

Final Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
 June 24-25, 2015
 Humboldt Bay Aquatic Center, 921 Waterfront Dr., Eureka, CA

Wednesday, June 24, 2015; 9:45 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	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Terri Simon-Jackson	Forest Service
Tim Hayden ¹	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 Alternate for Dave Hillemeier; ² Non-voting members.

Others that attended: George Kautsky, Sean Ledwin, Robert Franklin (Hoopa Valley Tribe); Paul Zedonis (USBR); Wade Sinnen, Tony LaBanca (Ca DFW); Bill Brock (Forest Service); Ed Duggan (Willow Creek Comm Serv District); Joe Polos, Vina Frye, Conor Shea (US FWS); Andreas Krause (Yurok Tribe); Emelia Berol (NW Environmental Center); Kristi Bevard (Lewiston resident); Denver Nelson (concerned citizen); Wes Smith (NOAA Fisheries); Paul Hauser (Trinity PUD); Bill Trush (River Institute).

Attended by phone: Ernie Clarke, Robert Stewart, Brandt Gutermuth, Logan Negherbon (TRRP).

Notes: Kim Mattson (ENW).

List of Motions made during the Meeting

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the agenda.

Teresa Conor seconded the motion

The motion passes unanimously.

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the March meeting minutes.

Terri Simon-Jackson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the TMC accept the changes to the Communication Guidelines as presented by Elizabeth Hadley.

Teresa Connor seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mike Orcutt made a motion to place the Forest Service watershed work under the right budget heading with a cap of \$500K.

The motion failed for lack of a second.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the budget be revised for all aspects of the program as directed today be and be submitted to the TMC for a discussion at a special meeting.

The motion was seconded by Keith Groves.

The motion passed unanimously.

Other Decisions or Action Items made during the Meeting

- 1. Federico Barajas will follow up with the Regional Office about the next steps regarding the Trinity River Temperature Management letter.**
- 2. Seth Naman will provide a new draft of the by-laws to the TMC.**
- 3. Seth Naman will write a letter to the TAMWG responding to their recommendations.**
- 4. Robin Schrock will provide a summary of SAB appoint terms for the TMC per Mike Orcutt's request.**
- 5. TMC members are to submit SAB nominations with contact information and a CV to Robin Schrock by July 2.**
- 6. Brandt Gutermuth and Robin Schrock will revise the budget and provide to TMC chair by mid-July.**
- 7. Terri Simon Jackson will present the Forest Service watershed restoration plan to the watershed workgroup.**

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

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the agenda.

Teresa Connor seconded the motion

The motion passes unanimously.

Approval of March Meeting Minutes

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the March meeting minutes.

Terri Simon-Jackson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Open Forum and Comments from the Public

Kristi Bevard asked if the Bureau or the TMC could make a comment on new tunnels for water diversions and whether that will result in the take more than 50% of Trinity water.

Federico Barajas responded that any new proposal would go through due process and the agencies would do outreach and be fully accountable to the public. There are constraints in the CVPIA that limit the water exported from the Trinity. There is a website on the tunnels for the Bay Delta project. There is a supplemental EIS being prepared and it will involve a public process.

3. Report from TMC Chair

Seth Naman, Chair of the Trinity Management Council (TMC) commented on action items and the progress of edits to the TMC by-laws.

TMC Action Items

Naman had drafted and signed the temperature management letter.

Tim Hayden asked if the Bureau of Reclamation Regional Office may move forward with a basin study. Federico Barajas said he would follow up on this.

Federico Barajas will follow up with the Regional Office about the next steps regarding the Trinity River Temperature Management letter.

Naman announced that a joint meeting is scheduled between TMC and the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG) at the North Fork Grange for August 13. A tour of restoration sites will occur from 9 AM to noon; lunch will be on their own; a meeting will follow from 1 AM to 3 PM at the Grange hall.

A public float is planned for Friday starting at Evans Bar at 9 AM and finish at the Lower Valley Suite of sites. Four commercial rafts are reserved for members of the public that have responded to the announcement. Four additional rafts will hold technical folks to hold discussions at stops along the float. Andreas Krause reported landowners/guides along Star Ranch Road did not hear about the float and would like to have attended. Seth Naman asked how to address this and asked if the Guides Association could be sent personal invitations for these types of events.

Regarding Humboldt County membership in the TMC, Naman said there was not much more information than what was covered at the conference call. He noted that new membership requires unanimous vote by the TMC.

This topic generated a lengthy discussion among the TMC both in support and opposed to Humboldt membership. Keith Groves asked if this matter might simply be dropped, noting that Humboldt County was not in attendance at this meeting in Eureka. Naman responded that their absence is not an indication of disinterest but an understanding that the TMC is not likely to make a unanimous vote. Mike Orcutt asked about the research about voting on a motion that formerly had failed. Naman replied that Robert's Rules of Order did not prohibit re-visiting failed motions. Teresa Connor suggested they write a response to the County. Bruce Bingham noted that previous versions of the by-laws were not clear about consensus versus unanimous votes for membership. He recommended they pass the by-laws to settle this before they respond to Humboldt County.

By-laws Approval

Seth Naman projected a copy of the TMC by-laws on the screen. Mike Orcutt queried that since the original signed copy of the by-laws cannot be found, it wasn't clear what were they approving. It was decided that this was not a major issue at this time. Bruce Bingham asked to see the language of Appendix C of the ROD regarding guidance for approval of new members. A copy was brought up on the web and projected on the screen but no guidance on approving new membership was found.

During the discussion, the TMC drafted language that adding membership requires all TMC members voting affirmative.

Regarding the ability of the TMC to hold executive or "closed-door" sessions, Elizabeth Hadley reported that TAMWG was not in favor of closed sessions, but if adopted by the TMC, it only be used as allowed by the Brown Act (e.g., personnel or legal issues). Naman pointed out that the TMC has input on hiring TRRP staff. Naman said he would draft language that the TMC would report afterwards on the topics of any closed-door sessions. Mike Orcutt added that closed-door sessions can help to get everyone on board on a topic and suggested such sessions would be useful to discover what issues may be sensitive and this would help to advance on such issues.

Further discussion of this item was tabled until later during the meeting in order to stay on agenda and hear the next presenter in Item 4. This discussion was taken up after the TMC returned from lunch.

After lunch, the TMC took up the language of the by-laws to allow executive or closed-door sessions. It was pointed out that that the Brown Act does not apply to federal agencies, so why constrain themselves? Mike Orcutt reiterated the advantages of maintaining a degree of latitude and that closed sessions allow more freedom to speak and not follow timing of an agenda. He noted this is a reason why the TMC is not a FACA group. Keith Groves stated that people in his district have questioned the secrecy of closed-door meeting; his emails ran 7-to-1 against and he was not convinced of the need. Bruce Bingham thought if the TMC were not going to hold votes during closed sessions, there was no reason to preclude non-voting members. Hayden agreed

and also suggested they add language that would lead up to an executive session. Mike Orcutt said it is important to have only voting members as this is the way to influence the voting the most. Groves responded to Orcutt's comment by pointing out that discussions about influencing voting are the types of discussions that are supposed to be held in public. Groves went over the California rules for limits on closed meetings such as safety, personnel, disposal of property.

The TMC did not make final decisions on the language of the by-laws. It was suggested they take this up again at the next meeting. Naman took notes on several changes such as definition of executive session, what leads to an executive session, and reporting afterwards.

Seth Naman will provide a new draft of the by-laws to the TMC.

4. Current Conditions

Robert Stewart presented on Trinity River WY 2015 current water conditions via a phone Powerpoint presentation.

Stewart noted that, compared to last year, Trinity Reservoir storage is lower, inflow to the reservoir is lower, and accumulated precipitation is lower. The general expectation is that the drought will worsen. Temperature targets for the Trinity River at Hoopa are generally being exceeded except during the high flow releases in May. Monitoring of high-release flows were carried out for water surface, sediment. They also performed surveys of tributary deltas, bathymetry at Lowden, gravel implementation. Others have performed seismic surveys, and hydrophones surveys.

Seth Naman asked about preliminary results from seismic or hydrophone monitoring. Stewart said they do not have the results yet from these surveys and expect it the end of this summer. Teresa Connor asked how the water temperature data match with the predictions by models and use of the auxiliary outlet for cooling. Stewart said their models used 50 F for the water coming out of Lewiston. But this year, Lewiston temperatures are higher and tributaries are likely running warmer. These are likely the reasons for the higher observed temperatures than modeled temperatures. He could not say about the use of the auxiliary outlet. Mike Orcutt noted the Yurok's recent letter on temperatures and that the Hoopa Valley Tribe will engage in government-to-government discussions with the Bureau on this issue. Orcutt warned that the regulatory agencies are leaning on users to limit Shasta water and they may seek more Trinity water. He thought that the TMC may want do more to preserve cool water in the reservoir.

5. Federal/Regional Updates

Federico Barajas presented the Federal updates. He noted the drought conditions and how this has affected recent decisions.

Water Management Update

Reclamation recently re-submitted the Sacramento River temperature plan. As a result of warmer water coming out of Shasta Reservoir the original plan has been suspended and is being revised to better meet specific Delta conditions. He said there will be no additional releases to the CVP system other than what has been released this spring. The end-of-September storage will be below the 600,000 acre-foot threshold.

Long-Term Plan

Barajas said a long-term plan for release of fall flows is underway. Reclamation is planning public scoping sessions for the EIS to occur later this summer at various locations.

This generated questions and lengthy discussion by the TMC. Seth Naman asked when a new operational forecast may be available on the website. Barajas said an update will be posted on the Central Valley Operations website. Mike Orcutt asked about opportunities for dialog with regulatory agencies about options that could be used if temperatures go bad. Barajas said yes there will be opportunities and the Sacramento River Temperature Management Plan will need to undergo consultation and approval. Andreas Krause noted if Trinity storage falls below 600,000 acre-feet, this triggers consultation with National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Barajas said consultation has been started to ensure compliance.

Mike Orcutt asked if the Flow and Temperature Workgroup could take a look at these temperature issues. Tim Hayden said the Workgroup has not had much discussion regarding the temperatures with flows or reservoir management beyond the ROD flows. Naman asked Paul Zedonis if BOR staff may help with information on reservoir management or flows. Zedonis said they are getting experts together to examine temperature. Wade Sinnen asked if the criteria for emergency releases would be similar for this year (e.g., run size, disease incidence, and Klamath flows). Barajas said yes. Robin Schrock also noted that the Program funds Zedonis and that the FWS is working on a new temperature model. Barajas said BOR is working on this and will be drawing on expertise and resources from the Klamath basin office and the CVO. Tim Hayden asked that the model be extended to provide more technical output. Orcutt commented that the dangerous part was the expected 575 acre-feet minus some volume for fall flows and if this constitutes a “red flag,” and the TMC would need to know sooner than later. Barajas said this year will be more difficult as a result of combinations of warmer water and less water. Seth Naman said by this time, in most years, they have seen output results. Barajas said they will be kept informed along the way. Orcutt said they need to have information in a timely manner.

Process for Fall Flow Implementation

Barajas commented on this year’s fall flows. Humboldt County has made a formal call for the 50,000 acre-feet of water. Reclamation is looking at the impacts and an EA is being drafted and consulting with fish agencies will be required. A draft will be available for comments. This will lead up to a determination for fall flows. The Humboldt County request is essentially the same as a fall flow. Keith Groves asked about other downstream users. Barajas said their dialog is with Humboldt County and they will rely on the County to determine who is a downstream user. Mike Orcutt said this will likely be subject to litigation and appeals.

Federal Budget Update

Barajas said he did not have any new information to report.

Before the lunch break, the TMC discussed item 6.

Lunch**Information/Decision Items****6. Report from TAMWG**

This item was discussed before lunch. Elizabeth Hadley, Chair of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG), noted her letter in the TMC members’ packets. She

went over the 4 recommendations. She noted a proposed change to the Communication Plan that better reflected the TAMWG purpose statement. She noted the comments on the by-laws and TAMWG concern over closed-door meetings. Regarding the water year, the TAMWG wished to receive the latest year water forecast. The TAMWG asked that the TMC seek to limit the diversions to the Sacramento River to the minimum needed. She noted a dissent opinion from a TAMWG member that believed that the whole state should be managed for drought and not just the diversions from the Trinity. She hoped the TMC could act on the first recommendations.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the TMC accept the changes to the Communication Guidelines as presented by Elizabeth Hadley.

Teresa Connor seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Teresa Connor noted the TMC had addressed the last recommendation (e.g., that out of basin diversions be limited) during their approval of the proposed flow schedule.

Seth Naman said the water forecast is a Reclamation document. He said he could write a letter to Reclamation requesting the operational forecast. Barajas said as soon as this is available; it will be sent to the TAMWG and will also be posted on the website.

Seth Naman will write a letter to the TAMWG responding to their recommendations.

7. Report from Executive Director

Robin Schrock gave her report on activities of the TRRP. She noted the dry water year and the revised release schedule. The Program had a very effective outreach which resulted in a “softened” editorial. The Program also got their water quality certifications renewed from the Water Quality Control Board.

Organizational Updates

Brandt Gutermuth was selected as the Acting Implementation Branch Chief. A Science Advisory Board (SAB) position is being filled. Todd Buxton is the new fisheries biologist. Ernie Clarke has accepted a position with FWS in Atlanta. Joe Polos will be serving as the Science Coordinator.

Work Group Updates

Schrock walked the TMC through the summary of activities of the Technical Work Groups in the TMC members’ packets and went over activities for the Flow, Fisheries, Gravel, and Watershed.

Top Down Management Model

Schrock and Clarke have worked on a top-down management model. She noted a handout in the TMC packet that showed a management design with roles and responsibilities. She did a search of the literature and found that all other models that involve partnerships had this similar structure.

Watershed FOA

A watershed funding opportunity announcement (FOA) has been prepared and is in review steps.

8. 2016 Proposed Budget

Robin Schrock noted copies of the FY2016 budget in the TMC's packets and she and Ernie Clarke (via phone) commented and answered questions on it. Schrock explained that the budget is based on the President's proposed budget and could change based on Congressional deliberations. The total for fiscal year 2016 is projected to be \$15.1 million. This broke down into Program administration \$2.88 million; Science \$4.88 million; Implementation \$7.37 million.

Ernie Clarke explained that the Science portion is not very different from the past years' except for the increase in funding for the extension of the fish production model to the confluence with the Klamath. He said an updated page that includes the gravel transport monitoring work that will be passed out tomorrow during his presentation.

The TMC had questions about the increase in funding from \$177K to \$266K in order to extend the fish production model from the 40-miles down to the confluence with the Klamath. Teresa Connor asked if this was needed or whether they should we see how the smaller model works first. Mike Orcutt asked if the focus is on fish production in the upper part of the river, and what was the value of extending it. Tim Hayden defended the decision by noting the fish production is a large part of the DSS and they need a full fish model. Schrock added that that the effect of flow on fish is difficult to assess and the fish production model will help; also that adults and juvenile use the lower river. Emelia Berol asked if Connor's question has been answered. Connor acknowledged "sort of" she added that she wanted to know if the fish production model was going to work, whether they should we invest so much, and if it will inform management decisions. Polos said that extending the model downstream to the confluence of the Klamath would allow it to be used to evaluate how the temperature down river may affect survival or growth of fish. Schrock said the Program spends hundreds of thousands on design and millions on construction and the public asks whether the Program knows the projects will produce fish. She said that the fish production model can predict production on a reach scale and we need a complete model.

George Kautsky asked about discrepancies in some of the budget numbers and Clarke said he would provide corrections tomorrow. Sean Ledwin asked about new projects that are not listed in the budget such as the river corridor strategy and large wood management. Clarke said they are waiting for the national guidance on the wood management and he said that the river strategy is being done as program staff effort and it is not reflected on the budget. He will address this tomorrow at his presentation.

Schrock continued her presentation of the budget items on the Implementation portion. There were questions on the \$695K for Forest Service for watershed restoration. Connor, Orcutt and Naman opined that this project should be vetted through the Watershed Workgroup. Schrock explained that she received notice of this available funding in March and was asked to commit funding quickly or risk losing the opportunity. The Forest Service owned lands in a large portion of the lower 40-mile section of the Trinity restoration area, it had a completed inventory of roads that need restoration for sediment losses with an estimate of sediment budgets and costs, and had the ability to carry out the work. Terri Simon-Jackson said the Forest Service can present the project to the Watershed Workgroup.

A couple of other concerns were expressed about the budget. Sean Ledwin commented the Bucktail project had been scaled back and they could have used additional funding. Schrock described the phasing of the Bucktail project as based on landowner issues and funding

limitations. Tim Hayden commented he appreciated this extra funding but noted the stakeholders should get some credit for it. He had some concern about some other “zeroed out” items in the budget such as support services for the Tribes. Schrock noted that these amounts are still in review and will be allocated based on who will construct the programs and whoever can perform those services. She explained that some of the environmental reviews are built into the individual projects and are no longer “lump summed.”

The TMC moved to discussion of Item 10 as Brandt Gutermuth was scheduled for a presentation. After addressing Item 10 the TMC returned to the budget discussion.

Schrock finished up her presentation of the Implementation budget. Orcutt asked about the geomorphology and geophysical support services. Schrock explained how these will be performed by a contract to Graham Matthews. Clarke explained that the TRRP goes through a funding planning process where the CVPIA asks for funding requests be formatted in a particularly way and some of that was still in this budget. Ledwin asked how the amounts were determined. Schrock said the Program is allocated funds and they “phase” projects (e.g., fund in the projects in sequential phases) based on the budget. She noted that the Watershed Coordination through the Trinity RCD was zeroed out as they indicated they no longer wished to perform this work. She also noted that the Watershed Workgroup development of the Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) would be helpful in development of grant proposals. Hayden noted the budget was the traditional budget for 50:30:20 and asked about the plans to do a unified budget. Clarke said they no longer use the guide and that some things funded in science are heavily used in implementation (such as salaries for Chamberlain or Gaeuman). Schrock indicated they can provide a unified budget, as well as the traditional budget the TAMWG and TMC are used to seeing.

Other TMC members expressed their concerns over this budget discussion. Schrock asked why the TRRP Watershed Workgroup made up of technical level staff would review a federal partner’s existing watershed program that already meets federal guidelines. Bruce Bingham agreed and thought they should get bogged down in this and they should not presume a review is obligated until the TMC asks for it. He felt this discussion had not been productive and suggested that perhaps budget processes could be discussed in a closed sessions. Terri Simon-Jackson said she wanted to comment that she had consider the Forest Service was acting as a “white hat” to help save this funding and the Forest Service was not attempting to “grab” it. She expressed that was difficult to sit through the scrutiny of the funding discussion in a public forum.

9. Science Advisory Board Nominations

This item was deferred and taken up at the start of Day 2.

Robin Schrock said the solicitor said they need to rotate SAB members and Clair Stalnaker’s contract was in need of renewal so, he was chosen to be rotated. She had received criteria from one partner. She is requesting nominations by July 2. She can do some research to see if these people are available. Mike Orcutt asked about the duration of appointments. Schrock said she can provide this from the Solicitor and grants officer. They are usually 4-year terms per the contracting agreements.

Robin Schrock will provide a summary of SAB appoint terms for the TMC per Mike Orcutt’s request.

TMC members are to submit SAB nominations with contact information and a CV to Robin Schrock by July 2.

10. Compliance Update

Brandt Gutermuth presented the Compliance Update via phone and an onscreen presentation. Gutermuth thanked the TMC for the letters written to the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Board renewed the water quality permits for the Program. The FONSI was signed for Limekiln. They are getting help on fish translocation in Upper Douglas City. Lower Dutch Creek is moving forward. Gutermuth noted that James Lee will give an update on frogs, turtles, and vegetation monitoring for compliance.

11. Public Forum

No comments from the public.

Adjourn for the day 5:00 PM

Day 2, Thursday, June 25, 2015, 9:05 AM

Seth Naman announced that they will be starting a few minutes late in order to allow time for members that were running late this morning. Also Mike Belcheck would not be able to attend and his presentation in Item 14 was cancelled.

Information/Decision Items

12. Implementation Update

Conor Shea gave a summary of Implementation Activities with Logan Negherbon (on the phone).

Shea listed several accomplishments such as the high flow releases, gravel augmentation, and several construction projects moving forward: Upper Douglas City, Limekiln, Bucktail, Hocker Flat revegetation, Lower Dutch Creek. Upper Douglas City and Limekiln are being constructed this year. He described the design steps that include modelling of flows and resultant habitat, and submittal to a value engineering assessment.

Shea described the Lower Valley Suite of sites that was started last fall. There are three contiguous sites. They will be permitted as separate projects. They are ambitious projects right now and will not be able to be done in one season and will likely take three years. The designs are now at 30 to 50%. They are using a common hydraulic model and the design teams can evaluate which produces the best habitat.

Mike Orcutt asked if the NEPA process can be streamlined in order to save money. Schrock noted that some is being done such as the water certifications that are good for five years. However she pointed out that CEQA and NEPA has certain requirements and it is streamlined as far as it can go. She added that every time there is a change to the design, it needs to be re-scoped with the public and some surveys and environmental documents need to be redone. Terri Simon-Jackson said in the Forest Service, once they go through public scoping, the design is finished. She also noted that the Shasta Trinity gets sued on nearly every EA so they need to be prepared for this.

13. Science Update

Ernie Clarke presented the Science activities via phone and an on-screen presentation.

He described the Preliminary Science Workplan for 2016 as a process where projects are submitted by program partners, proposals are reviewed, selected, and then budgeted. The individual submissions follow a common format and have budgets and deliverables of data and/or reports. The Science Workplan Summary contains abstracts of the submitted projects. The SAB has said that until the Decision Support System (DSS) is up, there are no great reasons to change the process of the workplan. These proposals and their budgets are used to create the annual budget summary the TMC is reviewing today.

Seth Naman asked how they review the reports. Clarke said they compare the report to the description of the deliverables and have internal and external reviews. The review process can take over a year and there have been cases where they did not accept reports and they remain as a “draft.” Tim Hayden asked about channel effectiveness monitoring and if there were enough resources to do a good job. Clarke said that some of these tasks will be done with staff time and there will likely be no extra data collection; he thought there will be enough funding. Clarke noted there may be a sense that not enough monitoring is occurring; he thought monitoring is occurring at a greater level than realized. Schrock noted since all partners have agreements and there is increased scrutiny of the deliverables, the partners need to allow sufficient time to do the deliverables. Otherwise, this can hold up funding. Shea added that the Design Team will be creating a list of “questions not being answered” to help with internal communications and will encourage partners to focus on these.

James Lee joined the teleconference via cell phone from the field and the TMC shifted to his Powerpoint presentation on environmental compliance monitoring for riparian vegetation and sensitive species (vegetation quantity and quality, foothill yellow-legged frog, western pond turtle, and birds). Lee said that, in California, there is a policy of no net loss of riparian vegetation. The Program’s compliance goal is a one-to-one replacement of habitats within ten years. They do surveys of vegetation and survival. Survival can be patchy on these harsh sites and natural recruitment is not accounted for, so his group is updating the monitoring plan to acknowledge some of these more complex elements.

Tim Hayden asked about input from the Wildlife and Riparian Workgroup on the changing revegetation designs. He asked if the designs conflict with the Flow Evaluation Study and whether they have done enough. Lee noted they really don’t have a formal process and do not receive a lot of feedback from the Wildlife and Riparian Workgroup but that they receive input from the State Board on compliance and it is more intensive now. How the revegetation work is done is not so different, but how it is recorded is changing. Lee also commented on issues of how to define riparian habitat. They currently use the California Wildlife Habitat classification system. The National Research Council has come up with definitions of habitats. Hayden was concerned that revegetation is too focused on compliance or uplands and not on restoration of river processes.

Lee continued his presentation on herpetological monitoring of foothill yellow-legged frog and western pond turtles and the effects of flow regulation on these species. They are completing a three-year occupancy study focused on distributions. Monitoring will focus on scour and desiccation. He noted the FWS study plan as a good source of information on monitoring.

Lee finished his presentation by describing the bird monitoring efforts. He stated that the Trinity River is excellent habitat for riparian birds and that birds are good indicators of riparian

condition. The Klamath Bird Observatory is monitoring 24 species and has produced a recent report of trends from 2002 to 2014 which show mostly stable populations.

Break

Ernie Clark continued his presentation on the Science Budget and projected on the screen a new budget with some corrections based on George Kautsky's observations yesterday. Teresa Connor asked how the specific items were ranked. Clarke went over some of the steps and inputs from the workgroups.

Clarke went down the budget line by line. He noted personnel item of the Science budget pays several positions (Gaeuman, Lee, Buxton and part of Clarke's). In the Monitoring and Evaluation portion, he noted they have abstracts for each item (project). He made comments on most of the items. The fish population model is new. The SH1/2DV vegetation model is zero for 2016 as it will be complete by the end of the year. Rearing habitat assessment includes funding to interact with fish production modelers. Juvenile monitoring was \$717K and some additional information is being sought from the proposers by Clarke. Coded wire tags involve partners with existing balances and the costs here just covered tag purchases. Chinook run-size estimates now included additional species. Hatchery coded wire tags has a question out on it. Yurok and Hoopa fish monitoring was being funded, as was age analysis by the Tribes. Gravel implementation monitoring field work is accomplished via the field contract to Graham Matthews; an additional line item in Science covers analyses by the Program. Riparian vegetation work is that led by James Lee and John Bair. Sediment monitoring costs are estimated is for a Normal water year. If it turns out to be Dry, they will need less funding and extra dollars can be reallocated or saved for the next fiscal year.

Mike Orcutt clarified that the total funding for Graham Matthews is over \$800K. Clarke said this was awarded via an open bid. Sean Ledwin asked about reallocating funds and if funds for Graham Matthews be subcontracted or be redirected. Schrock said any redirection within the existing contract would need to be within scope of that contract (e.g., sediment transport, remote sensing, or augmentation). Emelia Berol asked about delta monitoring. Andreas Krause responded that, as recommended by the Gravel Workgroup, this will get topography at Grass and Rush Creeks to estimate sediment delivery to Trinity River. This data is one of the greatest unknowns in the sediment budgets to the river.

Clarke continued his presentation of the Science budget. The gravel tracer work is not yet funded for 2016 but is going forward. Herpetological monitoring will pay for USGS field techs. They are considering using local techs such as those from the Klamath Bird Observatory in future years.

Mike Orcutt asked if bird monitoring is funded. Clarke said the bird monitoring is in the Implementation budget at \$180K. Robin Schrock said it is a good suggestion that the budget be more integrated so to show herpetological monitoring alongside monitoring birds. Birds had been placed in the Implementation budget since it was a compliance issue. Terri Simon-Jackson suggested they have a bigger discussion about integrating the budgets as this would better show how changes in science and overhead will affect implementation. Clarke agreed that one budget sheet for implementation and science would help. Simon-Jackson asked about salaries for personnel that are considered to work both in administration and science and whether that would need to be cleaned up in case of audits. Clarke thought the budgets are pretty transparent. Schrock said audits would focus on the CVPIA portion.

Tim Hayden asked about the Fish Workgroup priorities and noted that the fish model extension was ranked high and if TMC needed to provide guidance on this. Seth Naman opined that this

next step of the fish is pretty small portion of the total budget and if the Fish Workgroup ranked it high, he supports it. Mike Orcutt complained that the Program wasn't adhering to the Phase I review recommendations to evaluate fish habitat. He thought the Program wasn't able to answer the question about fish habitat and they instead introduced the DSS to do it. He did not support the decision to adopt DSS. He expressed concerns over spending \$266K. Clarke responded that he saw the conclusions of the Phase I review differently—that the SAB concluded they were not in a position to evaluate the Program because they did not have the monitoring data and that this is a missing element that the Program is working towards. Schrock added that the IHAP assessments of rearing habitat that is being done annually. The fish production model proposes to move this assessment information down to the confluence.

Clarke announced upcoming meetings, particularly the DSS presentation for March 30, 2016. He said that the DSS will not evaluate every decision but will be a system of models that address various categories. After Phase I they refined the Program goals and objectives. He thought it has been great to see how quickly they have embraced the primary recommendation of the Phase I review.

Clarke closed with a comment on the distributed science program and noted that not all work is done in the TRRP office. He recommended that technical staff should not advocate policy but to focus on technical inputs. The TMC can improve program by examining partners' commitment and see if the reports are following these commitments. Clarke noted that Chris Moore had said everyone has to come to the partnership with a collaborative, not an adversarial, approach. He complimented Joe Polos and Tim Hayden and other leaders that are committed to the Program.

Seth Naman complimented Clarke for his contributions and commitments. The TMC gave Clarke a round of applause on his departure.

14. 2014 Lower Klamath Flow Augmentation Outcomes

This item was canceled as Mike Belcheck was not able to attend.

15. Open Forum

Kristi Bevard asked why there is not more funding for Trinity County. Schrock said Trinity County has an excess funding balance currently and they need to spend this down. They have been under-staffed lately. Bevard would like to see the documentation on the funding for the County. Seth Naman suggested Bevard work with Keith Groves on a way to publish the funding for Trinity County in the newspaper.

16. 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. He noted his work on drafting up the by-laws, that a decision on Humboldt County membership would be tabled for now, and that the budget will need more discussion.

Tim Hayden said he would like to see the budget presented in a comprehensive manner so it could be vote on. Mike Orcutt also expressed his desire to discuss the total budget. TMC needs to make budget recommendation so the tribes can renegotiate their AFA (annual funding agreement)—these are the budgeted amounts to the tribes that are negotiated with the Bureau and the FWS and require 90-day reviews. The tribes want to start this process now to receive funding by December.

Mike Orcutt made a motion to place the Forest Service watershed work under the right budget heading with a cap of \$500K.

The motion failed for lack of a second.

Seth Naman summarized that Brandt Gutermuth and Robin Schrock will go through the budget and revise for review it by mid-July so it can be discussed via the July teleconference. Naman clarified that the TMC bylaws do state that voting can take place on the phone.

Brandt Gutermuth and Robin Schrock will revise the budget and provide to TMC chair by mid-July.

Terri Simon-Jackson said she and Robin will go before the next Watershed Workgroup and present their proposal. Schrock said the workgroup can have technical review but all other projects will need to go through review. She opined that the Workgroup does not need to see the budget. Sean Ledwin said the Watershed Workgroup needs to consider costs as part of their reviews.

Terri Simon Jackson will present the Forest Service watershed restoration plan to the watershed workgroup.

Keith Grove expressed concern that the TMC spent a day and a half and did not vote on the budget. He asked that they need to be better prepared for the budget discussion and perhaps not schedule presentations. Terri Simon-Jackson asked that this group do lunch today as partnership building. Emelia Berol suggested the TMC plan to vote on the budget during the August joint meeting with the TAMWG in attendance. The TAMWG should receive a copy of the budget before the meeting and can be prepared to comment on it. This idea was welcomed by the TMC.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the budget be revised for all aspects of the program as directed today be and be submitted to the TMC for a discussion at a special meeting.

The motion was seconded by Keith Groves.

The motion passed unanimously.

Adjourn Day 2, 12:15 PM

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
Humboldt Bay Aquatic Center
921 Waterfront Dr., Eureka, CA 95501 Tel: (707) 443-4222
Final Draft Agenda for June 24-25, 2015

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Time		Discussion Leader
	<i>Regular Business:</i>	
9:30	Introductions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Welcome ▪ Approval of Agenda 	Seth Naman, Chair
9:45	Open Forum: Comments from the public	Seth Naman
10:00	Report from TMC Chair <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TMC action items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Trinity River Temperature Management – draft letter ○ Joint Meeting August 13 ○ Humboldt County TMC membership ▪ By-laws approval 	Seth Naman
11:00	Current Conditions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Water Year 2015 	Robert Stewart
11:30	Federal/Regional updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Water Management Update ▪ Long Term Plan ▪ Process for fall flow implementation ▪ Federal Budget Update 	Federico Barajas, Co-chair
12:15	Lunch	
	<i>Information / Decision Items:</i>	
1:30	Report from TAMWG	Elizabeth Hadley
2:00	Report from Executive Director <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organizational Updates ▪ Work Group updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Quarterly summery (handout) ▪ Top Down Management Model ▪ Watershed FOA ▪ New GIS tool 	Robin Schrock
2:45	2016 Proposed Budget	Robin Schrock
3:45	Science Advisory Board Nominations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SAB criteria ▪ Current roster ▪ Next steps 	Robin Schrock
4:15	Compliance Update	Brandt Gutermuth
4:45	Public forum	
5:00	Adjourn	

Thursday, June 25, 2015

Time		Discussion Leader
9:00	Open Forum	Seth Naman
	<i>Information / Decision Items:</i>	
9:15	Implementation Update	Conor Shea/Logan Negherbon
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2015 Rehabilitation project monitoring ▪ 2016 Rehabilitation project status ▪ Outyear project designs 	
10:15	Science Update	Clarke/Polos
11:00	Break	
11:15	2014 Lower Klamath Flow Augmentation Outcomes	Mike Belchik
11:45	Open Forum	
12:15	Adjourn	

Join WebEx <https://trrp.webex.com/trrp/>

June TMC Meeting - Day 2

Thursday, June 25, 2015

9:00 am / Pacific Daylight Time (San Francisco, GMT-07:00) / 8 hrs

Join WebEx meeting

Meeting number: 571 305 855

Meeting password: Abc@123

Join by phone

1-408-792-6300 Call-in toll number (US/Canada)

Access code: 571 305 855