not likely an outside contractor could write a plan that would be acceptable by the Workgroup. But a contractor could successfully do small tasks and report back on them. They would need good project management skills and good modeling and report writing skills. The current members are very busy and cannot make much progress between the quarterly meetings.

Krause gave more of his perspective on the problem. He said the hang up is in defining what the future channel ought to look like and what gravel additions are needed for that. One stated objective is to create a dynamic channel—one with more bars than there is currently. One idea is that the biology should be driving the needed gravel additions. Do you use the amounts trapped by the dams or do you use measures of gravel bars? A complicating factor is that now the flows are reduced. The early predictions estimated gravel movement by the river that was ten times greater than those that have been actually observed.

Dave Hillemeier and Bruce Bingham both thought it would be useful to bring in outside help and perhaps meet more frequently than quarterly. Robin Schrock noted the SAB has a mechanism to help determine objectives. Krause opined that the Workgroup would be able to articulate what issues they need to resolve. Hillemeier asked if the Workgroup could get this figured out before the next TMC February phone conference and to report back at that time. He also suggested the Gravel Workgroup plan to meet monthly or as needed to do this. Hillemeier also asked that the Workgroup identify needed resources such as an expert geomorphologist.

7. Report from Executive Director

Robin Schrock, Executive Director of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) presented her report by commenting on the Action Tracker and the 2015 budget.

Action Tracker

Schrock noted a couple of items on the Action Tracker. One was the draft letter to the Regional Director on Trinity River temperature studies. Person asked that all responses be submitted to him so he can finalize the letter.

She also commented on the request of TMC to the SAB asking for written guidance on work in watersheds.

2015 Budget

The federal budget that was signed last night has only a total amount for Reclamation with no details for restoration. Schrock had held some conversations regarding what funding they may receive. \$15.65 million can be used as the 2015 budget for planning purposes.

8. Public comments

No comments.

Adjourn Day 1 5:05 PM

Day 2, Thursday, September 18, 2014, 9:30 AM; Trinity County Library

Brian Person called the meeting to order. He noted that he would have to leave shortly for an important conference call. Also Ann Garrett had emailed him to announce that she was accepting a permanent position in Hawaii. There was discussion over who would be the next chair of the TMC. Federico Barajas, Person's replacement was new to the program. Bruce Bingham and Terri Simon Jackson, the other federal members, were also still new.

There was discussion to nominate Seth Naman to be chair as a person but not necessarily elect any NOAA future representative. In constructing the motion, the TMC wanted someone with experience on the TMC.

Judy Pflueger made a motion that Seth Naman will serve as TMC chair for the year 2015 as long as Seth Naman is NOAA's selected representative. Federico Barajas will serve as vice chair.

The motion was seconded by Dave Hillemeier.

The motion passed unanimously.

Information / Decision Items:

9. Cold Water Pool Sensitivity Analysis

This presentation was moved to Day 1 and presented as part of Item 6, the Science and Workgroup Updates.

10. DSS Components Update

Ernie Clarke passed out two handouts and gave a Powerpoint presentation on the Decision Support System (DSS). He pointed out that the DSS was recommended by the SAB as a suite of models to help decisions.

Clarke went over a set of decisions that have been made up to this date. The TMC agreed to fund the fish production model. Clarke said the IDT is asking the TMC to appoint a lead for the DSS.

Dave Hillemeier asked Andreas Krause to comment on the DSS lead. Krause noted that, because the DSS is one component of an adaptive program and that there are gaps and weakness in the

adaptive management, they should identify an adaptive management lead instead of a DSS lead. He noted Ernie Clarke has done a great job on the science coordinator and does much of the adaptive management, but this is two jobs. Bruce Bingham opined the setup of the DSS is perhaps more important at this time than identifying the adaptive management lead. The DSS is a component of the adaptive management strategy. Bingham asked how well adaptive management is being carried out in the TRRP and that this is a bigger issue and needs more discussion. This prompted more discussion about how different stakeholders saw the role of the DSS lead. The IDT found that they were underpowered to provide leadership for lack of time. Besides the need to lead the DSS, there was a perceived need to lead all aspects of integrating adaptive management.

Seth Naman suggested a group be formed of Robin Schrock, Andreas Krause and other members of the IDT to consider this issue. Ernie Clarke said they can come back for the March meeting to present more information on this issue including the status of the DSS components, a draft implementation plan, and recommendation for a DSS lead.

11. Lower Klamath Fish Health Monitoring

Mike Belchik introduced himself as a fisheries biologist for the Yurok Tribe working on the Klamath River. He gave a Powerpoint presentation on the fish health monitoring of fish parasite ich and the events that occurred this year. He gave some background of ich noting the loss of 30,000 to 70,000 adult fish mortality in 2002. They found low to moderate cases of ich in 2003 and it was not noted in subsequent years. The USFWS pathologist has defined 30 ich per gill arch as an infection threshold. Ich appears as small white specks about the size of a grain of salt embedded in gills. It is difficult to see by eye or a hand lens. There was concern in 2014 based on elevated adult holding at Blue Creek as a thermal refuge combined with the low flows and warm weather. They began monitoring of adult fish July 17 and found no ich detections. July 25 a pink salmon at Pecwan refugia was moribund, but upon examination of a photo, experts did not think it was ich because the infections did not appear to be embedded in the gill. On September 13, 2014 ich was confirmed. Sampling at Tectah Creek found more ich. The next Monday, Dr. Scott Foote confirmed that the trigger for disease was reached and emergency flows were started.

Belchik described how they developed the process of gill sampling. He noted that despite the emergency flows, counts continued to climb and a fish kill seemed imminent. 100% of fish at Weitchpec had ich. He noted that he had good cooperation from the other tribes but he was not able to sample fish upstream of the Karuk Tribe as a result of Ca DFW prohibitions on gill netting off of reservations. They were able to get fish samples at Iron Gate Hatchery and these fish had very low infections of ich. They hypothesized that these fish could shed ich as they swam upriver. The life cycle of ich infections is to drop off the gill to reproduce. Another hypothesis is that the later run fish they sampled downriver never made it upstream. However, they observed relatively low pre-spawn mortality, suggesting to Belchik that the ich drops off as fish head upriver.

Belchik noted several conclusions. The early warning for ich appears to work. This was the first detection of ich without first finding dead fish. Their protocol for counting ich worked well. There are still many questions such as the effect of flow. No major fish kill was observed.

Belchik answered several questions such as the techniques to sample ich. They have not detected ich in juvenile fish. Salt water kills ich. They have not yet found a way to sample ich in the water or apart from the gills of fish. The fish in the Klamath seem to tolerate higher infection rates for ich. Because of these high infection rates and low mortality, Brian Person noted that the upcoming draft plan for emergency releases will pose questions as to whether the releases did

have a positive effect in reducing the ich mortality of fish. Paul Zedonis said he could be a contact in Reclamation for helping with the data assembly and analysis.

12. Public Forum

Before closing the meeting, Brian Person asked for any remaining public comments.

Kristi Bevard introduced herself as a recently returned Lewiston resident. She asked about the term stakeholders and suggested that the public does not consider themselves stakeholders. Elizabeth Hadley said there is a position on the TAMWG for public representation.

Robin Schrock said in their future announcements of meetings they will try to clarify that public is welcome to participate as stakeholders. She also noted that Michele Gallagher has taken on a greater role in program public outreach.

Robin Schrock used this opportunity to describe some public outreach activities. She noted a recent float along the river where the public were able to meet with experts at sites on the river. There were complaints that it was not advertised early enough in the newspaper. Another float will be organized for next year. She noted other field days that staff have acted as instructors to middle school students in restoration activities.

Robert Franklin noted that adaptive management will call for change and asked how this bears for the program. He also took this time to note that despite being on opposite sides of issues he liked Person and he expressed his appreciation for his service.

Andreas Krause acknowledged Bruce Bingham earlier stated concerns about the need to first address DSS before adaptive management. Krause said he hoped that the March discussion about DSS will not forget about the need to address synthesis and begin adaptive management. Krause further noted that they still do not have the synthesis reports that Bingham had asked about such as the overall effects of flow releases.

Krause's comments prompted more discussion. Seth Naman opined that the situation is not as dire as Krause laid out as they do have a pretty good idea of the effects of flow on sediment and riparian development, but acknowledged the value of a synthesis report. Bruce Bingham noted that program like the TRRP normally produces synthesis reports every 5 or 10 years. Naman noted that much of this synthesis information is in reports. Bingham said it may be but it does not appear to be fully synthesized and integrated into management decisions.

Many of the TMC members agreed about the need for more synthesis. Sean Ledwin noted ways that the current process does not provided the flexibility for synthesis. Dave Hillemeier agreed about the need for synthesis and noted the lessons learned workshops are important. Brian Person noted that over his nine years, a great deal has been expended to acquire an impressive amount of data and little time devoted to analysis and synthesis—especially analysis that would inform the next steps. He noted the changes from a Hocker Flat approach to the Sven Oberson approach but did not know from where this change came. Terri Simon-Jackson noted the program is at a cross roads and opined it is important to document the decisions for change. Ernie Clarke noted the difficulty in making changes, even small changes in this program. He noted the complex science selection process that still came up with the same projects as before. It has been difficult to trim very expensive projects. Robin Schrock noted that the budget process needs to ask for the same level of accountability as the science projects that now have both internal and external reviews. Sean Ledwin noted that the process creates reverse incentives and has had large projects grandfathered in. He thought there may be a way to have a more unified workplan with base funding. The current process is stuck in doing the same thing

over and over. Andreas Krause said synthesis is not a one-year effort and it needs to be paired with the strategic plan.

Judy Pflueger called for more maturity on the TMC, noting that the minutes take forever to get approved and that the TMC discusses issues for excessive lengths of time. She noted that changes are difficult and they need to gain some maturity. She appreciates the learning opportunity here, but we get stuck on minor details. The January meeting will be her last as Trinity County will be appointing a new replacement.

Tom Stokely thanked Brian Person and Judy Pflueger for their years of service.

Brian Person wished good things for the TMC members and program partners and said he cared for them. He recognized that some people are entrenched in their positions but he has never questioned their commitment to the program. He may go to work in Redding and has promised to follow his wife and her career in Boise in about a year.

13. TMC Meeting Dates

Schedule for 2015 was discussed at the end of Day 1 as some members would not be present on Day 2. The following schedule was decided.

January 15	conference call
February 19	conference call
March 25-26	TMC meeting at Forest Service in Redding
April 9& 16	conference calls tentative for water decisions
May 14	conference call
June 24-25	TMC meeting in Eureka
July 16	conference call
August 13	conference call
September 16-17	TMC meeting in Weitchpec
October 15	conference call
November 19	conference call
December 16 – 17	Weaverville, CA

Adjourn Day 2, 11:55 AM

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
Draft Agenda
December 17-18, 2014
Trinity PUD, December 17
Trinity County Library, December 18
Trinity PUD

Wednesday, December 17, 2014

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic, Purpose and/or Decision to be Made</u>	<u>Discussion Leader</u>
<i>Regular Business:</i>		
9:00	Introductions: ▪ Approval of Agenda ▪ Acknowledgements – TMC members	Brian Person, Chair
9:15	Open Forum: Comments from the public	Brian Person
9:45	Report from TMC Chair ▪ Federal/Regional updates FLAP ▪ Long Term Flow Augmentation Plan for the Lower Klamath ▪ TRH update ▪ BLM land acquisition - Trinity River priority ▪ Humboldt County Membership Request and TMC by-laws ▪ TAMWG recommendations	Brian Person
10:45	Report from TAMWG Chair	Tom Stokely
11:15	Implementation Update ▪ Design/Implementation Update for 2015/2016 ▪ Rehabilitation Project Prioritization Outcome ▪ New Design Process ▪ Design Team Technical Memorandum	DJ Bandrowski
12:15	Lunch	
<i>Information / Decision Items:</i>		
1:15	Compliance Update	Brandt Gutermuth
2:15	Science Update ▪ TRRP Program Workshop ○ TMC recommendation for next workshop	Ernie Clarke

- Channel Rehabilitation Workshop report
- Workgroup Updates

3:15	2015 Water Year	Robert Stewart
4:15	Report from Executive Director	Robin Schrock
	▪ Action Tracker ▪ 2015 Budget ▪ Restoration Fund Summary ▪ Watershed ○ ROD guidance ○ CVPIA statutory authorization	
5:00	Public comments	
5:15	Adjourn	

Trinity County Library

Thursday, December 18, 2014

Time	Topic, Purpose and/or Decision to be Made	Discussion Leader
-------------	--	--------------------------

Information / Decision Items:

9:30	Water Temperatures	Paul Zedonis
	▪ Cold Water Pool Sensitivity Analysis - Scoping Status	
10:00	DSS Components Update	TBD
10:30	Lower Klamath Fish Health Monitoring	Mike Belchik
11:00	Public Forum	
11:30	TMC 2015 meeting dates/locations	Brian Person
11:00	Adjourn	