

Draft 3 Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
 September 20-21, 2017
 Trinity River Restoration Program Office
 Highway 299, Weaverville, CA

Day 1, September 20, 2017, 9:00 am

Attending Members

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

¹ Arrived at start of Item 3. ² Nick Hetrick sat in for Bruce Bingham after 11 am on Day 2. ³ George Kautsky sat in for Mike Orcutt on Day 2. ⁴ Bobbi Chadwick sat in for Keith Groves on Day 2. ⁵ Non-voting members.

Others that attended: Bobbi Chadwick (Trinity County Board of Supervisors), Mike Dixon, Todd Buxton, Jennifer Norris (TRRP); James Lee, George Kautsky, Robert Franklin (Hoopa Valley Tribe); Kanta Kano (Japanese Grad Student Intern), Bill Brock (USFS); Kyle De Juilio, Andreas Krause, (Yurok Tribe); Teresa Connor (DWR); Nick Hetrick, Joe Polos (Fish and Wildlife Service); Jack Nordlund, Jerry Payne, Jon Ivanish (local residents); Linsey Walker, Elizabeth Hadley (Bureau of Reclamation); Seth Naman (NOAA Fisheries); Ken Lindke (CDFW); Chad Smith, Brigitte Barron (Headwaters)

Attending by phone: Hank Seemann, Alison O'Dowd (Humboldt State University)

Notes: Gus Kormeier (ENW).

List of Motions

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 July Minutes.

Mike Orcutt seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 6 ayes, and Forest Service abstaining.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to add \$303,000 to the construction budget line item to cover the tasks identified (road construction, sub-contractor payroll taxes,

sales tax, and reduced contribution from Yurok Tribe) for FY2018 by the Executive Director.

Keith Groves seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion that the TMC approve all of the synthesis reports (\$470,377) and additional 10 projects (\$1,929,863) identified on the FY2018 Bridge 2 spreadsheet highlighted with a green header.

Tony LaBanca seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the bird monitoring (\$122,000 TRRP-2018-008) not be funded for FY2018.

Keith Groves seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the TMC fund the Willow Creek Weir (\$433,994 TRRP2018-001) which would not include funding for the video weir or the boat gate.

Keith Groves seconded the motion for discussion.

The motion failed with 1 yes and 7 no votes.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to fund all eight of the pink projects (TRRP2018-001, 015, 026, 006, 010, 004, 005 at \$433,994) and fund the video weir (TRRP2019-015 at \$84,162) and reduce Yurok Tribal Harvest monitoring (2018-026) by 25 % and reduce the lower Trinity Creel Sport Harvest (TRRP2018-005) by 50 % with the intent of this project not be conducted during October and November of 2017. He accepted Mike Orcutt's amendment to reduce the Yurok Harvest Monitoring (2018-026 Total \$120,000), State Creel Survey Monitoring Project (2018-010 Total \$70,084) and the Sport Harvest/Trinity Creel (2018-005 Total: \$60,313) by 25% each.

Keith Groves seconded the amended motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Terri Simon-Jackson made a motion to approve FY18 funds for FY19 projects Gravel Implementation Monitoring (TRRP-2018-030 \$109,300) and Stream Gaging (TRRP-2018-036 \$244,850)

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed with seven yes votes; Hoopa Valley Tribe opposed.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to cap the combination of 001, 015, 026, 006, 010, 004, and 005 not to exceed \$900,000 in FY2019 with exact distributions to be determined by a sub-group of the Hoopa Tribe, Yurok Tribe and CDFW with the ultimate distribution to be decided by the TMC.

Nick Hetrick seconded the motion.

The motion failed with five yes, two no, and one abstention; Hoopa Valley Tribe and Reclamation opposed; Trinity County abstained.

Nick Hetrick made a motion to lock any remaining FY18 surplus funds (\$564,924) as available to Redd Monitoring (TRRP 2018-014) and Outmigrant Monitoring (TRRP 2018-012) in FY19 Status and Trend Monitoring Projects.

Bobbi Chadwick seconded the motion.

The motion failed with one yes and seven no votes; FWS voted yes.

List of Action Items made during the Meeting

Action item: Mike Dixon will add a briefing on revisiting the Cemetery Side Channel to the December TMC meeting agenda.

Action item: Chad Smith will add Keith Groves to his interview list.

Action item: Don Bader will look for another funding source for hatchery activities.

Action item: Caryn Hunt DeCarlo will put Jon Ivanish land issue on the TMC December agenda.

Action item: Mike Dixon will send a proposal for the FOA on watersheds to the TMC before the October TMC conference call.

Action item: Tom Stokely will work with Tony LaBanca on funding for the purchase of the house in Junction City.

Action item: Caryn Hunt DeCarlo will put the timeline for the synthesis reports on the TMC December meeting agenda.

Action item: Tony LaBanca will give an update on the house in Junction City at the December TMC meeting.

Regular Business**1. Introductions****Welcome**

Bruce Bingham, Trinity Management Council (TMC) Vice-Chair, opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda. Caryn Hunt DeCarlo stated that she would provide in the Executive Director's report on Justin Ly's request for Refinements process update. Mike Orcutt asked for clarification that the budget will be dealt with on today's agenda. Don Bader's SOD report will be moved to December.

Approval of Agenda

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the agenda.

Tony LaBanca seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

On other items, Caryn Hunt DeCarlo gave an update on Robert's Rules of Order, as put together by Don Bader. These included a change to friendly amendments and added documentation of motions and methods of voting. Mike Orcutt made an observation that the TMC still has by-laws that have not been addressed—for instance at the June meeting there were recusals. He felt that there was a need to reconcile the rules with the by-laws. There were different scenarios how votes and motions are enacted as effected by the by-laws. Tony LaBanca asked about the timeline for finishing it. Bingham stated the group agreed to wait until refinements had been laid out, which would address the discussion of recusal. Hunt DeCarlo concurred that the Robert's rules do not supersede the by-laws.

Approval of TMC July Meeting Minutes

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the July Minutes.

Mike Orcutt seconded the motion.

The motion passed with 6 ayes, and Forest Service abstaining.

Mike Orcutt asked whether changes to the minutes they submitted had been added. Caryn Hunt DeCarlo stated that his comments had been incorporated with one minor accommodation for other comments made.

2. Public Forum and Comments from the Public

Jerry Payne, resident at the Sheridan Creek project, thanked Caryn Hunt DeCarlo and Andreas Krause for having an open mind and for following his suggestion to change the plans and to not divert a spring at the Sheridan Creek site.

Jack Nordlund raised concern about Commitment #2 on water quality. He did not believe that the gravel is being washed before being put into the river, releasing a lot of dust into the air and water and that this sediment was going to wreck the Sheridan Riffle. He opined that the contractor is in violation of the environmental impact statement. Nordlund had spoken with some of the workers on site who, according to Nordlund, also believed things were being done wrong. He had been told that it will take 8000 cfs flow to clear out the sediment, and he asked, what would happen to the riffle this year. Nordlund asked for assurance that this will not be

continuing both on this project and further ones up river. Nordlund offered to share pictures, but suggested everyone will see it on the site visit.

Huntt DeCarlo acknowledged that there was a struggle this year with sediment, and that Nordlund's comments were heard. Mike Dixon responded that rock was being taken from the U4 area, as planned. He stated that during grading, pit run did make it into the river and that turbidity was a challenge this summer; there were a couple of instances where the limits were exceeded. The water quality board reviewed the project and allowed the exceeded limits due to the challenges of the project. Dixon added that due to the depth of channel, there was some learning as to how to isolate the features during the work. There was a berm that failed, releasing turbidity into the river. Dixon reiterated that the vast majority of the work has been within the water quality standards. As another example he stated that during the boat dance release, the background level of turbidity was found to be elevated above and below the project area. Bruce Bingham, Keith Groves, and Dave Hillemeier inquired how the landowners' concerns were to be addressed and monitored. Dixon stated that it was addressed two weeks ago with the inspector. It was noted that there is an inspector monitoring the site on a daily basis.

In response to this issue, Tom Stokely praised the people working with the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP or Program) for their attention to details. However, he raised an issue with the program of working beyond the environmental commitments on sediment, and exceeding the September 15th deadline to be out of the river. He opined that the benefits of large disruptive projects were not large enough to justify the high cost and that this money could be spent on watersheds with known benefits to both people and fish. It should not be people versus fish.

At this point, Don Bader arrived and took over from Bruce Bingham as Chair of the meeting.

3. Report from TAMWG

Tom Stokely, Chair of the Trinity River Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG) gave an update on the activities of TAMWG. They have not met this year due to holds on Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) meetings at the Federal level. They are hoping for a meeting in October, but not optimistic due to the continuing Federal hold.

Nick Hetrick stated that the Assistant Secretary of the Interior has asked to cease all FACA meetings, and therefore it is highly unlikely that the pause will be lifted. Paperwork would have to be filed this week to meet requirements for an October meeting. Stokely stated that without TAMWG meetings, it takes away some of the validity of the Program. Hetrick stated that the information is being held in queue and both agreed that the ban on meetings is not limited to this program. Don Bader asked if information is making it out to the TAMWG members; which Stokely affirmed.

4. Report from the Executive Director

Caryn Huntt DeCarlo, Executive Director of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP or Program) passed out her written report and touched on the main points.

She touched on some of the highlights of activities such as the work on an adaptive management budget, the Sheridan Creek/Deep Gulch project, and the winter variable flows topic has been worked on by fish and flows WG staff.

Huntt DeCarlo introduced Kanta Kano, a Japanese student who is volunteering at TRRP. Huntt DeCarlo is also evaluating positions in the Implementation Branch; they are currently not filling the civil engineer vacancy.

Mike Orcutt asked about hiring freezes from the new administration. Hunt DeCarlo responded that there is a waiver for filling GS12 and above. Don Bader said that they are getting quicker approval on new Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) positions. Hunt DeCarlo stated that for Reclamation positions, the hiring freeze has not been an impediment. Tony LaBanca asked for clarification on the civil engineer, Hunt DeCarlo clarified the civil engineer is not being filled currently but position will be evaluated. A full-time, on-staff designer was not needed.

Hunt DeCarlo noted that four TRRP Weaverville Office staff are leaving and are a big loss to the Program. Derek Rupert with the US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) is leaving mid- October, as he has accepted a promotion to a permanent position in the Redding Bureau of Reclamation office. Bader clarified that Rupert will be a bonus to the Bureau and that he will still be contributing to the Program, but in a different way. Hunt DeCarlo noted that the temporary FWS position for Chris Laskodi, a fisheries technician with the FWS, ended this September. Victor Haro, Indian Self-Determination Specialist, has taken a position in England. He has made invaluable contributions to the program with Tribal 638 Agreements and several TMC members voiced concern about his position being vacant. Lastly, Robert Stewart, hydraulic engineer, has accepted a position in West Virginia because it is a better location for his wife's career. He has been a key member of TRRP for geomorphology monitoring. Hunt DeCarlo said they plan to bring Nate Bradley to help out during hiring. For Indian Self Determination, they are working on a detail that should be in place immediately when Haro leaves. Haro is doing everything to get the tribal Initial AFAs ready for the 90-day reviews.

Hunt DeCarlo said the funding approved by TMC in the tribal agreements must go through at least four months of review. They are doing everything possible to speed up the funding process, so that it is earlier than the June of last year.

Kyle De Julio asked about filling positions. Hunt DeCarlo said that they plan on bringing someone in through internal Reclamation Denver TSC agreements for Robert's position while trying to fill positions. Bader stated that the waiver can be submitted ahead of time, but the job cannot be advertised until the position is vacant. For the two FWS positions, Bruce Bingham noted that these positions are not highly graded, are temporary, and therefore can be filled. Nick Hetrick clarified that temporary biology technicians can be added. Permanent and term positions need a waiver. Hunt DeCarlo stated that retention is a high priority for the program and that they will continue to work to recruit high quality people for the program.

Hunt DeCarlo turned the presentation over to Mike Dixon to give the Implementation Update. Dixon noted the realtor asked if the TMC was still interested in the 391 River Acres house. The house was in the area of the Helena fire, but was not burned down. Dixon noted that there had been no recent effects to the house from high flows, but the house comes into play with a major rain on snow event and was last impacted in 1997. The house sits low relative to other houses in the area.

Dixon stated that Derek Rupert had made an observation about the Cemetery side channel constructed during pre-Program years and that this side channel has been used heavily by spawning salmon. At winter base-flow, this feature may not flow, and would not provide spawning habitat. It is a feature that worked for a while and was beneficial, and could be a good investment to return to. Dixon stated that the Design Workgroup has had a lot of back and forth about revisiting sites, plus the nuance in the regulatory environmental permit with FEMA flood impacts. Tony LaBanca asked about getting a briefing from the Design Workgroup in the December meeting.

Action item: Mike Dixon will add a briefing on revisiting the Cemetery Side Channel to the December TMC meeting agenda.

Dave Hillemeier asked about what other sites would be revisited and what kind of cost and benefits can be achieved. Bader agreed it would be a good topic to explore and Dixon thought it would be a site-by-site issue. Tom Stokely stated that this would be a good issue for the TAMWG to review. Justin Ly suggested a side-by-side comparison of issues would be useful for evaluating these projects.

Dixon next moved on to the progress of the Sheridan/Deep Gulch construction project. Everything in-stream except for revegetation will be completed this calendar year. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) was asked for concurrence that working for two an extra weeks would not be detrimental and permission was given to continue with an obligation to minimize impacts. There are no concerns about being able to be out of the river by September 30th. Bader stated that the site visit will be very fruitful tomorrow where the group will be able to see what has been done and what is to be done from a key overlook at the head of Sheridan Riffle.

Dave Hillemeier asked about getting a state stream bed alteration permit. Dixon stated that this was informal with CDFW, they generally defer to Federal requirements. Tony LaBanca stated that there is no CDFW 1600 permit for this project, they provide input on water quality issues but rely on other agencies for compliance.

Dixon continued that DWR released a design report for Dutch Creek Site and some revisions are being made. On the Oregon Gulch project, there are concerns about previous mercury, so further monitoring will be done. On river right, the private landowner is very supportive of working with the TRRP. LaBanca asked about previous mercury experience with the project. Andreas Krause stated that USGS sampling has been done on mercury in sediments but water samples are needed. There are ideal sites for methylated mercury, so the findings will drive the design.

Dixon next noted that Sky Ranch should have project ideas put together by the end of the calendar year, but he hoped that new hires can pick it up. It would be a large amount of excavation, but most would be in the dry areas, which would reduce costs. Chapman Ranch was unlikely to have funds to build out an entire project in one year, so the Hoopa design team has focused on a phased approach. There are contingencies for a private landowner that may not want to participate. Robert Franklin clarified that the Hoopa have resolved the land ownership and that it is a very big site where both sides of the river are alluvial. The Design team is looking at employing willow trenches and plantings as opposed to piles of rock to plug and guide the channel. There will be a substantial side-channel component.

Dixon ended the Implementation update with the comment of the need to plan for a lot of time to get approval for projects. A goal is now to provide better relationships with landowners and stronger compliance documents. Terri Simon-Jackson asked for clarification about Sky Ranch and FY2019 and if Dutch Creek will get through compliance without litigation. Dixon responded that it is likely that Dutch Creek would end up in appeal or objection. Sky Ranch has BLM lands and Trinity County lands, but a land transfer on the County land is currently hung up. Sky Ranch should not have the complications present in Dutch and Chapman—no owl issues, a giant terrace of mine rubble that does not support any plants except star thistle. Simon-Jackson reiterated her prior concern about the age of the ROD and how the program deals with new science since the ROD.

Huntt DeCarlo resumed her TRRP update and commented on public outreach. The website is undergoing a redesign, there was a Trinity art contest, a variable flows brochure, the

Conservation Almanac, a summer day-camp, two public floats, a presentation at the Trinity County Fair, an open house, and many landowner and one-on-one meetings in office, sites, and homes.

Chad Smith of Headwaters Corporation, who is contracted to perform the review of the Program, noted that they have finished the first pass of reviewing documents. Yesterday was the first round of face-to-face interviews with staff. He has received 40+ online surveys responses. Don Bader asked about these responses. Smith said the goal was not to deliver a 500-page document about the TRRP, but to identify areas that need further investigation. He said he was hoping to get more interviews during this meeting and will move to Arcata and Redding over the next week. There will be follow-up phone interviews in October and then a written summary of interviews. They are looking for commonalities, interesting outliers, and themes. This will lead into strengths and weaknesses with a comprehensive report in the spring of 2018 and a possible one-day workshop.

Bruce Bingham asked about the interviews forming an understanding of the basic issues with the Program and if this would lead to a summarization of the strengths and weaknesses based on experience with other programs. He hoped that the concerns brought up by the Tribes would be addressed. Keith Groves asked to be added to the interview list.

Action item: Chad Smith will add Keith Groves to his interview list.

George Kautsky asked about how the Phase I review was incorporated into the Headwaters Corporation review, and whether it focused in on foundational documents and origin, and what people were seeing in the direction of the organization. Smith responded that the Phase I review will be incorporated more as the process continues. Bader asked about a monthly call with the coordination team. Smith acknowledged that it started, but was caught up by other projects. The next meeting will be around mid-October. Bader asked about Task 6, and Smith stated there is a draft report and then a workshop to refine the final. Bader asked that it be called a Draft Final Report, to clarify where it is in the process. Smith stated that it is, so far, on schedule. Smith closed by saying that he appreciates everyone being available for interviews in a very short period.

Huntt DeCarlo deferred the budget discussion and other items at the end of the director's report to later in the agenda.

Information / Decision Items

5. TRRP Budget

Caryn Huntt DeCarlo reiterated several steps that had been taken on the topic of the FY2018 TRRP budget. Last spring, a memo had been sent to the TMC on a process for the budget discussion. In June and July meetings, the budget was discussed with the implementation and administration and science personnel budget being passed. The science budget was discussed in June and July, but not approved. A memorandum from the Science Coordinator was sent to TMC in July prior to the July meeting. Another memo was sent out to the TMC by the Executive Director on September 13th on the process for budget discussion. The ED supports the adaptive management that is built into the science plan, and stressed the need to get a budget passed in order to move forward on FY17 development of grants, agreements and projects. She cited the watershed projects that were approved late in the FY and did not get funded by Reclamation as an example of the constraints the program is under. She suggested the TMC not change any of the Science Coordinator's recommendations, but that they try to approve the budget in a one-

step-at-a time process to get to a decision today. The recommendation of the science work plan was to make all the funding be for projects that follow an adaptive management process. Hunt DeCarlo commended Norris for her efforts on the Work Plan Process to identify appropriate adaptive management for the Program.

The TMC members noted their various support for an adaptive management science in the following comments. Bruce Bingham thanked Hunt DeCarlo for her efforts and support, noting that it is critical that the program take actions to support adaptive management to measure results of the actions. It is important to refer to it as a monitoring program, and not hypothesis testing for the sake of hypothesis testing. Bingham was hoping to stop the annual chaos on the budgeting process and to stop basing funding for science monitoring on just what is left over—it needs to be funded as part of the program.

Jennifer Norris restated Hunt DeCarlo's plea for a budget to move forward. Norris acknowledged the science staff in their work for putting together a work plan with rankings. Her recommendation remained that adaptive management be funded to achieve the desired restoration actions. Her "bridge option" was presented in July to support the partners during the shift in the program. The FY18 budget has less going to implementation and provides a good window for the shift to committing to adaptive management.

Tony LaBanca asked about the adaptive management framework. Norris stated that it needs a clear vision, she noted that the scientists are spinning their wheels with annual fights over the budget which then comes to the TMC where decisions are absent of the scientists considerations. LaBanca asked about how to get to the point of adaptive management—via meetings or via workshops? Bingham opined that they need a monitoring plan or documents that state how the information is used in decision-making, and that formalizes how to use the information. Norris noted that she sees this as her priority. LaBanca noted that he wanted to see completion of a framework, and practice to develop decision-making, and to shed bad behaviors. Norris stated that she takes a lot of responsibility for moving it forward but this cannot be achieved in a vacuum.

Dave Hillemeier asked where did they see the long-term trend monitoring fitting in—fish numbers, health, populations. Bingham added that information would continue. He felt that the effectiveness monitoring would be based on the goals of the project, more spatially and temporally restricted based on the project. Compliance monitoring should be spelled out as a requirement of the project. There was discussion about the synthesis reports to help make the determination of which long-term data to maintain. Hillemeier raised concerns about defunding existing data points that have been collected. . Some projects support both adaptive management and long-term monitoring needs, a prime example being the cohort reconstruction and the data that feeds into it. The challenge is figuring out how much money to continue the needed projects. There is some cycle of periodic reporting to look at.

Mike Orcutt asked about Hunt DeCarlo's recommendation about "amend" when nothing was passed. Hunt DeCarlo said she would like to go through what she proposes to be discussed today. Orcutt asked to simplify; they were two votes from passing a motion in July. Orcutt's issue was with the multi-year impacts and the out-years, hoping to expedite the discussion. The 25 % reduction in harvest seems like an additional change since the last discussion.

Justin Ly agreed with moving towards adaptive management, multi-year funding of status monitoring, and Dave Hillemeier's concern about what those are. But he is concerned about moving forward with multi-year funding when there are quite a few decisions to be made on projects and data to monitor. He then went through the list of labeled monitoring projects.

Norris stated her hope that these discussions come up with commitments, the scientists will soon need to know what the funding commitments are.

Huntt DeCarlo then went through the proposal to go through the budget with her Budget Discussion/Approval Proposed Steps. She explained changes in the construction budget and her hope to have a vote showing TMC agreement to fund adaptive management projects. Step 1 was to approve the change in construction funding; Step 2 was to approve the green adaptive management projects for one year. Step 3 was to discuss funding pink projects and alternative funding sources for them. The pink projects are primarily hatchery monitoring projects and might not be appropriate for TRRP funding related to AM going forward. Step 4 was to discuss and vote on pink Hatchery/Harvest Management projects. Step 5 was determining funding leftover surplus for TMC to discuss allocating. Huntt DeCarlo stated this year represents an opportunity to fund adaptive management science.

Norris asked to not debate the validity of the science on the projects, that the projects had been prioritized and vetted by the workgroups and internal and external reviews. Seth Naman asked about 25 % reduction in monitoring due to lower fish returns and how that affects funding. Norris referred to her July memo that the partners could carry the funds over from this year.

Lunch

Continuation of the TRRP Budget Discussion

Huntt DeCarlo began the discussion with changes in the construction budget and the watershed projects. She unilaterally had made a decision on the watershed projects based on project requirements. In June watershed projects were approved, but Reclamation acquisitions contracting were overloaded and there was \$520,000 the program would lose at the end of the fiscal year. That money was switched to funding the next-year construction budget costs. The FY17 watershed implementation projects were reduced by \$520,000 which was added to 2018 watershed projects. The FY17 Construction budget was increased by \$520,000 and reduced in FY18. The approved funding amounts for watershed and construction did not change, but was shifted. The watershed agreements that were already approved will be funded in 2018 budget. If these actions had not been taken then the funding would have been lost.

Huntt DeCarlo stated that the next topic was on construction and required a motion. There has been an increased cost from that approved in June. The construction contract did not include payroll taxes, which was at \$116,000 and \$5,000 on equipment rental taxes for non-tribal equipment, and road repair at Sawmill and Sky Ranch. Mike Dixon clarified that the Sawmill gravel processing area road was damaged on BLM land on Goose Ranch Road and that there is need for resurfacing. Sky Ranch Road in Junction City is in a similar situation as well. He put the estimate at \$150,000 for road repair, but until the project is done it is not clear exactly how much. The total increase to construction for road repairs and subcontractor payroll taxes was \$303,000. Under the 2018 column of the budget that was included in the \$1,033,000 subtotal. Previously this number was \$1,250,000, but that was increased by the \$303,000 and then decreased by the \$520,000 that was shifted to the 2018 budget.

Keith Groves asked about the payroll tax deductions and why the TRRP is paying for the Hoopa Tribe subcontracting, noting that normally the contractor would eat that difference. Huntt DeCarlo answered that the original process was not costed right by the TRRP and the contractor. Dixon clarified that the TRRP does a cost estimate with the contractor. During the reconciliation of the contractors and the TRRP's cost estimate both sides did not cost the project correctly to account for the payroll taxes to be paid for the subcontracting. Dave Hillemeier also clarified

that the Tribes are not profiting from the process, there is no extra overhead included. Don Bader stated that at the end of the project it will “true up” where actual expenses will be verified. Tom Stokely asked to where leftover funds would go. Hunt DeCarlo gave an example of the Yurok tribe, where funds from prior projects go back into the next-year budget. She stated that invoices continue after the in-river work is completed on the project and therefore early in the year tribal estimated contributions can change.

Terri Simon-Jackson asked about whether funding for science monitoring is reduced by the construction funding change. She also asked whether the TMC needed a half-million dollar placeholder or a percent of the budget to cover overages from other projects so that money is not taken from monitoring. Simon-Jackson was making that point to prevent it from becoming a standard way of operating. Hunt DeCarlo clarified that this is really only a result of the watershed projects not able to be funded.

Keith Groves asked about prevailing wages, Mike Orcutt clarified that the Tribe has the option to not charge Davis/Bacon prevailing wages and only chose not to on the riparian planting. Dave Hillemeier clarified that the Yurok follow the Yurok Tribe’s Prevailing Wage Ordinance, which is modeled after the state guidelines.

Don Bader made the point that the Executive Director needs to be able to make budget decisions and have the discretion requiring timely response. Mike Orcutt noted the need to have another motion approving the Executive Director's action on moving funds to the construction budget and pushing the watershed funds to 2018. Tom Stokely stated that the TAMWG strongly supports the move to save the watershed funds. Simon-Jackson raised the question of what authority the Executive Director has to make these kinds of decisions, but also gave her support of Hunt DeCarlo's action. Keith Groves stated that there was a discussion of this type of action and the short time-frame at the time the watershed projects were approved.

There was discussion about the amounts. These were clarified as: FY17 \$1,250,000 - \$520,000 + \$303,000. There was a net reduction of \$217,000 from the construction budget in FY18.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to add \$303,000 to the construction budget line item to cover the tasks identified (road construction, sub-contractor payroll taxes, sales tax, and reduced contribution from Yurok Tribe) for FY2018 by the Executive Director.

Keith Groves seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Hunt DeCarlo next directed the TMC to review the 2018 column: and noted Step #5 to talk about potential two- year funding for monitoring. This included the ten monitoring projects under green headings. Orcutt asked if the \$755,466 had been modified based on out-years. Norris stated that amount is what was proposed by the Hoopa based on costs, which was a reduction for out-years based on sampling. The reduction is from the other partners, other than the Hoopa Valley Tribe. The 2018 budget did not reduce the Hoopa costs, as proposed. Discussion included numbers from a July memo sent by Norris to the TMC. Hunt DeCarlo recommended starting with voting on one year funding of synthesis reports and green adaptive management projects.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion that the TMC approve all of the synthesis reports (\$470,377) and additional 10 projects (\$1,929,863) identified on the FY2018 Bridge 2 spreadsheet highlighted with a green header.

Tony LaBanca seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Justin Ly pointed out that some of the projects being funded do not have goals or objectives. Bruce Bingham, Ly and Tony LaBanca had a discussion about effectiveness monitoring, management thresholds and whether or not the protocols match the projects or overall objectives. Bingham asked whether there needs to be a team review of effectiveness monitoring. Norris stated that the team has reviews of these types of things, the workgroups have taken on looking into efficiencies and whether some data points are effective or not.

Simon-Jackson asked about funding of applications of S3 and whether those are informing the decisions of the other projects under the green headers. Norris stated that there is more work that needs to be done on what is needed for a true adaptive management.

Orcutt stated that all of the IP's that were responded to have metrics. He asked about totals for synthesis reports. Hunt DeCarlo stated that the synthesis report costs went down slightly from June presentation and the stream gaging had a similar amount slight increase, which was discussed in her prior memo to TMC. Norris and Mike Dixon gave information on further work suggested from the Design Team on modeling physical limitations on salmonid habitat. LaBanca asked for clarification on the soil amendment project at a construction site. Norris said that the Riparian Workgroup supported a test on which amendment is more effective (e.g., straw, etc.) and this project would target native grass.

Hunt DeCarlo next moved to Item #3 under proposed steps. She noted it was important to discuss where the program and TMC are at on those harvest and hatchery projects and which should be funded outside of the Program and identification of any outside funding options. She noted they have scientific merit, there is no other way to fund them this year, and acknowledged some TMC members may feel they have benefit to the adaptive management.

Norris noted how the video weir was discussed extensively in the Fish Workgroup as a way to validate the Willow Creek Weir. LaBanca, along with Ken Lindke, and Seth Naman clarified that this is a short-term project to validate the run estimate over several years. Lindke stated that the weir is only one part of a larger mechanism. This is a way to reduce impacts on fish from the counting and modernize the process. LaBanca asked that the project be called something different than the Willow Creek Weir Project, as it is not representative of the project.

Orcutt offered that the pink projects be called Fisheries Management, in the Hoopa Tribe's perspective the fisheries condition is a result of the Federal operation of the dam. He asked about how these projects would be funded after this year and the labelling of projects. Norris stated that these projects carry a lot of value for fisheries management, but whether or not they match the priorities of the TRRP program is the question. George Kautsky stated that if you look at the overall goal of the TRRP, these projects match that goal by supporting adaptive management for a long-term monitoring.

Simon-Jackson asked why coded wire tagging doubled in cost from 2017 to 2018. Kautsky stated that some of the project was originally funded partially through another project.

Bingham spoke of the overall goal and if these projects help monitor progress towards that goal, and then they can be considered a part of adaptive management. Norris explained the difference between the green and pink. The green are associated with goals of projects. The pink projects have goals which primarily benefit harvest and hatchery management goals.

Hillemeier tied the pink projects back to the adaptive management goals of survivability—that the cohort reconstruction information provides an age-3 abundance metric prior to harvest impacts (thereby standardizing for comparison across years, given that harvest varies from year

to year), which can be a key parameter for analysis associated with adaptive management. Keith Groves asked for some consistency comparing the water usage to the harvest metrics. Tom Stokely clarified the goal of the program as to restore salmon and steelhead production to match salmon runs prior to the dam. Bingham stated that the monitoring needs to be built into the design of the hypothesis of the projects, but are not currently built in. Hillemeier asked for calling the pink projects “Fisheries Management, Adult Population Abundance Monitoring and Adaptive Management.” Bingham clarified that with adaptive management they don't need to be their own categories.

Huntt DeCarlo asked whether the group felt these should be funded out of the TRRP. Hillemeier said yes, but “at what level” should be discussed. Some years this will be difficult for the goals of the program. Ly asked about funding for other activities, where the Bureau of Reclamation has discretion in other areas for funds. Bader clarified that there is no funding flexibility for FY18, so it would have to be requested as unfunded needs for the year and any extra funds would be reallocated based on priority in the Region. You would not know until late summer or fall about potential funding.

LaBanca asked for clarification from Bader that the next open budget would possibly be in 2019 but more likely in 2020. He agreed that the hatchery activities should all be in one place and that tagging should have been by the hatchery. Bader noted he would like to get all the hatchery projects together and that some of this should be funded out of hatchery funds—it could be FY19 or FY20. Bader agreed to look for another funding source in Reclamation’s budget.

Action item: Don Bader will look for another funding source for hatchery activities.

Orcutt suggested that the TMC provide three-year guidance ahead to the Bureau of Reclamation for recommendations of funding for things like coded wire tagging.

Huntt DeCarlo asked for TMC direction on FY19, for funding the pink projects. Norris stated that maintaining the \$1.4 million Fisheries management projects would consume the science budget and eliminate effectiveness monitoring and model research under the typical budget. If they were funding the pink projects, Norris said that she could probably have a budget in December for these projects and cut down the needs of the scientists to go through the work plan process to identify adaptive management science.

There was more discussion on the pink projects. Bingham mentioned a paradigm shift to build effectiveness monitoring into the cost of projects, so it is not an afterthought as a separate item. Hillemeier agreed for site-specific monitoring, but there was discussion of overall stream-wide monitoring needing to still be done separately. Bader stated he could not give a decision on #3 at this time and will pursue more information. Groves objected that there is not agreement or consensus on funding the pink projects (harvest management) and whether or not they are part of the adaptive management. Orcutt stated that any actions taken on the FY18 monitoring will help with allocations for FY19. Norris iterated how the scientists need guidance on priorities from the TMC. Hillemeier asked about surplus from FY18 and if it could fund monitoring projects except bird monitoring. He asked if they could create a budget mechanism to use FY18 surplus to make things happen in FY19.

Bader asked Huntt DeCarlo to recap #4 on the Proposed Steps, for TMC to discuss and approve the projects under the pink headings. There are a couple of options to make decisions on. The decisions in this section were which projects to fund, whether to fund bird monitoring, whether to take a 25% reduction in harvest surveys, having a reduction or not funding of the Willow Creek video weir. Savings would be put towards Step #5. If all of the projects were approved there is \$649,000 to be used as decided by the TMC.

Orcutt asked whether it is imperative to do #5 or if they could wait for later in the year, citing uncertainties for construction and harvest populations. Hunt DeCarlo asked for the decision to be made so as to provide guidance for the Program. It would help with developing agreements for any multi-year projects. Norris then spoke about bird monitoring, whether riparian bird populations are benefiting from restoration actions. This was built into compliance in projects; it ranked high by Workgroups, but low at Inter-disciplinary team (IDT). Bingham asked what justification was built into the projects. Norris stated that at the time there was probably a misunderstanding that this meets compliance needs but it has since been found to not be the case. The 84 Act and Reauthorization in 1996 obligated improving wildlife with fish. Norris stated that there was also a frog project that fell off as well. Ly asked about what has been learned from the monitoring by the Klamath Bird Observatory. It was pointed out that there was a presentation last September on the trends of key species within the restoration reach and there is an assessment coming from the Klamath Bird Observatory.

In discussion of the 25 % reduction in monitoring costs, Norris noted that conversations with some partners had indicated, due to low runs this year, funds could be carried over to the next fiscal year. There was some discussion on the ability to carry over savings from one year to the next, foreseeing a savings this year. Simon-Jackson asked whether the 25 % needs to be added back for FY19. This was dependent on the run in FY18. Orcutt and Kautsky responded that they do not have savings that are reduced based on the run size. Kautsky cited that there are two jacks affected for every steelhead landed. That the other groups scaled back their monitoring based on lower forecast, but the Hoopa Valley Tribe did not scale back monitoring. They found that 2-year olds were more representative than expected and this information would not be known without the continuing monitoring. Kautsky stated that a forecast of low abundance does not translate to a lower cost estimate. There is a table in Appendix B from July that indicates holes in information provided. By sampling less, there is less precision in the information. He asked about where the savings was, as far as what portion of monitoring is being scaled back? Hillemeier suggested not monitoring creel surveys for October and November, given there is no retention of Chinook salmon in these fisheries this year. The information will not be used to predict the next year. Hunt DeCarlo clarified that the state's timing of the end of their contracts meant that a 25 % reduction would not be gotten back by the state (CDFW).

The group discussed three options for the Willow Creek video weir. Norris noted that an external review suggested to reduce the cost as the video is for a validation of the weir data and is not a loss of data. Orcutt asked for separation of the cost of the boat gate from the video weir. The project ranked out well under review. Bingham asked for clarification that costs are mostly initial equipment and up front. The proposal includes about \$30,000 in salary and benefits, and relatively low cost going forward after the first year. Groves asked if the weir would be removed if successful. LaBanca clarified that the weir structure would still be needed whether using video, sonar, or other method. Seth Naman stated that sonar in some places can be used without a weir. Groves asked for the potential savings three years from now. Norris and LaBanca estimated that roughly \$200,000 is associated with running the weir. LaBanca stated that the Federal agencies asked the CDFW to move forward on validating the weir counts.

Hunt DeCarlo asked the TMC whether they want to approve all of the pink projects and remove the bird monitoring, whether to remove or reduce the video weir, and whether to do the 25 % harvest survey reductions.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the bird monitoring (\$122,000 TRRP-2018-008) not be funded for FY2018.

Keith Groves seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Next the discussion moved to funding the boat gate and the Willow Creek video weir. LaBanca suggested reducing the boat gate by \$63,000 to leave several thousand dollars to build a simpler boat gate. Simon-Jackson asked again about the Willow Creek video weir project requiring multiple years of funding to which Norris responded that the majority of costs would be only in the first year.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the TMC fund the Willow Creek Weir (\$433,994 TRRP2018-001) which would not include funding for the video weir or the boat gate.

Keith Groves seconded the motion for discussion.

The motion failed with 1 yes and 7 no votes.

There was then discussion among Groves, LaBanca, and Naman about updating the technology used to count the fish. This modernization would reduce the amount of handling of the fish. The Fish Workgroup has recommended moving to a more modern system. Nick Hetrick added this then becomes a census instead of an estimate. The video monitoring is the accepted way to monitor today with the ability to distinguish species. Ken Lindke added that there is a need to overlap the two methods to validate the numbers to match up with the historical record of data. Orcutt said that, as of a couple of weeks ago, there was talk of moving the weir, as part of the rationale. If videography is done three years from now, it might be done at another site. Ly added that there are two weirs in the lower trinity and there is concern about fish passage. This would reduce fish passage issues. The \$147,162 to validate the video weir is essential to validating the data.

Break for Public Comment

The TMC then took a moment for public comment. Jon Ivanish, a local landowner adjacent to Bucktail, commented that, normally when the river flooded, the water level would go down a foot per day on his property. This year his land was inundated for about 4 months, 7- to 10-feet deep and some parts are still holding water. This affected his property by flooding the access way in, and access to pastures with livestock. Much of the property is fill from an old highway project and is very porous. He watched this last winter as the river washed through a channel. Mike Dixon responded that the channel was originally a dredger canal and evolved to a scour channel that flooded every year. A portion of the project was to direct water into a side channel that was constructed instead of bisecting a peninsula. In so doing, a portion of the property was removed from the 100-year flood zone. Moving the material changed how long the water stands even at summer base flow and the side channel construction raised the water table.

Huntt DeCarlo noted that she provided documentation to Ivanish of his situation for his concurrence. The plan is to submit it to a solicitor to find out what the Program is authorized to do for him. Ivanish does not have a problem with the water itself but cannot afford to be cut off from the property for such a long period. When originally the project was proposed ten years ago to the landowner there was talk of putting in a bridge to provide access. Hillemeier and LaBanca asked that this issue will be on the agenda for the December meeting.

Action item: Caryn Hunt DeCarlo will put Jon Ivanish land issue on the TMC December agenda.

Continuation of the Budget Discussion

The group then returned to the budget discussion. Bader wanted to discuss the rules and Hunt DeCarlo asked to finish up on the video weir topic. There was discussion about approving the weir project before reducing the video weir.

Hillemeier made a comment that the Lower Trinity creel survey has no monitoring outside the one section of the river. Mike Orcutt responded that one of the indicators is the jack run and the group decided to not have a presentation on the 2017 runs. Ken Lindke added that there are \$50 reward tags that provide information on catch outside the lower Trinity area.

Ly started to draft a motion to fund the estimates of run size and the video weir. Ly's motion was replaced by a substitute motion by Hillemeier to fund all eight of the pink projects, and to reduce the Yurok monitoring by 25 % and the creel monitoring by 50 %. (By the Robert's Rules, a substitute motion replaces a motion if the substitute motion passes.) Several amendments were offered to Hillemeier's substitute motion. Groves offered an amendment to reduce the State creel surveys by 25 %, but this amendment was not accepted. Orcutt offered an amendment to reduce Yurok harvest monitoring by 50 % and this was not accepted. Orcutt then offered an amendment to reduce Yurok harvest monitoring by 25 % each which was accepted.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to fund all eight of the pink projects (TRRP2018-001, 015, 026, 006, 010, 004, 005 at \$433,994) and fund the video weir (TRRP2019-015 at \$84,162) and reduce Yurok Tribal Harvest monitoring (2018-026) by 25 % and reduce the lower Trinity Creel Sport Harvest (TRRP2018-005) by 50 % with the intent of this project not be conducted during October and November of 2017. He accepted Mike Orcutt's amendment to reduce the Yurok Harvest Monitoring (2018-026 Total \$120,000), State Creel Survey Monitoring Project (2018-010 Total \$70,084) and the Sport Harvest/Trinity Creel (2018-005 Total: \$60,313) by 25% each.

Keith Groves seconded the amended motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

There was discussion about the boat gate being reduced. Ken Lindke stated that the original design called for a 40-foot boat gate which could be reduced to a 15-foot gate and use existing materials. The Hoopa representatives raised their concern that there would be no monitoring of solely Trinity fish by not fully funding the Harvest Monitoring on the Trinity. Ly made a strong request that the Bureau of Reclamation reaffirm its commitment to seeking alternative funding sources for the subject projects. The group decided to continue to discuss the budget next morning, and Hunt DeCarlo asked to discuss priorities for surplus from decisions made today. The discussion of watershed priorities was moved to tomorrow.

Adjourn for Day 1; 5:36 pm

Day2, September 21, 2017; 9:00 am

Don Bader opened the meeting the second day with introductions and then reviewed the revised agenda. The agenda items presentation of CVP Re-initiation of Consultation and the Safety of Dam Operations were postponed to the December TMC meeting. Items 6-8 would be taken first, then they would take up the remaining discussion of the budget from yesterday.

6. Public Forum

Tom Stokely asked to clarify his remarks from yesterday about adaptive management. He felt that the program responded to the reduced gravel injections and adjusted the winter flows in response to the adaptive management. He also felt or hoped that the S3 model might give some information about the plus or minus of the larger more expensive projects.

Mike Dixon reported that Mr. Ivanish was very appreciative of being heard yesterday. He has been very supportive and cooperative, but that there have been some unforeseen negatives from the project. Caryn Hunt DeCarlo referenced a description of his issue, and that the program will go to a solicitor for guidance, but it was not clear on how it will take place. Dixon stated that some of his property now holds standing water year round.

7. Winter Flow Variability Update

Kyle De Juilio presented his slideshow on Winter Flow Variability. He began by thanking partners involved in the effort. He asked for the TMC to provide guidance today on winter flow variability in the early juvenile salmonid rearing period. If pursued, he would like to bring hydrographs to the December meeting. The idea has been around for a time, there are different thoughts on how to introduce and why, but it is generally agreed as a good idea. Robert Franklin added that 20-years ago the data had been collected on which the ROD and flow studies are based. There was a lack of clear evidence that releases from Lewiston should be managed other than what came up in the ROD. They were asked to prove that the water was needed for each moment of the year. The debates at the time were vigorous; the invariable flow was so different/wrong in comparison to native hydrology before the dam versus the other side that said “prove it.” However, since the streams below the dam introduced variability starting with Rush Creek, there was not group agreement or substantial proof that the variability needed to be introduced from releases from Lewiston.

De Juilio continued with his presentation and described how the March 2016 DSS work shop examined a natural flow scenario. The model calculated 150 % biomass of juvenile chinook under variable flows compared to ROD flat flows. More and larger fish translated to increased ocean survival. The Workgroup had split into two groups, a Trigger-based group (a large effort that might require new EIS) versus a Bridge-Hydrograph group (short timeline and work within current constraints).

De Juilio discussed some of the details (e.g., constraints, existing EIS or a new EA, pre-dam hydrology, variability on day/week time scale with wide range in magnitude, and effects on emergence and outmigration). He noted that by the time of the typical restoration spring release of chinook, 60 % of fish have already out-migrated. De Juilio said the Workgroup decided to focus on < 34,000 acre feet. He noted the potential for redd scour but that coarse sediment transport does not initiate until 4,500 cfs and Chinook pick spaces that are not prone to redd scour. Kautsky asked about keeping the goals of other species in the report. De Juilio stated that there is a lack of information but concurred some assumptions can be made. Seth Naman asked about the peak flow for WY2018. There was also discussion of redd scour downstream and benefits to macro-invertebrates.

De Juilio reviewed the hypothesized benefits—the primary benefit is that benthic macro-invertebrate species composition is affected by flood and pulses, they are disturbance-adapted. Recent studies have found that physical habitat and capacity of physical habitat will increase due to the flow-habitat relationship and more suspended drift in the water column. Another benefit is

the adaptive management and learning opportunities. Pre-determined and reviewed effectiveness monitoring and hypothesis testing associated with variable flows.

Key Points on Winter Flow Variability:

- February 1 – April 22, 34,000 af
- Max peak of 3600 cfs (1,800 cfs for WY2018 and 2019)
- Remove the daylight ramp down restrictions (no change to rates).

The TMC discussed the concept and asked questions. Tony LaBanca asked about testing hypotheses. De Juilio said the main focus would be to see how flow variability affects food availability. Bruce Bingham stated his desire to keep it clean and explicitly stating how actions and tests achieve goals and objectives. Jennifer Norris stated that the proposal for effectiveness went through adequate peer-review. Joe Polos added that there is a huge opportunity to use flow to improve riverine conditions for salmonids since significant changes to the river have occurred due to channel rehabilitation projects. One of the main reasons that adaptive management was a component of the ROD in establishing the TRRP was the river was going to undergo significant change with mechanical channel rehabilitation and higher flows and it was uncertain on how the river and fish populations would respond. It was expected that the flow-to-habitat relationship would change from existing conditions (this was the justification for channel rehabilitation to change the existing degraded channel form at the time of the signing of the ROD) and under the adaptive management program it was expected that this would be reevaluated and flow modifications recommended based on the implemented fish habitat studies. Dave Hillemeier asked about the proposed action for WY18, primarily for testing benefits. De Juilio stated that instead of getting a habitat benefit, the focus would be on flow variability which gives an increase in food availability. They could use it as an opportunity to test hypotheses to use less water for more gain.

Bingham asked Hunt DeCarlo and Bader about requirements for SIR. Hunt DeCarlo stated that they need a white paper and that Julia Long and Brandt Gutermuth are working on an SIR. De Juilio asked the TMC if they have any staff that can support the effort.

Kautsky asked about skimming water off the ROD flow, and what mischief might arise from the change. He mentioned the Humboldt 50,000 af and if this might be served by this at the same time. He asked about the need for experimental controls for testing hypotheses. Nick Hetrick stated support for this project, the shift of water to where it can have more effect on juvenile fish and spoke of the history of the battle over flow variability introduction in the Klamath River. Justin Ly stated the desire to mimic natural flows like in the Klamath. The Klamath does not exactly mimic nature due to delays in the system, but it is the best they can do. He sees this as an experiment that answers specific questions, hoping to not see FERC flows. Andreas Krause followed up that there are two efforts within the Flow Workgroup, one within the constraints of the ROD, another group looking at can mimic natural flow hydrograph that would have significant impacts and require new EIS.

Tom Stokely asked that the use of Humboldt County 50,000 af would trigger opening the EIS. De Juilio responded that if the EIS is eventually redone, this would help build the case for any changes to be made. Norris stated that the findings have been put out for review and the Workgroup needs to process the review. The goal was to see the TMC's response to this, there is a lot of work to still be done by December if there is to be a decision to change the flow regime. De Juilio hopes to have the white paper to the TMC by the October teleconference, and then to get a decision on whether to move forward or not.

8. Reinitiation of Consultation on the CVP

Postponed to the December TMC meeting.

9. Safety of Dam operations

Postponed to the December TMC meeting.

10. Discussion of Watershed Priorities

Mike Dixon introduced this item with his presentation Tributary Restoration Priorities for the Trinity River Basin in FY18, "We need some." He noted several points such as that by approving funding in June would be too late. Dixon was looking for feedback to the Watershed Workgroup. He stressed that it needed to be now before submitting the project for review. He noted a lack of strategy in the scoring which is arguably subjective. Trinity County Resource Conservation District (RCD) is working on a gap analysis which coupled with TMC input will be very helpful. Feedback from biologists in workgroups is showing that sediment is perhaps not the limiting factor that it was. The priority has been fine sediment reduction but has been expanded to include "habitat connectivity" but this is broadly defined. Dixon reviewed examples of connectivity such as culverts and dams, permitted and illegal diversions, seep wells, temperature, base flows, habitat improvement/restoration (channel rehabilitation and revegetation). He said the IDT questioned why funding others to do design and why not have the TRRP staff do design and contract out the implementation.

George Kautsky started the discussion by stating that the funding opportunity announcement (FOA) needs to capture the change from sediment to habitat. In the tributaries, the Hoopa is interested in pursuing benefits to multiple species. Where you benefit coho you help steelhead as well. They are interested in projects that support recovery items listed in Appendix F for the Upper Trinity. He mentioned points benefit to coho in the rankings. Dave Hillemeier commented that, in the past, the FOA was done over a couple of years to describe connectivity and lateral connectivity in the channel. He said that to broaden it to include large wood structure input for diversity and water storage is important. In regards to focal species, he is reluctant to prioritize coho due to so many funding sources being coho-centric. They are important, however a high priority for the Yurok Tribe is harvestable surplus for Chinook, and they hope to see spring Chinook get funding. He also thought watershed funding needs to be leveraged with additional outside funds.

Tony LaBanca asked about a specific recovery task and making it through the initial cut on projects. The Fisheries Grant Program has been focused on coho, but it does benefit other species; for instance, projects that focus on water are good for all the fish. He asked how to work in the short term for fire-impacted areas. Kyle De Juilio echoed the need for the tributaries to be resilient for dealing with fire impacts. Tom Stokely noted the need to get rid of ditches or find alternatives for people should be primary concerns in tributaries. He liked the idea of using Program staff to design for other organizations to implement. Justin Ly spoke to the coho-centric focus, but that it has opened up to steelhead and Chinook recently. LaBanca stated that they are moving more towards a multi-species recovery plan. Keith Groves wanted to see more focus on watersheds, but ditch lines need to be very gently dealt with. Stokely gave an example of Barker Creek as a success story. Kautsky questioned the groups thinking that there is a large amount of money available for coho, that there is also a large amount of work to be done for coho.

Terri Simon-Jackson said she liked the proposal of watersheds but the Forest Service cannot do NEPA in less than 18 months. Even as the owner of 80 % of the land in region, they are unable to be anything but reactive. Also the Federal priority for next few years is on timber production.

She was approached last week by a non-profit looking to do a half-dozen culvert replacements; they are looking for NEPA and other permitting. She hopes to see projects that are leveraging funds and getting permissions of landowners. Trespass and water diversions for illegal grows are a large issue, but they do not expect to have law enforcement assistance for those in the near future. Where pipes and ponds are removed they do not return for a few years, but funding is not available. The Forest Service is going towards having third parties do the NEPA, they are also interested in things that do not need EIS or EA or can be done with Categorical Exemption's.

Stokely suggested that the FOA should have links to the Forest Service or BLM NEPA requirements so people can review them. Dixon stated the FOA will go to review within Reclamation the first week of November so as to be out in February.

Kautsky asked about the criteria currently used, Dixon responded that there won't be a drastic change. Bader asked that Dixon send a proposal to the group that can be discussed and reviewed as a near final report during the October phone call.

Action item: Mike Dixon will send a proposal for the FOA on watersheds to the TMC before the October TMC conference call.

Teresa Connor asked that TMC members coordinate with Watershed Workgroup personnel so that they have continuity. Dixon stated that in the future the IDT will have to refine any future Watershed Workgroup criteria. Simon-Jackson encouraged Dixon to make the same presentation to the IDT.

Groves added that Trinity County is going to soon start a study on chemicals in tributaries; this information would be useful for the Watershed Workgroup to determine which tributaries to focus on. Caryn Hunt DeCarlo stated that two weeks ago the TRRP adjusted funding on the County's agreement to go towards water quality monitoring.

Dixon closed that the projects are in a good area but that there is a glaring need for guidance. He will have the Workgroup folks funnel their feedback up through the TMC members.

Continuation of Item 5: Discussion of Budget Remaining Funds/Priorities

This was a continuation of the discussion from yesterday of Item 5, TRRP Budget. Caryn Hunt DeCarlo began by presenting a revised spreadsheet showing the decisions from yesterday. Don Bader reviewed the results of the votes and the remaining funds; there were two remaining issues. One was whether or not there was agreement on where to put the remaining funds, and second was to circle back to the science coordinator priorities for the fiscal year.

During the general discussion, Bader asked Jennifer Norris to explain how she came at her plan. Norris stated now is when they start the FY19 planning, not knowing the level of commitment on the science from the TMC and Reclamation. Based on the historical expense for harvest monitoring, the science is overspent for FY19. Terri Simon-Jackson asked for the timeline for the synthesis reports. Dave Hillemeier asked about the \$3M budget for status and monitoring noting the totals did not add up. Kyle De Juilio added that, in the long term, the green house on River Acres in Junction City is an impediment to flows at 10,000 cfs. The group reviewed other avenues and groups for funding this purchase. Hillemeier suggested not funding Coded Wire tagging in FY19, capping the other projects in Status and Trend at \$900,000. George Kautsky and Hillemeier discussed the monitoring and assumptions about run size driving costs. Hillemeier asked how little can be put towards the Status and Trend projects that would still maintain an adaptive management program. Kautsky responded that there needs to be a "bridge anchored on both ends" to another funding source for fisheries management monitoring. Bader noted a commitment to look at it and the expectation was that this would pull money from the

program to fund these activities. Nick Hetrick asked about the search for “efficiencies” within these projects. Tony LaBanca reviewed his projects and that he has made concessions and would not be able to “go back to the well” to reduce costs further. Hillemeier said that the co-managers would go through a process to work out how to achieve the lower numbers.

Huntt DeCarlo suggested the TMC take up the decision of allocating the \$900,000 with the recommendation of keeping it in the science Program area. The group discussed TRRP 2018-014 \$269,000, TRRP 2018-012 \$668,142, and TRRP 2018-010 \$109,000. Norris stated that the stream gage network review is still on-going and there is not a good prediction on what the cost would be. LaBanca, Justin Ly, and Simon-Jackson voiced strong support for supporting stream gaging. Hunt DeCarlo noted that there are different options to fund different projects in different time frames. The TMC discussed the funding history of the various projects and whether to get this done at this meeting. Kautsky noted, that in January, the Fish Workgroup discussed finding efficiencies in out-migrant trapping and the consensus was to await results of the out-migrant synthesis report prior to adjusting scope of the effort meet needed levels of precision.. Norris clarified that some partners agreed to a reduced cost. For the FY19, the PI's looked at estimating what it would be if all partners were working at the same reduced effort.

The group discussed the timing of the synthesis report, the findings of the Fish Workgroup, and allocating remaining funds for out-migrant monitoring. LaBanca agreed with Kautsky about the need to wait for the synthesis report, but the timeline for the report was too long to apply to the decision. Joe Polos as a member of the Fish Workgroup said that the feedback of what precision is wanted for the synthesis report would help to prevent “back and forth.” The Fish WG has tried to address the issue of refining sampling for the outmigrant monitoring project as well as the age composition project but decisions hit a dead-end when members bring up that it is a TMC decision to determine what level of precision is needed for various monitoring projects. When “it’s a TMC policy issue” is invoked, any progress in refining projects is stopped. LaBanca asked about putting the money into rehabilitation. Ly and Simon-Jackson agreed about keeping the money in the science budget. Teresa Connor suggested covering three projects with the leftover going to rehabilitation over-runs. The discussion went to precision of costs and FY19, Bader clarified that the FWS does not have an idea of funding for FY19. Kautsky asked for another column showing the FY19 expected costs of projects to be included in helping make the decision on what to fund.

Nick Hetrick noted that the science budget is pretty grim showing cost increases each year, which then swallows any money for adaptive management. He suggested that Norris put together scenarios that equate to the \$918,000 funds. If there was a commitment from the TMC to fund science projects, they then decide at a later date which out-year projects to fund. Simon-Jackson added, from her experience, that if the money is not obligated in a project then it would likely be made available for other things.

The group discussed the purchase of the house in Junction City. LaBanca discussed a longer-term option of accessing other funding sources to purchase the property. He suggested that on the State route it might involve less paperwork to get through the process. The quickest would be to involve a land trust that would hold it until the BLM goes through its process. Tom Stokely added that he had not heard back from one land trust, but did hear from another group that would be interested. Stokely agreed to help work with LaBanca about getting the process started.

Action item: Tom Stokely will work with Tony LaBanca on funding for the purchase of the house in Junction City.

Ly gave a pitch towards the run size estimates (2018-001), noting the estimate gives the status of the program. He also noted that NOAA does not understand why redd monitoring was top ranked as redd monitoring does not give information about species. Norris read from a prior report that the redd distribution monitoring gives a spatially explicit data about the effects of projects. Seth Naman questioned the lack of program goals tied to adaptive management. Norris countered that external reviews gave redd monitoring the highest ranking. Joe Polos gave some background about the adult spawning escapement metrics and stated that the harvest managers do not recognize the TRRP spawning escapement goals and fisheries are not managed to achieve them. Trinity fall Chinook Salmon (the only species/race with a comprehensive harvest management plan) are managed as an part of the Klamath Basin fall Chinook Salmon aggregate. Kyle De Juilio added that the design teams use any data that they can get, the changes in redd distribution are slow, except due to construction, and that monitoring may not be needed every year. Hetrick asked about process and how workgroup disagreements are being voiced in TMC meetings, that it is not an efficient process to have within the TMC meeting. Norris explained that the projects went through a very thorough process and the projects reflect the priorities from the Science work plan process.

Bader made the point that the budget funding is still in flux, including over a million dollars, prompting a series of motions.

**Terri Simon-Jackson made a motion to approve FY18 funds for FY19 projects
Gravel Implementation Monitoring (TRRP-2018-030 \$109,300) and Stream
Gaging (TRRP-2018-036 \$244,850)**

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed with seven yes votes; Hoopa Valley Tribe opposed.

**Dave Hillemeier made a motion to cap the combination of 001, 015, 026, 006, 010,
004, and 005 not to exceed \$900,000 in FY2019 with exact distributions to be
determined by a sub-group of the Hoopa Tribe, Yurok Tribe and CDFW with
the ultimate distribution to be decided by the TMC.**

Nick Hetrick seconded the motion.

**The motion failed with five yes, two no, and one abstention; Hoopa Valley Tribe and
Reclamation opposed; Trinity County abstained.**

The discussion next went back and forth over the weir and other project savings. Kautsky indicated he would vote in opposition citing, "It seems premature to offer up a cap on these activities at this time, perhaps in December." Hillemeier responded that he was trying to move in a positive direction and move to a point where the TMC could fund these projects at a reasonable rate. Kautsky noted of projects over the last year, there was a lot of redundant work going on, and he did not see how not revisiting was going to reduce the workload. Hillemeier suggested they fund the Status and Trend monitoring at the current level, to give them an amount to work with for adaptive management so that the scientists can determine how to spend those dollars. This triggered another concern of Kautsky that by taking the TMC out of deciding projects. Norris pointed out the repetitive nature of the conversations that are going on each year. Hillemeier asked to discuss an amendment to fund the Outmigrant Monitoring 2018-012 in FY19. Norris clarified that if the TMC is willing to commit FY19 funds to monitoring, this would reduce conversations at the Workgroup level.

Simon-Jackson asked that the science team look at projects 035, 023, 028, and 029 to determine how often they need to occur. Norris suggested that the TMC give a commitment of an amount of money to effectiveness monitoring. Kyle De Julio brought up the need to move the monitoring into the project budgets noting the Flow Workgroup had asked for money to be set aside for monitoring and that they are working on a list of things that can be done for effectiveness. Todd Buxton pointed out that the harvest data has been finally gathered, but the precision is not known. George Kautsky raised concern on putting a price point before evaluation. Hetrick asked about the risk of losing funding and it was clarified by Hunt De Carlo that this discussion is for FY19 and there is time. Hetrick asked about a motion to commit the funds to science. Hillemeier recapped the thinking as to cap the projects to free up adaptive management funding and to take them out of the mix in the work planning process. Simon-Jackson added that typically the path is that the amount from the Workgroups for the projects goes up a little each year, not down.

Hetrick drafted a motion to lock surplus FY18 funds for reddy and out-migrant monitoring. Dave Hillemeier stated his rationale for not supporting the motion: that the funds came from construction and there were future needs that might need funding. Kautsky also stated his opposition as he found exception with the numbers. Hetrick responded that it was impossible to have a long-term plan based on leftover money. LaBanca iterated the need to fund a conversion period to move towards a more permanent solution.

Nick Hetrick made a motion to lock any remaining FY18 surplus funds (\$564,924) as available to Reddy Monitoring (TRRP 2018-014) and Outmigrant Monitoring (TRRP 2018-012) in FY19 Status and Trend Monitoring Projects.

Bobbi Chadwick seconded the motion.

The motion failed with one yes and seven no votes; FWS voted yes.

During more discussion, Simon-Jackson pointed out that science has gone from 16 % in 2016 to 35 % in 2017 to 45 % in 2018. She wanted to see on December agenda a timeline for the synthesis reports.

Action item: Caryn Hunt DeCarlo will put the timeline for the synthesis reports on the TMC December meeting agenda.

Hunt DeCarlo made the point that the budget total for the Program has been the same since 2009, but inflation and salaries have increased. There is a bigger discussion about rehab projects moving to more difficult stretches, getting bigger and more expensive. Bader raised his concern about bigger and bigger projects being presented, and that concerned him. Hillemeier discussed the goal of the Program and his concern that the science budget is getting the leftover crumbs. Dixon showed a graphic of the program budget adjusted for inflation relative to science budget going back to 2012.

Tom Stokely noted that the Central Valley (CVPIA) rate payers desire to pay less funds to the Program, and that this does not foretell an increase in the budget. Kautsky mentioned that budget categories have moved back and forth, so making trend decisions off that information is not a perfect indicator of trends. Hunt DeCarlo concurred about that there is a history of some items being moved to different categories over the years, especially staffing as she didn't know who was put in each category previously.

Bader wrapped up the discussion that they will revisit the surplus at the December TMC meeting. LaBanca will do his best to give an update on the house in Junction City by the next meeting.

Action item: Tony LaBanca will give an update on the house in Junction City at the December TMC meeting.

Adjourn for Day 2, 2:45 pm

After adjourning the regular meeting with no lunch break, the TMC decided not to take the field trip to view the Sheridan construction site.

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
Location: Trinity River Restoration Program
1313 South Main Street, Weaverville, CA
Agenda for September 20 and 21, 2017

Wednesday September 20, 2017

<u>Time</u>		<u>Discussion Leader</u>
<i>Regular Business:</i>		
9:00	Introductions:	Don Bader, Chair
	▪ Welcome ▪ Approval of Agenda ▪ Updated TMC Robert's Rules of Order ▪ Approval of July TMC Meeting Minutes	
9:30	Public Forum: Comments from the public	Don Bader, Chair
9:45	Report from TAMWG	Tom Stokely
10:00	Report from Executive Director	Caryn Hunt DeCarlo
<i>Information / Decision Items:</i>		
10:30	TRRP Budget (Decision Item)	Caryn and Jenny Norris
11:00	Break	
11:15	TRRP Budget continued	Caryn and Jenny
12:15	Lunch	
1:15	TRRP Budget continued	Caryn and Jenny
2:15	Break	
2:30	Reinitiation of Consultation on the CVP	Don Bader
2:45	Safety of Dam operations	Don Bader
3:15	Discussion of Watershed Priorities	Mike Dixon
3:45	New TRRP Website	Eric Peterson
4:15	Public Forum: Comments from the public	Don Bader, Chair
4:30	Adjourn	
6:00	TMC Dinner at La Grange Café 520 Main Street in Weaverville (https://www.facebook.com/LaGrangeCafe/menu)	

Thursday September 21, 2017

Time

Discussion Leader

Regular Business:

9:00	Public Forum: Comments from the public	Don Bader, Chair
<i>Information / Decision Items:</i>		
9:15	Winter Flow Variability Update	Jenny/Kyle De Juilio
10:15	Site Visit to Sheridan Creek/Deep Gulch Rehab Project	Mike and Caryn
12:45	Return from site visit/adjourn	

Note: Dates for remainder of TMC 2017 teleconference and meetings:

- Teleconference: October 19 - 10:00 to noon
- Teleconference: November 16 - 10:00 to noon
- December TMC meeting: December 6 and 7 in Weaverville

Webex and Call in Information:

TMC - Day 1 and 2

Wednesday, September 20th, and Thursday, September 21st

JOIN BY PHONE

1-408-792-6300 Call-in toll number (US/Canada)

Meeting number (access code): 807 104 514

Meeting password: xJQSpGj7

TMC Meeting

Link: <https://trrp.webex.com/trrp/j.php?MTID=mf5209b75b1d919fd8887880ac645bc6b>