

Summary of Public Comments on the Winter Flow Variability

This summary includes both comments at the November 30, 2017 Public Meeting at TRRP and in subsequent emails sent up to the date of preparation of this document. **The full emails are included in Attachment A.**

WINTER VARIABLE FLOW INFORMATIONAL MEETING 11/30/2017 - Public Meeting Summary:

Timing and Public Notice:

1. Why is the winter flow proposal only being introduced now, hasn't this been considered for a long time?
2. A two month notice is a hardship to the fishing guides and local community. Many in the fishing community (guides and local hotels) already have clients booked during the period of proposed flows and will have to cancel reservations.
3. Can the winter flows be put off until 2019 in order to provide advance notice?
4. Will the Program monitor the river after flows to check for safety hazards? And if so, will the Program work to remove any hazards or provide notice to river community?

Scheduling and Volumes:

5. Can the winter base flow of 300 cfs ever be adjusted? A higher base flow of 400-450 cfs seems like it would be mutually beneficial for the river and for the fishing community – is this being considered?
6. Are the winter flow increases irrelevant to winter storm events? If a storm event occurred, would a scheduled winter flow be cancelled or re-scheduled?
7. How many peaks of 1,800 cfs are proposed? How long will the peaks be? How many days of the month?
8. Why not time the winter flows with storm events?

Justification:

9. It appears the Program is using the river above Rush Creek as a "lab" to test the hypothesis that winter flows will produce more food, but the Program has not explained why this test is necessary. The community needs more information on why the Program proposes certain actions, especially when those actions are done to test a hypothesis.
10. Most of the redds have been observed downstream of Pigeon Point – what impacts will the winter flows have on redds downstream with tributary accretion.
11. What is the baseline data to show how much food is currently in the river? Why have studies not been done in the past to gather this baseline if it doesn't already exist?
12. The winter flow proposal doesn't seem to account for tributary flows.
13. What will the Program be monitoring during the flows?
14. Why propose new ideas if you haven't allowed time for current efforts to produce results?

Economic Impacts:

15. The winter flows will produce a direct negative economic impact to fishing guides from reduced guiding days because of the winter flows. Local restaurants and hotels will be impacted by the decrease in fishable days on the river.

16. If the program paid the county for the water it uses, then business owners and the community would be more supportive – is this being considered?
17. How many days will fishing be reduced because of the flows (both drift boat and wade fishing)?

EMAILS: Summary of comment topics from emails received by the date of preparation of this document (full emails included in Attachment A):

Economic Impacts

1. Proposed flow will significantly affect guide business for 3 weeks, will be forced to cancel trips booked for more than a year.
2. The peaks would leave the river unfishable for at least 4 days, with 12 days total. This impacts guides with clients booked, in many cases for over a year. It is not worth economic impact to local businesses.
3. Disruption to sport fishing was understated (by TRRP at the public meeting). At \$700/day guide, lodging, meals, shuttles, etc. losing revenue from just 10 guides per day will negatively impact community to the tune of \$7,000/day, with the number of guides on the river closer to 20 a day for a loss of \$14,000 a day for 4 lost days is \$64,000, \$192,000 total. Also losses from individuals that fish on their own. Also impacts from bad press for those planning trips to the Trinity.
4. Economic impacts include a fishing industry up to 200 outside retail, lodging, and dining patrons per week. The pulse flows would impact them and send them to other rivers in the future because of instability. A good percentage of clients book a year in advance with travel and lodging with dates tied to jobs and airlines. This will impact every service and retail industry business in the County. Question if it's worth the damage to the economy by taking away fishing days for a study that might not steer us in the direction.
5. Additional information after the public meeting has improved the expected impact, but don't expect those whose families depend financially on every available day of steelhead season to not be impacted. If meeting was last spring the proposal wouldn't have as much push back, as guides could have planned.

Alternative Suggestions to Proposal:

1. Use water releases instead to increase winter base flows for improved boat passage, fishing, and fish habitat. Show expected benefits from year round higher flows to fisheries compared to the proposed study. Use natural storm events downstream below tributaries instead of releases to conduct food study. Consider releases be 1,200 instead of 1,800 to reduce impact to fishability?
2. If proceeding, suggest delay until Feb/March of 2019 to be fair to the people who depend on fishing for a living and have commitments, provide a faster rampdown to decrease number of days the river isn't fishable, authorize no more than 3 pulse releases.
3. Suggest study downriver where the rain events will raise the river naturally or raise winter base flows.

General Support

1. There will be very few days missed where guiding will not be practical and the benefits of this action might far out way the inconvenience. Potential missed days guiding is a variable that no guide can predict as last February the Trinity was unfishable for the entire month due to naturally occurring high flows.
2. Information forwarded from TRRP: Sounds like a great way to go.

Suggestions that results of proposal are already known:

1. Even non-anglers know that more water means more food and is accomplished by natural flows so why perform an experiment on that?
2. The proposed experiment is to prove a principle that is already established that increased flows produce increases in food supplies. Results of experiment won't add to scientific knowledge or add meaningful answers to relevant questions.
3. Resulting benefits are already known.

Other Comments:

6. Chinook spawning activity has significantly shifted away from the uppermost parts of the river to below Canyon Creek.
7. Proposal may be to mitigate the low thin river conditions created by TRRP impeding downstream smolt and steelhead outmigration. Reading between the lines, TRRP would prefer higher releases but Reclamation has limited them for the time being.
8. Almost all the work performed by TRRP on the river has had a negative impact.
9. Statement that drift boat fishing impacts are expected to be limited to 1-2 days per month is not correct.

Attachment A – Emails received after Public Meeting

General emails received:

From: **Andrew Harris** <andrew@headwatersit.com>
Date: Mon, Dec 4, 2017 at 4:52 PM
Subject: Re: proposed 1800 cfs pulse flow comments..
To: Randy Hamann <randy@steelbridgeguides.com>
Cc: chunttdecarlo@usbr.gov

Dear Caryn,

I attended the meeting on 11/30 at the TRRP office regarding the proposed pulse flows during the Feb-Apr time frame.

I am a fly fishing guide and outfitter responsible for roughly two hundred guided fly fishing float trips on the Trinity River each year. The 34,000 acre feet used for the proposed food study could be used in many ways. For purposes of navigation and providing more fish habitat, I would much prefer to see that water used to provide higher base flows throughout the winter months. Base flows currently drop from 450cfs to 300cfs on October 15th and stay at 300cfs until April. Boat passage is difficult at 300cfs and much better at 450cfs. 34,000 acre feet is enough to provide 114 extra days of flows at the 450cfs level. That would last from October 16th until about Feb 10th. Alternately, the same amount of water could provide a base flow of 400cfs for 177 days which would take us well into April. I would like to see the potential fishery benefits of higher year-round base flows (450cfs year-round would be great) compared to the potential benefits of the proposed food study. The higher base flows may provide similar benefit without the difficulty of making the river unfishable for any length of time.

Regarding the proposed food study and pulse flows for this winter, I believe it would be a slam dunk if the TRRP already had strong positive results from a similar food study conducted right here on the Trinity River downstream from the proposed study area. I think it would be wise to delay the food study one year and use naturally occurring storm events this winter to conduct a food study below tributaries where the flows already exceed 1800cfs on a regular basis. Strong positive results from such a food study would go a long way toward convincing me of the potential benefits associated with what you are proposing to do this winter.

Regarding the design of the study, would it be significantly less valid/useful/beneficial with pulse flows of 1200cfs instead of 1800cfs? 1200cfs or 1500cfs would be considerably less problematic for the fishability of the river and the resulting economic activity.

Please forward my comments to the Trinity Management Council.

Thank you,

-Andrew Harris

Confluence Outfitters

530-632-3465

(Portions of comment below that wasn't sent to the wider group):

I see absolutely no problem with what you are proposing. I encourage it! In my opinion there will be very few days missed where guiding will not be practical and the benefits of this action might far out way the inconvenience, we won't know till it is implemented and given time.

As for the potential missed days guiding, that is a variable that no guide can predict, last February the Trinity was unfishable for the entire month do to naturally occurring hi flows, your proposed actions could be a moot point depending on unknown storm cycles.

- Much of the grumblings of excessive rock introduction could be mitigated by increasing the base Winter base flows from 300 cfs to 450 cfs - 500 cfs making boaters, anglers and the fish all that much happier.

- Again, it will all be a moot point if we lose the Anadromous Runs of fish in the Trinity.

Thanks for your consideration.

From: **Brian Kohlman** <bskohlman@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Dec 4, 2017 at 7:50 PM

Subject: Proposed Pulse Flows

To: chunttdecarlo@usbr.gov

Ms. Huntt Decarlo,

I am a professional fly fishing guide and have been licensed and permitted (BLM and NFS) to guide the Trinity River for several years. I was unable to attend last week's meeting as I was guiding in Redding on the 30th, but have spoken to some friends that were in attendance. I also reviewed a copy of your proposed pulse flows and understand the reasoning behind it. First of all, these pulse flows will significantly affect my business and essentially put me out of business for three weeks. It is my understanding the reasoning behind for pulse flow experiment is to determine (confirm) a very basic principle that even non-anglers could deduce - more water = more food. This is accomplished through naturally occurring high-flow events, so why would you perform an experiment with a known outcome that will affect the livelihood of so many people?

This is a ridiculous idea that will prove nothing. Quite honestly, I feel almost all of the work performed by the Trinity River Restoration Project has actually had a negative impact of the river. The work being completed has done nothing to restore the river, it has scarred the river permanently. EVERY one of my clients ask me why the work is being completed and EVERY one comments on how the river is so much uglier and scarred since the work has begun.

If your useless flow experiment is completed, I will be forced to cancel trips that I have had booked for nearly a year.

Respectfully,
Brian Kohlman
Redding, CA

Emails shown below are in response to TRRP Director Hunt DeCarlo December 1, 2017 email shown below in blue:

From: Hunt DeCarlo, Caryn [mailto:chunttdecarlo@usbr.gov]
Sent: Friday, December 01, 2017 11:23 AM
To: sje132@humboldt.edu; Amy Gittelsohn <amyg@trinityjournal.com>; tldavis02@fs.fed.us; khopkins@yuroktribe.nsn.us; bryan@theflyshop.com; jletton@jletton.com; fishslayer.lb@gmail.com; jeffconnection@gmail.com; jgclark1123@yahoo.com; kgparker@shasta.com; editor@trinityjournal.com; mattdover67@gmail.com; agh2112@gmail.com; info@indiancreeklodge.net; jwsmith48@hotmail.com
Cc: Dixon, Michael <mdixon@usbr.gov>; Kyle DeJulio <kdejuilio@yuroktribe.nsn.us>; Andreas Krause <akrause@yuroktribe.nsn.us>; Kevin Held <kheld@usbr.gov>; Aaron Martin <yurokfish@gmail.com>
Subject: Proposed Winter Flow Hydrograph

To Attendees of the TRRP 11/30/17 Winter Flow Variability Public Meeting:

The public meeting held last night at Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) was intended to share general information on the concept and purpose for considering increased winter flow releases, answer questions and listen to public thoughts about this type of management action.

It was very clear many participants wanted more specifics including the proposed flow release schedule. In response to this expressed request, attached is a DRAFT proposed hydrograph developed by TRRP technical staff and will be presenting to the Trinity Management Council (TMC) on December 6th at TRRP at 1:30 p.m.

If you have questions on the attached you can contact TRRP staff you know and/or the following Program staff who are cced on this email including Mike Dixon at 530-623-1811 or Kevin Held at 530-623-1809.

We will work to get this information out more broadly in addition to this email.

Thank you for attending the meeting and for the direct input you provided.

Caryn

Caryn Hunt DeCarlo
TRRP

From: **Bryan Quick** <bryan@theflyshop.com>
Date: Sun, Dec 3, 2017 at 8:42 AM
Subject: Re: Proposed Winter Flow Hydrograph
To: "Hunt DeCarlo, Caryn" <chunttdecarlo@usbr.gov>
Cc: sje132@humboldt.edu, Amy Gittelsohn <amyg@trinityjournal.com>, tldavis02@fs.fed.us, khopkins@yuroktribe.nsn.us, jletton@jletton.com, Lonnie Boles <fishslayer.lb@gmail.com>, jeffconnection@gmail.com, jgclark1123@yahoo.com, Mike Parker <kgparker@shasta.com>,

editor@trinityjournal.com, Matt Dover <mattdover67@gmail.com>, agh2112@gmail.com, info@indiancreeklodge.net, jwsmith48@hotmail.com, "Dixon, Michael" <mdixon@usbr.gov>, Kyle DeJulio <kdejuilio@yuroktribe.nsn.us>, Andreas Krause <akrause@yuroktribe.nsn.us>, Kevin Held <kheld@usbr.gov>, Aaron Martin <yurokfish@gmail.com>

Caryn,

Thank you for providing this.

Bryan

From: **info@indiancreeklodge.net** <info@indiancreeklodge.net>

Date: Fri, Dec 1, 2017 at 6:54 PM

Subject: RE: Proposed Winter Flow Hydrograph

To: "Huntt DeCarlo, Caryn" <chunttdecarlo@usbr.gov>, "sje132@humboldt.edu" <sje132@humboldt.edu>, Amy Gittelsohn <amyg@trinityjournal.com>, "tldavis02@fs.fed.us" <tldavis02@fs.fed.us>, "khopkins@yuroktribe.nsn.us" <khopkins@yuroktribe.nsn.us>, "bryan@theflyshop.com" <bryan@theflyshop.com>, "jletton@jletton.com" <jletton@jletton.com>, "fishslayer.lb@gmail.com" <fishslayer.lb@gmail.com>, "jeffconnection@gmail.com" <jeffconnection@gmail.com>, "jgclark1123@yahoo.com" <jgclark1123@yahoo.com>, "kgparker@shasta.com" <kgparker@shasta.com>, "editor@trinityjournal.com" <editor@trinityjournal.com>, "mattdover67@gmail.com" <mattdover67@gmail.com>, "agh2112@gmail.com" <agh2112@gmail.com>, "jwsmith48@hotmail.com" <jwsmith48@hotmail.com>
Cc: "Dixon, Michael" <mdixon@usbr.gov>, Kyle DeJulio <kdejuilio@yuroktribe.nsn.us>, Andreas Krause <akrause@yuroktribe.nsn.us>, Kevin Held <kheld@usbr.gov>, Aaron Martin <yurokfish@gmail.com>, "kgroves@trinitycounty.org" <kgroves@trinitycounty.org>, "bchadwick@trinitycounty.org" <bchadwick@trinitycounty.org>, "editor@trinityjournal.com" <editor@trinityjournal.com>, Elena Letton <eletton@icloud.com>, John Letton <jletton@jletton.com>

Thank you for getting this draft hydrograph out quickly. I also appreciate the fact that it reflects only 3 pulse flow releases, not a higher number as had been rumored.

TRRP has now explained that the proposed pulse releases would rapidly ramp up from the winter level release of 300 cfs to 1,800 cfs over a period of one day, hold the release at 1,800 for five hours, and then gradually ramp back down to 300 cfs over five days. If the 5 hour peak is Tuesday afternoon then hopefully the ramp up would not start until late Monday, leaving Monday fishable. The gradual decrease from 1800 to 300 over 5 days would leave the river unfishable for Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday. Assuming that the decrease in release is 300 cfs every 24 hours over 5 days, the upper river would be between 900 cfs and 600 cfs on Saturday. The guides know the conditions they need to work from a drift boat far better than I do, but to me it appears that at least 4 days of work would be lost with each "flow pulse". Unless I misunderstood something last night, that would be twice as many lost days as TRRP projected. To me it appears that this proposal with 3 "pulses" would put the guides in the position of having to contact clients and cancel at least 12 days' worth of reservations--reservations that in many cases have been on the books for as much as a year.

TRRP has also made clear that the pulse releases would have to be scheduled well in advance for several reasons, including coordination with BOR and informing the public, and they would have to be kept on

the pre-set schedule regardless of what weather events occur. Other variables that affect the efficacy of the experiment are the differences in terrain, vegetation, and insect life between the stretch above Rush Creek and the areas of the river that are actually serving as spawning grounds for wild salmonids, i.e. portions of the remaining 80 miles of river. Also, the amount of additional food supply that might be introduced into the water column through pulse releases is not shown to be statistically noticeable when compared to the food supply introduced into the entire upper 80 miles of river by natural winter weather events. Relevant to that last point, the guides report, and TRRP evidently agrees, that Chinook spawning activity has significantly shifted away from the uppermost parts of the river to below Canyon Creek.

In summary, the goal of the proposed experiment is to prove a principle that is already established and accepted: in general, increased flows produce increases in food supplies. Due to lack of control over variables such as weather events and the inflexibility of the schedule of release increases, the results of the experiment will probably not add to the scientific knowledge already available. It would not address the overriding question of whether a few skimpy pulse releases from Lewiston Dam would add any noticeable effect on the amount to the food supply available to juvenile salmonids in the stretches of river where they are actually found in February and March. This proposal might be a good subject for a grad student research paper, but it would not yield any meaningful answers to any relevant questions. It definitely is not worth the economic impact it would have on local businesses that benefit from winter steelhead fishing, and it would do further damage to TRRP's shaky reputation.

If despite these points and the powerful points made by the guides about their livelihood the TMC somehow gives serious consideration to this experiment, i.e. decides that there are identifiable benefits that outweigh the costs, then I suggest the experiment should:

1. Be delayed until Feb/March of 2019 to be fair to the people who depend on fishing for a living and have commitments for the dates that will be affected.
2. Provide a faster ramp down in order to decrease the number of days the river would not be fishable by drift boat.
3. Authorize no more than 3 pulse releases.

I trust that you will include this email and all other correspondence you receive on this subject in the materials you supply to the TMC.

Thanks for your consideration.

John and Elena Letton, Proprietors

[Indian Creek Lodge](#)

530 623 6294

Check us out on [Yelp](#) and [TripAdvisor](#) and like us on [Facebook](#)

From: **jim smith** <jwsmith48@hotmail.com>

Date: Fri, Dec 1, 2017 at 9:45 PM

Subject: Re: Proposed Winter Flow Hydrograph

To: "info@indiancreeklodge.net" <info@indiancreeklodge.net>, "Huntt DeCarlo, Caryn" <chunttdecarlo@usbr.gov>, "sje132@humboldt.edu" <sje132@humboldt.edu>, Amy Gittelsohn <amyg@trinityjournal.com>, "tldavis02@fs.fed.us" <tldavis02@fs.fed.us>, "khopkins@yuroktribe.nsn.us" <khopkins@yuroktribe.nsn.us>, "bryan@theflyshop.com" <bryan@theflyshop.com>, "jletton@jletton.com" <jletton@jletton.com>, "fishslayer.lb@gmail.com"

<fishslayer.lb@gmail.com>, "jeffconnection@gmail.com" <jeffconnection@gmail.com>, "jgclark1123@yahoo.com" <jgclark1123@yahoo.com>, "kgparker@shasta.com" <kgparker@shasta.com>, "editor@trinityjournal.com" <editor@trinityjournal.com>, "mattdover67@gmail.com" <mattdover67@gmail.com>, "agh2112@gmail.com" <agh2112@gmail.com>
Cc: "Dixon, Michael" <mdixon@usbr.gov>, Kyle DeJulio <kdejulio@yuroktribe.nsn.us>, Andreas Krause <akrause@yuroktribe.nsn.us>, Kevin Held <kheld@usbr.gov>, Aaron Martin <yurokfish@gmail.com>, "kgroves@trinitycounty.org" <kgroves@trinitycounty.org>, Elena Letton <eletton@icloud.com>

Thanks for your analysis John, it is right on the mark. The disruption to sport fishing and subsequent economic impacts was very much understated. Resulting benefits of this "experiment" are already known and as you pointed out limited for Trinity and not cost effective.

My cynical observation is that their proposal may be to help mitigate the low thin river conditions created by TRRP projects that may be impeding down stream smolt and steelhead out migration. Additionally its likely serving as someone's thesis project. When an organization has large amounts of unaccountable funding they can be creative. Also, reading between the lines at the meeting I believe TRRP would have preferred much higher releases, (over 4000 cfs) which will likely come in future years. Thankfully BOR has limited them for the time being but only due to operational and coordination issues.

Jim Smith

From: **kgparker@shasta.com** <kgparker@shasta.com>
Date: Fri, Dec 1, 2017 at 7:36 PM
Subject: RE: Proposed Winter Flow Hydrograph
To: "Huntt DeCarlo, Caryn" <chunttdecarlo@usbr.gov>, "sje132@humboldt.edu" <sje132@humboldt.edu>, Amy Gittelsohn <amyg@trinityjournal.com>, "tldavis02@fs.fed.us" <tldavis02@fs.fed.us>, "khopkins@yuroktribe.nsn.us" <khopkins@yuroktribe.nsn.us>, "bryan@theflyshop.com" <bryan@theflyshop.com>, "jletton@jletton.com" <jletton@jletton.com>, "fishslayer.lb@gmail.com" <fishslayer.lb@gmail.com>, "jeffconnection@gmail.com" <jeffconnection@gmail.com>, "jgclark1123@yahoo.com" <jgclark1123@yahoo.com>, "editor@trinityjournal.com" <editor@trinityjournal.com>, "mattdover67@gmail.com" <mattdover67@gmail.com>, "agh2112@gmail.com" <agh2112@gmail.com>, "jwsmith48@hotmail.com" <jwsmith48@hotmail.com>, "info@indiancreeklodge.net" <info@indiancreeklodge.net>
Cc: "Dixon, Michael" <mdixon@usbr.gov>, Kyle DeJulio <kdejulio@yuroktribe.nsn.us>, Andreas Krause <akrause@yuroktribe.nsn.us>, Kevin Held <kheld@usbr.gov>, Aaron Martin <yurokfish@gmail.com>, "kgroves@trinitycounty.org" <kgroves@trinitycounty.org>, Elena Letton <eletton@icloud.com>

Thanks for forwarding this info. At about \$700/day [guide fee, lodging, meals, shuttles, etc.] losing revenue from just 10 guides per day will negatively impact the community to the tune of \$7000/day. As I'm sure we all know, the daily number of guides fishing the river each day is usually closer to 20 guides/day and therefore you can assume a loss of \$14,000/day. \$14,000 x the 4 days lost = \$56,000 x the 3 "proposed" flows = \$168,000 lost revenues. One can only guess what the loss to the community will be when you factor in the loss from individuals that fish on their own [fuel, rooms, food, etc.] without hiring permitted guides. I also wonder what bad press may result from these "experiments" when anglers are planning trips to the Trinity during this time period.

From: **Matt Dover** <mattdover67@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Dec 1, 2017 at 7:51 PM
Subject: RE: Proposed Winter Flow Hydrograph
To: kgparker@shasta.com
Cc: "Huntt DeCarlo, Caryn" <chunttdecarlo@usbr.gov>, "sje132@humboldt.edu" <sje132@humboldt.edu>, Amy Gittelsohn <amyg@trinityjournal.com>, "tldavis02@fs.fed.us" <tldavis02@fs.fed.us>, "khopkins@yuroktribe.nsn.us" <khopkins@yuroktribe.nsn.us>, "bryan@theflyshop.com" <bryan@theflyshop.com>, "jletton@jletton.com" <jletton@jletton.com>, "fishslayer.lb@gmail.com" <fishslayer.lb@gmail.com>, "jeffconnection@gmail.com" <jeffconnection@gmail.com>, "jgclark1123@yahoo.com" <jgclark1123@yahoo.com>, "editor@trinityjournal.com" <editor@trinityjournal.com>, "agh2112@gmail.com" <agh2112@gmail.com>, "jwsmith48@hotmail.com" <jwsmith48@hotmail.com>, "info@indiancreeklodge.net" <info@indiancreeklodge.net>, "Dixon, Michael" <mdixon@usbr.gov>, Kyle DeJuilio <kdejuilio@yuroktribe.nsn.us>, Andreas Krause <akrause@yuroktribe.nsn.us>, Kevin Held <kheld@usbr.gov>, Aaron Martin <yurokfish@gmail.com>, "kgroves@trinitycounty.org" <kgroves@trinitycounty.org>, Elena Letton <eletton@icloud.com>

Thank you for forwarding this information to me. I think this sounds like a great way to go forward. Matt Dover.

From: **info@indiancreeklodge.net** <info@indiancreeklodge.net>
Date: Sat, Dec 2, 2017 at 12:57 PM
Subject: RE: Proposed Winter Flow Hydrograph
To: "Huntt DeCarlo, Caryn" <chunttdecarlo@usbr.gov>

Caryn,

There are a few points from the meeting on Thursday evening that I would like to get forwarded to the TMC before any decisions are made.

There have been a few emails coming in from guides and businesses here and I am not sure if you are receiving all of the comments. One point that keeps coming up and was brought up in the meeting is the economic impact that these pulse releases will have on Trinity County. The fishing Industry brings in upwards of 200 outside retail, lodging, and dining patrons per week. (this figure has been thought to be low) Not only will pulsing the river this year impact those patrons, it will inevitably send them to other rivers now and in the future because of the instability of being able to book and be assured the water will be fishable. There is a good percentage of these people that book a year in advance and are tied to the dates with their jobs and their airlines. These issues will impact every service and retail industry business in the county, which employs the largest percentage of Trinity County's workforce. You are talking about impacting people's livelihood from the fishing guides all the way down to the housekeepers and bagging clerks that will be losing their jobs or at the least having their work weeks cut drastically. I think the impact on the county, as a whole, would be tragic just for an experiment/study. I asked Thursday if it seemed reasonable to take away these fishing days for a study and was told yes, if it increases the fish in the river. I still fail to see how this study will increase the fish in the river. The results of the study might steer us in that direction, but it might not, so again, is it worth the damage it will do to the economy at this time?

You are a group of educated, intelligent people and I am sure you could come up with a way to run this study without the impact that pulsing the river will bring. From an observer not educated in this field of study, it seems that if you ran your study down river where the rain events will raise the river naturally this would not need a pulse, and would not impact anyone.

One of the suggestions from the audience to increasing food in the river was to raise the winter flows to 400 to 450 cfs coming out of the dam. I do believe this proposal would be worth researching as it would benefit everyone with concerns about this issue.

I too would hope that this is forwarded to the people making the decision.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joel and Mary
Management

[Indian Creek Lodge](#)

530 623 6294

Check us out on [Yelp](#) and [TripAdvisor](#)
and like us on [Facebook](#)

Emails listed below are in response to TRRP Director Hunt DeCarlo December 4, 2017 email shown below in blue:

From: **Hunt DeCarlo, Caryn** <chunttdecarlo@usbr.gov>

Date: Mon, Dec 4, 2017 at 3:31 PM

Subject: Additional Information on TRRP Winter Flow Variability

To: sje132@humboldt.edu, Amy Gittelsohn <amyg@trinityjournal.com>, tldavis02@fs.fed.us, khopkins@yuroktribe.nsn.us, bryan@theflyshop.com, jletton@jletton.com, fishslayer.lb@gmail.com, Jeff Morris <jeffconnection@gmail.com>, Joel Clark <jgclark1123@yahoo.com>, Kelly Gain Parker <kgparker@shasta.com>, editor@trinityjournal.com, Matt Dover <mattdover67@gmail.com>, agh2112@gmail.com, info@indiancreeklodge.net, jwsmith48@hotmail.com, Randy Hamann <randy@steelbridgeguides.com>

Cc: "Norris, Jennifer" <jennifer_l_norris@fws.gov>, "Dixon, Michael" <mdixon@usbr.gov>, Aaron Martin <yurokfish@gmail.com>, Kyle DeJulio <kdejulio@yuroktribe.nsn.us>, Kevin Held <kheld@usbr.gov>, Andreas Krause <akrause@yuroktribe.nsn.us>

To Attendees of the TRRP 11/30/17 Winter Flow Variability Public Meeting:

I have received comments from several people regarding the subject proposal. Comments have included both concerns and support, and are being shared with the TMC.

Attached is some additional information (an hourly graph of one of the single proposed peak) that depicts more clearly the potential effects to fishing for each of the three proposed peaks. We believe the impacts are likely less than some of the comments received and hope this additional information will help clarify the numbers presented on this topic at the public meeting last Thursday.

Impact to drift boat fishing is expected to be 1-2 days per month and 2-3 days per month to wading for the three month period of the proposal. A more detailed description is included with the figure provided.

The associated monitoring will assess the effectiveness of these flow releases and how they achieved the desired response.

Thank you.
Caryn

From: **John Letton** <jletton@jletton.com>
Date: Mon, Dec 4, 2017 at 6:00 PM
Subject: RE: Additional Information on TRRP Winter Flow Variability
To: "Huntt DeCarlo, Caryn" <chunttdecarlo@usbr.gov>, "sje132@humboldt.edu" <sje132@humboldt.edu>, Amy Gittelsohn <amyg@trinityjournal.com>, "tldavis02@fs.fed.us" <tldavis02@fs.fed.us>, "khopkins@yuroktribe.nsn.us" <khopkins@yuroktribe.nsn.us>, "bryan@theflyshop.com" <bryan@theflyshop.com>, "fishslayer.lb@gmail.com" <fishslayer.lb@gmail.com>, Jeff Morris <jeffconnection@gmail.com>, Joel Clark <jgclark1123@yahoo.com>, Kelly Gain Parker <kgparker@shasta.com>, "editor@trinityjournal.com" <editor@trinityjournal.com>, Matt Dover <mattdover67@gmail.com>, "agh2112@gmail.com" <agh2112@gmail.com>, "info@indiancreeklodge.net" <info@indiancreeklodge.net>, "jwsmith48@hotmail.com" <jwsmith48@hotmail.com>, Randy Hamann <randy@steelbridgeguides.com>
Cc: "Norris, Jennifer" <jennifer_l_norris@fws.gov>, "Dixon, Michael" <mdixon@usbr.gov>, Aaron Martin <yurokfish@gmail.com>, Kyle DeJulio <kdejulio@yuroktribe.nsn.us>, Kevin Held <kheld@usbr.gov>, Andreas Krause <akrause@yuroktribe.nsn.us>, "Keith Groves (kgroves@trinitycounty.org)" <kgroves@trinitycounty.org>, Bobbi Chadwick <bchadwick@trinitycounty.org>, "eletton@icloud.com" <eletton@icloud.com>

Correction: I should have said the Fifth and Sixth days, not the Fourth and Fifth days, could be better fishing after losing 4 days--clearly not a trade off anyone wants. JL

From: John Letton
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 5:48 PM
To: 'Huntt DeCarlo, Caryn' <chunttdecarlo@usbr.gov>; sje132@humboldt.edu; Amy Gittelsohn <amyg@trinityjournal.com>; tldavis02@fs.fed.us; khopkins@yuroktribe.nsn.us; bryan@theflyshop.com; fishslayer.lb@gmail.com; Jeff Morris <jeffconnection@gmail.com>; Joel Clark <jgclark1123@yahoo.com>; Kelly Gain Parker <kgparker@shasta.com>; editor@trinityjournal.com; Matt Dover <mattdover67@gmail.com>; agh2112@gmail.com; info@indiancreeklodge.net; jwsmith48@hotmail.com; Randy Hamann <randy@steelbridgeguides.com>
Cc: Norris, Jennifer <jennifer_l_norris@fws.gov>; Dixon, Michael <mdixon@usbr.gov>; Aaron Martin <yurokfish@gmail.com>; Kyle DeJulio <kdejulio@yuroktribe.nsn.us>; Kevin Held <kheld@usbr.gov>; Andreas Krause <akrause@yuroktribe.nsn.us>; Keith Groves (<kgroves@trinitycounty.org>) <kgroves@trinitycounty.org>; 'Bobbi Chadwick' <bchadwick@trinitycounty.org>; eletton@icloud.com
Subject: RE: Additional Information on TRRP Winter Flow Variability

Dear Caryn:

Thanks for reacting and communicating quickly with this clarification.

Speaking for myself, over the last four days the information I have been able to obtain from TRRP has changed twice from: 1.) "periodic pulse releases from February 1 to April 22" to 2.) "three pulses with gradually ramp back down to 300 cfs over 5 days" to 3.) today's hydrograph, which shows that the proposed ramp back down will be relatively quick over 3 days--not 5 days as stated last Thursday.

By the way, your statement that the the impacts on drift boat fishing are expected to be 1 - 2 days per month is just not correct. As I read it the latest hydrograph shows that the flow at 8:00 a.m. on the third day would be around 1,000 cfs at Lewiston Dam (much higher downriver), meaning the river would not be fishable that day, nor the previous two days.

If the public meeting on the experiment had been last spring guides/businesses would have known they had time to plan for the impact, and you would not be seeing as much push back from the fishing community. But no matter when it was proposed, I would be critical of the proposed experiment for the reasons I expressed in my email of December 1 and I am urging the TMC not to approve it. However, I acknowledge that the two changes in the last 4 days have improved the proposed experiment by reducing some of the impact on the fishing community. I don't expect the other affected businesses or the guides to support any compromise--especially the guides, whose families depend financially on every available day of steelhead season. However, if for some inexplicable reason the TMC feels that the experiment must go forward, the blow to the fishing community could be lessened by following the suggestions I made in my email of December 1: push the experiment off until February/March of 2019 with selected dates set now, maintaining the limit of 3 pulses and with the ramp down over no more than 3 days with the "maximum down ramping", or 4 days with the "natural recession". Obviously the guides should "guide" that choice, just so everyone remembers to consider the lag time between a change in the release at Lewiston and the change in flow at any given point downstream. I think the "natural recession" ramp down might well knock out a fourth fishing day below Junction City, although the fourth and fifth days could be better fishing.

Thanks again for reacting and communicating quickly, and for your consideration. Please continue to put all communications on this subject in the meeting materials for the TMC members.

Sincerely,
John Letton

P.S.: A question: what are the limiting factors on the speed of the ramp down? The maximum down ramping appears to be pegged at 500-600 cfs per 24 hours.