

Final Minutes TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

March 25-26, 2015
US Forest Service, 3644 Avtech Parkway
Redding, CA 96002

Wednesday, March 25, 2015; 9:30 AM

Attending Members

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

1) Filled by George Kautsky unit discussion of item 3 2) Non-voting members.

Others that attended: Ernie Clarke, Robert Stewart, Brandt Gutermuth, Robert Stewart, Logan Negherbon, Dave Gaeuman (Trinity River Restoration Program); George Kautsky, Seth Ledwin, James Lee (Hoopa Valley Tribe); Justin Day (Redding Electric); Tony LaBanca (Ca DFW); Bill Brock (Forest Service); Ed Duggan (Willow Creek Comm Serv District); Joe Polos, Conor Shea (US FWS); Don Bader (USBR); Alex Cousins (Trinity Co. RCD); Tim Hayden, Andreas Krause (Yurok Tribe); Kristi Bevard (Lewiston resident); Paul Hauser (Trinity PUD).

Attended by phone: Paul Zedonis (USBR).

Notes: Kim Mattson (ENW).

List of Motions made during the Meeting

Mike Orcutt made a motion to adopt the flow recommendations for the dry year alternative peak or if in a normal water year, to adopt the normal year water alternative peak as recommended by the Flow Workgroup. The TMC further urges the BOR to pursue all other options to preserve the cold water pool to meet Trinity River objective for the remainder of the year.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 6 “Yes” votes; Trinity County voted “No” and the Bureau of Reclamation abstained.

Keith Groves made a motion to accept the gravel recommendations based on the water year type as presented.

Teresa Connor seconded the motion

The motion passed unanimously.

Other Decisions or Action Items made during the Meeting

1. Seth Naman and Bruce Bingham and Teresa Connor will seek guidance from their respective agencies whether or not the TMC can hold closed door meetings and report back at the next coordination call.
2. Terri Simon-Jackson will do more research on what is needed to satisfy her interpretation regarding the amendments to the by-laws Section 605 on being transparent to the public.
3. Robin Schrock will seek guidance from the SAB on the types of expertise to be supplied by new rotating members and will forward to TMC members. TMC members will then provide recommendations on potential SAB members back to Schrock.
4. Seth Naman will contact Humboldt County regarding their interest in joining the TMC and will invite a County representative to attend the next TMC meeting in June.
5. Seth Naman will update the by-laws to make the unanimous voting section more clear.
6. Seth Naman will seek signatures to the by-laws from the TMC members.
7. Seth Naman and other TMC members will write a letter of support to the Regional Water Quality Control Board in support of the permit for channel construction.
8. Seth Naman, Elizabeth Hadley, and Robin Schrock will work on plans for the joint meeting scheduled for August.
9. Ernie Clarke and Robin Schrock will prepare a briefing paper on top down management and the restructuring of the program.
10. Seth Naman will circulate the draft temperature management letter before the next coordination phone call.
11. Robin Schrock and Joe Polos will work on a tentative schedule for completion of the SRH2D hydrologic model before the next coordination call.
12. Sean Ledwin will prepare a white paper on the values of stream roughness and connectivity to the floodplain.

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 if they could reconvene at 1:15 PM following lunch tomorrow. The agenda was approved.

2. Open Forum and Comments from the Public

No comments at this time.

3. Report from Trinity Management Council Chair

TMC Action Items

Seth Naman proposed they table the discussion of the TMC Action Items until tomorrow as this will be covered by Federico Barajas then.

Seth Naman asked Joe Polos to review the TAMWG Charter and membership renewal process. Polos noted that the TAMWG members are approved and the list of members was in the packets for the TMC members. He reviewed that the Charter needs renewal every two years and the members are renewed every three years. The two renewals came on the same year this year. The Charter renewal occurred quickly, but not the membership renewal. The TAMWG was not able to meet this quarter as the renewals had not yet been approved in time to meet the federal register deadline for publishing their meeting.

By-laws Discussion

Naman noted his email sent out January 20 about the by-laws and Robert's Rules of Order regarding adding new entities and signatures. He referred to the copy of the by-laws in the members packets. He said they were seeking a signature of each member to the by-laws.

Teresa Connor commented that there had been a request to have a closed-door meeting regarding adding new entities. Naman pointed out the by-laws only allow for public meetings. Therefore to have closed-door meetings would require an amendment in the by-laws. Joe Polos said the TMC is not a FACA group and therefore do not have to follow those rules. But he noted that the Brown Act rules may apply. There was discussion about the phone calls and public attendance or lack of on these calls. (The next day, Keith Groves said the Trinity County Council did not think the Brown Act would apply to TMC meetings.)

Dave Hillemeier thought they need to ask the Solicitor about how to proceed. Bruce Bingham thought it would be important to describe what would be covered in these closed meetings. Bill Brock noted that in the past, they had additional meetings beyond the normal meeting times.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to ask for guidance from Interior and Cal for regulations for TMC to hold closed meetings. The motion also asked for any restrictions on subject matter.

During discussion of the motion, Mike Orcutt commented that such a motion could be useful but it could also "box the TMC in." He opined that it may be better to use their current discretionary or administrative ways to get at these issues. He thought they could have some level of closed door discussions already.

Dave Hillemeier said if Orcutt's characterization is indeed the case, he would be willing to pull his motion. There was more discussion about what the by-laws said on the topic of public participation. Bruce Bingham said members of the public may object. If having closed door meetings becomes a regular process, it may need to be made a formal process via the by-laws. Seth Naman quoted the by-laws that regular and special meetings are open to the public. Keith Groves noted that the by-laws cannot be more clear--that meetings shall be open to the public. Elizabeth Hadley thought the TAMWG should be present during any meetings where voting occurs such as phone calls.

Dave Hillemeier withdrew his motion.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion for the TMC to seek legal guidance from Interior and State of California regarding limitations for holding meetings not open to the public or portions of meetings not open to the public. If not, are there any limitations on the topics to be discussed in closed meetings? If so, what are those limitations?

Teresa Connor seconded the motion.

Dave Hillemeier withdrew the motion based on the discussion above.

In place of the motion, the following action item was made.

Seth Naman and Bruce Bingham and Teresa Connor will seek guidance from their respective agencies whether or not the TMC can hold closed door meetings and report back at the next coordination call.

The TMC returned to the original discussion of approval of the by-laws. Naman noted the copy of the amended by-laws with the highlighted sections 605 in their packets. This prompted discussion about whether or not they needed to sign the by-laws. It was pointed out that Section 800 allows amendments may be adopted and therefore do not require signatures.

Terri Simon-Jackson said she was not ready to vote on the by-laws without more clarification on Section 605 paragraphs (a) and (b) voting without public inputs. She suggested that any matter of business to be voted on be brought back to an open forum to allow for public comments.

Teresa Connor noted examples where they voted on phone calls such as the need to approve water year schedules after the April 1 determination, to approve minutes, and to approve gravel management actions.

Elizabeth Hadley opined that the phone calls were being used a little too frequently for votes. Keith Groves thought they could hold a special meeting by phone and allow the public to participate. Naman asked if they can table this discussion until they hear back from their research. Groves disagreed. Hillemeier said he would do research on what the minutes said tonight and bring it up tomorrow.

Terri Simon-Jackson agreed to do more research on what is needed to satisfy her interpretation on being transparent to the public.

Naman said they may still need to discuss Robert's Rules of Order weigh in regarding the adding of new entities. He asked if there were any questions regarding his email on this subject. There were none.

4. Federal/Regional Updates

Federico Barajas commented on the 2015 Central Valley Project (CVP) Initial Water Supply Allocation made on February 27, 2015. Reclamation determined that it is a Shasta critical year for 2015. For senior water rights holders (i.e., those with pre-1914 rights), will have their allocation reduced by 25% per contract. Agricultural water service contractors North-of-Delta are allocated 0 percent of their contract quantity. M&I water service contractors North-of-Delta will receive enough water to meet their health and safety needs or at least 25 percent of their historic use, whichever is greater. Barajas noted that it is a drought year on top of three previous drought years. He noted that last year M&I got 50% of allocations. Trinity is 11 feet below levels of last year. With the exception of Shasta, all major CVP reservoirs have less water than last year.

Keith Groves asked if they will shift more water out of Shasta. Barajas said yes, they will rely on it to a greater extent. Mike Orcutt asked if it will be as aggressive as last year, involving people in high levels of government. Barajas said it will be as aggressive or even more so.

Barajas next gave an update on the Lower Klamath River Long-term Plan. Reclamation has received comments and plans to have a final draft on March 31. It is anticipated at this point that they will be proceeding with a full EIS. The EIS is a major document and is not expected to be completed this year. Dave Hillemeier asked how they will operate this year. Barajas said they will have a concurrent path to address 2015. Mike Orcutt asked if the long-term plan will be the preferred alternative. Barajas did not know at this time. To the extent they can, they will include a range of alternatives and address the legal issues identified.

5. Report from TAMWG

Elizabeth Hadley, Chair of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG), reported that they did not hold their spring quarterly meeting.

Before breaking for lunch the TMC took up Items 7, 8 and 9.

Lunch

6. Humboldt County TMC Membership

This item was discussed following Item 9. Seth Naman said it would be useful to discuss the merits of having Humboldt County and what their potential role may be.

Naman started the discussion by stating that he thought it was a good idea to have Humboldt County on board and they have a stake in the claim to some of the water. He said Ryan Sundberg and others have expressed interest in serving on the TMC. Federico Barajas commented that the County has a legal right to request uses of their 50,000 acre-feet for their benefit. Elizabeth Hadley noted that the TAMWG also brought this up and a motion did not pass. She said there were two schools of thought—one being that Humboldt County deserved a right to be on the TMC, the other being that the County has not participated lately and that they could instead seek a seat on the TAMWG. Keith Groves asked if Humboldt County could sell their water and send it down the tunnels. Teresa Connor said Humboldt County had written a letter to the TMC requesting a seat but then withdrew their request at the December 2014 TMC meeting. Naman said that was more of a question of delegation of authority. Mike Orcutt noted they are getting into “arm-chair quarterbacking.” He reviewed that, at the February phone call, they were discussing a number of issues, and he had requested this item be deferred to a meeting in April and that they invite Humboldt County to that meeting for discussions.

During further discussion, it was reviewed that a letter was written by Humboldt County requesting membership and that the request was not withdrawn but deferred. Review of the by-laws provides guidance on membership. Teresa Connor said it would be good to have Humboldt County at a meeting to answer questions. Orcutt noted this is a reconsideration of a past action that has been voted on. Terri Simon-Jackson asked why have another vote if it had already been voted on and not passed and if it was known that it will not be passed.

Naman said the next meeting will be in Eureka and that will be a good venue to have Humboldt County attend and be able to field questions.

Federico Barajas suggested the TMC Chair ask the County if they are still interested and to invite them to attend the next June meeting.

Bruce Bingham noted that the by-laws Section 300 and Section 603 do not specify a unanimous vote is needed to accept new members. If the TMC wishes it to be a unanimous vote, the by-laws need to state this.

Naman said he would work with Simon-Jackson on this and closed door sessions. He would send out his draft to Robin Schrock and then it would be sent on to the membership.

7. Report from Executive Director

Robin Schrock gave her report before lunch following Item 5.

TRRP 2015 Assessment Strategy by Water Year

Robin Schrock explained that, because of the drought, they are considering alternatives for geomorphic assessments and are seeking input from the workgroups. These assessments will contribute to the fish production model. The alternatives will be proposed to the TMC.

Organizational Updates

Rotations among the Science Advisory Boards are being considered.

All TMC members are being asked to suggest candidates for replacement of Claire Stalnaker's position by April. They were asked to provide a statement of skills and the CV of the candidates. Joe Polos asked Schrock to ask the SAB what skills they thought were needed.

Schrock gave some explanation of funding up and downs and noted that Limekiln Gulch was funded and Bucktail Phase I was included once extra funding became available. She noted that the 2016 Presidents budget proposes flat funding comparable to last year.

Work Group Updates

Schrock noted some updates from the workgroups. She noted that the Flow, Gravel, Design, and Watershed Workgroups will have presentations tomorrow. The Fish Workgroup prepared a 2016 workplan and they are looking at the river corridor management strategy. Wildlife and Riparian did not meet. Public meetings were held but there was no public attendance at the March 11 meeting for the Limekiln Gulch Draft Environmental Assessment. She noted the newly posted final documents and publications on their website. She noted an upcoming public meeting in Weaverville by the North Coast Regional Water Quality Board for public comments on the recertification of the program's Water Quality Certification for Rehabilitation Projects.

Information/Decision Items

8. Solicitor's Watershed Guidance

This item was addressed before lunch. Federico Barajas referenced an email distributed to the TMC members on February 25 regarding the guidance on TRRP work in tributaries of the watershed. Barajas noted that this guidance was from the Interior's solicitor office that provides legal advice to the agencies. One attachment to the email was a solicitor's authority summary document and the second attachment is a memorandum from the Solicitor to Interior Secretary titled: *Trinity River Flow Evaluation Study*, dated May 22, 1998. The summary noted that the Trinity River program is limited in the scope as to how far into the watershed it should go. Barajas said funding is tied to the authority and this scoped area of the Trinity River.

Teresa Connor asked for clarification. She said her impression was that this guidance was to stay within the 40 miles restoration on the mainstem and it is not a tool for the tributaries and that the emails confirmed this unless a causal linkage to the operation of the TRD is clearly demonstrated. Barajas said he would need to review the three elements of fish passage, fine

sediment reduction, increased coarse sediment, but in general it is backing up the original philosophy of limited work in watersheds.

Seth Naman summarized that this should be clear guidance for groups such as the Watershed Workgroup so they can know what types of projects are allowed.

It was clarified that if there were downstream impacts from the dams and the projects and if the TMC can find a direct link, they can devote funding in these cases.

Seth Naman suggested the TMC write guidance and provide it to the Watershed Workgroup.

9. Funding Opportunity Announcement

This item was discussed before lunch. Robin Schrock went over the Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) first presented at the Weitchpec meeting. The project would be advertised on Grants.gov. It was sent to the solicitors for comments and we are waiting to hear back. The work group will review it and the TMC will get to see it. The deadline for advertising is June. Ernie Clarke said they are trying to clarify the proposals geographic extent and types of proposals. Sean Ledwin will provide a copy and provide decision points to TMC tomorrow.

Ed Duggan commented that the guides groups have asked what is the definition of the watershed and they want more spending in the tributaries. He is of the opinion the watershed includes the tributaries up to the top of the watershed. He noted that the tributary mouths are often blocked and fish cannot access the restored tributaries such as Soldier Creek.

10. Implementation Update

Conor Shea of the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and Logan Negherbon of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) presented a Powerpoint presentation on the Implementation Update.

2014 Rehabilitation Project Update

Negherbon reported that the Lower Junction City that was completed with the final walk though several weeks ago. He showed over-head views of the final design features. For this year, they will be constructing Upper Douglas City and Limekiln Gulch. At Upper Douglas City they will be completing a forced meander. At Limekiln Gulch they will be building side channels and a wood structure and two gradient features.

2015 Rehabilitation Projects Updates

Shea described the Bucktail site that will have a new bridge replaced. Trinity County is seeking funding and it is not available yet. The goal is to get the permits in place so funding can be obtained this year. This means a 2016 implementation for this site.

Out year Project Designs

Shea continued the presentation and listed the next projects as Dutch Creek and a lower valley suite of several projects. The Lower Dutch Creek is in the final stages of design for an alternative that has consensus from the Design Team. The Upper Dutch Creek needs more research as it poses problems of high terraces and a straight reach. The lower valley suite projects are Chapman Ranch, Deep Gulch, and Sheridan Creek all next door to each other. Chapman Ranch design is assigned to the Hoopa Valley Tribe with help by McBain and

Associates, Deep Gulch design is assigned to the Federal Design Group led by Gaeuman and others, and the Sheridan design is being done by the Yurok Tribe led by Aaron Martin and others.

They are using a joint hydraulic model under development by the Bureau of Reclamation. The schedule is to have designs finalized by December 2015. The designs will be coordinated and will be model driven. The goal is to increase the habitat across the range of discharges.

Robert Franklin asked if the goals of the design shouldn't be river health and its capacity for renewal instead of being habitat driven. Shea said the design group struggles with these questions and they hope they are doing both habitat and health improvements.

11. Compliance Update

Brandt Gutermuth gave a Powerpoint presentation on the Compliance Update and the 5-year 401 water quality certifications for three types of permits. He reviewed that in 2009 there was a programmatic environmental impact report led by the North Coast Regional Water Control Board (NCRWQCB) that led to a set of long-term permits. The long-term coarse sediment management and fine sediment management permits expired in January 20, 2015. Channel rehabilitation permit will expire May 20, 2015. New permit applications are being processed and are anticipated for April 29. The NCRWQCB has a public meeting scheduled for 7-9 PM on March 26 at the Weaverville Public Library to explain the channel rehabilitation permit to protect water quality. They hope to get a permit by June 1st.

Gutermuth mentioned the revegetation goal is to have no net loss of riparian and wetlands (1:1 areal replacement) per their permits from the State. He noted it is difficult to grow restoration vegetation on riparian areas where there is little soil and in the fourth year of drought

Another thing they are working on is the Biological Assessment (BA) and the Biological Opinion (BO) from the National Marine Fisheries Service on channel rehabilitation, fine and coarse sediment management, infrastructure for high flows and restoration, and a portion of the watershed activities. They hope to get the BO from FWS in April and it should cover multiple species such as the northern spotted owl changes in critical habitat, eagle now delisted, yellow billed cuckoo surveys for presence, and fisher.

12. Public forum

Kristi Brevard introduced herself as Tom Stokely's TAMWG alternative and asked about burning at Lowden. Brandt Gutermuth said he will discuss this with her. Teresa Connor also noted that the State owns property there and they are opposed to burning on their property.

Robert Franklin commented he is a member of communities at Hoopa Valley and the Coast. He thinks there are many people down river that are interested in and affected by the program. The program has done a poor job of reaching down-river residents and anglers.

Seth Naman asked if having Humboldt County on the TMC may help with outreach. Franklin thought this may help as it is good to have people to meet in coffee shops and have opportunities to talk about the river. Naman asked if advertising may help to get more public attendance at the June meeting. Dave Hillemeier suggested a field trip or a float. Keith Groves said they sometimes have the same feelings about the top half of the river—that is, the area above the dam is ignored. Robin Schrock said that the program should repeat its message. She also noted that outreach has been attempted down river and response has been poor. She asked that all members and TAMWG help with providing outreach. George Kautsky questioned the idea that areas were being ignored and drew attention to the new TAMWG membership by commercial fisheries and by Trinity Lake.

Adjourn Day 1 4:30 PM**Day 2, Thursday, March 26, 2015 9:05 AM**

Seth Naman called the meeting to order.

Information / Decision Items:**13. Open Forum**

Mike Orcutt noted the under-prediction of the runs last year together with the uncertainties in the hydrology and asked about the path forward for using water releases this year. Federico Barajas said the Bureau is watching the conditions and will be waiting for more hydrology and information on the fish runs and will be formulating a plan and will be ready to implement it if needed.

Elizabeth Hadley mentioned opportunities for a joint meeting and float on the river. Seth Naman thought a joint meeting between the June and September meetings might be possible. Ernie Clarke mentioned a “lessons learned” workshop that could be held in conjunction with a joint meeting in September. This type of meeting may be better held in Weaverville. Dave Hillemeier thought there may be some merit for a joint meeting in July or August. Mike Orcutt said he enjoyed the float and thought it was good way for more informal discussion. Keith Groves suggested they choose the August 13 since that is the conference call date. Dave Hillemeier thought visiting construction sites is a good idea such as Lorenz or the Junction City sites.

Naman asked the members to lock in August 13 for the date of the joint meeting. Naman said he would work with Hadley and Joe Polos about the details.

14. Science Update

Ernie Clarke passed out an outline as part of his presentation on the Science Update. He mentioned he went on a detail for one month and learned about a different part of the FWS. He noted they have made an offer to a fish biologist that would be a FWS position working in Weaverville.

Annual Work Plan (AWP) timeline –for 2016 AWP

Clarke noted that a preliminary plan is expected to be delivered to the TMC in June. The priorities from workgroups will largely be the same. They are behind the intended timeline as they address additional rehabilitation sites, adopt the river corridor concept, bolster adaptive management, and address discrepancies in expectations in the “RIG” versus “Science” efforts.

Workgroups

Clarke explained how the river corridor concept may help to integrate the workgroups and make the program stronger. He further recommends the reduction of the separate workgroups. Robin Schrock said the Science Advisory Board recommended more integration of the RIG with the Science. Bruce Bingham thought this offers tremendous opportunities but would entail a much larger discussion of at least a day about business needs and operations as restructuring of staffing occurred. He thought it is important for the TMC to have a common vision before marching down that road of restructuring.

Terri Simon-Jackson suggested that Clarke and Robin Schrock might prepare a paper or briefing for the TMC members on the concepts of restructuring as explained by Clarke.

Dave Hillemeier said this is very related to their adaptive management program and mentioned that Andreas Krause may be able to put some of these ideas on paper. Mike Orcutt commented that this has been discussed for some time. The Tribe has continued to raise this with the trustee agencies. He suggested more in-depth discussion and possibly a closed session. Keith Groves said as an outsider, he is a bit confused. Normally, if this were a business, management would come with a plan as how to restructure. Mike Orcutt reviewed a restructuring attempt in 2007.

Continuing his presentation, Clarke said that projects will be preparing quarterly reports from now on with updates. He noted several reports in progress.

15. Fish Production Model

Joe Polos gave a Powerpoint presentation on the work on a fish production model (stream salmonid simulator or S3). He reviewed the history that it was recommended by the SAB, approved by the TMC, and its goal is to predict juvenile chinook production. Polos listed the ways the model could support the TRRP adaptive management efforts by evaluating: 1) the response of fish to varying flows; 2) the response of fish to channel rehabilitation; and 3) the overall restoration strategy of the TRRP utilizing potential habitat estimates to attain fish population goals.

The third item above prompted discussion about the goals of the TRRP.

Polos continued his presentation and mentioned that the model may also be used to evaluate the effects of water temperature related to flow and reservoir. He listed a variety of scenarios that the model could be used for: flow, channel change, hatchery, reservoir, predations, tributary productions, and climate change.

Regarding the current status of the fish model, Polos said it was waiting on the hydrodynamic model, SRH2D which was behind schedule. The fish model needs three components: 1) water temperature model, 2) flow data, and 3) flow-habitat relationships. He noted that the fish model may need to proceed without the SRH2D model.

The path forward involves continued development of datasets. A workshop is planned for the summer or fall to present status of the model. He asked whether expansion of the habitat component of the model from the North Fork to Weitchpec should be planned as part of the 2016 efforts.

16. Water Year 2015

Robert Stewart gave a Powerpoint presentation on 2015 flow recommendations.

Current Conditions

Trinity Lake is about 67% of normal (or 49% full). The drought in Trinity County was in extreme status but this has improved to severe status. NOAA predicts the drought will continue or intensify. Snow packs are low and are considered to be similar to last year and the dry years of 1976-77. The Inflow Forecast is heading to a dry year by April 1.

Flow Recommendations

Stewart showed potential hydrographs for this year's releases from Trinity Lake. He described a Dry Alternative 1 Peak that contained a peak release of 8,500 cfs. He showed an analogous alternative for a Normal water year with a peak release of 9,000 cfs. These alternatives varied from the ROD hydrographs that had flatter peaks of 4,500 and 6,000 cfs for Dry and Wet years, respectively. The alternatives concentrated the flows into higher peak flows but used the same amount of water over the year.

Temperature modeling using a presumed 50 degree F continuous release from Trinity showed the proposed alternative hydrograph for Normal year would be 2 degrees F is warmer during July at Weitchpec compared to the ROD hydrograph. Dry alternative hydrograph was similar to ROD for temperatures at Weitchpec.

Stewart summarized his presentation as the proposed hydrographs do more geomorphic work and accomplish the ROD objectives.

Paul Hauser asked if they gave any consideration to saving water for fall flows. Stewart said no, they only consider ROD objectives. Hauser thought it is prudent for TMC to consider this reserve. Federico Barajas said Reclamation is going to look at those specific conditions as they develop the option of a 50,000 acre-foot scenario. Hauser was worried that under these releases, they may not have any ROD water left. Keith Groves asked if the Bureau can't over-rule these proposed releases. Barajas said Reclamation will have to follow its legal and regulatory obligations and they are operating in a new light given the legal exposure that has developed.

Stewart explained the higher peaks will provide scour along banks to discourage establishing willows and the receding limb is designed for cottonwoods and amphibians. Dave Gaeuman also mentioned that the high peaks in the recommendations are to help mobilize the gravel deposits at tributary mouths that resulted from the high spring flows this year.

High-flow Gravel Recommendations

Stewart showed locations for the two injection sites (Diversion Pool and Lowden Ranch). Under a Dry year, the Diversion Pool would get 1,500 tons and Lowden Ranch would get 1,050 tons. Under a Normal year, these volumes would be increases by approximately 500 tons at each site.

Seth Naman asked Stewart to explain the rationale for the increased peak flow over that prescribed by the ROD. Stewart said these higher flows will help to inform the design and will help to mobilize deposition at tributary mouths. Gaeuman explained that as flows increase, the ability to mobilize the bed increases exponentially. So by doubling the volume of the flow and halving the time of the flow, you can move much more gravel.

Naman asked for discussion about holding water back for fall flows. Members asked if they could caucus over lunch on this subject. Conor Shea suggested they consider where this water would come from and what effects would this have on fish production. The question was whether it was prudent to use the same volume of water and reserve a part of it for the fall and whether this would be using ROD volume of water for purposes outside of the ROD.

Andreas Krause reviewed that, in developing the ROD flows, every acre foot was considered for purposes of the ROD. There was some flexibility to recraft the flows to better meet ROD objectives. To release water in August to avoid a fish die off was not considered to be a ROD objective mainly because a fish die off had not occurred before.

After lunch Seth Naman returned to this topic and asked if the TMC wanted to take action on flow and gravel.

The flow topic was addressed first. Mike Orcutt made a motion to adopt the recommendations for flows as made by the Flow Workgroup. The motion generated a lot of discussion. Keith Groves suggested they reserve some water for the fall. Orcutt opined that they may not need the water for fall flows. He cited the Bureau as managing the system so that the water will be available for fish. He also cited the fish trigger will not likely be met this year because of expected lower returns. He finally stated that he was reasonably assured it will be handled by the court systems. Teresa Connor asked about the litigation. The Bureau had been sued and it is now being appealed. But Orcutt, Federico Barajas, nor Dave Hillemeier could speak much about the details. Hillemeier thought the solicitor's opinion supports the concept that ROD water is to be used for ROD objectives and fall flows will be met elsewhere. Paul Hauser opined that it makes

sense to reserve cool water for the fall as the fall temperature targets will not be met. Several staff of the TRRP thought the temperature targets at Weitchpec will be met. Hillemeier offered an amendment to the motion to urge BOR to preserve the cold water pool for use down river.

Mike Orcutt made a motion to adopt the flow recommendations for the dry year alternative peak or if in a normal water year, to adopt the normal year water alternative peak as recommended by the Flow Workgroup. The TMC further urges the BOR to pursue all other options to preserve the cold water pool to meet Trinity River objective for the remainder of the year.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 6 “Yes” votes; Trinity County voted “No” and the Bureau of Reclamation abstained.

After the flow recommendation, the TMC took up the consideration of the gravel injection recommendations. There was little discussion of this topic.

Keith Groves made a motion to accept the gravel recommendations based on the water year type as presented.

Teresa Connor seconded the motion

The motion passed unanimously.

17. Gravel Augmentation Presentation

Robert Stewart, Dave Gaeuman, and Andreas Krause gave Powerpoint presentations on the Long Term Gravel Augmentation Compendium.

Stewart started the presentation by listing the goals of the gravel program: 1) promoting geomorphic processes (short term), 2) sustaining geomorphic processes and fish habitat (long term). He went over the injection locations from the Hatchery down to Lowden Ranch. He noted the dredger piles that are piled up and out of reach of the river. He also noted that most restoration programs target spawning gravel but the TRRP uses gravel to also promote geomorphic processes and therefore uses slightly larger sizes. The volumes proposed are those assumed to support desired fluvial processes to produce a complex bed and these will improve anadromous salmonid populations.

Stewart said they assess the success of the gravel program by monitoring geomorphic forms, bedload budgets, and salmonid production. They do this by via measures of fine and coarse sediment transport, aerial photography, bathymetry, and creation of geomorphic maps. They are assessing juvenile habitat under a range of flows, and assess adult holding, and spawning. He showed example aerial photos of deposition and erosion at the Diversion Pool. He showed other photos of the Lowden Ranch site and results from numeric modeling of deposition. This modeling showed that injections should have no filling of a downstream anabranching section of good fish habitat. Modeling indicated total habitat would be increased at all flows in Lowden Ranch with gravel additions.

Draft Compendium

Dave Gaeuman presented results of recent analyses he had prepared regarding the gravel program. The objective of the ROD for the short term was to add 16,000 cubic yards of gravel

and for the long term to maintain river geomorphology. He noted since 2003 they have added 52,000 cubic yards of gravel and he thinks they have filled the river to close to what it was before the dam. He next addressed the long term objective. He noted that the lower tributaries have been adding gravel to the mainstem after dam construction and aerial photos show large gravel bars down stream of Indian Creek. Above Indian Creek, there are fewer gravel bars and he has estimated that 1914 +/- 440 cubic yards are needed to feed the river annually. He showed a schedule of gravel additions by water years to achieve this. He showed aerial photos of Wheel Gulch before channel rehabilitation work. Since Wheel Gulch is downriver, it is receiving gravel input from the tributaries. But the pre-construction aerial photos showed little to no gravel deposits in this relatively straight reach. Gaeuman speculated that the lack of gravel deposits despite gravel moving through Wheel Gulch was due to lack of channel complexity to trap the gravel. Aerial photos of the post-construction with added complexity showed a newly formed gravel bar. This change suggested that gravel additions are not enough and you need structure with which the gravel can interact.

Potential Next Steps

Andreas Krause gave a Powerpoint presentation on the River Corridor Management Concept. Krause noted the fundamental goals of gravel management are to develop desired channel form and produce fish habitat. He introduced a River Corridor Management Map/Strategy as a way to achieve these goals. The Gravel Workgroup realized that they cannot simply add gravel but they need to integrate their efforts. This Corridor Concept would integrate the efforts of the workgroups better. He said it would guide for a suite of management tools and would be location-specific to achieve these goals. He showed maps of a segment where both short term and long term objectives can be achieved using the River Corridor Management Map/Strategy.

Krause said the next steps are to get TMC input, present it to the IDT, and identify a core team.

The TMC appreciated these efforts. Mike Orcutt asked how other members of the Gravel Workgroup felt about the effort. Conor Shea expressed his support and noted that up to this time, they had looked at a “uniform river” and this tool requires looking at the river more closely.

Dave Hillemeier thought it was a good idea and perhaps should have been adopted years ago. He noted it can be used at next rehabilitation project sites.

Lunch

18. Riparian Vegetation Approaches

James Lee introduced himself as working for the Hoopa Valley Tribal fisheries and being stationed in Weaverville as a full time staff member on the TRRP. Before his formal presentation, he explained the ideas behind the receding limb of the design hydrograph. If the limb recession was slowed down, it was thought this would help the establishment of black cottonwood along the river edge. Black cottonwoods are thought to be species dependent on snow-melt driven stream systems.

Lee gave a Powerpoint presentation entitled “Riparian Mapping and Band Transect Sampling.” He noted that the riparian conditions have not changed very much over the recent years and the current conditions were likely set from the past gold mining along the river. The State regulations stipulate no net loss of riparian habitat and the TRRP needs to demonstrate this for their compliance for their permits. The program normally affects about 5 acres of riparian habitat per year and this is relatively a small amount of the measured habitat of about 950 acres of vegetation cover over the approximately 4,000 acres of riparian area.

He noted that they had expected lots of seedlings this year since they had low flows in the past years and little mobilization of the gravel bars. However, they are not seeing these expected high numbers. They don't know why and this should be an area of further investigation. He noted that flow effects on the upper surfaces of the floodplain is much reduced compared to the lower surfaces. They are doing manual revegetation in these upper terraces. They have moved away from using planting poles to using container stock.

He commented on how the riparian work fits into the larger picture of moving toward a healthy river. He cited the positive elements of the riparian work as being process based, being consistent with the ROD, gaining stakeholder support, and placing their work in a large or landscape perspective. He displayed a River Health Evaluation Form that asks questions about river function and scores a river to generate discussion and sheds light on the best alternative.

Mike Orcutt asked if the emergency flows may have acted to reduce seedling success. Lee agreed that the cooler water would be a stress but the flows were not large enough to create scour.

19. Trinity River Temperature Management – draft letter

Seth Naman reviewed this topic and explained that Brian Person had drafted a letter from the TMC to Reclamation asking to advance some of the temperature management studies. The TMC members should expect to see this letter.

20. Open Forum

The Open Forum segment was used to allow Sean Ledwin to give a Powerpoint on Watershed Workgroup's efforts to development of a solicitation for grant program or funding opportunity announcement (FOA). Ledwin was seeking TMC input on three elements of the process.

First, the Watershed Workgroup was proposing that applicants be among these groups: federal, state, tribes, local governments, non-profits, and universities. Ledwin noted that private landowners and for profit firms are more difficult to contract with because of regulations. He said private and for profit firms can subcontract to one of the prime contractors.

Second, the applicants will be required to show a causal link between action proposed and Section 3406 of the CVPIA. Section 3406 says that "mitigation for fish and wildlife losses incurred as result of construction operation or maintenance of the CVP shall be based on the replacement of ecologically equivalent habitat." Ledwin said that therefore funded projects would likely be focused on fine sediment reduction or creation of fish habitat connectivity. Anticipated projects included road decommissioning, wood augmentation, road treatments, erosion control, and sediment trapping. Fish habitat connectivity projects might include longitudinal and latitudinal connectivity and improving floodplain connectivity.

Third, Ledwin was seeking input on the geographic scope of the projects that may be funded. He noted the CVPIA includes language to rehabilitate habitat between Lewiston and Weitchpec but the ROD is more limited and solicitors have identified the need for a causal link.

Regarding the eligibility, the TMC responded that that the groups Ledwin listed were eligible as grant applicants.

Regarding the types of projects, it was thought that work in the tributaries should include a demonstration that there is a causal link to the mainstem. Dave Hillemeier suggested the workgroup develop a white paper on the value of stream roughness and connectivity to the floodplain as this would help convince the funders or solicitors of the value of these types of projects. The former statement by Brian Person that no "brick and mortar" projects should be constructed in the tributaries was brought up also.

Regarding the question of where, Teresa Connor thought as long as the solicitor is going to look at the FOA, the TMC does not need to make decisions about this. However, it was pointed out that the solicitation should clearly provide guidance to the applicant that they need to make the causal link to the mainstem and TRRP objectives for projects proposed in areas below the 40 miles of the TRRP.

21. TMC Chair Meeting Summary of Action Items

Seth Naman went over the action items that were assigned. These are listed on the first page of the minutes.

Adjourn Day 2, 4:12 PM

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
US Forest Service, 3644 Avtech Parkway
Redding, CA 96002
Draft Agenda for March 25-26, 2015

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Time	Topic, Purpose, and/or Decision to be Made	Discussion Leader
<i>Regular Business:</i>		
9:30	Introductions: ▪ Welcome ▪ Approval of Agenda	Seth Naman, Chair
9:45	Open Forum: Comments from the public	Seth Naman
10:00	Report from TMC Chair ▪ TMC action items ▪ By-laws discussion – signatures on 2013 as amended version	Seth Naman
10:45	Federal/Regional updates	Federico Barajas, Co-chair
11:30	Report from TAMWG	TBD
12:00	Lunch	
1:15	Humboldt County TMC membership	Seth Naman
1:45	Report from Executive Director ▪ TRRP 2015 assessment strategy by WY ▪ Organizational Updates ▪ Work Group updates ○ Quarterly summery (handout)	Robin Schrock
<i>Information / Decision Items:</i>		
2:15	Solicitor's Watershed Guidance	Federico Barajas
2:45	Funding Opportunity Announcement update	Robin Schrock
3:00	Implementation Update ▪ 2014 Rehabilitation project update ▪ 2015 Rehabilitation projects updates ▪ Outyear project designs	Conor Shea/Logan Negherbon
3:45	Compliance Update	Brandt Gutermuth
4:15	Public forum	
4:45	Adjourn	

Thursday, March 26, 2015

Time	Topic, Purpose, and/or Decision to be Made	Discussion Leader
9:00	Open Forum	
9:15	Science Update Ernie Clarke ▪ Annual Work Plan timeline / status	
9:30	Fish Production Model	Joe Polos
10:00	Water Year 2015 ▪ Current Conditions ▪ Flow recommendation ▪ High-flow gravel recommendation	R. Stewart / D. Gaeuman
11:00	Gravel Augmentation ▪ Draft compendium ▪ Potential next steps	Stewart / Gaeuman/ A. Krause
12:00	Lunch	
1:45	Riparian vegetation approaches	James Lee
2:15	Trinity River Temperature Management – draft letter	Seth Naman
2:45	Open Forum	
3:15	TMC Chair Meeting Summary of Action Items	
3:30	Adjourn	