

Final Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
 December 16-17, 2015
 Trinity River Restoration Program Office, Weaverville, CA

Wednesday, December 16, 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
Joe Polos ¹	Fish and Wildlife Service
George Kautsky ²	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Terri Simon-Jackson	Forest Service
Dave Hillemeier	Yurok Tribe
Teresa Connor	California Natural Resources Agency
Keith Groves	Trinity County
Elizabeth Hadley ^{3,4}	Trinity Adaptive Management Work Group
Robin Schrock ³	Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director

¹ Alternate for Bruce Bingham, ² Alternate for Mike Orcutt; ³ Non-voting members; ⁴ replaced by Tom Stokely on Day 2.

Others that attended: Kelli Gant (Trinity Lake Revitalization); Tony LaBanca (Ca DFW); D.J. Bandrowski, Andreas Krause (Yurok Tribe); Claire Stalnaker, Mike Merigliano, and Chris Jordan (Science Advisor Board members); Leslie Bryan (Redding Electric Utility); Brandt Gutermuth, Eric Peterson, Michelle Gallagher (TRRP); Shiloe Braxton, Donna Rupp (Trinity County RCD); Mark Lancaster (5-Counties).

Attended by phone: Wade Sinnen (CDFW); Sean Ledwin (Hoopa Valley Tribe).

Notes: Kim Mattson (ENW).

List of Motions made during the Meeting

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the agenda.

George Kautsky seconded the motion

The motion passed unanimously.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to approve the September minutes

Keith Groves seconded the motion

The motion passed unanimously.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion that the TMC send a letter to the fishing guides rephrasing the TAMWG recommendation to the TMC to conduct an inventory of tributaries to the Trinity River and ask for observations regarding tributaries drying up.

Teresa Connor seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Other Decisions or Action Items made during the Meeting

Dave Hillemeier volunteered to draft a letter to the guides regarding tributaries and have it ready for edits at the January telephone call.

Robin Schrock will inquire about whether they can adjust the FOA process for watershed work in order to advance the March 1 application deadline.

Joe Polos will ask the Fish Workgroup to provide a summary of fish returns to Klamath/Trinity basin as well as other river systems for the March TMC meeting.

The TMC elected Federico Barajas to serve as chair and Seth Naman was elected to serve as vice-chair of TMC for the next two years.

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

Seth Naman noted minor edits or adjustments to the agenda.

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the agenda.

George Kautsky seconded the motion

The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of the September Minutes

Terri Simon-Jackson and George Kautsky added some edits to the September minutes.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to approve the September minutes

Keith Groves seconded the motion

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Open Forum and Comments from the Public

No comments.

3. Report from TAMWG

Elizabeth Hadley, Chair of the TAMWG, reported on the TAMWG meeting last week. She noted that the TAMWG was extremely happy when Dave Wellock announced that his claim with the Program had been resolved. The TAMWG was concerned about the open positions in the Program and they discussed escapement goals. They had two recommendations on the watersheds program. The TAMWG wanted the funds not used last year for watersheds to be rolled over for watershed work this year. They also recommended that the TMC conduct an inventory of tributaries connectivity with the mainstem for any remedial action to improve fish passage.

Dave Hillemeier asked who might perform the inventory and suggested it may be a good topic for the Watershed and the Physical Workgroups. The IDT was also mentioned as a group. Tony LaBanca noted that California Department of Fish and Wildlife does this type of monitoring and data on tributaries to the Trinity should be in their data base. He asked that they contact the Department if inventories are planned. George Kautsky asked if this is a need for this Program. Naman pointed out this first effort would be to answer that question and would not be a construction effort. Dave Hillemeier suggested they enlist the fishing guides as they watch the river continuously. He noted that tributary access is important for juvenile coho in the lower river. Joe Polos noted that the Forest Service and State do spawner and habitat surveys and would have a good idea about fish access.

There was an extended discussion regarding a motion that they start an inventory. Federico Barajas thought they should review their own data and consult the guides. Schrock noted that BLM has a list of the guides and they should send a letter to everyone, and find those under the USFS, too. George Kautsky noted he was lukewarm about sending out a letter to the guides and suggested the letter go back to the TAMWG. He did not wish to raise expectations nor leave anyone out. Dave Hillemeier thought contacting the guides was an opportunity for outreach. Keith Groves did think the TMC should be addressing this instead of their working groups. He supported a letter being sent to everyone.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion that the TMC send a letter to the fishing guides rephrasing the TAMWG recommendation to the TMC to conduct an inventory of tributaries to the Trinity River and ask for observations regarding tributaries drying up.

Teresa Connor seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Action item: Dave Hillemeier volunteered to draft a letter to the guides regarding tributaries and have it ready for edits at the January telephone call.

4. Federal/Regional Updates

Federico Barajas reviewed that the Federal government has been operating on a continuing resolution (CR). The CR was extended for three day that expires tonight. There are expectations that this will be resolved today with an approved budget, but this is not certain. A CR poses handicaps on contracts. They are moving their current contracts forward using last year's funding levels.

Barajas has an interest announcement out for an interim Executive Director position (6 months) and he hopes to be filled by next month. The candidates have to come from within the Bureau.

He will be enlisting thoughts and recommendations regarding filling the permanent position. George Kautsky asked about TMC members participating on the interview. Barajas said he would be willing to consider having one or two TMC members on the interview panel. Dave Hillemeier suggested the interim position be kept in place until the upcoming Program review is completed. Andreas Krause offered to forward information from the last Program review to Barajas pertinent to the role of the Director.

Joe Polos noted that Damian Ciotti will be retained as the next the interim Science Coordinator beginning in mid-January and work is in progress for refilling the position on a permanent basis..

Barajas noted the two other open positions for the Implementation Branch Chief and civil engineer.

Barajas reported that the Bureau of Reclamation was able to settle the claim with Dave Wellock. Naman responded that the TMC and TAMWG were both happy with this. George Kautsky pointed out that Reclamation did not need to use Program funding for payment for the claim.

Keith Groves noted more precipitation and inflow to Trinity Lake and asked if more flow was also going over the hill. Barajas said that only the minimum flows are going over the hill.

Information/Decision Items

5. Report from the Executive Director

Robin Schrock went over her memo that constituted her report. She noted that Limekiln and Upper Douglas City construction sites have been completed except for seeding and revegetation. She noted some savings on the FY2016 budget. The proposed budget for rehabilitation construction is \$3.3 million, and \$500K for watersheds. She noted that Clair Stalnaker was here today and he is rotating out as a Science Advisory Board (SAB) member. Her last day as Executive Director is December 18. Brandt Gutermuth has been extended as the interim Implementation Branch Chief.

She gave updates on activities of the workgroups and referred to the summary handout in the TMC members' packets. Flow did not meet. Fish is working on a synthesis, discussing a video monitoring option, and strategies for 2017. Gravel summarized their workshop. Wildlife and Riparian did not meet. IDT discussed River Corridor Management Plan, workplan for 2017, and DSS. Design discussed effectiveness monitoring at constructed sites and reviewed plans for upcoming construction sites.

Workgroup meetings initiated a discussion over workgroup effectiveness. Dave Hillemeier expressed concern that the IDT Workgroup has trouble meeting when their leader is absent. He felt the TMC all need to direct their staff to continue work and resolve issues of leadership. Joe Polos expressed several problems with the IDT and the other workgroups—he noted having large membership on the IDT but that not everyone was contributing. He said the Flow Workgroup works well as they typically have a deadline. Teresa Connor suggested that the Branch Chiefs take on the leadership of the IDT. He also said that he would be setting up a meeting for the IDT in January so the IDT could complete the FY17 science workplan and continue work on DSS-workshop planning. Hillemeier suggested they have some method to keep the Workgroup meeting in the absence of Branch Chiefs. He suggested the IDT meet to determine how to choose an interim leader until they have Branch Chiefs hired. Federico Barajas suggested they have this as an agenda item for the next meeting or take it up at the Efficiencies Subcommittee discussion.

Schrock continued her report and noted the Funding Opportunity Announcement for the watershed work was posted today at grants.gov. As the TMC was behind schedule, they decided the remainder of the Executive Director's Report could be read in Schrock's memo. Teresa Connor asked that the River Corridor Concept be discussed later during the meeting.

Lunch

6. Watershed Update

Seth Naman introduced this topic and noted they would be hearing about watershed updates from Sean Ledwin and Mark Lancaster. He also noted they would discuss the projects that did not get funding.

Sean Ledwin gave a watershed workgroup update via telephone. He presented a list of steps that had occurred regarding the FY16 Watershed Solicitation starting with the first draft circulated in January 2015 and ending with the request for pre-proposals in October 2015. The pre-proposals have not been reviewed pending clarity over conflict of interest.

He had a set of questions regarding how to provide input back to applicants and how the Federal agencies will be treated. A major concern was to avoid any other delays or else contract the award process to the NFWF which would require 20% in overhead.

Ledwin said likely the Bureau would preview the proposals for content and format. The Watershed Workgroup would then review and make recommendations to the TMC. Robin Schrock clarified that federal agencies would be funded as always under interagency agreements. She also clarified that the solicitor it would be a conflict of interest for Watershed Workgroup members to review proposals if they or their organization had submitted a proposal.. Teresa Connor verified that proposals from the Forest Service would still be reviewed by the Watershed Workgroup together with the other proposals. Sean Ledwin agreed that this was his understanding and that the Watershed Workgroup would recommend funding based on those projects that would contribute the most to the objectives of the Program and the funding for the Forest Service would be through another mechanism. Schrock explained the technical workgroups do not recommend funding but prioritize projects that meet the program objectives. The TMC approves funding.

Dave Hillemeier asked why go through the FOA process. He also asked if a group should only recuse themselves on their own proposals or from the entire review process. Ledwin thought their guidance from the Solicitor was that proposers should be recused from the entire process. Schrock responded that the FOA process was started two years ago. The FOA process makes the proposer responsible for the completion of the proposal process. Terri Simon-Jackson asked for the next steps for the Forest Service. She said they had not submitted a preproposal but could do that now. Sean Ledwin recommended they consider the pre proposals as informational and everyone including the Forest Service submit a formal proposal to the Watershed Workgroup for the March 1, 2016 deadline.

Ledwin closed his presentation with a slide of all the potential projects proposed by 5-Counties, TCRCD, Watershed Center, and the Yurok Tribe. He noted that this was the best set he had seen. These preproposals totaled to \$1.5 million.

Mark Lancaster director of the 5 Counties Salmonid Program (5-Cs) reviewed that they work mostly with local governments but have started to work with private landowners in Trinity County. They have done \$25 million of work over the past 15 years. He said the process of preparing pre-proposals is a lot of work as he has to get commitment for matching funding, go to sites, and develop maps. But he said it is worth it to get the \$700K from the TRRP.

He showed slides of some of the accomplishments the 5-Cs had done while he gave more details about the onerous grant application process. He cautioned that the 5-Cs, TCRCD, and others do not have line items for grant management and they do not get paid for grant applications. He asked that they make the process simple.

Donna Rupp agreed that the last BOR grant application process was arduous and nit-picky. The Trinity County Resource Conservation District (TCRCD) had three separate requests from the BOR for different formats for budgets. While the TCRCD was able to comply with the requests by dropping everything to meet the deadlines, she noted that the 5-Cs did not make the deadlines and did not get funded. Robin Schrock said last year was the first year of the FBMS budgeting system and it caused problems throughout the system. Terri Simon-Jackson said they have a road crew that would be committed to the watershed project but she is not sure if they need to keep them on. She is concerned with the late date for the application and fire season demands that may be made on the crews. Lancaster said an earlier award would help with other grants as that would then allow them to show matching funds. Robin Schrock said that this year's grant awards cannot be moved up but she can ask if future years can be moved forward. Seth Ledwin suggested a letter to the Sacramento contracting office may help with awards processing.

Action item: Robin Schrock will inquire about whether they can adjust the FOA process for watershed work in order to advance the March 1 application deadline.

There was an extended discussion about budget changes. Seth Naman asked for inputs from TMC members about whether they could follow the TAMWG's suggestion to roll over \$250 K of unspent funding. It was generally conceded that they could not do that. George Kautsky said he had concerns over where the extra funding from last year went and how decisions are made about this. Schrock said it stayed in the Program and she did not make the decisions but it likely went toward the cost overruns of construction. Kautsky did not recall a discussion about this unspent funding. Keith Grove asked if this budget adjustment was approved by the TMC. Schrock responded that it is difficult for the TMC to do line item adjustments due to the timing and emergency nature of adjustments and all of the issues occurred at the end of the fiscal year. The adjustment was made within the Program but it was difficult to show where the funding was reallocated but some likely went toward overruns was for gravel in Upper Douglas City. Seth Naman said it would be good to have notification of budget changes so the TMC can be involved in these decisions. Federico Barajas suggested they always receive budget updates at meetings and phone calls. George Kautsky asked if the updates could be in the format of the budget spreadsheets. Naman thought quarterly updates would be sufficient. Keith Grove said they should prioritize this \$500 K for watersheds and that they do any cuts somewhere else. It was also suggested they try to make up the \$250 K. Federico Barajas said they may want to afford that opportunity for extra money to the construction.

Keith Grove made a motion that the TMC direct the Executive Director to give watersheds the highest priority to get the full budgeted amount and the TMC recognizes that this is a high priority for FY2016.

George Kautsky seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

There was more discussion about reporting budget adjustments. Federico Barajas noted the TMC must consider the level of control on the budget they wish to have versus allowing discretionary spending for the Program. Schrock said adjustments come with construction

activities and these occur at the end of the year. Teresa Connor noted the time spent in past reviews of the budget and that it was not very productive. Keith Groves said it should be a simple matter to print off a quarterly budget. He said it is normal for the County to have budgets that show their rate of spending. Dave Hillemeier said looking at what has been invoiced is not useful as long as the project is on task to spend it. Schrock explained that all agreements and contracts are allocated throughout the year so balances are not informative unless an allocation has been made.

George Kautsky made motion that the Executive Director provide to the TMC quarterly budget summaries indicating obligations, shortfalls, savings, and recommended budget adjustments.

Keith Groves seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

7. Implementation Update

Brandt Gutermuth gave his update of planning activities for implementation. The NEPA/CEQA documents for Bucktail are out for public review until January 4, 2016. They held a public meeting and 25 people attended with good questions about the effects of the Bucktail Bridge which is a pinch for some of the upstream project. They are looking for additional funding to replace the bridge with the County. They are still working on an agreement with the Marshall property regarding rental and there are no negotiations for purchase at this time. Lower Dutch Creek has completed designs and NEPA/CEQA is in progress. There are some questions about access. Deep Gulch is a relatively smaller project and they are close to final the designs and they are working with the BLM to produce an EA for public review with 2016 construction. They are updating the 2000 Biological Assessments and it will be ready for review in January. They are giving a month for review.

The Limekiln site is finishing planting this week and the wetlands look very good. Upper Douglas City is finishing up revegetation. The will be pulling the bridge out over Weaver Creek on the 22nd using a crane that does not enter the water.

8. Efficiencies Subcommittee

This item was taken up at the start of Day 2. Dave Hillemeier gave an update of two meetings that had been held. The Efficiencies Subcommittee was formed to look for ways to expedite the long-term work schedule. Projects were getting more complex and expensive over time. Based on some rough assumptions projections were made as to how long it would take to complete the remaining projects. These projections of time and costs to complete the Program were unacceptably high. Robin Schrock noted the assumptions were it were part of the 2016 budget discussions to determine if more Designs needed to be funded in 2016. She also remarked on documentation of a range of 278 to over 800 days per design and suggested efficiency could be found in that process, too.

The committee decided to first focus on the non-science parts of the Program Robin Schrock passed out a diagram of site prioritization based on the 2D-HBLM (Logic Model) that prioritized sites based on habitat condition. Sites with highest priority for 2015 were Chapman Ranch and Dutch Creek and lowest were Upper Rush Creek and Poker Bar.

Hillemeier went over bullets at the bottom of his handout of recommendations from the Efficiencies Subcommittee. The first bullet recommended use of a planning tool to estimate

costs and timeline for projects. Schrock and Hillemeier showed an example result chart that estimated time required to complete a project based on all phases of public review and compliance.

George Kautsky noted that there is a collection of wisdom in the room with SAB presence, and he was interested in if there were opinions about how well the Program was doing on adaptive management. He noted that the sites have high costs and complexity that is slowing the Program. He noted an additional bullet may be needed that they should consider how these new and future sites for 2030 are departing from the original vision of the Program. This discussion would be visited during the SAB presentation later on agenda.

The second bullet recommended the TMC to reconsider the “go big” direction given to the design team. Currently there is no consideration given to costs. The estimated costs for Chapman, Sheridan, and Deep Gulch sites are \$20 million.

To stay on time, this item was put on hold and the TMC returned to this item at the end of Day 2.

Bullet 3 recommendation was for the TMC to consider alternative funding sources for construction.

Bullet 4 TMC should conduct exit interviews with staff to seek ways to increase longevity of staff in Weaverville. Hillemeier suggested they come up with a list of questions.

Hillemeier switched up to the top of his sheet of the 8 recommendations/questions from the second meeting. He touched on the first bullet, to create a map of landowner constraints. Given the time of the day, Hillemeier said the remaining items could be left for the next meeting.

9. Public Forum

No comments.

Adjourn for the day 4:15 PM

Thursday, December 17, 2015, 8:30 AM

Regular Business

10. Open Forum

Tom Stokely commented that it was disappointing that the \$250 K did not get into the watershed budget last year, especially since Reclamation is funding \$17 million for the Twin Tunnels project in the Bay-Delta area that is mainly a water conveyance project.

Information/Decision Items

11. Scientific Advisory Board

Mike Merigliano introduced himself as a riparian ecologist, Chris Jordan introduced himself as a mathematical ecologist now working with NOAA fisheries on fish issues, and Claire Stalnaker introduced himself as an aquatic ecologist that has worked mostly with groups such as the TRRP in restoration.

Chris Jordan described the new member recommendation process. Six people were selected and the SAB thought that all were qualified but they did perform a ranking based on 8 skills. The

skills included foundations in fish, streams, models, and working with interdisciplinary groups. Their ranking was Andrew Paul, Nick Bowes, Jason Dunham, Dave Hankin, Tracy Hillman, and George Pess. They will pursue negotiations with Paul.

Jordan commented on the Decision Support System (DSS). One of the main recommendations of the Phase I review of the Program was to have a structured decision system as a way to integrate models into the decision process. Jordan said a system would give “backup” for decisions and it is also a framework to give answers to questions that they may not feel comfortable asking (e.g., should they work in tributaries?). It also gives accountability and integrates science into the Program. Component models would feed to the DSS. The remaining question was whether the DSS would be incorporated into the decision system or would it just be given one vote.

Seth Naman noted that the DSS is not in place yet, but asked the SAB for recommendation on how to integrate the information into decision. Claire Stalnaker said you don’t have to have the models perfected but they should use it to “game” with the system. He recommended they put together what they have now and to go with that. He thought they were “on the cusp” of doing that within the next six months.

Terri Simon-Jackson expressed her appreciation and noted it was the clearest description of the DSS she had heard. George Kautsky said there are five management actions under TRRP oversight and there are an infinite set of scenarios which could be modeled. Is it possible for models to be run in reverse from a desired condition to optimize management actions for desired outcomes? Jordan said that if they had a single model, yes, and this is a technique that is used. But currently the Program has multiple models. They may try to develop a boiled down version to get a single model.

Claire Stalnaker noted that the use of models is experimental and contributes to learning as you often find that the real world outcomes are different than model projections.

Dave Hillemeier noted that the Program has evolved in site design since the Phase I Review, and asked if the SAB had any thoughts about the newer projects. This prompted a set of speculations by Mike Merigliano. He first noted that the designs have become bigger and that, originally, there was no “currency” of fish habitat as the approach was more intuitive. Also, back in 2004, the Program thought that the creation of big bars would provide more habitat. He said 11,000 cfs may not be enough to provide the alluvial power needed as rivers do not change very fast based on 100-year return photos. He related how big flows helped with fluvial change on the South Fork Snake River in Idaho. Merigliano then shifted his comments to the value of models and his experience with models as an “empiricist.” He said there is a natural affinity to measuring real things to modelling and, early on, the Program had a problem with sampling. There was a lack of integration and lack of knowledge of quantitative benefits from the early projects. He commented on people’s fears that the model will be a “big thing.” He encouraged the Program to embrace it given their large data sets at their disposal. He finished up with encouragement, saying, “It will pay for itself. If you are afraid to be wrong, don’t do the model. Being wrong is how you learn new things.” He finished by noting that the Program has many people that know the river very well and they will not likely get fooled by models. Skepticism about models is good, but the progress on models such as the fish production model is a bit slow.

Seth Naman thought there is not really resistance to the model but the fish production model takes a bit of time to get running. Merigliano disagreed and suggested it was easy to get started. He sensed there was resistance in the Program. Hillemeier said one short-coming was that there was not a person designated to assemble the models. Merigliano said they should at least do the fish model, where the geomorphic model may be more difficult. He said it is impossible to

predict where a bar may form but they don't need that information. Stalnaker reminded them that the Program got here by modeling when they showed that modeled increases in habitat would double the fish production. Jordan added to the values of modeling by stating that you cannot answer the question of whether the project is working for increasing fish by going back to the site. Instead, fish populations work at larger scales and this can readily be addressed by modeling.

Joe Polos said to incorporate more modeling efforts and the additional monitoring that may be needed to evaluate management action outcomes, the Program will need to retool the Science Workplan process and perhaps the RIG planning and rethink their budgeting decisions. The program has tried to set aside funds in the past (water year specific line item in past budgets) and this was discussed at the recent Fish WG meeting. In past years, this funding task was typically swallowed up to fund ongoing monitoring and in the recent discussion in the Fish WG there were concerns that setting aside funding for unforeseen monitoring would jeopardize funding for ongoing monitoring programs. This should be discussed at the next TMC meeting when we take up the FY17 budget.

12. 2015 Chinook Salmon Returns

Derrick Rupert of the US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and Wade Sinnen of California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) reported on the salmon returns. Rupert presented slides describing the results of the salmon redd surveys for fall Chinook in the Trinity River. This year's redd counts were the lowest observed since 2002 monitoring and were 50% of last year. Carcass counts were also very low, especially coho. One positive note was that they found only 8 dewatered redds caused by the reduced winter flows.

Terri Simon-Jackson asked if the low numbers are mostly part of a cyclical process. Rupert repeated his point that these are the lowest since 2002.

Wade Sinnen gave a presentation via telephone on the run-size estimates for the basin. Run-size estimates include escapement and harvest combined and include tributaries above the weir where the data were collected. He reported that the run-sizes were also low this year and in the lower 20% range of the historical data. Spring Chinook run-size passing above Junction City Weir was 4400 fish with 67 % of hatchery origin. Fall chinook run-size above Willow Creek Weir was 10,000 fish which was the fourth lowest observed; 42% were hatchery fish. George Kautsky had a concern over a potential bias by noting that the grilse were 25% of run-size at the weir but only 10% at the hatchery. Sinnen thought the hatchery operations does not favor the return of 2 year-old fish. Coho run-size was 4,900 fish with 82% hatchery origin.

Sinnen said fish returns to the Klamath, Scott, and Shasta and likely Central Valley are all down. It may be the ocean, and specifically El Nino conditions, that result in lower survival. Basin-wide, pre-season projections were 119,000 fall Chinook and the actual number will likely be much lower and they will not have reached their floor objective. Steelhead seems to be down a bit so far and the hatchery component is 78%. Higher hatchery component may be a result of four years of drought whereas hatchery survival is not affected by drought.

Seth Naman showed Morgan Knetchle's data on fall Chinook returns to the Shasta River. He pointed out that last year 18,000 Chinook returned versus 6500 for this year. The Bogus Creek returns are also about 20 to 30 % of last year's, suggesting low fish returns are a system-wide phenomenon.

Tom Stokely said that last year, the Klamath had good runs but the Trinity was down. Wade Sinnen countered that the runs in the Trinity last year were pretty good. Dave Hillemeier recommended that the Fish Workgroup summarize this information for several years. Robin

Schrock said it would be good to track the Klamath with other northwest rivers as they seem to agree. George Kautsky agreed with Hillemeier and added that the Fish Workgroup should prioritize efforts to synthesize knowledge across the program's science.

The discussion on the value of fish data was continued. Tom Stokely asked Sinnen if the CDFW has good funding for next year. Sinnen said that spring Chinook or coho is not well funded for next year and he pointed out that the TRRP is focused more on fall Chinook. Federico Barajas pointed out that the priority for assessing marked returns at the hatchery for steelhead is not high. Kautsky defended the focus on fall Chinook by pointing out that the Program has prioritized comprehensive assessment for fall Chinook given funding limitations. Sinnen further clarified this by pointing out that the fish review identified the best data was for fall Chinook and that this is a good place to focus for analyses. Hillemeier said as the "lion's share" of the work is already being done, they should try to complete the data collection for coho and steelhead. Sinnen said they have estimates of the costs and it would not be huge. Joe Polos said they currently spend over \$1million for the fall Chinook assessment. Hillemeier said they need to know how much more money it would cost so they can make a decisions. Naman suggested this could be a topic for the March meeting. Dave Hillemeier suggested the Fish Workgroup provide annual report on runs, harvest, and escapement

Action item: Joe Polos will ask the Fish Workgroup to provide a summary of fish returns to Klamath/Trinity basin as well as other river systems for the March TMC meeting.

Lunch

13. TCRCD Outreach

Donna Rupp and Shiloe Braxton of the Trinity County Resource Conservation District (TCRCD) gave a Powerpoint on the outreach efforts they perform for the TRRP. Rupp made the point that their outreach has been active and successful and that they hoped to continue this work for the TRRP. She started the presentation by noting that the TCRCD has worked with the TRRP for over 20 years. The TCRCD has been traditionally known for doing fuels work, working with schools, fire, revegetation, GIS, and road work. For the current outreach and education agreement they have with the TRRP, they provide engagement of community stakeholders, listen to their input, dispel misinformation, and translate scientific information. They hold public meetings, workshops, rafting trips, and help with the science symposium. They have produced printed materials, such as tri-folds, newsletters, articles for the newspapers, website and electronic media, and a video. They host a several youth camps and festivals that introduce kids to the river and restoration sites. In the next seven months they plan, among other things, to start a citizens' monitoring program for yellow-legged frog egg masses and a brochure on best management practices for those living on the river front.

Their contract ends July 2016 and they are hoping to continue this work with the TRRP. Robin Schrock asked for any inputs on outreach from TMC members and suggested they contact Michelle Gallagher and Donna Rupp directly. Rupp listed several "next steps" including identifying target audiences, clarifying the message, building the program identity, and addressing myths versus facts. She gave a few ideas that may be effective, including holding regular meetings with Lewiston property owners, and sponsoring scientific events.

George Kautsky asked if there were anyone that puts meeting announcements in the Trinity Journal. Donna Rupp said the TCRCD could take care of that.

14. TRRP Website

Eric Peterson gave a Powerpoint presentation on the TRRP website. He noted he was seeking input regarding ways to improve the website. He pointed out that there are essentially two websites. The TRRP.net is the main website and they also maintain a Data Portal website with information that goes back to 1900's about the river. He showed how to navigate the website and showed an improved way to find out about upcoming meetings. The main website is linked to the Data Portal. He went over a few more items on the main webpage and the menu and the topics with links to videos, reports, news releases, flows, channel rehabilitation, current flows from USGS gages.

15. TMC 2017 Election

Seth Naman explained that it was time to elect a new chair and vice-chair for the next two years. Eligible candidates have to be from one of the four federal agencies that sit on the TMC. Joe Polos reported for Bruce Bingham by stating that now is not a good time for Bingham to commit the time to serve. Terri Simon-Jackson said her highest priority is supervising fire crews during six months of the year and this would impact her ability to serve. Federico Barajas and Naman both stated their commitment to serve in any way the TMC saw useful. The TMC took a written vote for chair and vice-chair.

The TMC elected Federico Barajas to serve as chair and Seth Naman was elected to serve as vice-chair of TMC for the next two years.

16. Public Forum

No comments.

17. Action Items

The TMC set the meeting schedule for next calendar year.

January 28, teleconference 10 am – 12 pm

February 18-19, Quarterly TMC meeting begins 9 am, Weaverville, CA

March 29, Flow meeting, Weaverville, CA

April 21, teleconference 10 am – 12 pm

May 19, teleconference 10 am – 12 pm

June 1-2, quarterly meeting, Eureka, CA

July 21, teleconference 10 am – 12 pm

August 18, teleconference 10 am – 12 pm

September 28-29, Quarterly meeting, Weaverville, CA

October 20, teleconference 10 am – 12 pm

November 17, teleconference 10 am – 12 pm

December 14-15, Quarterly meeting, Weitchpec, CA

Before adjourning, TMC considered items to return to for unfinished discussions; these items included the grant applications process, the Efficiencies Subcommittee recommendations, the DSS and funding, the River Corridor Concept, and the Tribe's request for Program review.

Joe Polos reviewed that the IDT discussed the River Corridor and DSS and was not able to come up with consensus. The IDT is meeting next month and they will know then if they can resolve this and will report to the TMC for their January 28 phone call. Some concern was expressed that the IDT had not acted on determining how to use these funds. Joe Polos responded that it was impossible to develop a scope of work on how these funds could be used to support the further development of the Corridor Plan or DSS since the DSS pilot was not due to be completed until the end of Dec so IDT would need to see that document to develop a SOW to expend these funds and the DSS effort was also not developed sufficiently to identify where these funds could be used to help the TRRP efforts.

Federico Barajas reviewed the “fixer document.” A draft was passed out yesterday of both Tribe’s request for an outside review of the Program in order to provide as set of recommendations on Program structure, roles, and responsibilities. The Tribes have been in government-to-government discussions with the Department of Interior. Dave Hillemeier said the Yurok Tribe is concerned that the adaptive management portion of the Program is “not functioning as well as possible.” Teresa Connor responded that they have had Program reviews and it seems they adopt the recommendations they like and there is no change on the others. Tom Stokely agreed with Connor saying it would be fruitless to recommend changes if they won’t commit to the changes. George Kautsky said this review would be conducted along with additional discussions between the Tribes and the Department of the Interior as a way to get information to filter down from senior offices to ensure implementation.

In the remaining time, they took up the Efficiencies Subcommittee discussion of Item 8. Hillemeier explained the third bullet from the first meeting regarding the exploration of outside sources of funding. However, given the time, the TMC did not get through the remainder of the Efficiencies Subcommittee’s recommendations. Hillemeier said he could wait until the next meeting to continue this discussion.

Adjourn 4:10 PM

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**Trinity River Restoration Program Office****Weaverville, CA****Agenda for December 16-17, 2015**

Call in number: 866-721-5952

Passcode: 4702048

Wednesday, December 16, 2015

Time	Topic, Purpose and/or Decision to be Made Discussion	Leader
<i>Regular Business:</i>		
9:30	Introductions: ▪ Welcome ▪ Approval of Agenda ▪ Approval of September minutes	Seth Naman, Chair
10:00	Open Forum: Comments from the public	Seth Naman
10:15	Report from TAMWG	Elizabeth Hadley
10:45	Federal/Regional Updates ▪ FY-16 Funding update ▪ TRRP staffing update ▪ Mr. Wellock's well	Federico Barajas, Co-chair
11:15	Break	All
<i>Information / Decision Items:</i>		
11:30	Report from Executive Director ▪ Work Group Quarterly summary ▪ Science Update ▪ River Corridor Map ▪ Other	Robin Schrock
12:00	Lunch	All
1:00	Watershed Update ▪ Status of Funding Opportunity Announcement ▪ Projects Not funded in 2015 ▪ Contracting issues ▪ Recommendations/Next steps	Sean Ledwin
2:00	Break	All
2:15	Implementation Update ▪ 2016 planning update • Status of 2015 restoration sites • Status of Bucktail, Deep Gulch, Lower Dutch sites • Status of Bucktail Bridge	Brandt Gutermuth

6:00 Group Dinner-Location TBD

Thursday, December 17, 2015

Regular Business:

9:00 **Open Forum:** Comments from the public Seth Naman

Information / Decision Items:

11:30	Lunch	All
	▪ Farewell for Robin-Trinity Alps Golf Course	

4:00 **Adjourn**