

Final Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
 June 1-2, 2016
 Wharfinger Building, 1 Marina Way, Eureka, CA

Day 1, Wednesday June 1, 2016; 9:00 am

Attending Members

Member	Representative Seat
Federico Barajas ¹	Bureau of Reclamation, Chair
Seth Naman ²	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Adm. Fisheries, Vice-
Mike Orcutt ³	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Dave Hillemeier	Yurok Tribe
Bruce Bingham	Fish and Wildlife Service
Terri Simon-Jackson	Forest Service
Tony LaBanca	California Natural Resources Agency
Keith Groves	Trinity County
Caryn Hunt DeCarlo ⁴	Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director
Tom Stokely ^{4,5}	Trinity Adaptive Management Work Group, Vice-Chair

¹Replaced by Don Bader on Day 2; ²Chaired Day 2; ³ alternate George Kautsky sat in until Item 4; ⁴ Non-voting members; ⁵ alternate for Elizabeth Hadley.

Others that attended: Kyle De Julio, Aaron Martin, Andreas Krause (Yurok Tribe), George Kautsky, Sean Ledwin, James Lee Robert Franklin (Hoopa Valley Tribe) Linsey Walker, Todd Buxton, Robert Stewart, Brandt Gutermuth (TRRP), Joe Polos, Vina Frye, Bill Pinnix, Nick Hetrick, Nick Som, Damon Goodman (FWS), Teresa Connor (DWR), Wade Sinnen, (DFW), Bill Brock (USFS), Jennifer Curtis (USGS), Andy Colonna (member of the public), Don Bader (BOR).

Attending by phone: D.J. Bandrowski (Yurok Tribe) and Ron Mulligan (CVP), Eric Peterson (TRRP).

Notes: Kim Mattson (ENW).

List of Motions that Passed

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the agenda.

Tony LaBanca seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the April and May minutes as amended.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mike Orcutt made a motion the TMC reduce FY-16 funding on the top five watershed projects by 2.7% The TMC use any additional funds not spent on top five be spent according to the Watershed Workgroup priority and capped at \$500K.

Seth Naman seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 6 yes, 2 recusals.

Recusing were the Forest Service and Yurok Tribe.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion that TMC approve the FY-17 budget as detailed at \$15,009,576 including science projects through item 10, recognizing they still need to find \$285K to meet this savings by first looking for efficiencies within existing projects. If savings are not found by the September meeting, the savings will be made up by proportionally reducing all projects except Administration to reach the shortfall.

Mike Orcutt amended the motion to first use any additional savings to fund the \$44K for Hoopa Valley Tribe work at the Junction City weir, unless it was funded by other sources.

Keith Groves amended the motion to second use any additional savings for watershed work.

Dave Hillemeier amended the motion to cap the additional watershed funding at \$250K with any additional savings to go to either construction or watershed as determined by the TMC at that time.

The motion passed unanimously.

Keith Groves made a motion that the TMC sign the Lewiston Appraisal Study letter as amended.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously with 7 yes votes.

Mike Orcutt was absent and did not vote.

List of Action Items made during the Meeting

Coordinating Committee members shall email their list of candidates for the leader of the Fixer Process to Andreas Krause by June 10. Andreas Krause will then forward this composite list back out.

Regular Business

1. Introductions

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

Approval of the Agenda

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the agenda.

Tony LaBanca seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of the April and May Minutes

Minor edits were amended to the April and May minutes.

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the April and May minutes as amended.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Open Forum: Comments from the Public

Vivian Helliwell introduced herself as an attendee and representing the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations.

3. Report from TAMWG

Tom Stokely, Vice-Chair of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG) gave an update of the TAMWG meeting held last week. He noted presentations on the Decision Support System (DSS), brown trout, current conditions, monitoring compliance, and temperature issues. He went over several recommendations from the TAMWG to the TMC: that the TMC adopt the Lewiston letter, the TMC should increase funding for watersheds and otherwise accept the budget, the TMC consider compliance monitoring, and that the TMC shift some funds from South Fork Trinity watershed project to Salt Creek.

Seth Naman asked about the brown trout presentation. Stokely said that some had thought the research project was killing many fish but apparently is not. Alvarez presented an interesting story on brown trout life history.

4. Watershed Workgroup Presentation

Sean Ledwin, Coordinator for the Watershed Workgroup, gave an update on the projects chosen for watershed funding. Ledwin projected the proposal titles with their scores and the proposed funding for each of the nine proposals they received. The top five ranked proposals went \$13.7K over the allotted \$500K for watershed work. The Watershed Workgroup scored proposals using criteria of benefits to anadromous fish, technical merit, cost, and qualifications of the applicants.

Ledwin walked the TMC through the prioritization list. Top ranked was large woody debris placement in the South Fork proposed by the Yurok Tribe with guidance by D.J. Bandrowski, Rocco Fiore, and Aaron Martin. Second ranked was the Salt Creek Confluence Rehabilitation proposed by the WRTC. Third ranked was Sidney Gulch near the US Forest Service Offices in Weaverville proposed by Five Counties. The fourth and fifth ranked were Valdor Gulch and Oregon Street which were both sediment reduction projects also submitted by Five Counties.

Ledwin asked the TMC to provide guidance on how to allocate funding and meet the \$500K budget limit. The Watershed Workgroup proposed they reduce funding for the fifth ranked, Oregon Street, by \$13.7K (option 1). In contrast, the TAMWG had recommended reducing funding of the South Fork and using those funds for the Salt Creek Crossing, the sixth ranked project.

Ledwin's presentation generated an extended discussion among the TMC about the value of the South Fork project and whether funding should be reduced, how to make up the \$13.7K overage, and whether the Program had the authority to use funds in the South Fork for large woody debris placement.

Tom Stokely gave the rationale for the TAMWG recommendation of reducing funding for the South Fork. He noted it was a pilot project, it was receiving substantial funding from other sources, there was concern over its efficacy and that it was not in any specific plans for restoration of the South Fork such as the South Fork CRMP. Seth Naman countered that studies had noted lack of wood in the South Fork as an important issue for fish recovery. Tony LaBanca asked about the nexus with the Trinity River and Record of Decision. He asked if the wood would be contributing to sediment reduction and if this was the best use of Program funds to achieve goals of the TRRP. Ledwin recounted that Robin Schrock had discussions with the Solicitor about acceptability of the projects. Ledwin cited language about mitigating habitat in documents from the Central Valley authorizations. He noted that woody debris will increase retention time of sediment but acknowledged the main focus is fish. Dave Hillemeier provided support by noting Proposition 84 had funded a large portion of the project but the funding had been cut in half. Helicopters were expensive but it was chosen as a way to avoid heavy equipment use in the South Fork. Hillemeier also noted that about 20 spring Chinook were counted in the South Fork in 2015 and the wood placed in appropriate locations can provide thermal refuge. Ledwin said he thought there was definitely a linkage with the goals of the Program but he couldn't say about the priority.

Mike Orcutt commented that the door had been previously blocked for work in the South Fork and he thought the TMC may be "a little ahead of themselves." He noted that spring Chinook management is not well defined and that he would like to "agendize" this for a future discussion. While spring Chinook may eventually be listed, the Hoopa Valley Tribal Council may not see listing as a panacea for the fish but instead a limitation on fishing. He questioned the logic of investing money in restoration of habitat in South Fork Trinity River without considering the whole package.

Bruce Bingham asked if all projects have an effectiveness monitoring element to see how well they are working. Ledwin said the South Fork does have some monitoring, but there is concern over monitoring becoming too expensive. Bingham said they should fund monitoring. Dave Hillemeier noted the South Fork had tagging of wood pieces as part of the projects.

Orcutt said he would hate to approve something but then see it run into contract issues. Ledwin said the Solicitor reviewed the solicitation package before it went out. Federico Barajas said any funding of projects have to go through the Solicitor's review. Caryn Hunt DeCarlo said the contracting or grants officer has to submit the projects for review by the Solicitor. Hillemeier

said that TMC had already approved the scope of the solicitation package. Keith Groves said he signed on to the solicitation package as he was of the opinion the work was focused mainly on sediment reduction. Hillemeier said that large woody debris is a good way to reduce sediment transport. Tom Stokely said he helped write the Record of Decision and the mechanical restoration alternative was cited as way to work in the tributaries to reduce sediment and the South Fork was cited as an area for work. He went on to relate that a former BOR representative had worked to remove the South Fork as an area to work in. Orcutt said the South Fork is a large watershed. He cited the need for work to be linked to dam operation and if there has been a shift in policy they need to know that answer. Any shift in policy is not clear to him. Barajas argued that a shift in policy was clear as in the responses they received from the Solicitor and that they had submitted maps. He further noted that the Solicitor will need to review the individual projects. The role of the TMC is to advance the proposals. He thought Orcutt will get a policy response during their review. Seth Naman said they had received the Solicitor's most recent opinion and the Watershed Workgroup has done a good job in using this information

Terri Simon-Jackson said the Forest Service was disappointed their FY16 watershed project proposal was rated dead last (noting the evaluation criteria rated the bottom three project final scores as almost the same). She noted she appreciated the review done by the Watershed Workgroup. She went over the ROD, and it cited sediment reduction and specifically road maintenance as priorities. She noted their project came in first in priority only a few years ago but last this year, which was puzzling. The Forest Service project was focused on road storm-proofing which would reduce sediment delivery to the main stem of the Trinity River. The TAMWG had also made a recommendation to support this work. The objective of the Forest Service project was to reduce sediment from National Forest System roads, looking ahead to the threat/risk of wildfires in the watershed and adding to the risk of catastrophic landslides and threat to the instream restoration investments in the main stem. This proposal would have provided the capacity to deal with this road issues now while the Forest Service has resources/capacity available to accomplish the work, as it may not be true down the road.

Federico Barajas pressed the TMC to make a motion about the issues before them. Dave Hillemeier asked if he should abstain from voting and Barajas thought yes. The discussion focused on whether or not to accept the TAMWG recommendation to shift funding from the South Fork to Salt Creek. Seth Naman did not want to second guess the Watershed Workgroup decisions and noted they may need extra funding for coded wire tags. Keith Groves said he supported watershed funding. Orcutt commented that this cost is high and will eat up money. He did not want to second guess the workgroup and said he was more in favor of option 1. Bingham thought the South Fork could be rescaled with reduced funding. He suggested funding the top four and use the savings for monitoring. LaBanca agreed that the South Fork had additional funding and reduction should not hurt that project too much. Barajas said they will not be able to discuss FY2016 funding after this meeting.

Tony LaBanca made a motion that the TMC approve the FY-16 funding as recommended by the Watershed Workgroup and accept the TAMWG recommendation to reduce funding from \$188 to \$93K for the South Fork and shift this \$95K to the Salt Creek Stream Crossing and the TMC create a contingency plan for use of additional funds that become available.

Bruce Bingham seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion was suspended.

Seth Naman made a competing motion that the TMC decided if passed, would replace LaBanca's motion. Orcutt asked that Reclamation provide clear guidance about using TRRP money in the South Fork. Barajas said unless the TMC specifically provided for "a contingency," extra unspent money would go back to the Treasury. Simon-Jackson said if there were additional funds to be spent, the last ranked Forest Service project should be considered by the TMC to be moved up to number 7 as she did not agree with the ranking of the last three proposals, based on Sean Ledwin's description of the criteria/ranking. Orcutt stressed that the TMC should be consulted over spending of extra funds.

Seth Naman made a motion that the TMC approve the FY-16 watershed projects as ranked and take the \$13.7K from the first ranked project. The motion was amended that any funds not spent on the top five projects be prioritized per the ranking of the Watershed Workgroup and the total be capped at \$500K.

Mike Orcutt seconded the motion.

The motion failed with 4 yes votes, 2 no votes and 2 recusals.

Voting no were Keith Groves and Tony LaBanca; recusing were Terri Simon-Jackson and Dave Hillemeier.

The TMC then returned to the first motion. Orcutt said he did not agree with changing the Watershed Workgroup recommendations as it "turns it on its head." LaBanca disagreed that the motion turns the Watershed Workgroup effort "on its head," they simply wanted to fund the next project.

Tony LaBanca recommended the TMC approve the FY-16 funding as recommended by the Watershed Workgroup and accept the TAMWG recommendation to reduce funding from \$188 to \$93K for the South Fork and shift this \$95K to the Salt Creek Stream Crossing and the TMC create a contingency plan for use of additional funds that become available.

Bruce Bingham seconded the motion.

The motion failed with 3 yes votes, 2 no votes, 2 recusals and 1 abstention.

Voting no were the Hoopa Valley Tribe and NOAA Fisheries; recusing were the Forest Service and the Yurok Tribe.

Mike Orcutt made a motion the TMC reduce funding on the top five watershed projects by 2.7% The TMC use any additional funds not spent on top five be spent according to the Watershed Workgroup priority and capped at \$500K.

Seth Naman seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 6 yes, 2 recusals.

Recusing were the Forest Service and Yurok Tribe.

Trinity County at first voted no, but changed its vote to yes to make sure there was no confusion over the motion passing and the super majority rules with recusals.

5. Regulatory/Compliance Monitoring

James Lee riparian ecologist with the Hoopa Valley Tribe gave an update on permit requirements and compliance monitoring. The sediment permits from the State have a number of mitigation measures for wildlife and to minimize the detrimental effects of restoration. CEQA uses the present as a baseline by which to compare impacts to individual organisms. Minimum mitigation requires no net loss of wetlands, preconstruction survey for rare species (paid by the construction budgets), and management of monitoring reports. Alternatively Lee suggested they could just communicate with the State regulators. He suggested they could use the long-term monitoring showing effects of populations from management actions. Bingham commented on the problem on funding expensive monitoring where the requirements may be vague. Caryn Hunt DeCarlo said she had received emails from regulatory agencies that stressed that monitoring could not be dropped but they wanted to continue discussions on this.

Bingham argued for a comprehensive monitoring plan with funding to meet compliance. Dave Hillemeier agreed and that projects should have plans with power analyses.

Lee suggested they mitigate with a plan that listed who when what where how. The ROD and EIR are not very specific; the best guidance in the 1984 Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Act. The options were to take the CEQA approach or the TRD-impact approach or another option. Lees listed the steps to organize a program. Bingham suggested they evaluate their past and current monitoring to see how it may help to meet compliance monitoring.

Barajas said they need to simply see what the next steps are. There are other decisions that they probably cannot do today. The TMC needs to think about the right avenue in moving forward. Bingham thought this may not be for the efficiencies committee or the fixer process. Barajas said they needed to know that there is flexibility and that they should take advantage of that. Reductions in funding can be discussed in the budget item. Bingham said he thinks they need a plan but he is not ready to make recommendations on what would be in that plan. He said he needs to give it more thought. The current staff and FWS may not be ready to make these changes given that they have been monitoring another way. Tony LaBanca asked what the State staff would need to do to help in developing objectives. Barajas said they need some more work on the outline. Orcutt would like to see the Federal agencies that own the land merge their efforts with the Program to ensure they would meet the regulatory standards. Barajas asked Lee to formulate his thoughts more and present at the next meeting.

The TMC broke for lunch before addressing the next two items.

6. Presentation on Scale Analysis

This item was discussed after the lunch break. Joe Polos and George Kautsky gave a slide presentation on the Klamath Trinity Fall run Chinook scale analysis. The scale analysis had fallen off the funding line for FY2017 and the reason for this presentation was to discuss whether this project should continue to receive funding.

Polos gave rationale for monitoring fall Chinook—the recovery of fish was the basis of the Program. Fishery returns are important to estimate overall run-size and scale samples are used to age the fish and project ocean stocks for returns next year. The data contributes to the Mega table that summarized fish returns to the Klamath Basin. The data are collected and aggregated over the Klamath Basin.

Kautsky said the scale analyses contribute to answering the question of "what are the numbers of naturally produced Trinity River fall Chinook?" He said the age-2 recruits estimated by age-structured cohort reconstruction together with coded wire tags are a way to answer that. Seth Naman asked why not simply use the out-migrant screw-trap data. Kautsky said the screw traps estimate in-river production but the scale data provide adult recruitment information. Kautsky showed a graph of numbers of adult spawners in the Trinity River by year and the age-2 recruits produced by those spawning adults. While he acknowledged there was no trend in the pattern, he said this is a way to look at how the progeny of successive spawner escapements perform in terms of age-2 fish in the ocean. Reconstructed cohorts are also useful in estimating the numbers at age of naturally produced Trinity fall Chinook contributing to all fisheries (marine and terminal areas).

Tom Stokely asked if the Program did not fund this project, will others step up and fund it. Polos and Kautsky were not certain if someone would fund it or not. But Kautsky pointed out that other programs are paying for items such as recovery of coded wire tags. For example, The Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission annually supports sampling of salmon landings in recreational and commercial fisheries west-coast wide. Those data are vital to TRRP's ability to sum up contributions of Trinity naturally produced fall Chinook to these marine fisheries. Restoring the historic contribution of Trinity naturally produced fish to dependent fisheries is a fundamental objective of the TRRP.

Wade Sinnen said that one of the key ingredients is having the data. He noted they are also going to lose the creel data. This translates into lost fishing opportunities for next year because they may underestimate ocean abundance.

Dave Hillemeier thought that the Lower Klamath has a legal mandate to monitor the harvest so as to ensure the 50:50 harvests.

7. Current Conditions

This item was taken up following Item 8 budget discussion.

Robert Stewart of the TRRP gave an update on how well they were implementing the hydrograph. Stewart showed the inflows to the reservoir and noted they were at a Wet Water Year. He showed the natural inflow to Lewiston had peaked earlier than the scheduled outflows. He showed releases from Lewiston to date and that the actual measured releases had met the projected releases very well. The temperature targets for out-migrating fish at Weitchpec and temperature at Hoopa showed that most days were below the target but there were some above target mainly before the releases. The targets are from the Flow Evaluation and are not compliance. Turbidity was up to 380 NTUs in January from tributary contributions and was below 80 NTUs during the restoration releases.

Seth Naman noted the graph on inflows and outflows and how matching the outflow closer to inflows would be able to match the tributary outputs and it would have a number of benefits. Dave Hillemeier agreed with Naman and asked that the TMC agendaize these at a future meeting. Tony LaBanca also agreed.

Tom Stokely asked about the comments of higher observed stages of about 1 foot during the high releases. Stewart said the only way increased stage could have been observed would have been due to cross sectional changes at Mr. Wellock's house. It was noted that gravel was injected upstream of Wellock's at the Lowden Ranch site.

Lunch**Information / Decision Items****8. 2017 Funding Discussion**

This item was addressed following Item 6.

The TMC took up the review of the budget to see if they could pass a motion to approve a balanced budget for FY2017. The TMC had suggested additions to the budget at the April meeting and the TRRP staff had looked for ways to balance the budget with these new additions. Caryn Hunt DeCarlo walked the TMC through the FY2017 budget with their newest updates. Hunt DeCarlo first noted that the hoped for \$300K in cuts were no longer available from riparian and wildlife.

Administration

There were no funding changes to the administration. The subtotal was \$2.95 million.

Implementation

Three changes were made but according to the permitting agencies, the Program could not remove the compliance monitoring. The net change to Implementation was an increased \$3K. The subtotal was \$7.67 million.

The TMC discussed the Implementation Budget about possible cuts. Mike Orcutt questioned the value of gravel and sediment monitoring and the biological assessment development. DeCarlo checked with Program staff and said that the \$50K in Biological Assessment was needed for watershed projects but it was an estimate.

Dave Hillemeier noted that bathymetry funded at \$135K was already paid for with FY16 funds and asked if bathymetry would need funding next year. Teresa Connor thought they had wanted to do monitoring every year in order to detect change.

Science

Joe Polos said there were no real changes to the Science budget since the last meeting. He noted that the purchase of coded wire tags was not an issue; it is funded under another Reclamation project. Polos noted the reviews by the SAB of the Science workplan that was contained in the TMC packets. The Science subtotal was \$4.39 million.

Barajas asked the TMC how they may find funding for the scale analysis. He noted that the smolt monitoring may be cut back from its estimate of \$800K. Orcutt thought they should explore the flexibility with compliance monitoring. Hillemeier noted they are about \$285K short to fund the next three fish projects and he asked if the other projects could do some “sharpening their pencils” and find this funding. He also advocated they rank the Scale Project higher. LaBanca expressed support for all three projects as they were part of an “entire packet.” Bingham said he has not yet reviewed the SAB comments on the Science work plans and lamented that it would have been good to have this beforehand. He noted that the reviews, if valid, would affect how he voted and he suggested they review it before deciding. Orcutt said to get the needed \$285K, why not use \$50K from Biological Assessment and \$102K from gravel monitoring, combined with further reduction in riparian monitoring. He thought it was more important to monitor for fish than compliance. DeCarlo commented on the Biological Assessment was mostly done except for the watershed piece and that \$50K was an estimate of what was needed. Barajas offered another

solution to leave it to the Executive Director to look for the efficiencies and he was confident she could find the \$285K.

Pressing the TMC to pass the budget, Barajas suggested they approve the balanced budget and look for reprogramming to cover the \$285K shortfall with efficiencies elsewhere in the budget. He estimated that may take one to two months and that it could be followed up on at the next meeting. Hillemeier agreed and suggested they look for savings, and if they don't have it, use an across the board cut. Orcutt said one "efficiency" was the weir for spring Chinook at Junction City, which had lost its funding commitment. He said they should add \$44K to the \$285K deficit to maintain the weir operation in preparation of a possible listing of spring Chinook. Groves then asked that the additional \$250K for watershed also be added to the search.

Before proposing a motion, the TMC took a break to confer on this issue. After returning, the TMC developed a motion to pass a balanced budget for FY2017 of \$15,009,576 million. To start the motion making steps, Barajas reiterated they were looking for \$285K for fish monitoring projects in the Science plus \$44K for Hoopa Valley for spring weir work at Junction City, and \$250K for added watershed work. The Executive Director could look for efficiencies for the \$285K, and if not found, apply a 2 % across-the-board cut. Terri Simon-Jackson noted that if the Hoopa Valley Tribe weir were funded elsewhere, the \$44K then should not be part of the TMC discussions.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion that TMC approve the budget as detailed at \$15,009,576 including science projects through item 10, recognizing they still need to find \$285K to meet this savings by first looking for efficiencies within existing projects. If savings are not found by the September meeting, the savings will be made up by proportionally reducing all projects except Administration to reach the shortfall.

Mike Orcutt amended the motion to first use any additional savings to fund the \$44K for Hoopa Valley Tribe work at the Junction City weir, unless it was funded by other sources.

Keith Groves amended the motion to second use any additional savings for watershed work.

Dave Hillemeier amended the motion to cap the additional watershed funding at \$250K with any additional savings to go to either construction or watershed as determined by the TMC at that time.

The motion passed unanimously.

At the close of Item 8, the TMC took up Item 7 Current Conditions and then returned to this point of the agenda.

Before adjourning for Day 1, Barajas asked for comments from the public.

Robert Franklin noted his longevity in the Program and he thanked the TMC for making decisions about the Science. He acknowledged that perhaps the workgroups lacked a "backbone." It was also his hope that the DSS discussion takes the Program forward.

Federico Barajas expressed his appreciation for their work at passing the budget today. He noted this was his last day and he would miss the friendships. Don Bader would be sitting in for Reclamation until a permanent replacement was found.

Adjourn Day 1; 4:00 pm**Day 2, Thursday, June 2, 2016, 9:05 am**

Seth Naman, Vice-Chair called the meeting to order and noted that Andy Colonna was filming the meeting for Access TV.

9. Open Forum

Vivien Helliwell of the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations noted her group wanted to see the Program work well for fish. She reviewed the TMC bylaws and commented on the voting and noted it was "consensus minus one." This leads to what is called a "tyranny of the minority." She suggested a three-quarter simple majority in order to keep one or two parties from stopping progress. She noted there are people that want to take the Program down and her group did not want that to happen.

Tom Stokely said he agreed with Helliwell's comments. He noted that the old bylaws would not have allowed the watershed funding motion to pass and he thanked Keith Groves for his support on the watershed vote. There is a new letter in from the California Advisory Committee on Salmon and Steelhead Trout (CACST) in support of the Fixer Document. He noted that the TAMWG had negative views based on that letter. He expressed his own opinions that the TMC needed to add new members, add conflict of interest rules for voting on the budget, and look at the Collaborative Decision Resources Associates' (CDR) 2008 Trinity River Restoration Program adopt the recommendations of the 2008 CDR Situation Assessment about voting. He lamented that the Program has not been able to implement reforms. He said the Program is a grand experiment and has great people working for it but has not been able to produce results. He cited the Science Advisory Board (SAB) that the production of juvenile habitat is only 1.6 % per year. He cited frustration on TAMWG over recommendations being consistently rejected.

Seth Naman countered that the 1.6 % increase per year was a draft statement and this was shown not to be an accurate calculation of change in the river. The recent returns to the Klamath Basin may be related to the current poor ocean conditions. He cited that in 2015 the hatchery returns of coho smolt to adult was 0.7 %, the same as the hatchery in the Rogue River—both showing poor ocean conditions.

Information / Decision Items**10. Report from Acting Executive Director**

Caryn Hunt DeCarlo went through her report that was contained in a memo in the TMC members' packets. She noted accomplishments including the Science Symposium, Bucktail Channel environmental assessment, coordination with the Tribes on construction, flow release, addressing public concerns, budget updates, and hiring of a new Implementation Branch Chief.

Hunt DeCarlo noted the large negative public response over the effects of the high flow release. There were reports of water and flood effects on streamside property. TMC members asked about how people reacted this time compared to 2011 and the effort made for public notices. She commented that the public is also concerned over Trinity Lake being drawn down. Dave Hillemeier commented that it is important the public realizes that 52 % of the water is being diverted to the Sacramento River. Keith Groves countered that the public only see the lake dropping and the river flowing at high level and they really don't care about water going over the hill to the Sacramento Valley. Seth Naman noted that if they shifted to a more natural release

when other tributaries are high, it would help to alleviate public concerns. Groves said having a minimum pool would help to alleviate public concerns. He said the Program needs to accept that they damage people's lives and they should acknowledge that. Hunt DeCarlo said they need to have basic talking points to communicate to the public. Terri Simon-Jackson suggested a Q and A.

Hunt DeCarlo continued with her updates on TRRP activities and turned to Brandt Gutermuth to described Implementation activities. Gutermuth detailed the permitting for Bucktail. He noted they will be implementing the Bucktail project without the private inholding. The FEMA CLOMR package has been submitted. The CLOMR process has been complex and stipulates no change to the Base Flood Elevation level where there is infrastructure and this has required design changes. George Kautsky asked about the ROD's intention to restructure the channel and the FEMA requirement for no change in the Base Flood Elevation. Gutermuth said FEMA is not dealing with this very well as they are focused on insurance for the County and do not use models. Hunt DeCarlo said the Program is not prohibited from floodplain lowering but in the Bucktail they did not have the time to go through the process. Gutermuth closed his comments by noting the work on Deep Gulch and Sheridan, Chapman Ranch, and Lower Dutch and that he hopes these sites will be "permissible" by next year.

Hunt DeCarlo gave updates on personnel noting that Michele Gallagher had taken a new position with Reclamation and Mike Dixon is coming on as the new Implementation Branch Chief June 13. An offer has been made to the top candidate for the Science Coordinator position. Mike Orcutt commented that he was not notified of the process very well. Bruce Bingham countered that he had gone over the process at the January TMC meeting and he noted the notifications he mailed out to all TMC members. Orcutt acknowledged he missed the April TMC meeting and he expressed a desire to have a more streamlined process. Hunt DeCarlo said they are preparing the job announcement for the Executive Director. Don Bader added Reclamation had chosen a new acting Executive Director, Don Anderson out of the Reclamation Denver Policy office.

Hunt DeCarlo noted her last day as Acting Executive Director will be July 2. She expressed her appreciation for Brandt Gutermuth and his efforts over the last year and filling in as the Branch Chief and Executive Director. She noted the high-functioning employees on the TRRP staff. Tom Stokely and Seth Naman both thanked Hunt DeCarlo for her good work and the TMC gave a round of applause for both Hunt DeCarlo and Gutermuth.

11. DSS and Adaptive Management Presentation

Bruce Bingham and Joe Polos gave a Powerpoint presentation on adaptive management. Bingham said he would focus on things that they can work on as a start towards adaptive management. He thanked Tom Stokely for commenting on some of the institutional challenges in the Bylaws. He cautioned it will take some time to arrive at a "full adaptive management." He noted that programs like TRRP have challenges including their fiscal capacity to fully implement the Program.

Bingham said the TRRP has opportunities to implement key pieces of an adaptive management program but perhaps not all components of an adaptive management program. One key element that the TRRP can adopt is monitoring. He listed five types of monitoring: status and trends, effectiveness, validation, implementation, and compliance. He defined each type and stressed the value of effectiveness—seeing how well projects actually worked. He noted implementation is different from compliance or effectiveness as it sees how well the project followed the design. He projected a table contrasting and comparing the five monitoring types as to their funding and

reporting. He noted that adopting a monitoring program and adopting changes to the Bylaws as two focus areas that the TMC can address. Bingham gave some ideas about how monitoring reporting would be handled. He differentiated between annual quick summaries and synthesis reports that focus on a 5 to 10 year cycle. He closed by stressing the need to use monitoring as integrated into the decision making and planning.

Mike Orcutt noted the Fixer Document will be making recommendations about monitoring. Bingham clarified that the types of changes he is talking about can be adopted now and could have been adopted before this. The TMC needs to make these decisions.

Joe Polos continued with the presentation by reviewing the foundations of the Program and known issues with using adaptive management. He noted that decisions for adaptive management had been made in the Program but they have not always followed up. He commented that the TMC could be instrumental in supporting and leading the adoption of changes. Polos reviewed some of the earlier attempts at adaptive management and noted several documents on this. He listed known impediments to implementing adaptive management—a mechanism must be in place, managers resist it and are often short-sighted, stakeholders are not engaged, and lack of institutional commitment. Regarding the TRRP, it was recognized that there were big uncertainties in the Program. He noted that Appendix O of the Flow Evaluation Study lined out things they did not know as hypotheses. As they wrote the Flow Evaluation Study, policy reviewers did not allow the report authors to use the word “experiment” as they felt it may have demonstrated a weakness of the Program; Polos said it is now recognized the Program is a large experiment.

Polos reviewed earlier efforts at adaptive management specifically the Big Questions and the Performance Measures but both of these may have partially fizzled out. The newest effort is the Decision Support System (DSS) and this came about with the Phase I review. Polos noted an effort to produce a synthesis report for fisheries. Such efforts are hindered in that most partners are focused on their immediate projects and there are different ideas of the extent of such a report. Polos listed some of the concepts they would like to examine for fisheries or channel rehabilitation. Polos closed by noting there are many things already in place for adaptive management—blocks of information they can bring together, the foundation documents, DSS, River Corridor Plan, and existing synthesis reports. Further discussion is something they could handle at a future meeting.

Seth Naman said this would be a good item to take up at the September meeting. Dave Hillemeier said he was really impressed with what he saw at the DSS symposium such as the fish modeling and he said he did not want to wait for the Fixer Effort to fix things as they should be doing it now. He noted the new hires coming on and that he hoped someone would be able to take charge in this effort. There was more discussion of whether the Program can start adaptive management now. Dave Hillemeier and Seth Naman felt positive about moving in this direction. Terri Simon-Jackson commented that she has worked in programs when, if data synthesis was not happening, they had stopped all data collection for a year to give time for synthesis efforts.

12. Design Workgroup Presentation

Effectiveness Monitoring

Brandt Gutermuth, Robert Stewart and Aaron Martin gave a presentation on monitoring following implementation activities. Stewart went over the 2016 effectiveness monitoring the Weaverville staff is working on: Gold Bar geomorphic modeling, side channel inventories, and site-specific monitoring. As Stewart presented a list of monitoring questions, Bruce Bingham

objected and opined that these questions were more of hypotheses or validation monitoring and not effectiveness monitoring questions—that is, effectiveness monitoring of how well the project achieved its objectives. He stressed the need to make these distinctions in order to advance the discussion. Terri Simon-Jackson added that this is not a criticism of Stewart's questions but simply an effort to better focus the overall discussion.

Aaron Martin next presented on monitoring questions for fish habitat and specifically over-summering habitat. These focused on the effects of juvenile production. Another set of questions looked at adult use of constructed habitat which has not been done yet. Martin next presented a set of slides on the monitoring of the large wood structures regarding flow changes. He listed some of the data collection tasks—GPS, photos. He showed changes following the high flows. D.J. Bandrowski responded to questions via phone about assessing change of the log jams. He related they will be following the changes observed and comparing to the design and they expect change to the structures over time. Martin said they will be watching how they unravel and this will be important feedback to the design team. Todd Buxton asked about what specific aspects they may try to monitor. Martin said they are probably not able to get into these sorts of specifics yet.

13. Federal and Regional Updates

CVP Ops

Ron Milligan from the California Valley Project office of Reclamation called in to give an update on forecasted operations for Trinity Lake. He noted the forecasted runoffs through July have been moved downwards, probably due to the past drought. They are not bringing that much water through the Carr Tunnel probably 65,000 acre-feet (AF) per month. Exports will be fairly steady until September and ramped down in October. He estimated Trinity Lake storage by September 30 at 970K AF and it depended on the extent of augmented flows in late summer.

Mike Orcutt asked when the estimates may be finalized and what would be the status of the Humboldt County 50,000 acre feet. Milligan said they are not final until they get through the water year. Don Bader said they don't know the fall flow yet and this could be about 35,000 acre feet. Mulligan responded it depends on whether the 50,000 AF was part of the 35,000 AF fall flow.

At this point the TMC broke for lunch.

Lunch

Long-term Plan EIS

The TMC returned to this item following lunch and Don Bader gave an update on the process. He described the four proposed alternatives: no action, two sorts of supplemental flows, and more storage in Trinity Reservoir. There is a scientific review ongoing. Internal reviews will occur in July-August, and a public draft will be available September 27. They plan to sign a ROD by February next year.

14. Flow Workgroup Letter

Seth Naman provided some background on the Flow Workgroup letter noting it was essentially a second version of a letter written about a year ago. It was rewritten by the Flow Workgroup and involves six options to reconfigure Lewiston Reservoir to help keep water transiting through the

reservoir from heating the 2-3°F during the summer. This would help managers keep Trinity and Sacramento rivers within the established temperature targets.

Keith Groves made a motion that the TMC sign the Lewiston Appraisal Study letter as amended.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously with 7 yes votes.

Mike Orcutt was absent and did not vote.

15. TRRP Fixer Process

Mike Orcutt and Dave Hillemeier gave an update on the Fixer Process. Mike Orcutt explained that during a field trip last year, they looked at evolution of site designs. The concept of sites evolving with flow as called for in Trinity Record of Decision appears to have been replaced with evolution of site design strategies. In follow up Government-to-Government meetings, and a number of meetings among Bruce Bingham, Federico Barajas, Dave Hillemeier, and Seth Naman, a “Fixer Proposal” was drafted. A copy dated November 3, 2015 was inserted the TMC members’ packets. They now have FY2016 dollars to fund it.

The Fixer proposes a Program review to find better ways to meet Program goals and mandates and to develop refinements. The first step is to select a senior scientist/manager to perform this process and he/she should be selected from a pool of qualified individuals. Dave Hillemeier said they first need to assign people to the Coordination Team that will choose the lead individual. Tony LaBanca and Bruce Bingham noted the problem of urgency to set up the team but commented on the timing and notification of this issue and that they did not have enough time for proper review. Mike Orcutt said they had contacted Mike Callan of DWR. Tony LaBanca asked why not pull together recommendations made in 2010. Seth Naman said that a scope of work has been developed and that step is on it. Keith Groves asked what would be the Coordination Team’s responsibilities. Hillemeier said to help select the individual, provide documents, and arrange contacts. Andreas Krause said this process will differ from past program reviews in that a collective set of recommendation will be developed and they will follow up to help insure recommendations are implemented. Groves asked if the TMC will then approve the recommendations. Krause said yes, the TRRP will be able to review the recommendations and it will be finalized. Terri Simon-Jackson read from the ROD that the TMC role was to fulfill the objectives of the ROD, but asked if the Fixer is a different process. Seth Naman said the Fixer is not designed to upend the ROD. She then concluded that the TMC should be on the Coordination Committee and she asked to be assigned. Seth Naman, Tom Stokely, Bruce Bingham, Don Bader, Mike Orcutt and Keith Groves all said they would sit on the Committee. Dave Hillemeier said that Andreas Krause would sit on the Committee for the Yurok Tribe. Tony LaBanca said he would need to confer with the State before choosing who would sit on the Committee. Tom Stokely commented he was hopeful about the Fixer but was worried that changes would need to come from the Department of Interior as the TMC would not be able to institute changes for reasons he listed during the public comment period.

Mike Orcutt commented on the letter from The California Committee on Salmon and Steelhead Trout. The letter dated May 31, 2016 was rewritten on June 1, 2016 in a more toned down version. Tom Stokely noted the letter was intended to be helpful. Seth Naman said he did not think it was helpful and was overly critical. Tony LaBanca said he would have liked that the Committee on Salmon and Steelhead discuss this letter first with some State representatives as it

is now going to be difficult to respond. Terri Simon-Jackson said she has worked on issues like this and she noted this letter felt like some members from the Program had lobbied outside against the Program. Bruce Bingham noted that the letter had been CC'ed to many other people and there may be fallout. Vivian Helliwell defended the public nature of the letter by noting that the Committee on Salmon and Steelhead is "advisory" to the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the State Legislature but the letter is "public information."

The TMC discussed the timing of decisions that were needed versus the time needed to review the issue. Keith Groves asked if the Coordinating Committee would be operating under TMC voting rules or other rules. Bingham suggested they get the list together with three suggestions for the lead individual and let the Regional Director choose. Seth Naman said he would send out the most recent Fixer proposal and the scope of work. Bingham said a week from Friday was more reasonable to email a list of candidates to Andreas Krause.

Action item: Coordinating Committee members shall email their list of candidates for the leader of the Fixer Process to Andreas Krause by June 10. Andreas Krause will then forward this composite list back out.

16. TMC Chair and Vice-Chair

Seth Naman introduced this item noting that TMC Chair Federico Barajas had been promoted and the TMC needed to select a new Chair. Mike Orcutt asked why the Chair needs to be a Federal employee and if this could be researched. Naman said this is in the Bylaws and could be discussed at the September meeting and revised in the Bylaws. Dave Hillemeier cited 7.1.1 of the implementation plan that cited that the Chair would be selected from the Federal membership of the TMC. Terri Simon-Jackson also cited language from the 2003 Bylaws.

Seth Naman said he would be happy to serve as Chair but that Justin Ly may exchange positions with him in December of this year. There was discussion over voting or whether the Vice-Chair normally replaces the Chair. Naman proposed he stay as Chair until September and they could take it up at that time. Following more discussion, the TMC took a voice vote.

Keith Groves nominated Seth Naman as Chair of the TMC.

Mike Orcutt seconded the motion.

The motion failed to pass with two yes votes, and an uncertain number of abstentions.

Voting yes were Keith Groves and Mike Orcutt. The remaining members abstained or did not vote.

Dave Hillemeier and Bruce Bingham said were fine with electing Naman but did not want to set a precedent on how to hold elections by voice votes and no other candidates. The TMC decided to leave Naman as acting Chair and discuss this in September. Hillemeier said the Federal agencies said they should give consideration as to their willingness to serve as Chair or Vice-Chair during the interim.

17. Public Forum

Robert Franklin commented that the upstream residents don't know the boundaries of the 100-year floodplains. In Europe they post the extent of the 100-year floodplain and call it "room for the river." He suggested the Boy Scouts go out and post this room for the river.

Keith Groves wanted to thank the Bureau for sending a relatively small amount of water over the hill this year.

Tom Stokely commented the TAMWG is interested in having presentation on a grading ordinance. The TAMWG also wanted a presentation on a review of the smolt numbers. Seth Naman said the best measure may be the smolts per spawner.

Vivian Helliwell noted there were several things that Humboldt County could do with their 50,000 acre-feet and she has volunteered to make a presentation to the County. She asked that the TRRP help her in making this presentation. She will coordinate with Seth Naman on this.

Adjourn 2:45 pm

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**Wharfinger Buidling (Bay Room)****1 Marina Way****Eureka, CA 95501****Agenda for June 1-2, 2016****Wednesday, June 1, 2016****Time****Discussion Leader*****Regular Business:***

9:00	Introductions: ▪ Welcome ▪ Approval of Agenda ▪ Approval of April and May Meeting Minutes	Federico Barajas, Chair
9:15	Open Forum: Comments from the public	
9:30	Report from TAMWG	Elizabeth Hadley
9:45	Watershed workgroup presentation ▪ Recommendations ▪ Next Steps	Sean Ledwin
10:15	Regulatory/Compliance Monitoring	James Lee
10:45	Presentation on Scale Age Analysis	Joe Polos/George
11:45	Current Conditions ▪ ROD Flows update	Robert Stewart
12:00	Lunch	

Information / Decision Items:

1:00pm	2017 Funding Discussion ▪ Revised TRRP Program Budget • Administration • Implementation • Science ▪ Next Steps	Caryn and Linsey
4:45	Public forum	
5:00	Adjourn	

Thursday, June 2, 2016

<u>Time</u>		<u>Discussion Leader</u>
9:00	Open Forum	Seth Naman, Vice-Chair
	<i>Information / Decision Items:</i>	
9:15	Report from Acting Executive Director	Caryn DeCarlo
9:45	DSS & Adaptive Management Presentation ▪ Synthesis Reporting ▪ Next Steps	Bruce Bingham/Joe Polos
11:00	Design Workgroup Presentation ▪ Effectiveness Monitoring ▪ Outyear project designs	Brandt/Robert/Aaron
11:45	Federal/Regional Updates ▪ CVP Ops ▪ Long Term Plan EIS	Reclamation
12:00	Lunch	
1:00	Flow Workgroup Ltr ▪ Discuss Flow Workgroup Ltr re:Trinity River Temperature Mgmt	Seth Naman
1:30	TRRP Fixer Process ▪ Discuss List of potential candidates for independent review ▪ Funding ▪ Next Steps	Mike O./Dave H.
2:00	TMC Chair and Vice-Chair	All
2:30	Public Forum	
2:45	Adjourn	