

Final Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
 April 6, 2016
 Trinity River Restoration Program Office, Weaverville, CA

Wednesday, April 6, 2016; 9:30 AM

Attending Members

Member	Representative Seat
Seth Naman	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Adm. Fisheries, Vice-chair
George Kautsky ¹	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Kyle De Juilio ²	Yurok Tribe
Joe Polos ³	Fish and Wildlife Service
Bill Brock ⁴	Forest Service
Don Bader ⁵	Bureau of Reclamation, Chair
Tony LaBanca	California Natural Resources Agency
Keith Groves	Trinity County
Caryn Hunt DeCarlo ⁶	Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director (Acting)

Attending Members by Phone

Member	Representative Seat
Elizabeth Hadley ⁶	Trinity Adaptive Management Work Group, Chair

¹ Alternate for Mike Orcutt; ² alternate for Dave Hillemeier, ³ alternate for Bruce Bingham, ⁴ alternate for Terri Simon-Jackson; ⁵ alternate for Federico Barajas; ⁶ non-voting members.

Others that attended: John Letton, Kristi Bevard (local residents); Brandt Gutermuth, Robert Stewart, Linsey Walker, Todd Buxton, Dave Gaeuman (TRRP); Ed Duggan (TAMWG); Justin Ly (NOAA); Andreas Krause (Yurok Tribe); Teresa Connor (DWR).

Attended by phone: Damion Ciotti (TRRP).

Notes: Kim Mattson (ENW).

List of Motions made during the Meeting

Keith Groves made a motion to accept the agenda.

Joe Polos seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Keith Groves made a motion to accept the February minutes as edited.

Bill Brock seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Joe Polos made a motion to accept the Flow Workgroup recommendation for a Wet water year. The motion was amended by Keith Groves to include the Flow Workgroup recommendations for Normal or Extremely Wet water year. The motion was further amended by Tony LaBanca that the Flow Workgroup shall modify the early releases on April 22-24.

George Kautsky seconded the motion.

The motion passed with one no vote.

Voting no was Trinity County.

List of Action Items made during the Meeting

Seth Naman will follow up with Dave Hillemeier and Federico Barajas on status of letter regarding Trinity Reservoir storage (described in Item 18 of February meeting notes).

Seth Naman will ask Federico Barajas for the scope of work regarding the Fixer Document for distribution to the TMC and to be discussed at the next teleconference or May meeting.

Elizabeth Hadley will discuss a joint meeting with Federico Barajas.

Regular Business

1. Introductions

Seth Naman opened the meeting and asked for attendees to introduce themselves. Naman noted that Federico Barajas and Bruce Bingham and others were not able to attend as they were at a ceremony for removal of Klamath dams.

Approval of the Agenda

Naman went over the agenda. George Kautsky asked about the status of Trinity Reservoir letter referenced in Item 18 of the February TMC meeting notes.

Action item: Seth Naman will follow up with Dave Hillemeier and Federico Barajas on status of letter regarding Trinity Reservoir storage (described in Item 18 of February meeting notes).

Keith Groves made a motion to accept the agenda.

Joe Polos seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of February minutes.

Seth Naman made two edits to the minutes.

Keith Groves made a motion to accept the February minutes as edited.

Bill Brock seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

TRRP Fixer Document Update

Seth Naman reviewed the status of the Fixer Document, a proposal by both Tribes to review the overall Program by the regional offices of the Federal agencies. The proposal was favorably received by the agencies. The Tribes have developed a scope, budget, and timeline for a party to perform the review. An announcement should be ready by June.

George Kautsky asked if the TMC would make a motion of support. He cited the slow motion of the process and that support by the TMC may help accelerate the process. Seth Naman said they could pass a motion, but did not think it was needed. Joe Polos said he was not supportive of a motion because this was not an effort that was initiated by the TMC and the TMC has not had the opportunity to review the current proposal as submitted to the Regional Directors. Tony LaBanca also noted his lack of specific knowledge. Naman said he would ask Federico Barajas for the scope and see if he could provide it to the TMC.

Action item: Seth Naman will ask Federico Barajas for the scope of work regarding the Fixer Document for distribution to the TMC and to be discussed at the next teleconference or May meeting.

Joe Polos gave an update on the hiring of the Science Coordinator—they have received 17 applications. Reclamation is working on some details of the position for the Executive Director. They have received 11 applications with 5 phone interviews and 3 in-person interviews for the RIG Branch Chief.

2. Open Forum

Ed Duggan reported that the guides have received the letter from Federico Barajas on reports on the mouths of tributaries. He said he has heard back from three guides. He also noted there are some new guides and this outreach if useful.

Kristi Bevard said she appreciated the details in the written notes for the budget and asked that discretionary line items be defined during the budget discussions.

John Letton commented on the flow release. He found out there may be a change in the start of the ramp up for peak flows. He said he makes plans for visitors to his resort up to 13 months in advance and needs to know these things as river flow affects use by his guests at the Indian River Lodge. He asked that better notification be made to the public on these sorts of changes. The change to an earlier date of peak flow release has caused him some hardships. An organization called Casting for Recovery for women recovering from cancer had planned to do a fishing outing for April 22-24 and this may be during the ramp up dates. If they cannot get on the river in a safe manner, it would have a large impact on their plans. Had he known a year in advance that there was a chance of shifts in flow scheduling he would have been able to avoid taking reservations at that time.

Seth Naman acknowledged Letton's need to be better informed. He apologized for that and said they would do better to get information out. Naman also explained the nature of their planning and the need to be flexible in the adaptive management process. Letton noted that the dates may be manageable for the women's group, but he emphasized the need to know for his planning.

Ed Duggan recommended that a public notice be sent out about the Flow Workgroup meetings.

Information / Decision Items:

3. Report from TAMWG

Elizabeth Hadley, TAMWG Chair, gave her report by phone about the TAMWG meeting. She referenced her letter of the TAMWG motions she emailed out last night. She noted the TAMWG's concern over the cold-water pool in the fall and the TAMWG motion that recommended an extra 50,000 AF be reserved in the Trinity Reservoir from the ROD allocation for fall use. Had she known the concerns of John Letton, she may have recommended the start of peak flows be moved a few days. She noted the TAMWG did not think the budget was ready for a decision since the Science Workplan was still under development and was awaiting responses from peer-review. TAMWG recommended the TMC delay their decision too. She noted the TAMWG's recommendation to increase funding for watersheds. Finally she noted the Flow Workgroup's recommendation for increase monitoring for high flow releases and the TAMWG recommendation for the IDT to review this as part of the Science Workplan.

Seth Naman asked if the TAMWG had ideas of what the extra reserved water would be used for. Hadley said not specifically but it would be used for later in the year. George Kautsky said the letter of Trinity storage he referenced earlier today would address this issue to reserve water. Keith Groves said the TMC cannot ask for someone else's water. Kautsky said there is no mention of cold-water storage in the ROD and use of such water is therefore not the purview of this group. Groves noted that according to Barajas it was reviewable by this group. Don Bader said they would be providing Reclamation's projections for the end the year Trinity Reservoir storage on their website. Naman said this information would be helpful to know whether or not they will run into temperature problems. Without that information it would not make sense to make a decision on reserve water at this time. Groves said it is unlikely they will be a 1.2 million at the end of this year, the last time they were told it was 700,000 acre-feet. He was surprised this group did not see the wisdom of holding water back.

Groves asked Hadley if they considered information that this would actually a Normal year. Hadley said the forecasts that were presented to the TAMWG were indication of a Wet year.

Hadley said the TAMWG was interested in another joint meeting, but was concerned over lack of participation by TMC. The TMC members attending this meeting said most of the members or alternates did attend last year. Naman said he supported joint meetings and is something they should do every year.

Action item: Elizabeth Hadley will discuss a joint meeting with Federico Barajas.

4. 2017 Funding Discussion

Caryn Hunt DeCarlo reviewed the status of the FY17 budget. She noted they received five comments on an earlier draft of the budget, but they were not able to take action on all comments as some would have made substantial changes to the total budget.

Linsey Walker next walked the TMC through the FY17 proposed budget in a set of handouts and via a projection on the overhead. She first clarified for Kristi Bevard that costs considered to be non-discretionary were operating costs of the TRRP office and grants and contracts with others. The total budget for FY17 was \$15.0 million compared to \$15.2 million and \$14.5 million in FY16 and FY15, respectively. She noted the changes based on both her corrections and based on

the five the reviews were shown in yellow. She focused her comments mainly on these yellow highlights.

During Walker's presentation, the TMC members asked questions about various aspects of the budget. Walker started with the Program Administration (total \$2.5 million). Keith Groves asked about what the TMC costs cover. Walker said a various number of things such as travel or labor of some personnel. Tony LaBanca and Teresa Connor said they budget some hours for their staff but neither LaBanca's or Connor's salaries were included.

Walker next moved to Implementation (total \$7.6 million). Kyle De Julio asked about the Biological Assessment Development. Brandt Gutermuth explained the BA's were for listed species (coho) and also included a programmatic assessment of watershed effects on listed species. George Kautsky asked about the whole block of \$1.6 million for Planning as being a large portion relative to the Construction portion (\$3.8 million) planned for FY17. Gutermuth described some of the activities and specifically field monitoring that is planned such as the riparian bird monitoring which has been deemed to be very important. Kyle De Julio asked about the BLM wood harvesting agreement with zero funds. Gutermuth said there is already funding available from previous years.

Walker continued her presentation on the Implementation portion of the budget. She noted \$185,000 savings in the set of monitoring projects in the Geo-physical support services (sediment, bathymetric surveys, and aerial photography). Andreas Krause and Joe Polos both noted that some of the projects listed here were combinations of Implementation and Science items and it may be clearer have them separated out. Gutermuth said some the projects listed are needed as part of compliance and are therefore high priority.

Walker continued her presentation on Implementation and went through the Design and Support Services. Kyle De Julio noted the need for funding to complete a bathymetry project for about \$30-40K. Walker moved on to Construction and noted a change in that Construction Inspection will be contracted out. George Kautsky commented that the Hoopa Valley had suggested a different amount for Revegetation monitoring. De Julio also noted Coarse Sediment Processing may need up to \$150K.

Before they moved onto the Science portion of the budget the TMC heard from Andreas Krause on the Flow Workgroup recommendation for funding of monitoring the effects the high flow releases. Krause reviewed that they have not had consisting funding for monitoring the effects of high flow releases. The recommendation was to put funding back into the budget similar to a recommendation by the Fish Workgroup. The IDT had prioritized it as 19 out of 20 but the Flow Workgroup recommended it be prioritized higher. Krause acknowledged that he did not have specifics for monitoring but these could be built into a portfolio of described monitoring tasks. The request was to elevate the priority and allocate some funding to it. He noted the funding from past years for such monitoring was about \$50K but Krause thought less may be needed in the FY17 budget. The Workgroup could work up a scope of work if this was to be pursued. Krause listed some of the items that are already monitored; he said the increased funding would focus on flow variability as benefits for the Yellow-legged frog and for increased feeding and rearing for fish. Kyle Julio said such monitoring will provide justifications on specific flow releases. Seth Naman clarified said they would expect more information on this so they could discuss it more fully on the conference call or at their next meeting.

Linsey Walker moved onto the Science portion of the FY17 budget (total \$4.8 million) again focusing on the yellow highlighted sections. George Kautsky asked why the Hoopa Valley Tribe suggested increases for their Science personnel were not in these changes. Hunt DeCarlo said Federico Barajas went over the suggested edits and he made the decision what changes to

incorporate so as not to increase the total budget. Kautsky noted that the Fish and Wildlife had approximately a \$300K increase. Joe Polos said the increase reflects the shift of the TRRP Fish Biologist from BOR to FWS as well as some of the FWS costs were included as part of the Admin Budget in previous years and it was all included in the Science Program in this version of the budget. Walker said that BOR funds the Tribes and the FWS provides their own portion of funds. LaBanca asked if they should note the Hoopa Valley Tribe's changes also in yellow so as to show that it is a negotiable issue. Walker said it is negotiable but that would be handled by Barajas.

Walker moved onto the Monitoring and Evaluation Priority Items of the Science budget. She noted the large block of yellow highlighted items were tasks that were broken out in this new budget. De Juilio asked if the rehabilitation effectiveness monitoring were still up for review. Damion Ciotti said that yes, these projects will be undergoing peer review. Gutermuth said there was a priority for projects that tied rehabilitation to its effectiveness. The Design Team and SAB will be reviewing these projects and commenting. Kautsky asked how much over budget would they be if they added in all the Science monitoring projects. He asked if Walker could show budgeted amounts for all the projects as a running total. This would allow them to draw a line to show the funding threshold. He noted that many of the things below the hypothetical funding line are troubling such as the harvest monitoring or creel surveys.

On the next block, Other Science Tasks, Naman asked about some details about the fish population model.

The TMC discussed how to format the next version of this budget. It was reiterated that there will be more review of the newly proposed projects. Walker said she could provide two versions of the next budget, one showing the original project funding requests and another showing the budget after adjustments based on the project reviews.

Regarding why SAB funding went up \$30K from FY15 to FY17, Walker clarified some of her adjustments of funds. Andreas Krause clarified that the \$10K was used in the past for technical reviews by outside parties such as university professors.

No action was taken on the budget as the TMC wanted another set of modifications based on the peer reviews and on how the budget would be displayed.

Lunch

5. Water Year 2016

Andreas Krause introduced this item by projecting a graph of the proposed hydrograph (referred to as BPR) versus the ROD hydrograph so as to set the stage for the following presentations. He said that Dave Gaeuman would be presenting first the recommendations for this year's gravel injections since he had limited time. The proposed BPR hydrograph shown by Krause had a slightly earlier peak that was composed of two separate peaks, more slowly descending limb, and contained more variable flows as opposed to flat benches or monotonic declines.

Gravel Injection Recommendation

Dave Gaeuman gave a Powerpoint presentation for the recommendations for the gravel injections based on the BPR hydrograph. He reviewed that last year, total injections were 1,700 cubic yards. He showed for comparison that the sediment export last year past Douglas City was in the same ballpark or 1,300 cubic yards. He showed the locations for the two proposed injection sites: Diversion Pool and Upper Lowden Ranch (IC2). This year the recommendations

are for 3,600 cubic yards for a Wet year and 2,800 cubic yards for a Normal year. This is the recommendation they were seeking to confirm today.

Gaeuman explained that the double peak is hypothesized to move more sediment. They hypothesize that more sediment is moved on the rising limb of a peak so having two peaks will have two rising limbs. Other hypotheses were that the first peak is more effective in total gravel movement; that gravel will move a farther distance downstream if injected at the rising limb versus the peak; and that gravel injected on the second rising limb will move farther downstream versus the first rising limb.

George Kautsky asked if channel migration might also occur. Gaeuman said that they should see some of this such as the erosion at Rush Creek delta and at the mouth of Grass Valley Creek. He thought the double peak may cause more erosion than a single peak. Gaeuman said they will do bank erosion measures. They will get a good measure of scour using their multi-beam sonar.

Ed Duggan asked about a side channel and logjam in Wheel Gulch and if Gaeuman will be able to monitor changes there. Gaeuman said they will be able to do monitoring post-release but that area is not targeted for detailed monitoring—but they may be able to get at it and he expected changes there. However, the release from Lewiston will not be as effective that far down river as the winter storm events are more the main drivers of flow far down river from Lewiston Dam

Current Hydrological Conditions and Water Year Determination

Robert Stewart next presented on the current hydrologic conditions in the Trinity basin and the water year determination for this year. He reviewed the water year determination criteria and that a Wet year has a total release from Lewiston Dam to the Trinity River of 701,000 acre-feet. The Daily CVP water supply report showed as of today, an increase over last year in Trinity Reservoir storage. Total storage in Trinity Reservoir currently was 1.3 million acre-feet which was 74 % of the 15-year average and 54 % of total capacity (2.4 million acre-feet). The accumulation since October 1 was 147 % of average and the precipitation at the hatchery since October 1 was is at 112 % of average. Snow sensor reports indicated most stations were below the April 1 average water contents. There appears to have been an approximately 5-7 inches of water gain in early March followed by a decrease in the last two weeks of March. Stewart said field surveys of snow water contents were performed April 1 and the results should be on the websites by April 8. The inflow forecast to Trinity Reservoir by the California Nevada Forecast Center is trending to a Wet year. The B120 forecasts for April have not come out yet, but the March 1 forecast was on the boundary of the Normal and Wet. He noted that the beginning of March prediction of inflow was much below the actual measured inflow for the month. So, Stewart said it is looking like a Wet year.

Keith Groves commented that the game seems rigged. He noted with only 112 % of normal precipitation at the hatchery and below normal snow contents, how can it come to a Wet year? Seth Naman noted that the range of values in the inflow “bins” for a Normal year are narrower than either a Dry or Wet year so there is a less chance of Normal year occurring than either a Dry or Wet. Gaeuman noted that precipitation at the hatchery may not reflect precipitation in the mountains. Andreas Krause pointed out that the snow water contents are likely lower due to greater rate of melting earlier this year, and this would have resulted in the higher measured flows to the reservoir.

Flow Recommendation Presentation

Andreas Krause gave his Powerpoint presentation on the recommended hydrograph from the Flow Workgroup. He reviewed the ROD recommended hydrograph and describes the various

parts. The increasing limb of the ROD had benches for fish habitat, the peak and first bench of the descending limb were for geomorphic work and to provide riparian habitat. The last bench was for Yellow-legged frog and temperature targets. The recommended BPR hydrograph was comprised of a more variable rising limb, two peaks and a more slowly and variable descending limb. The rising limb was designed to get fish to move around a bit more and to prevent initiation of the laying of eggs by frogs. The double peak was designed to gain more geomorphic movement. Reviews had shown that they are not getting as much sediment movement as they had expected. The double peaks used 40 % less water than the ROD peak and were expected to move more sediment. The double peaks were capped at 10,000 cfs as greater release would necessitate the use of auxiliary outlets and their use draws more on the deeper, colder water. The riparian ramp down had benches to facilitate monitoring and it also had daily variation (increases and decreases). He said under normal snow melting, rivers undergo a diurnal fluctuation in flows (high and low in a single 24-hr cycle).

George Kautsky said the Hoopa Valley Tribe has some concerns about the daily variation especially if they cannot test the hypotheses. Krause said there is no extra work on the daily operations. He said it likely cannot hurt to do the extra flow variation even though they cannot monitor it, but if extra money does come up, they can monitor it. Kautsky expressed concern over making a decision over this hydrograph if it could be bad for fish and concern that they could not validate it either way. Joe Polos said he did not have any problem with the variation and noted literature supported such variation. Krause, responding to Kyle De Juilio said there were hypotheses that the variation had benefits for riparian conditions such as capillary fringe.

Ed Duggan said he thought the recommended hydrograph appeared to mimic natural conditions. Justin Ly asked if it were possible to design the ramp down to mimic rainfall conditions. Krause said the Flow Workgroup has discussed whether they could use real time meteorological data information on seed dispersal. He said this approach needs more work on logistics and what sort of real time flexibility they have. Keith Groves asked if they have considered variation in flows during the summer. Krause said they have considered this and the literature supports it. In fact, constant flow supports more plant establishment on the bank edges. But he noted the need to also meet temperature targets. Seth Naman said they have put in a proposal for funding to have the temperature model incorporate daily fluctuations. Groves asked if they have considered timing the high flow releases with natural storms to really magnify the impacts. Krause said this was considered in the Flow Evaluation Study but there were concerns over redd scour, they would have not yet determined the water year and did not know how much water they would have for release, and there was the possibility of flooding houses in the floodplain. He also noted the purpose of the releases were to mimic snow melt.

Krause commented that for a Normal year, the BPR was largely the same but with different volumes; the Extremely Wet would need to have the peaks initiated about a week earlier in order to accommodate the declining flows so to reduce high flow impacts to construction in July.

Krause noted the draft letter included in the TMC members handouts. This letter could be used as the letter to the Regional Director for flow release based on the decisions the TMC made today.

George Kautsky said if they could delay the start of the initiation and add that discharge to the peak to get the 11,000 cfs release. Krause reviewed that two peaks allowed them to test hypotheses, and staying below 10,000 avoided release of cold water. Kautsky argued that actions to conserve the cold water pool were not part of the ROD objectives and therefore were more the concern of the CVP operations. This would put the pressure on CVP to export less water.

Krause finished his presentation by noting that above an 8,500 cfs release, things do not always go according to plan. He listed a series of precautionary measures such as releasing of peak flows on weekdays, using real-time monitoring, following an emergency response plan, and performing public notification. Tony LaBanca suggested they a news article on how they are considering these changes to the flow schedule. Kristi Bevard said there has not always been signage at all river boat launches and the Program could consider having people at all put-ins.

Seth Naman asked if the Flow Workgroup could adjust for the initiation dates of April 22-24 and avoid those dates cited by John Letton when his group would be on the river. Krause said it could be done, but would be easiest if the Flow Workgroup had discretion on how to make that adjustment. Krause reviewed that they had at first tried to adjust the flow release to avoid the trout opener. But eventually they stopped this and the State adjusted the trout opening.

Keith Groves asked for clarification of the rational for the early release. Krause said earlier initiation of releases would help the fish out-migration. Earlier peaks help to get the descending limb down low enough by the start of construction in July.

The TMC discussed how to address the public's concerns over the changes in flow. It was pointed out that if you appease one party, will you need to open the door to others? The public already had chatter about an earlier release. It was pointed out that the release was only a draft concept until the TMC made its decision. George Kautsky opined that it would be preferable that the public concerns be brought through the TAMWG.

Krause finished his presentation with comments on the need for more formal planning. He listed Flow Workgroup tasks for the coming year: make use of the DSS models, identify synthesis reports, develop a portfolio of experiments, and participate in an annual budget development.

Joe Polos reviewed the motion of the TAMWG to reserve water for fall flows and use ROD water for that reserve. He noted that the TMC has gone on record that fall flows should not use ROD water. Naman said that they have gone over this before and he presumed the sentiments would be the same. Kyle De Juilio said that given a Wet year, fall flows may not be needed. Joe Polos noted the TAMWG also wanted to maintain higher water levels in the reservoir, and maintain water temperatures. Ed Duggan commented the thinking was to use water to cool the river down in the fall. They thought they would save water in the front end and use it in the fall.

Joe Polos made a motion to accept the Flow Workgroup recommendation for a Wet water year. The motion was amended by Keith Groves to include the Flow Workgroup recommendations for Normal or Extremely Wet water year. The motion was further amended by Tony LaBanca that the Flow Workgroup shall modify the early releases on April 22-24.

George Kautsky seconded the motion.

The motion passed with one no vote.

Voting no was Trinity County.

6. TMC 2016 Schedule

The next teleconference calls are scheduled for April 21 and May 19. The next TMC is scheduled for June 1-2 in Eureka

7. Open Forum

No comments.

Adjourn 3:45 pm

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

Trinity River Restoration Program Office

Weaverville, CA

Agenda for April 6, 2016

Call in number: 866-618-5350, passcode 2295361

Time	Topic, Purpose and/or Decision to be Made	Discussion Leader
<i>Regular Business:</i>		
9:30	Introductions: ▪ Welcome ▪ Approval of Agenda ▪ Approval of February minutes ▪ TRRP Fixer Document Update	Seth Naman, Vice-Chair
	Open Forum: Comments from the public	
<i>Information / Decision Items:</i>		
9:45	Report from TAMWG	Elizabeth Hadley
10:00	2017 Funding Discussion Caryn & TRRP staff ▪ Revised TRRP Program Budget ☐ Science ☐ Restoration ☐ Administration ▪ Next Steps and Key Milestones	
12:00	Lunch	
1:00	Water Year 2016 ▪ Current Conditions ▪ Flow recommendation Presentation ▪ Flow recommendation Letter to Regional Directors	R. Stewart
3:00	TMC 2016 Schedule ▪ Next Teleconference April 21 & May 19 ▪ Next meeting - June 1-2 in Eureka	All
3:15	Open Forum: Comments from the public	
3:30	Meeting Summary of Action Items	
3:45	Adjourn	