

Final Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
 March 28-29, 2018
 Trinity River Restoration Program Office
 1313 South Main Street, Weaverville, CA

Day 1, March 28, 2018 9:00 am

Attending Members

Member	Representative Seat
Don Bader ¹	Bureau of Reclamation, Chair
Justin Ly	National Marine Fisheries Service, Vice-chair
Nick Hetrick	Fish and Wildlife Service
Mike Orcutt ²	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Dave Hillemeier ³	Yurok Tribe
Terri Simon-Jackson	Forest Service
Teresa Connor	California Natural Resources Agency
Keith Groves	Trinity County
Caryn Hunt DeCarlo ⁴	Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director

¹ Justin Ly sat in as Chair during the afternoon of Day 1 and Brandt Gutermuth sat in as Reclamation TMC representative; ² Robert Franklin sat in the morning of Day 2. ³ Kyle De Juilio sat in for Item 4. ⁴ Non-voting member.

Others that attended:, Dave Gaeuman, Todd Buxton, Brandt Gutermuth, Kevin Held, Jenny Norris, Eric Peterson (TRRP); James Lee, Robert Franklin, George Kautsky (Hoopa Valley Tribe); Bill Brock, Joe Smails (USFS); Kyle De Juilio and Eric Wiseman (Yurok Tribe); Nancy Marinchuk, John White, John Letton, (local residents); Elizabeth Hadley, Linsey Walker, Carina Miller (Bureau of Reclamation); Ken Lindke, Andrew Hill and Tony LaBanca (CDFW); Hank Seemann (Humboldt County); Seth Naman (NOAA Fisheries); Bill Pinnix (FWS); Donna Rupp, Kelly Sheen (Trinity County RCD); Bobbi Chadwick (Trinity County); Cindy Burton, Oliver Rogers, Sandra Perez (NWCRCDC) .

Attending by phone: Jennifer Norris, Wade Sinnen Day 1. Bill Pinnix Day 2.

Notes: Kim Mattson (ENW).

List of Motions

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the agenda.

Justin Ly seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the December minutes.

Nick Hetrick seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Justin Ly made a motion to accept the following amended policy statement regarding drone use:

As a “Good Neighbor” in the Trinity River watershed regarding the use of Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS), while conducting work for the Trinity River Restoration Program, staff of the TMC member organizations and contractors will conduct UAS activities under “fly for work” rules (FAA Part 107 or future equivalents), will make reasonable efforts to contact private and public landowners within flight plans prior to the flights, and will annually report usage of UAS (date, agency, and purpose) for listing on the TRRP website.

Keith Groves seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Brandt Gutermuth made a motion to accept the Dry and Critically Dry hydrographs as recommended by the Flow Workgroup.

Keith Groves seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to accept the gravel augmentation recommendation of zero augmentation in a Critically Dry Year and 400 cubic yards at the Diversion Pool in a Dry Year.

Nick Hetrick seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Keith Groves made a motion to fund Watershed proposal 1, East Weaver Creek Dam Removal for FY18 as presented by the Watershed Workgroup.

Nick Hetrick seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mike Orcutt made a motion to fund Watershed proposal 3, Sidney Gulch Riparian Habitat Improvement for FY18 as presented by the Watershed Workgroup.

Teresa Connor seconded the motion.

The motion passed with six yes votes with FWS abstaining and Trinity County recusing.

Keith Groves made a motion to fund Watershed proposal 2, McKnight Ditch Water Conservation for FY18 with the condition they do not fund the second pipe with TRRP funds.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed with six yes votes, with the Hoopa Valley voting no and the California Resources Agency abstaining.

Keith Groves made a motion to fund the Watershed proposal 4, South Fork Trinity River Road Upgrade and Maintenance, Phase I for FY18 as presented by the Watershed Workgroup.

Justin Ly seconded the motion.

The motion passed with seven yes votes, and Hoopa Valley voting no.

Keith Groves made a motion to continue discussion of Watershed proposals 5, 6, and 7 at a special meeting.

Mike Orcutt seconded the motion.

The motion passed with seven yes votes, the Yurok recusing.

Keith Groves made a motion to accept the FY18 budget adjustments as presented by the Executive Director in the March Executive Director's report under the budget section.

Mike Orcutt seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Keith Groves made a motion to accept the proposed FY19 budget as presented by the Executive Director with the amendments to shift TAMWG funding to FWS administration. This allows contracts and agreements to be prepared earlier to help ensure obligations of funds. The Executive Director will provide quarterly updates on the FY19 budget. The Executive will provide recommendations for priorities for changes in funds at future meetings.

Teresa Connor seconded the motion

The motion passed unanimously.

List of Action Items made during the Meeting

Action item: Caryn Hunt DeCarlo will work with staff to research and assemble the history of the wells program for a presentation at conference call or a TMC meeting.

Action Item: Caryn Hunt DeCarlo and Jenny Norris will have the Physical Workgroup and IDT be part of gravel augmentation recommendations. FY18 Watershed Projects Rankings for TMC approval

Action item: Jenny Norris will make available to the TMC an abstract of the River Corridor first steps document.

Action item: Jenny Norris will work with technical presenters with guidance on content to make effective presentations to the TMC. TMC requested it be identified why a presentation is important to them.

Action item: Caryn Hunt DeCarlo will send hard copies of the 2016 annual report to TMC members that requested it.

Regular Business

1. Introductions

Welcome

Don Bader, Trinity Management Council (TMC) Chair, opened the meeting and asked the attendees to introduce themselves. He next reviewed the agenda and noted the decision items and that public comments would be addressed at their respective time slots.

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the agenda.

Justin Ly seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Bader next asked for a review of the December meeting minutes.

Approval of TMC December Meeting Minutes

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the December minutes.

Nick Hetrick seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Public Forum and Comments from the Public

Jim White owner of Trinity Pump and Supply passed out a copy of a letter he had sent to the Program regarding the damage by high flows of the river to permitted seep wells owned by landowners along the river. He noted that five families had lost water near Steel Bridge due to the river moving 40 feet. He was concerned over the lack of response from the Program.

Nancy Marinchak one of the river-side landowners said she is soon to lose her access to water and right now she has no water at her house while the river is at low flow. She says she has heard a lot of negative comments about the Program, but in her opinion, the Program has been very responsive in attempting to resolve her broken pipe. Still, there has been no overall solution and she thought there appears to be no recourse.

Hank Seemann, Deputy-Director for Humboldt County Public Works Department, announced that Humboldt County is interested in using its contract water as the source for winter flow variability releases in 2019. Humboldt County's 1959 water contract is based on Proviso 2 of the 1955 Act and was recognized in December 2014 by the Department of Interior Solicitor as being separate and independent from Proviso 1. He expressed that Humboldt County's interests include improving fisheries and the health of the river; increasing salmon harvest opportunities; and looking for economic development opportunities. Humboldt County seeks to collaborate with stakeholders that share common goals and make science-based decisions. He heard the December presentation on winter variable flows and believes there are advantages to using the County's contract water rather than ROD water. Humboldt County has initiated discussions with the Bureau about exercising its contract for this purpose, and certain issues still need to be resolved. Humboldt County has reached out to the Hoopa Valley and Yurok Tribes, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, and NMFS requesting technical assistance, to ensure that the action has the most benefit to fish, avoids unintended consequences, and maximizes the learning opportunities. TMC would not be a party to this action, but Humboldt County would like to coordinate and share information with the TRRP.

3. TAMWG Status Update

Nick Hetrick provided an update through reading a Regional Office update which included the following:

“The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service values the collaborative work with our partners on Trinity River restoration and we remain committed to ensuring their input is fully considered as we move forward. The Department of Interior took a comprehensive review of the Trinity River Adaptive Management Working Group and has reaffirmed the decision to keep the group inactive. We strongly believe we can provide the same level of involvement with our stakeholders as we continue the important restoration work in the watershed. Any questions should be sent to John Heil, Deputy Assistant Regional Director for Region 8 in Sacramento (telephone number 916-414-6636).”

4. Report from the Executive Director

Caryn Hunt DeCarlo, Executive Director of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP or Program), passed out her written report and touched on the main points. She commented that Jenny Norris will be presenting her portions tomorrow and Mike Dixon will not present today as he was in mandatory Coast Guard Reserve training.

She acknowledged Deanna Jackson and Linsey Walker in their work to develop the contracts and agreements for all Partners. She noted the retirement of Joe Polos and the departure of Andreas Krause for a new position and these departures represented a large loss of institutional knowledge. JD Lewis has been promoted to TRRP Surveyor. Kathy Martens is the new TRRP Secretary. Linsey Walker has been selected for a detail as a 4-month Indian Self-Determination Specialist. Caryn noted the Civil Engineer position should be filled this fiscal year.

Hunt DeCarlo next moved to the Implementation Update. The Junction City house owners are not interested in raising the house, but wish to sell. The Program is pursuing purchase of the house with disposal to BLM or possibly Trinity County. The Program is looking at sites that may be re-visited for enhancement; the Hamilton Ponds is being considered for re-dredging with FY18 funds. Dutch Creek Rehabilitation site is moving toward the 80% design. Sky Ranch will be going through a Value Engineering study. Oregon Gulch is in the conceptual design phase. New rules by FEMA have increased compliance staff time and staff is spending time updating the flood insurance maps. As-built drawings have been prepared for Bucktail site. They are working on the USFWS and NMFS Biological Assessment contract and have prepared a scope of work for environmental services contract with solicitation in FY18.

Hunt DeCarlo commented on the public outreach activities that included publication and educational materials. There have been discussions with landowners in the Indian Creek subdivision about increased flows effecting gravel bars. The public informational meeting on the ROD flow releases is April 12th. They will host an information and activities booth at a community event in Weaverville in April 7. Headwaters have completed tasks 1-3 of the Trinity River Refinements. Headwaters have requested an extension of two months due to the loss of their executive director. Hunt DeCarlo went over the new schedule. Hunt DeCarlo went over the five new publications and reports. She noted the Workgroup updates on the back of her report.

Keith Grove asked that they formulate some type of plan to move forward on the landowners' well concerns. Don Bader said he could review the past 2006 program. Teresa Connor noted it had been reopened once, but had limited funds.

Action item: Caryn Hunt DeCarlo will work with staff to research and assemble the history of the wells program for a presentation at conference call or a TMC meeting.

Mike Orcutt commented that the meandering of the river has never been tackled head on and needs to be addressed for the property owners to search for solutions. Teresa Connor noted that she will see if DWR has any funding available to assist with domestic water issues. Keith Grove mentioned he could check with Trinity County Public Health to see they can provide assistance.

Information / Decision Items

5. Winter Flow Variability White Paper and SIR Update

Caryn Hunt DeCarlo reviewed the SIR (Supplemental Information Report) status on potential use of ROD waters for winter variability flows and restoration. The SIR looks at whether this use of water is already covered in the existing EIS. If not covered and TMC voted to use ROD water, it would require a NEPA document, possibly an EA for a pilot project.

Robert Franklin gave a presentation on the development of a white paper regarding the scientific review of variable flows for environmental uses. He noted a need to have a clear answer using adaptive management and hypothesis testing. Several rounds of review resulted in restructuring the document with a planned delivery by August 2018. There will be two documents: one on the need to move forward with decision-making, the second will be more with the use of science.

This generated discussion. Teresa Connor clarified they don't need to ask the solicitor if they can change the winter flows. If Humboldt County decides to use their flows for winter, is that covered? Hunt DeCarlo said no, it is not part of the ROD EIS. Connor said they should try to avoid getting locked into a particular flow regime asking if they could kill two birds with one stone. Bader opined that they were two separate issues. Justin Ly asked when they can expect a solicitor's answer and hoped one was coming soon. Hunt DeCarlo said they expect one by the June meeting on the SIR related to ROD flows only. Mike Orcutt noted there was still ambiguity over the SIR. He speculated how water may be used for winter variability flow and he noted that it was unlikely the Hoopa Valley Tribe would support taking ROD water for winter variable flows. He reviewed the decision about the 50,000 acre-feet for Humboldt County, noting that the decision also recognized downstream water users and was one of the oldest contracts for water. He noted the two provisos were incorrectly perceived as consolidated until the Solicitor clarified that the two are not the same, and that every time there was action to use more water for fish, it was litigated. He thought they need to be better prepared and be ready to move more quickly. Proviso 2 and Humboldt County water use needs to be resolved about its use and they need to be prepared for litigation. Nick Hetrick noted that where the water comes from will be a policy decision, not a technical decision. He also noted the development of the fish production models will be useful in helping to demonstrate how water will benefit fish. Hunt DeCarlo said that if the Solicitor finds that the ROD EIS does cover winter variable flows, his finding would not be making a decision that ROD water should be used, only that if TMC decided to do so, it would be covered under existing NEPA. Justin Ly asked if the white paper could use outputs of the fish production model. Jenny Norris noted it is not planned, but it could be added. Kyle De Juilio said the white paper would not be recommending flows but analyzing the effects of flows.

6. Re-initiation of Consultation on the Coordinated Long-Term Operation of Central Valley Project and State Water Project

Katrina Harrison from the US Bureau of Reclamation, Sacramento Office, gave an update on the re-initiation of consultations on long-term operations. Re-initiation was driven by drought, low fish, and new information. There are now three projects. Track 1 examines improve water supply with work to be completed in one year. They are hoping for an EA with focus on the Delta. Track 2, is an 18-month programmatic analysis to maximize water deliveries and marketable power. This looks at new storage, new conveyance, changes to regulations. Large hydropower is not considered renewal energy for the purposes of California future planning and the State has a goal of 50 % renewables by 2030. The BOR is expecting renewable energy may make their power less valuable. They want to quantify other stressors such as invasive species, predators, and hatcheries are affecting fish resources. Track 3 is to complete the re-initiation of consultation of long-term operations and authorized uses and benefits of CVP using a fresh look, biological objectives, best available science and transparency. It will include the Trinity. The schedule is likely a two or three year project. They have held brainstorming meetings and scoping meetings. She said they had received over 600 written comments. She noted the Hoopa Valley Tribe and their letter of concerns over the Trinity River, flows, fish, and management. The Winnemem Wintu comments asked for balance of water use versus other benefits. Letters from the water users asked to maximize water deliveries. Delta interests opposed increasing water exports from the Delta. NGOs said they were in violation of NEPA. Public is opposed to more water going to the CVP.

7. UAS Good Neighbor guideline for TMC approval

Eric Peterson presented a draft policy statement for how the TRRP would manage drones and contacts with landowners. He passed out a handout and he reviewed that various agencies have different policies about how drones are used that may fly over private lands. He noted that the California Department of Fish and Wildlife needs to get written permission, but the Forest Service does not. He modified a motion that he had presented at the December meeting and presented it here for consideration by the TMC as their good neighbor communications. He modified the original motion to follow FAA rules and changed obtaining written permission to attempt to contact landowners. He said it was more similar to that used by property surveyors. He explained by using contractors it removes operational control and liability from the Federal Government, and that contractors would be required to make contacts. There was discussion about the benefits of the Program doing the initial contacts.

Justin Ly made a motion to accept the following amended policy statement regarding drone use:

As a “Good Neighbor” in the Trinity River watershed regarding the use of Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS), while conducting work for the Trinity River Restoration Program, staff of the TMC member organizations and contractors will conduct UAS activities under “fly for work” rules (FAA Part 107 or future equivalents), will make reasonable efforts to contact private and public landowners within flight plans prior to the flights, and will annually report usage of UAS (date, agency, and purpose) for listing on the TRRP website.

Keith Groves seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Lunch

8. WY18 Hydrograph and Gravel Augmentation

Todd Buxton gave a slide presentation on the water year 2018 hydrograph. He said they are talking about the 46% of the flows that have historically flowed downstream. This year is looking like a Critically Dry year. The most recent B120 forecast 50% probability is 515k acre-feet of annual basin runoff above the Lewiston Gage. Buxton went over the technical evaluation of how they come up with the hydrograph: the Flow Workgroup meets during January through March, the IDT reviews the recommendations, and this has led to the TMC is presentation today. He showed graphs of the ROD hydrograph, the recommended hydrograph and the pre-dam river flows in a Critically Dry year. He walked the TMC through the various portions of the ROD hydrograph. He noted the functions of the ROD hydrograph and that most portions have temperature regulation functions. Other parts aid vegetation establishment, fish outmigration, frog breeding or gravel mobilization in higher flows. The Recommended hydrograph had more peaks and troughs and would start slightly earlier. The first peak or bump would aid invertebrate drift. Later bumps help to delay frog breeding as they track constant and warmer flows. The bumps also have other functions such as providing thermal diversity, introduce more leaf litter, variable water tables, and help disperse Chinook fingerlings. The descending limb is intended to keep moisture levels on bars so as to keep establishing plant roots watered as they grow deeper.

Buxton explained that they ran the hydrographs through models RBM10 and SSS. The model output for the hydrographs for ROD CritDry, the Recommended CritDry and an alternate CritDry, the fish responses were not very different. The Recommended CritDry had fewer temperature exceedances at Weitchpec. Despite the lack of more differences, the expert opinion on the Workgroup was that the Recommended CritDry would be better for the river.

George Kautsky noted the similarity and asked if they may explore more varied hydrograph to get an idea of how the SSS model behaves. Nick Hetrick pointed out that for a Critically Dry Year, the hydrographs will by necessity be similar, and that contributes to the similarity of the model outputs. Buxton said the model is not able to pick up the small differences in flows and that may be a limitation of the model or there are no differences.

Dave Hillemeier noted the low predicted natural Chinook abundance at Willow Creek and asked about opportunities to increase smolt survival such as leaving the system earlier. Buxton noted they are looking for ways to get smolts out before the system heats up.

Buxton next presented the scenarios for a Dry Year, though he noted that a Dry Year looks improbable. Dave Gaeuman pointed out the fish production was lower in the Dry Year versus the Critically Dry Year. Kyle De Juilio said the actual hydrographs used to model the outputs were not the same between the Dry and Critically Dry. Dry used 2013 data and Critically Dry used 2014 and the tributary inputs would have been different. Also it was pointed out that perhaps 80% of the fish would be out of the system by March when the flows would be initiated. It was further pointed out that the model does not include fish response below the upper 40 miles of the river. Buxton said the dry years tend to be good for frog production and they want to get a lot of frogs. They tried 5 FAM model frog model last year, however, they still have a knowledge gap for frog response in September and they did not want to model frogs until they have a better handle on that.

Kyle De Juilio noted that there is no modeling of the success of hatchery smolts. Justin Ly asked if they could run the model under a fully seeded scenario. Buxton said it takes him a couple of hours to produce the new temperature inputs and then Nick Som typically produces fish outputs

within a couple of weeks. There was no time to do this as a decision was needed today. There were suggestions to move the releases two week earlier and to parameterize the model down to the confluence. Buxton noted that fish start emerging about late January and the natural flows were well timed to help outmigrants. Nick Hetrick noted that an important concept of variable flows would be to synchronize the flow peaks with the environment, particularly the tributary inflows.

Brandt Gutermuth made a motion to accept the Dry and Critically Dry hydrographs as recommended by the Flow Workgroup.

Keith Groves seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Dave Gaeuman next gave a slide presentation on gravel augmentation. He went over the gravel objectives and showed the three areas they use for additions. Gaeuman said if it is Critically Dry Year, he recommended there were no gravel additions. If it were Dry Year, he recommended additions of 400 cubic yards at the Diversion Pool.

Teresa Connor noted that State representatives on the Physical Workgroup said gravel augmentation was not discussed at the last Physical Workgroup meeting. Gaeuman said gravel additions have not been discussed recently and they are not meeting as frequently. Last year, he made recommendation based on the 2014 report for the 5-year permits. Connor asked about the role of the Physical Workgroup if they are not addressing gravel. Robert Franklin noted that the synthesis report will be addressing issues that should help to provide guidance on questions such as the role of the Physical Workgroup. Nick Hetrick echoed Connor's comments regarding changes in role of the Physical Workgroup and suggested if its role were diminished, perhaps they no longer need the workgroup.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to accept the gravel augmentation recommendation of zero augmentation in a Critically Dry Year and 400 cubic yards at the Diversion Pool in a Dry Year.

Nick Hetrick seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Action Item: Caryn Hunt DeCarlo and Jenny Norris will have the Physical Workgroup and IDT be part of gravel augmentation recommendations. FY18 Watershed Projects Rankings for TMC approval

9. FY18 Watershed Projects Rankings for TMD Approval

Caryn Hunt DeCarlo referred the TMC members to the handout in their packets and noted the schedule for the approvals of the watershed proposals. However, just yesterday, the Denver Office notified her that one of the proposals was not forwarded to the TRRP and it is still a valid proposal. Hunt DeCarlo said they need to make decisions on proposals today in order to have time to obligate the funding, but also need to consider the new proposal. She proposed they reserve some funding so the missed proposal could be considered in light of the bottom-ranked proposal and a decision between these two be made at a later date. She said they could decide to not fund the watershed proposals, but she does not have many other places to use those funds this year. She said they could schedule an additional TMC meeting to make the decision or to allow the Workgroup to make the decision.

This prompted discussion among the TMC about funding and priorities. Dave Hillemeier agreed with Hunt DeCarlo's suggestion. But there was back and forth among the TMC about whether to allow the Watershed Workgroup to make a decision about funding or TMC. Mike Orcutt thought they have shifted gears such as including the South Fork and he asked how to get more focused on recovery of the listed coho and if that can be part of the criteria of watershed proposal application. Justin Ly questioned why Mike Orcutt viewed proposals in the South Fork Trinity as not benefiting coho? While current habitat conditions in the South Fork are not ideal, there is a population of coho in the South Fork, so why should we exclude South Fork proposals? Mike responded that there weren't any coho in the South Fork Trinity. Dave Hillemeier stated that coho juveniles are found in the South Fork Trinity.

At this point the presentation was turned over to Eric Wiseman of the Yurok Tribe and the Watershed Workgroup Coordinator to give his updates of the review that the Workgroup performed on the proposals at their March 16 meeting.

Wiseman's overview of the scoring prompted Tony LaBanca to ask how they parceled out the 50 points for things such as restoring fish populations. Wiseman said fish were broken down into 10 points each for five areas: 1) restoring low flows and in particular 2) low flow in the Weaver and Browns Creeks area, 3) addressing limiting factors, 4) proximity to anadromous streams, and 5) improvement to ecological function. He went over the other scoring criteria: technical, cost, qualifications, cost sharing, and implementation. He said the rationale for focus on Weaver and Browns Creek was that these were considered to be a focus area for coho.

Wiseman next went over the individual proposals and started with the proposal 1, East Weaver Creek Dam Removal. Wiseman said this was an old failing dam and he had seen juvenile coho at the base of the dam. They brought a lot of funding as a match and it was mostly an implementation. Upstream of the dam the stream is mostly natural with good habitat for two miles. This would be the last phases of the dam removal as permitting and design has already been funded. Phase I of this project would add in a new diversion to serve as the municipal water for the city of Weaverville and remove 6 feet of the dam. They would watch how the channel behaves and Phase IIB would remove the last 4 feet of the dam.

Responding questions, Wiseman said the diversion amount would not change, but there are considerations about transfer of water rights to get more flow in the stream.

Mike Orcutt asked an over-arching question about the need for funding the South Fork versus recovery of natural coho, and asked if the need for coho is high, why are there not more proposals asking for more e.g., \$2 million. He also noted that the lowest ranked proposal only achieved half the total points and asked if they need to impose a minimal threshold. Other TMC members did not accept that these proposals reflected the actual need. The TMC members asked that the watershed proposal solicitation and ranking process be discussed further at the next TMC meeting.

Back to the East Weaver Creek proposal, Tony LaBanca clarified that there will be a screened and properly regulated diversion and asked if the TRRP is paying for the infrastructure to move the diversion. It was noted that this project has a significant match and that may be the funds for the diversion. Terri Simon-Jackson said it would be important that the funds be used for dam removal and not something the rate payers should be paying for. Nick Hetrick asked if there is any effectiveness monitoring. Wiseman said there are some reporting requirements. Nancy Snodgrass said they will be seeking those deliverables.

Wiseman next presented proposal 2, the McKnight Ditch Water Conservation and East Weaver Creek Instream Flow Project. This project would design and implement an improved diversion

by eliminating a pushup dam on East Weaver Creek and replacing the ditch with a pipe to serve two permitted water users. They would also put a second pipe below the ditch as they expect the other ditch-side residents may likely file a prescriptive water right claim, and this would have the needed pipe in place. The Five Counties would build the project but not maintain it. The TMC asked about the rationale of building the extra pipe.

Wiseman presented on proposal 3, the Sidney Gulch Riparian Habitat Improvement as a planning and implementation to improve riparian function along 800 feet of Sidney Gulch in downtown Weaverville. They proposed to remove non-native trees and blackberries and add irrigation to aid establishment of native trees. Wiseman said the Workgroup had concerns over the proposal to keep six parking spaces and that this project would not address the channelized nature of this reach. He also noted that other work is planned for upstream and downstream reaches and fish are using this creek.

Responding to questions, Wiseman said they were planning to leave mature black locust to keep some level of shade. It was considered whether this project could be redesigned for better restoration potential. Sidney Creek is within the important geographic location of Weaver Creek.

As the meeting was nearing the close for the day, the presentation jumped to presenting proposal 6, the Phase II South Fork Trinity River Heliwood Loading project. Nancy Snodgrass explained this project as Eric Wiseman as an employee of the Yurok Tribe had to excuse himself from the discussions. This was a continuation of second phase of a two phase project to place wood in the South Fork. The first phase had not been implemented. The Watershed Workgroup recommended funding the project pending the completion of the pilot project.

Terri Simon-Jackson said that any work on Forest Service lands would require NEPA which is not yet completed. \$500k of match is not yet certain. There was discussion about whether or not projects should be funded just because there is money available. Nick Hetrick expressed his concern over the Forest Service's inability to have NEPA ready puts this project as not ready and he concern that the unrated project may be automatically be funded regardless of their score. Teresa Connor noted that the TAMWG had they met would have likely said the TMC is not spending enough on watersheds.

Brandt Gutermuth noted the first two projects have benefits for water in Weaver Creek. Terri Simon-Jackson noted these projects are schedule for a single year and they have not completed the permits yet.

At this point, the TMC stopped discussion, and having no public comments (Item 10), adjourned for Day 1. They returned to continue this item at the end of Day 2.

At the end of Day 2, Eric Wiseman continued his presentation of the proposals. He walked the TMC through proposal 4 the South Fork Trinity River Road Upgrade and Maintenance Project. Wiseman explained this was a sediment reduction project in the South Fork Trinity River by making road improvements on 14.3 miles. Improvements include brushing, culvert replacements, inlet repairs, and rip-rap.

Terri Simon-Jackson said she needs to know if this project has landowner permissions and she could not tell from this material here. If they were on Forest Service lands brushing could impact things like archeological sites and that would need a NEPA assessment. Responding to questions, Wiseman said the roads are not all along salmonid streams but the access to the South Fork is important and road failure could impact streams. Two roads are entirely Forest Service, some are on private property.

Wiseman next moved to project 5, Little Browns Creek Road Improvement. This would improve 1.07 miles to reduce sediment delivery from three roads near fish bearing streams in a high-priority watershed. One road is unauthorized and possibly should be decommissioned. One of the roads is only for the power company to access a single pole and that type of road maintenance is normally the power company's responsibility.

In considering all the proposals, Terri Simon-Jackson relayed her discussion with the District Ranger about the South Fork wood loading phase I that has been funded. It was originally planned to be on private lands but the landowner backed out. They approached the District Ranger who was supportive. Permits have not been scoped and they presume it could be passed as a Categorical Exemption. But they also anticipate some level of public opposition. It is possible it could be implemented in September 2018. The Forest Service is the supportive.

To move the decision process along, Caryn Hunt DeCarlo suggested that TMC decide to fund any projects they felt appropriate up to \$350k and reconsider the remaining proposal together with the unfunded proposals. She said they could go through each proposal one by one and then stop at \$350k. Don Bader noted that they may decide to allow the Watershed Workgroup to decide on the last proposal; otherwise the TMC could approve the last of the funding. Dave Hillemeier read the by-laws and thought it would allow a phone vote.

At this point, the TMC took up Item 19, Public Comment as it was now 3 pm and they wanted to keep to the original schedule as posted. After that, they returned to this discussion.

Mike Orcutt expressed his concern over the scoring points, there are no minimum thresholds of scores for funding, and they have opened up tributaries for restoration actions below the 40-mile restoration zone. He has problems with some of the projects. He thinks they need to give more guidance to the Watershed Workgroup about conflict of interest. Hunt DeCarlo thought the Watershed Workgroup could propose a revised process based on this procedure and they could present this at the June meeting.

Keith Groves made a motion to fund Watershed proposal 1, East Weaver Creek Dam Removal for FY18 as presented by the Watershed Workgroup.

Nick Hetrick seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

The TMC thought there were some limitations to proposal 3 such as the parking near the stream, lack of signage, and not doing more in the riparian zone. They liked the idea that it was high visibility.

Mike Orcutt made a motion to fund Watershed proposal 3, Sidney Gulch Riparian Habitat Improvement for FY18 as presented by the Watershed Workgroup.

Teresa Connor seconded the motion.

The motion passed with six yes votes with FWS abstaining and Trinity County recusing.

Mike Orcutt and Teresa Connor were nervous about the water rights and some were concerned whether project 2, would actually go forward. There were concerns over placing the second pipe. Dave Hillemeier and Nick Hetrick liked the removal of the pushup dam and removing excess taking of water.

Keith Groves made a motion to fund Watershed proposal 2, McKnight Ditch Water Conservation for FY18 with the condition they do not fund the second pipe with TRRP funds.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed with six yes votes, with the Hoopa Valley voting no and the California Resources Agency abstaining.

Mike Orcutt noted project 4, South Fork is not a high priority coho watershed and it may not be easily fixed. Other TMC members noted it was a small cost for a lot of roads.

Keith Groves made a motion to fund the Watershed proposal 4, South Fork Trinity River Road Upgrade and Maintenance, Phase I for FY18 as presented by the Watershed Workgroup.

Justin Ly seconded the motion.

The motion passed with seven yes votes, and Hoopa Valley voting no.

The TMC considered the remaining funds and they decided to not fund at this time.

Keith Groves made a motion to continue discussion of Watershed proposals 5, 6, and 7 at a special meeting.

Mike Orcutt seconded the motion.

The motion passed with seven yes votes, the Yurok recusing.

10. Public Forum: Comments from the Public

No comments.

Adjourn for Day 1; 5:00 pm

Day 2, March 29, 2018; 9:00 am

Don Bader opened the meeting the second day. The morning agenda items 12- 14 were shifted to after Items 15- 17 as the Hoopa Valley Tribes was absent in the morning due to another meeting.

11. Public Forum: Comments from the Public

No comments.

Information/Decision Items

12. Science Metrics

Items 12-14 were taken up following items 15-17.

Jenny Norris passed out a two handouts: Trinity River Restoration Program: Current Draft Science Metrics (March 2018), and an updated Schedule of the Completion of Synthesis Reports. These listed the Workgroups, the metrics, and how defined or not currently, and potential the synthesis reports that could inform metrics. Some Workgroups had metrics such as Fish, Temperature and Flow but others did not have defined metrics and most needed refined metrics

that are quantifiable. Norris suggested that guidance from TMC is needed and that the synthesis reports will also help. She also asked the TMC members to help their staff to better respond to her requests about the metric discussions and synthesis report updates.

This prompted a long discussion about the synthesis reports and how to allocate resources for them. Kyle De Juilio said that Andreas Krause was doing the temperature synthesis but with Krause's departure, this has been passed to River Bend Sciences Eli Assarian. Terri Simon-Jackson again noted her frustration with delay in the synthesis reports. Dave Hillemeier said part of this problem is the delay in funding AFAs. Caryn Hunt DeCarlo acknowledge this and explained 4-month Secretarial review been instituted and that is delaying the AFAs. Norris noted that there was recent clarity provided by the Hoopa Valley Tribe and that staff were working on these reports, the Yurok were waiting approval of their AFA. Nick Hetrick noted that problem of waiting for funding can be a problem when the other partners are not notified about the expected dates when the projects can restart and it is difficult to drop everything to restart a project. Simon-Jackson also noted the government shut-downs that has complicated matters and disrupted schedules. Norris noted that synthesis reports are collaborative efforts and folks can get off-sync with these delays. She also noted that staff seem to be very busy and asked TMC to make this a priority for their staff as well. She suggested that TMC have action items to move this forward and without prioritization, the Program staff will be drawn off on other tasks. Hetrick thanked Norris for this assessment and said this is very valuable. Justin Ly echoed Hetrick's comments as this is a nice step toward a report card.

Seth Naman commented on the undefined metrics, and noted the Fish Workgroup has worked on this over the years and has gotten as far as they can. So kicking it back to the Fish Workgroup would not work. He suggested more feedback from the TMC via meetings or workshops as waiting for the synthesis reports would not necessarily help. He noted they continue to fund projects for which there are no metric. Norris agreed that the Fish Workgroup is the furthest along but there are still things this Workgroup can do. She suggested that some workgroups have more work than others. She requested the TMC ask the Workgroups to push this along. Simon-Jackson thought they had talked about freezing projects until they get their work done. Todd Buxton commented how delay occurs by the example of the departure of Krause, Buxton's new assignment, and the Tribes delayed funding pointing out that these are real world conditions. Kyle De Juilio noted that workgroup and synthesis reports will stop just short of making recommendations on metrics. Norris said she is sorry to hear this and she may need to circle back with the Workgroups. Simon-Jackson noted the importance of the technical groups to make recommendation otherwise someone else may and they may have less technical knowledge and more political objectives. Ken Lindke thought they may be able to make their highest level of recommendations, and he noted that all work has not been put on hold to complete synthesis reports, but the work is concurrent with synthesis reports. Naman commented that there may be an expectation that their recommendation will be specific such as recommending the number of juveniles needed to meet the TRRP restoration objectives. Norris agreed that more discussion is needed to help develop focus and direction and she is happy to facilitate this, but it is also important for TMC to press this. Simon-Jackson thought that the TMC had done this. She also noted that she hears these same problems in her job at the Forest Service. To solve this, the Forest Service sequesters teams until this get their tasks completed. Justin Ly asked if there is a schedule for each report. Norris said yes, detailed plans exist, and are in the investigation plans which they have access to and updates have been requested quarterly from the PIs on Synthesis Reports.

Don Bader agreed with Simon-Jackson and it seems they are slipping. Simon-Jackson said she liked the idea of having the technical do as much as they can and then convene a workshop with

TMC or SAB to help assess risks associated with assigning metrics. Teresa Connor said the TMC is partly to blame as they continually assign work to the staff. Nick Hetrick noted that they will not be able to say produce “x” smolts per year as there is discomfort with some metrics, but they could use metrics from other basins.

Norris asked for a motion for the technical groups to support metrics and synthesis. Don Bader thought this is not needed as everyone supports this. Hetrick brought up the fact that some of the metrics, such as recovery targets for coho salmon are set by NMFS, and the program doesn’t have ability to change those. Ly agreed that NMFS has recovery targets and asked why can’t this Program have the same recovery targets. Hetrick said they could use NOAA’s targets but it would have be reviewed and approved more broadly, but this group cannot easily come up with new targets.

Simon-Jackson asked if they can’t come up with some direction. Bader suggested they discuss this at the next meeting to see if they are on track. Norris asked if the TMC can encourage their staff to stick to her deadlines and Simon-Jackson suggested they at least respond to her request.

Lunch

13. FY18 TRRP Budget Update

Caryn Hunt DeCarlo noted individual meetings she, Jenny Norris and Mike Dixon had with all TMC members for both the FY18 and FY19 budget. She noted that some budget items had changed since the FY18 budget that had been approved in December. She walked the TMC through these changes using her budget’s sheet handout. The FY18 budget decreases were proposed to be applied to the WC Weir, the watershed proposal slight increase, Sky Ranch and Sawmill road repairs, VE study, and the annual report.

Hunt DeCarlo asked for guidance about allowing her discretion about limited budget adjustments. This prompted a discussion. Mike Orcutt said he was not comfortable with allowing budget adjustments. Terri Simon-Jackson and Teresa Connor thought it would be efficient for the Executive Director to have some level of discretion. Several members expressed appreciation for the quarterly reports on the budget. There was more discussion about the need to obligate funds and not lose them. Nick Hetrick said there is always latitude in budgets and noted the funds provided to Reclamation via interagency agreements allow carry over to next year’s and it has been used in the past. Hunt DeCarlo said certain areas cannot have new funds, but she can put added funds onto the AFAs and they used this at the end of last year for construction projects when the watershed agreements were unable to be funded. Keith Groves thought they would need to have a motion to approve budget changes. He commented that these are simple budget adjustments particularly if you do just adjustments within areas such as implementation. Giving latitude for adjustments would be good, but he is not sure what the limits should be. Justin Ly agreed the Executive Director should have authority and they should agree on the limit. Mike Orcutt said he was appreciative of knowing the amounts being moved. Nick Hetrick said he was uncomfortable with transfers of large round numbers into categories such as \$100k for more stock piling of trees.

Keith Groves made a motion to accept the FY18 budget adjustments as presented by the Executive Director in the March Executive Director’s report under the budget section.

Mike Orcutt seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Information / Decision Items**14. FY19 TRRP Draft Budget Proposal**

Caryn Hunt DeCarlo went through her spreadsheet handout for the FY19 budget. She compared FY19 to FY18. The total for FY19 is \$14.83 million and is \$140k less than FY18 in the FWS budget. This is assuming that funding from USBR remains constant compared to last year. This is an iterative budget that changes throughout the year and items such as Partner indirect cost rates are not yet determined. After the base Science projects were funded, the remainder was put on the rehabilitation project. This project is still in the cost estimating phase and will have a secondary review by an unbiased party in the Regional Office.

Hunt DeCarlo said if they can approve this budget, she can start her planning. She reminded the TMC that they need to undergo the 3-4 month Secretarial review of spending on all grant agreements. Hunt DeCarlo next walked the TMC through the FY19 budget sheet. She noted that the Implementation was what the TMC members saw on their one-on-one discussions, with some increases from reduced NEPA contract and all of Willow Creek FY19 costs now being funded in FY18. Jenny Norris walked the TMC through the Science budget. She noted an increase in the SAB budget for FY19 as there will be new SAB and Norris would like more participation by the SAB. She noted the need to shift some funding for review of synthesis reports from FY18 in FY19. Hunt DeCarlo suggested if the TMC approves the budget they could request quarterly updates on changes.

Don Bader asked about TAMWG line item. Nick Hetrick said until last Friday they had a TAMWG and this may be moved to FWS administration, as most of these monies are USFWS employee costs. Dave Hillemeier said we may need some funds for monitoring effects of late winter variable flows related to Humboldt County water. Keith Groves asked about funding projects for winter flows and whether it is a part of the Program's purpose, particularly if they are not willing to use ROD water for winter flows. Dave Hillemeier and Jenny Norris both provided examples of the value of understanding how flow affects the river. Nick Hetrick noted that support for harvest management is another example of the value of information that describes river function and response and is useful in assessing the Program.

Keith Groves made a motion to accept the proposed FY19 budget as presented by the Executive Director with the amendments to shift TAMWG funding to FWS administration. This allows contracts and agreements to be prepared earlier to help ensure obligations of funds. The Executive Director will provide quarterly updates on the FY19 budget. The Executive will provide recommendations for priorities for changes in funds at future meetings.

Teresa Connor seconded the motion

The motion passed unanimously.

At this point, the TMC returned to Item 9, the discussion of the Watershed proposals where they stopped at the end of Day 1.

15. General Shape/Concept Hydrograph for SOD/Storage Management Releases

Items 15-17 were taken up in the morning Day 2, following Item 11.

Todd Buxton gave a slide presentation on safety of dam (SOD) release and ways they may be used for restoration. Caryn Hunt DeCarlo also noted the memo with his graphs in the TMC member's packets. Reservoir storage management (RMS) releases can be for dam safety and

storage management releases and are to maintain dam safety and protect property downstream and secondarily they can be used for restoration flows. The TRRP staff developed guidelines for release that may be used for restoration.

He showed graphs of a typical RMS release flow versus time as a mostly flat-topped pattern of constant release; over that, he projected a more variable pattern of peaks and troughs that may be a restoration recommended release. He presented some information about the rates of increase and the rates of decrease in the flows. The idea would be to try to mimic these rates. He noted they would target slower rates of change during periods of smolt emerge or seedling root establishment. Some of the Flow Workgroup's recommendations were peak flows would be less than 3600 cfs for September-November for spawning; if peak flow < 2 days, to limit to < 9,000 cfs to avoid redd scour; if flow > 2 days, limit to 6,000 cfs.

Don Bader noted they may not ever have those high of RMS releases. Buxton agreed but noted, to be complete, they thought they would include this information. Nick Hetrick asked about the peaks and troughs in the recommended RMS releases and suggested there may be negative effects to periphyton and invertebrates. Buxton said his memo was passed to the Flow Workgroup but he did not receive any adverse comments. Dave Hillemeier asked about how the peaks were chosen in Buxton's recommended RMS. Buxton said he played around rates and he said he may be able to come up with a single equation but it would have if-then variables in it. Bill Pinnix asked about Buxton's figure 1 in his memo that was the 2017 release. Don Bader commented they came up with the block release as they had been planning for several weeks and they had a block of water to move out before the ROD spring release. Pinnix said they may be able to propose a series of releases based on the likely RMS releases so the CVO could review this smaller set. Bader said the past releases since 2006 could be reviewed to see how the recommendations would have modified those. He thought it should be kept simple as the CVO office can get pretty busy when you have years like last year. Keith Groves asked about flows regarding turbine capacity. Bader said they have one turbine that can handle 1800 cfs and they plan to have two turbines by next year.

16. Update on Run Size/Stock Projections and Harvest Monitoring

Ken Lindke, CDFW, gave an update on run size and projections for next year fall Chinook in the Klamath and Trinity rivers (handout in TMC packets). They collect data on age-specific abundance estimates to estimate returns to the basin and to help predict next year returns. Table 1 of his handout showed that they under-predicted the returns to the Klamath River basin: predicted 18,400 versus actual 31,838. Table 2 showed a total return of fall Chinook to the Trinity of 18,237. There were a high number of two-year old jacks and that suggests a high return for next year: with no fishing the model estimates at least 99,800 returns to the mouth of the Klamath River. He noted this would be 120 % of the long-term average. Figure 1 showed the fall Chinook returns to the Klamath and Trinity since 1978. Klamath varied from lows less than 50,000 in 2016 and 1991 to highs to near 250,000 in 1986, 1996, 2001, and 2012. The Trinity River mostly paralleled those trends but at about 1/3 the returns.

Bill Pinnix asked about the reported smaller fish observed this year. Lindke said they used scale analysis to determine age structure and that is not very sensitive to size. But the model could account for small size and could affect harvest impacts. Pinnix said smaller fish could lead to a smaller harvest as they are less vulnerable to capture. Robert Franklin asked about the over-fishing review and its effect. Dave Hillemeier said if the stock falls below a geometric mean of 30,325 three years in a row, the fishery is considered over-fish and that starts a review. Tony

LaBanca noted the value of these presentations so the TMC had a good idea of the monitoring. He suggested they have a more detailed presentation on this.

17. Request for June TMC Agenda Items

Caryn Hunt DeCarlo referred to the handout in the TMC member's packets that listed some agenda items. These included a review of all the implementation projects, winter variable flow updates, SAB and peer reviews, budget updates, and the Refinements.

The TMC members suggested more items. Terri Simon-Jackson suggested a review of the sites being re-visited. Justin Ly suggested a summary of assessments on the restoration sites that have been performed. Nick Hetrick agreed with Ly that they need to have a closer look at assessments of site and habitat and noted the first report in Hunt DeCarlo's publication list that summarized the 10-year trend analysis of salmon rearing and use of habitat. Terri Simon-Jackson wants a regular status report on where the Synthesis reports are at and wants to know if they are slipping. Kyle De Juilio said the River Corridor first steps document was a move to use of the DSS—it is a 200+ page document. Simon-Jackson asked for an abstract for that.

Action item: Jenny Norris will make available to the TMC an abstract of the River Corridor first steps document.

The TMC suggested other agenda items for June. Simon-Jackson noted the value of a discussion of timelines for AFAs particularly as they affect the watershed proposals. Dave Hillemeier proposed to have a cohort reconstruction as part of the run size/stock projections; Jenny Norris noted that cohort reconstruction will be part of the synthesis report and doing a complete presentation will take effort away from the report. Hillemeier said just a summary will do.

About presentations, Robert Franklin noted the trick of guiding the presentation to TMC so they are not excessively complex and to keep them focused to the TMC and their decision process. Hunt DeCarlo said it would be good for Norris to provide this guidance. Tony LaBanca said they may focus on the history of the project, context, the objectives, how it meets objectives and how it is useful to the program.

Action item: Jenny Norris will work with technical presenters with guidance on content to make effective presentations to the TMC. TMC requested it be identified why a presentation is important to them.

Justin Ly asked about effectiveness monitoring of whether flows are affecting fish. Norris said this is a good point, but they may not be at a point where we can provide information. Kyle De Juilio noted that a dip in the hydrograph provided an opportunity for monitoring and they are working that data up now. Nick Hetrick asked if the flow relationships will be covered in the Synthesis reports. Norris said yes.

Ly asked where about the status of the Program's adaptive management, such as DSS or others. Simon-Jackson again brought up the lack of synthesis reports and expressed concerns of an audit.

Ly asked to see the strategic plan that states where they are going and how will they get there. Dave Hillemeier noted that the River Corridor document is a step in that direction. Simon-Jackson asked about the annual report and its use as developing talking points. Hunt DeCarlo said it is available on the website and took a list of whom to send hard copies. Ly asked that information in the annual reports be reported out to the TMC so the TMC is aware of the program's achievements and messages. Tony LaBanca suggested the annual report have a report card about how well they met their objectives. Norris said strategic planning is great, but she

asked who is defining the objectives for the year and work planning. The budget dictates the priorities.

Action item: Caryn Hunt DeCarlo will send hard copies of the 2016 annual report to TMC members that requested it.

At this point, the TMC returned to Item 12.

18. Public Forum: Comments from the Public

This item was taken up during discussions of Item 9 at 3:00 pm to allow public comments on schedule. After this item, the TMC returned to finish Item 9 at the end of Day 2.

Donna Rupp of the TCRCD asked if excess funds from watersheds is put somewhere else, they be put for instream monitoring as they currently are suffering from a lack of data.

Adjourn for Day 2, 3:40 pm

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**March 2018 Quarterly Meeting**

**Location: Trinity River Restoration Program
1313 South Main Street, Weaverville, CA**

Agenda for March 28-29, 2018 (WebEx info on page 2)**Wednesday March 28, 2018**

<u>Time</u>		<u>Discussion Leader</u>
	<i>Regular Business:</i>	
9:00	Introductions: ▪ Welcome and Introductions ▪ Approval of Agenda ▪ Approval of December TMC Meeting Minutes	Don Bader, Chair
9:15	Public Forum: Comments from the public	Bader, Chair
9:30	TAMWG Status Update	Nick Hetrick, FWS DFO
9:35	Report from Executive Director (includes JC House update)	Caryn Hunt DeCarlo
	<i>Information / Decision Items:</i>	
10:30	Winter Flow Variability White Paper and SIR Update	Kyle De Juilio/Robert Franklin and Caryn
10:45	Break	
11:00	Reinitiation of Consultation on the Coordinated Long-Term Long-Term Operation of Central Valley Project and State Water Project	Katrina Harrison
11:30	UAS/Drone Good Neighbor guideline for TMC approval <i>Decision Item</i>	Eric Peterson
11:45	Lunch	
1:00	WY18 Hydrograph and Gravel Augmentation <i>Decision Item</i>	Todd Buxton, Dave Gaeuman, James Lee and Kyle
2:30	Break	
2:45	FY18 Watershed Projects Rankings for TMC approval <i>Decision Item</i>	Eric Wiseman/Nancy Snodgrass
4:30	Public Forum: Comments from the public	Don Bader, Chair
4:45	Adjourn	
6:00	TMC Dinner: Stagecoach, Weaverville, CA	

Thursday March 29, 2018 REVISED**Time****Discussion Leader*****Regular Business:***

9:00	Public Forum: Comments from the public	Don Bader, Chair
------	---	------------------

Information / Decision Items:

9:15	General shape/concept Hydrograph for SOD/storage management releases	Todd Buxton
9:30	Update on run size/stock projections and harvest monitoring	Ken Lindke
9:50	Request for June TMC Agenda Items	Caryn
10:00	Science Metrics	Jenny Norris
10:30	FY18 TRRP Budget update <i>Decision Item</i>	Caryn
11:00	Lunch	
12:00	FY19 TRRP Draft Budget Proposal <i>(includes discussion of FY19 Science Workplan/direction)</i> <i>Decision Item</i>	Jenny and Caryn
1:45	Break	
2:00	FY18 Watershed Projects Rankings for TMC approval Continued <i>Decision Item</i>	Eric Wiseman
3:00	Public Forum: Comments from the public	Don Bader, Chair
3:15	Adjourn	

WebEx and Call in Information:**TMC – Day 1 Wednesday, March 28th**

Call in number: 1-408-792-6300

Passcode: 805 092 908

<https://trrp.webex.com/trrp/j.php?MTID=m1f23ebafacd3163c64f01038d9b9e851>

TMC – Day 2 Thursday, March 29th

Call in number: 1-408-792-6300

Passcode: 800 926 201

<https://trrp.webex.com/trrp/j.php?MTID=m37754ee45f8b1c6fd5b48147d4cfe45d>