Final Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
May 19, 2016
Trinity River Restoration Program Office, Weaverville, CA

Thursday May 19, 2016; 10:00 am

Attending Members

Member	Representative Seat
Federico Barajas	Bureau of Reclamation, Chair
Seth Naman	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Adm. Fisheries, Vice-chair
Mike Orcutt [1]	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Dave Hillemeier	Yurok Tribe
Bruce Bingham [2]	Fish and Wildlife Service
Bill Brock [3]	Forest Service
Tony LaBanca	California Natural Resources Agency
Keith Groves	Trinity County
Brandt Gutermuth [4,5]	Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director (Acting)

Attending Members by Phone

Member	Representative Seat
Elizabeth Hadley [5]	Trinity Adaptive Management Work Group, Chair

[1] George Kautsky sat in until Item 3. [2] Joe Polos sat in until Item 3. [3] Alternate for Terri Simon-Jackson.
[4] Alternate for Caryn Huntt DeCarlo. [5] Non-voting members.

Others that attended: Kyle De Juilio (Yurok Tribe), George Kautsky, Sean Ledwin, James Lee (Hoopa Valley Tribe) Linsey Walker, Todd Buxton (TRRP), Joe Polos (FWS).

Other that attended by phone: Teresa Connor (DWR) and Caryn Huntt DeCarlo (TRRP).

Notes: Kim Mattson (ENW).

List of Motions made during the Meeting

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the agenda.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to approve the April and May minutes at the June meeting.

Bill Brock seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

List of Action Items made during the Meeting

James Lees will work with Tony LaBanca and Brandt Gutermuth to put together a table on monitoring describing agencies, their requirements, and recommendations for the June TMC meeting.

Kyle De Juilio and Joe Polos provide a cross-walk between old and new projects. Polos will populate the 2016 columns and merge the Science budget with Linsey Walker's budget.

Regular Business

1. Introductions

Federico Barajas, Trinity Management Council (TMC) Chair, opened the meeting and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Approval of the Agenda

Barajas noted the main purpose of this meeting was the funding discussion. He also noted the need to address the TMC chair position and the agenda for the June meeting in Eureka.

George Kautsky noted that James Lee could provide an overview of riparian work and budget savings.

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the agenda.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of the April Minutes

Barajas next moved to approval of the April meeting minutes. Dave Hillemeier asked that they wait until the June meeting to approve the minutes to give him more time to review them. Seth Naman noted the TMC had committed to prompt turn around approval of minutes for the TAMWG. Joe Polos noted that the TMC had agreed to approve minutes at the following meeting due to criticism of the public and partners outside of the TMC not having access to minutes and not knowing what had transpired at meetings. He suggested that maybe the TMC should follow what the TAMWG has implemented concerning meeting minutes. The TAMWG allows 10 days for review and following this, the minutes are posted as draft. Elizabeth Hadley said a summary of the actions are useful for the TAMWG. There was general consensus to try to approve the minutes quickly but approval in June would be soon enough.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to approve the April and May minutes at the June meeting.

Bill Brock seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Open Forum: Comments from the Public

No comments.

Information / Decision Items

3. 2017 Funding Discussion

Federico Barajas introduced the budget discussion and stressed the need for the TMC to finalize the budget at the June meeting. At this point he asked Caryn Huntt DeCarlo who was on the phone and Linsey Walker to walk the TMC through this draft of the budget.

Revised TRRP Program Budget

Caryn Huntt DeCarlo noted two handouts: a budget overview and the draft budget as of 5/17/16. The budget overview summarized the changes made to the budget as suggested at the April TMC meeting. She noted that this version of the budget was $1,038,000 over the available funds for FY17 ($15.0 million) if all 20 of the proposed Science projects were funded.

She walked the TMC through the three portions of the FY17 budget (Administration, Restoration, and Science) noting the highlighted changes shown in yellow on the line items in the budget and described on her budget overview sheet.

Administration

The Administration portion of the FY17 budget was increased from $2.53 million to $2.70 million. Huntt DeCarlo discussed the increases in the line items for NOAA, Forest Service, Hoopa Valley Tribe, Yurok Tribe, and the Fixer Document.

Restoration

Huntt DeCarlo next moved to the Restoration portion of the budget. Overall, the Restoration budget had decreased from $7.70 million to $7.67 million. Details of these changes were reviewed. Planning was decreased by $126K in four line items: riparian bird monitoring, sediment monitoring, summer aerial photography, bathymetry. Realty was also reduced by $50K. Design and Support was reduced a net amount of $5K. Within the Design and Support, Technical Services on USFS lands was reduced by $41K and Bill Brock asked that he first verify the decreased funding with Brian Bair to see if this would still be valid for their FS contract. This decrease was partially offset by the increase in Design Support Services of $36K. Brandt Gutermuth provided some explanation for this—the need to review the floodplain maps and FEMA requirements. Construction Coarse Sediment Processing/Placement was increased by $150K. Revegetation maintenance and irrigation was increased by $2K.

At this point, the TMC had an extended discussion about bird monitoring and monitoring in general. Joe Polos noted the need to review the all monitoring efforts and noted that some savings might be achieved with these two projects since there is a riparian monitoring task in the bird monitoring proposal. Brandt Gutermuth commented that the much of the monitoring was necessary to fulfill their CEQA and NEPA requirements. Bruce Bingham said the FWS saw bird monitoring as important and he stressed that the Program needed to look at the comprehensive monitoring effort to get a better idea of how monitoring could be better organized to see if it were fulfilling the Program and regulatory objectives. Mike Orcutt agreed that these were valid questions and it is important to fulfill their regulatory needs. Seth Naman noted a table could be developed that would lay out the monitoring requirements. Tony LaBanca agreed with Bingham and he noted that while monitoring is required, there are few clear guidelines as to the specifics.

James Lee commented that he had reviewed the monitoring requirements over the Program and had put together a list of recommendations. The TMC wanted to hear Lee's findings at their June meeting. Seth Naman suggested Lee put together a summary table. Bingham asked that the table would have the requiring agency, metrics, the reporting. This would help to understand why monitoring is needed and the frequency of monitoring.

Action Item: James Lees will work with Tony LaBanca and Brandt Gutermuth to put together a table on monitoring describing agencies, their requirements, and recommendations for the June TMC meeting.

Bingham said he would want to know more about the specifics of the required monitoring so they may be able to find cost savings. Dave Hillemeier said Lee's presentation at the TMC June meeting would be a good place to talk about the $300K in savings.

Science

Joe Polos presented the updates to the Science program budget that were suggested at the April TMC meeting. Polos handed out a new version of the Science budget that was slightly different than that passed out by Huntt DeCarlo. He also passed out his overview sheet. Polos then walked the TMC through the changes.

The Science budget was originally proposed at $3.94 million and the changes made at the April TMC meeting reduced this to $3.03 million. Reductions were made for channel rehabilitation effectiveness monitoring, while biophysical effectiveness monitoring, and large wood effectiveness monitoring were dropped completely. This prompted discussion about the rationale of the changes and the use of the SAB, IDT recommendations. Bingham noted that monitoring normally is designed and funded as part of a project.

Polos continued walking through the Science budget and moved to fisheries monitoring. Those unchanged in funding were: smolt outmigrant, mapping the fry/juvenile rearing, and Chinook run-size estimates. Polos noted that the smolt monitoring is ripe for a review of what data they have and then to look for ways to pare it back. The CDFW Chinook run-size estimates. (Item 7 on Polos' overview sheet) was also noted as needing review. Chinook coded wire tags were reduced to $142K or back to about the same as FY16. George Kautsky noted that the original proposal included the need to purchase new tags. There was a question of whether they were going to tag Spring Chinook. Linsey Walker was asked to research the PSMFC contract if the purchase of tags was covered.

Polos next went over the projects that no longer had funding. These were Lower Trinity sport harvest surveys, Lower Klamath creel surveys, scale analysis, mapping of riparian vegetation, active bar and DSS, delta monitoring, and cohort reconstruction.

Next Steps

Seth Naman commented on the importance of coded wire tags for fall and Spring Chinook. Dave Hillemeier commented that he thought the scale analysis should have been rated higher. Tony LaBanca clarified that the ranking of proposals was vetted by the IDT. Polos confirmed that it had.

LaBanca asked for clarification on the new projects and asked if they were sacrificing old projects for new projects. Mike Orcutt asked if the new projects may be peer reviewed. Polos said they had not yet been reviewed but they will be; there just has not been the time to do that yet. Bingham asked that they still proceed with peer review for next year. Bingham further noted that they need to commit to long-term status and trends monitoring and they don't need to review the monitoring every year, but they should have annual reports to see if the monitoring is achieving its goals. Orcutt asked if the monitoring is covering disease. Polos said the Program does not do disease monitoring. Kyle De Juilio said they have provided fish to Scott Foote; but last year was the first year they did not do that for lack of funding. Sean Ledwin wanted to know where the decreased funding dollars went to.

Bingham asked about projects that have been combined into others and if the protocols have changed. Polos said no. LaBanca asked if there was a cross-walk about these changes. Barajas said no. Kyle De Juilio said he could provide some of the cross walks. Barajas asked that De Juilio work with Polos to provide this information for the next version. George Kautsky commented on reviews of new projects and noted that he could not see budgeted funds for reviews for FY17. Polos said FY17 projects need to be reviewed in FY16 and use those funds. It was clarified that the line item for reviews was for SAB. Hillemeier asked that they can get a single spreadsheet before the June meeting

Bingham asked that they tag the new items and include an estimate for peer review. Keith Groves asked that the estimate of funds needed for the tags be available for the June meeting. Orcutt suggested oversight be conducted if they don't spend all the funds on projects.

Dave Hillemeier thought the scale analysis needs to be funded and explained how this data supports several other efforts. Hillemeier hoped that Lee would come back with $300K in savings. LaBanca noted that the IDT had prioritized the projects already and several were higher than the scale project. Hillemeier said he disagreed with the priorities as scale data had relationships to other projects. Barajas said they need to see what the cost savings are and see how far it gets down the line on unfunded projects. Hillemeier suggested that Polos take a look at the scale data to explain it to the TMC at next meeting. Bingham said that they may need to move away from this annual prioritization and look more comprehensively at long-term efforts.

Action item: Kyle De Juilio and Joe Polos provide a cross-walk between old and new projects. Polos will populate the 2016 columns and merge the Science budget with Linsey Walker's budget.

Barajas also noted the need to look for funding opportunity to include peer review. He said the TMC will approve new projects in June with the understanding that peer review will be a part. He asked if they might have a presentation on scale analysis for June meeting.

Barajas returned to the complete the discussion on the Fixer Document (item 6 on Huntt DeCarlos' overview handout). He noted that $120K for DSS and river corridor plan has been diverted to the Fixer. An agenda item for the June meeting was to come up with a list of potential people of who would oversee the Fixer process. .

4. <u>TMC Chair Position</u>

Barajas said he had accepted a new position with the Bureau of Reclamation in Sacramento and it was questionable whether he would be attending the June meeting. He said Don Bader would sit in as the Bureau representative for the near future until they find a permanent replacement. Barajas said he is supposed to report for duty in Sacrament on June 1 but will try to meet with TMC. Keith Groves suggested they follow the bylaws and since they have a vice-chair to serve as chair, they may simply need to elect a new vice-chair. Seth Naman said that Justin Ly may be switching with him as the NOAA representative in December. Mike Orcutt noted that there are still some key staff positions to be finalized. He asked how to proceed on the Executive Director. Barajas said he has been working with HR and the position description has been finalized. The vacancy announcement will be made available to the TMC. Caryn Huntt DeCarlo is here until July 2. Barajas thinks they will need another interim director. Orcutt said there is interest that the second interim may be from the TMC. Barajas said it was “duly noted.”

June TMC Meeting Agenda Items

Barajas summarized agenda items for the next TMC meeting in June 1-2 in Eureka:

- Regulatory monitoring for compliance with a presentation by Lee and LaBanca
- Funding and budget approval
- Review the Science projects
- Fixer Document
- Adaptive Management and synthesis reporting presentation by the FWS
- Watershed Workgroup recommendations
- Design Workgroup monitoring and lessons learned
- Construction site prioritization efforts
- Update on 2016 flows and a CVP update
- Tom Stokely presentation on temperature
- Approval of April and May minutes
- Temperature letter Lewiston Reservoir
- ROD flows and flow variability in the hydrograph
- Fisheries management overview with scale analysis by Kautsky.
- EIS on the Klamath long-term plan for supplementation flows
- Delta connectivity responses update

5. Open Forum

No comments.

Adjourn 12:30 pm

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
Trinity River Restoration Program Office
Weaverville, CA
Draft Agenda for May 19, 2016

Time	Purpose and/or Decision to be Made	Discussion Leader
	Regular Business:	
10:00	Introductions: • Welcome • Approval of Agenda • Approval of April minutes **Open Forum**: Comments from the public	Federico Barajas, Chair
	Information / Decision Items	

10:10	**2017 Funding Discussion**
	• Revised TRRP Program Budget
	    • Science
	    • Restoration
	    • Administration
	• Next Steps
		TRRP

11:45	**Discuss TMC Chair Position** • Next meeting - June 1-2 in Eureka **Open Forum**	All
12:00 Noon	**Adjourn**	