

Minutes

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

April 3-4, 2019
TRRP Office
1313 South Main Street
Weaverville, CA 96093

Day 1, Wednesday April 3, 2019

Attending Members

Member	Representative Seat
Mike Dixon	Trinity River Restoration Program
Justin Ly	National Marine Fisheries Service, Acting Chair
Elizabeth Hadley	Bureau of Reclamation
Mike Orcutt	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Teresa Connor	California Department of Water Resources
Dan Everson	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Dave Hillemeier	Yurok Tribe
Terri Simon-Jackson	U.S. Forest Service
Keith Groves	Trinity County

Other Attendees: Logan Negherbon, Eric Peterson, Kevin Held, Brandt Gutermuth, Linsey Walker, Kathy Martens (TRRP), Tony LaBanca, Ken Lindke (CDFW), Bill Brock (USFS), George Kautsky, Justin Alvarez (Hoopa Valley Tribe), Kyle DeJulio, Dave Gaeuman, Chris Laskodi (Yurok Tribe), Seth Naman (NMFS), Jennifer Norris, Connor Shea, Nick Hetrick (USFWS), Dave Steinhauser, Jerry Payne (members of the public)

Attending by Phone: Russ Callejo (Reclamation), Bill Pinnix and Nick Som (USFWS)

Notes: Heidi Trathnigg (EPP)

List of Motions

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the meeting agenda.

Dan Everson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the December TMC minutes.

Teresa Connor seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to accept the recommendations of the Inter-Disciplinary Team (IDT) for flow and gravel augmentation.

Teresa Connor seconded the motion.

The motion was passed unanimously.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) related activities, such as the Hatchery Run Size Estimates (CDFW) and coded wire tags (PSFMS) which were added as additional costs to the FY19 budget and future budgets, amounting to \$421,477 in FY19, should be included in budgeting in Reclamation's appropriate funding authority for mitigation and regulatory (ESA) requirements associated with the TRH rather than being included in the Restoration Program budget. This would be conveyed in a letter to the USFWS and Reclamation Regional Directors.

It was seconded by Dave Hillemeier.

The motion was passed with 7 votes in favor and one abstained (Elizabeth Hadley).

Keith Groves made a motion to accept program administration portion of budget.

Teresa Connor seconded.

Dave Hillemeier made a competing motion to approve budget with exceptions:

- Any savings received from not funding TRH tasks or other funds that become available be redistributed following prioritization assessment by IDT and recommended to TMC
 - o effectiveness monitoring and**
 - o watershed restoration with the goal of up to \$500K.**
 - o funding for SAB****
- And we move \$100,000 from geophysical support services monitoring to channel rehabilitation effectiveness monitoring**

Teresa Connor seconded the competing motion.

Different people made friendly amendments to Dave Hillemeier's competing motion, and they were accepted by Hillemeier and seconded by Conner.

The motion passed with seven in favor and one absent.

Regular Business

Welcome and Introductions

Justin Ly (NOAA Fisheries) opened the meeting with introductions of all TMC members and members of the general audience.

Approval of Agenda

Ly discussed overview of the agenda and asked if anyone had proposed changes. Also, Ly discussed that the meeting may go faster than the proposed schedule and some items on the agenda may shift from Thursday to Wednesday.

George Kautsky sat in for Mike Orcutt temporarily and mentioned that since officer elections are late in day, he wanted to make sure Orcutt was present to vote.

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the meeting agenda.

Dan Everson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of the December TMC Meeting Minutes

No comments were provided on the December Meeting Minutes

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the December TMC minutes.

Teresa Connor seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Public Forum

Jerry Payne (public) inquired about the plan for Sky Ranch Road near Hwy 299. A flood in Oregon Gulch blocked the culvert during a storm, which undercut the road and 1/3 of the width of the road failed. Mr. Payne is worried that the Chapman Project is scheduled to start soon, and the log trucks may make the road fail further, trapping residents on the other side. He would like the group to talk to the County to fix the road. Mike Dixon said they would like to look at avenues to get the culvert replaced as part of the road repair; there may be further conversation with the county. Logan Negherbon stated that they are planning to bring in equipment by early June. Mr. Payne stated that there is time to get it fixed but worried that it will take too long and does not want to see project start before road is fixed. Keith Groves thinks there is opportunity in current budget to use unused watershed money. They are working with Andy Pence from Trinity County DOT to determine a plan and try to expedite the culvert repair. Dixon said the County was asking for FEMA funding to repair the road but that use of federal funds would require that the culvert be replaced to meet NMFS fish passage standards. Mr. Payne stated that it is another intermittent stream and when flowing fish can't get past the culvert at Sky Ranch Road [Sheridan Creek]. Fish passage lanes should be fixed.

CVP Operations Update

Elizabeth Hadley stated that Shasta Dam on the Sacramento side was in flood operations and releasing began at 40,000cfs then went down to 15,000cfs and is going back up again. Now the water is 17ft from top of Shasta Dam. They have provided a 100% water allocation to water contractors. They are not anticipating flood control releases out of Trinity Dam since the water is

25-30ft from the top. There is a significant increase in storage this year, because the snow pack is at 162% of normal. Groves stated that it already peaked at 33ft. and there will be more releases.

Hadley is predicting that Turbine 1 from the Trinity Power Plant will not be in service for ROD flows this year. They expect to receive some of the parts around April 12, and then other parts will be running by the end of June or July.

Executive Director's report

Dixon provided an overview of the information contained in the ED report, which was available as a handout. Highlights from the conversation it generated are included.

Organizational Updates

There are a lot of vacancies which are in various stages of being filled. Justin Ly read Caryn Hunt DeCarlo's closing thoughts of the Program. Dixon mentioned that Hunt DeCarlo had brought a fresh level of humanity to the Executive Director role and went a long way to restoring trust. Terri Simon Jackson asked the group if they should prepare a plaque of appreciation. Dixon stated that Kathy Martens prepared a photobook where staff could provide quotes and photos. Simon-Jackson would like to get a card for everyone to sign.

Science Update

Nick Som and Mike Dixon are leading the IDT. Eric Peterson is tracking Synthesis and other Program reports. Som and Peterson are co-coordinating peer review reports coming in including SAB coordination. The ED is tracking WG updates/reports. Som is coordinating WG metric objectives and targets updates to track success. Program staff are pushing to get a Science Symposium for Riparian and Aquatic Ecology (RAE) this year but at this point probably can't use FY19 funds to pay for it. They would like to allocate funding for next year. RAE WG meeting will be held in April to discuss Science Symposium Planning

Synthesis Reports

During Peterson's run-through of the status of synthesis reports, Orcutt mentioned that he would like to hear a follow-up on what the IDT is doing with the reports at the December meeting. Simon-Jackson stated that the reports keep getting moved out and they need these reports for science to keep going. Justin Ly agreed but noted that most of the synthesis reports will be completed this year.

SAB Staffing and Work Prioritization

Jenny Norris has and will distribute the results of the SAB survey. This survey included over 20 participants from TRRP staff and partners. If TMC would like a presentation on this information, Norris is happy to provide this. Dixon stated that this will inform the work of the future Science Coordinator to reformulate the SAB. Norris suggested that SAB survey information may also be valuable in the refinement conversations for TMC. Dixon provided that due to Program budget reductions in the 2020's President's budget, the ED extended all three of current member SAB contracts to cover FY20; these agreements still have unspent funds that can be used for report

review in the coming year. Simon-Jackson stated that they would like the survey results to be on the agenda for the next meeting.

Program Science Metrics Objectives and Targets

WG continued to refine their objectives and targets. Made some progress on which objectives may be dropped from current assessment, based on lack of data or redundancy. WG tried to complete a first pass at this review and dropping objectives but they lost momentum with the government shutdown. There is an existing spreadsheet (objectives and targets) that anyone can comment on.

IDT Proposal Targeted Science Work Plan

This Flow and Fish WGs have had initial discussions on the initiative to identify hypotheses and research questions related to adaptive management of restoration flows. Further discussion is planned for the Physical and RAE WGs.

Orcutt stated that this was a work in progress. Winter flow variability is just one attribute. He has concern about how it was characterized during the discussion. How much will the major hypotheses from the ROD factor in? How will synthesis reports and science symposium factor in?

It was mentioned as an example that members of the Fish WG may propose a juvenile survival study to identify the bottleneck that prevents juveniles from getting to ocean.

Orcutt brought up conversation that had occurred at the IDT meeting on this topic regarding removal of Trinity River flows from the ROC on LTO, but conversation was deferred until the presentation on that topic later in the agenda.

Implementation Update

Negherbon walked the group through this section of the ED report.

There was some discussion of the status of permits for future projects. Simon-Jackson asked about land ownership at some of the sites. Negherbon answered that Upper Connor Creek is BLM and Oregon Gulch is private and BLM.

Dixon discussed the status of the JC House. They would like to elevate the house to facilitate fishery flow releases in the river without impacting the house. The flows were 18,600-19,000cfs and the water was within 3/10ths of foot from flooding the house.

Public Outreach Update

Kevin Held provided an update on the high points of Public Outreach.

Orcutt said that he would like some level of public outreach participation in the Klamath-Trinity School District's Fish Fair on May 10th.

TRRP Budget

Conversation was deferred to the budget section of the agenda.

Trinity River Restoration Program Refinements

TRRP needs to reschedule the first Refinements meeting after cancellation of the December 5, 2018 meeting due to the executive order to close the Federal Government for a National Day of Mourning for President Bush. Previous attempts to reschedule have been foiled because of the furlough and lack of availability of key members. Chad Smith and the contract facilitator Mike Harty cannot meet in June, so July would be the soonest the meeting could happen. It has been 8 months (November 28, 2018) since Smith provided the draft Final Report TRRP Refinements. A doodle poll will be open with the new dates. Please respond as fast as you can so the meeting can get locked in. Smith's contract with Reclamation ends November 2019.

Hadley suggested to look at the previously scheduled dates and select one of those. Hillemeier said that it has taken too long to schedule, and they need to have the meeting sooner. Groves commented that he did not think TMC has taken the meeting very seriously. Orcutt suggested that they schedule during the June TMC meeting and not do a doodle poll; Dixon responded that the facilitator is not available in June.

Someone asked the question if TMC should get someone other than Smith? Groves stated that they should use Smith, but not the facilitator. Dixon stated that Smith is still under contract through latter part of this year. Connor stated that it was Smith's recommendation to use a facilitator. Ly said that it has taken too long to get the facilitator's availability. Simon-Jackson and Dixon mentioned that they could use no-cost options to rely on volunteer facilitator. Simon-Jackson also stated that in July, fire season starts and she will not be available. Ly said we would check to see if Smith would be available for the previous meeting date in May.

Publications and Reports

Peterson reported on the data packages received for this quarter.

Notes from the December Action Items states that the program would pursue video streaming for this meeting. Ly responded that this meeting is currently being streamed but participants on the phone could not see the video feed.

Officer Elections

Ly stated that Don Bader's two-year term as TMC Chair has ended. Simon-Jackson declined having her name on the ballot since she is going to retire. Bader is still interested in participating, but he is still at the regional office and will not be able to participate until June. TMC members voted for the chair position and Connor and Groves counted the vote.

Connor and Groves announced that Justin Ly was voted as chair, which prompted a vote for vice chair. The vote was determined as a tie. The two nominees were Dan Everson and Don Bader. Everson stated that he is willing to go with what the group decides and will take the first year if that is the consensus of the group. The chair has the power to make the decision. Ly confirmed that Everson will be the vice chair for upcoming year (starts today) and Bader will be vice chair for the next year.

Mr. Payne asked if the Refinements meeting was open to public and if the report was available? Ly responded yes to both. Mr. Payne asked how the public will be notified of the meeting? Dixon responded that it will be posted on the TRRP website and that he would pass along the information to Mr. Payne; he also said that, while the meeting is open to the public, it is not a “public meeting” in the traditional sense and will not include slots for public comments.

Program Science Metrics Objectives and Targets

Som presented on the Program Science Metrics Objectives and Targets. Workgroups are actively working to refine objectives by identifying and justifying objectives to be dropped. They have made some progress on which objectives may be dropped from current assessment, based on lack of data or redundancy. TRRP needs to align the science driven objectives to justify a specific target and define clear and measurable targets to assess retained objectives. Objectives should be measurable to see if they are hitting target or not. The outcome of this effort will be rolled out during the September TMC meeting.

In response to some examples provided, Orcutt asked if there was a monitoring program in place that assesses fry stranding and green sturgeon production on annual basis because these were two examples of objectives without targets. Som answered no.

Hillemeier mentioned that the 62,000 escapement target for the Trinity does not match with Pacific Marine Fisheries Council of 47,500 escapement for the combined Klamath/Trinity Basins. Ly stated that should be a question for the Fish WG. Ken Lindke stated that they have not gone there yet. Kautsky stated that the Pacific Marine Fishery Council’s control rule and conservation for Klamath River fall Chinook and the TRRP goal to restore populations of Trinity River naturally produced fall Chinook are not mutually exclusive. At high level of abundance exploitation is capped in fisheries to a rate of approximately 2/3 of the potential spawners in any year. Hence, at high abundances, it is conceivable, at the restored condition, that 62,000 naturally produced Trinity fall Chinook could escape fisheries and contribute to spawning.

Som stated that this shows that it is hard to agree on specific targets and reiterated that objectives are living concepts and they can be revised.

Discussion of June TMC Agenda Items

- Regular business and topics were proposed.
- Other items proposed were informational decision items and SAB survey. Norris stated that she will send the survey results for review, and it will be determined whether she needs to give a presentation.
- Dixon suggested a discussion about the budget as it relates to routine tasks and if the FY19 budget money needs to be re-distributed. If the FY20 budget does not pass today it will be discussed in June.
- Orcutt added that the agenda include a discussion of the recently completed biological opinions for the Klamath Project from the Services. He would also like Kautsky to present on what is going on in Pacific Fisheries Management Council.

- Another suggested topic of discussion was restoration work and/or science occurring in the Trinity watershed that is external to the TRRP. At a minimum, FWS, Reclamation, Forest Service, State of CA, and Hoopa Valley Tribe, and Yurok Tribe are conducting restoration not related to TRRP but is good work. It would be good to provide a forum for some of the work being done in the watershed. Hillemeier thought that would be a good idea but would like watershed work group involved to inform their work as well.
- Simon-Jackson stated that with the Paradise Fire, PG&E is approaching Forest Service about fire as it relates to the power and distribution lines. PG&E is on fast track for tree felling. There is a huge fuel load left under the power lines since they leave the trees on-site. They would like to reduce fuels and protect communities. The work that is being done and may increase sedimentation to the river. This topic may be better suited for the September meeting. Caltrans is a big partner in this effort since they lost assets in the Delta Fire. Dixon stated that they can save a place for this topic during the September meeting.
- Groves made a statement about how Caltrans is spraying herbicide on the roadsides. Forest Service was aerial spraying herbicides in Trinity County 40 years ago. Trinity County tried to ban aerial spraying with an ordinance and the State told them they could not do that so they passed a resolution. Due to pressure following the Carr Fire, Caltrans said they are going to start spraying again. They are going to use a contact and pre-emergence herbicide. The County is in an uproar. This is the only county in state with no roadside herbicide spraying. Sensitive fish are one reason that the County does not want the spraying. Should TMC be involved? Ly asked if Groves wanted to make a motion to participate in the discussion. Groves stated that he did not want to, but they should have Caltrans come and present their plans to the Council. Hillemeier suggested that the Fish WG could give input on effects of herbicide on fish. Groves asked about what the herbicide thresholds for the fish are. The project consists of 16-18 miles in the County with parameters, but they have not mentioned the chemicals they will use. They also want to spray along the Hwy 299 corridor (100 miles or so). Groves believes they have not developed a management plan yet. He also questioned why they are not revealing what herbicides they will use. Are they not saying what herbicides they are using because they don't know or that they do not want to discuss with the public? Orcutt asked if there was a point of contact for the project. Groves stated that it would be someone with Caltrans District 2 out of Redding.
- Simon-Jackson elaborated that rodenticide on the land would not be removed from cannabis grow sites during cleanups because of exposure and hospitalization that had occurred which violated OSHA.
- Simon-Jackson suggested that they might want to invite others involved in similar work, such as PG&E transmission

- Everson suggested that they meet the first day to discuss the refinements with the facilitator and the second day they meet to revise them. Ly reminded the group that Smith is not available in June.
- Connor stated that she would like to have an update on the macroinvertebrate study and Sky Ranch Project in June. Kautsky stated that this could be covered by poster session if there was no time.
- Ly suggested that there be an update on data gaps regarding flow management.
- Simon-Jackson stated that she cannot be at June meeting. It was discussed that maybe they need to look at rescheduling the June meeting since several people will not be there. The rules state that if primary or alternate representative are not present, they may designate someone with full voting rights. Simon-Jackson stated that they will ask Michael Green to represent USFS at the meeting.
- Som stated he would be happy to present the systemic habitat changes.
- Orcutt would like an update on TRRP budget, particularly discussing if there is money that can't get spent. There is some flexibility from December decision. Dixon stated that most funds are obligated. All things that redistribute funds have already been reallocated. Orcutt wants to see that funds that are not spent are not redistributed to Reclamation so they would like to obligate funds as much as possible.

BREAK

ROC on LTO CVP and SWP update

Russ Callejo provided an update on reinitiating Central Valley Project (CVP) and the State Water Project (SWP). Reclamation in Sacramento is completing an EIS for the project with the primary responsibility to oversee the re-initiation. Reclamation requests opportunities for input on the process and schedule. Orcutt asked what part of the proposed action includes the Trinity River Division (TRD) operations? Callejo stated that the Trinity River Biological Opinion completed in 2000 will not be changed. Trinity basin is included in that analysis and will be described in that context as they are moving forward. They will evaluate the potential effects of species in Trinity to use as an environmental baseline for the “No action” scenario, so what will happen if they do not operate the project. They will see if there is a difference between the baseline and effects to coho, green sturgeon, and eulachon to without action. Dave Hillemeier asked for clarification if he was saying that the baseline includes Trinity ROD flows? Callejo responded that no, that Reclamation's baseline is without operation of the project. It is not something they are proposing and not part of the alternatives. Ly clarified that Reclamation's definition of baseline is inconsistent with the Endangered Species Act definition of baseline, which includes past and present impacts of all actions in an action area, which means that the baseline includes Trinity ROD flows.

Orcutt was curious if the Operations Criteria and Plan (OCAP) ROC includes any reference to the TRD Proviso 2 water that Humboldt County has a 50,000 acre-feet contract with

Reclamation? Callejo responded that they mention it, but not part of the action because they do not have specificity to model it.

Callejo stated that they are in the ESA process. Reclamation has submitted biological assessment to USFWS and NMFS. They are planning for release of the EIS and BO on June 17. Both are consistent with presidential memorandum signed Oct 2018 working with Services on the BO to meet recommendations outlined by president. They meet regularly to discuss project.

Hillemeier stated that one time there was a meeting where everyone was asked to submit comments. From that comment meeting, TMC thought that Reclamation would open consultation on the Trinity River. Callejo stated that Reclamation made the decision not to consult because Trinity River has its own BO that was completed in 2000. Orcutt asked if there was an existing BO on the CVP? Callejo answered yes. Orcutt asked then why there was not a decision to go for the re-consultation on the TRD? Callejo stated that he can't provide any more information because he only has the info available but can discuss further offline. Orcutt stated that the BA submitted on January 31st stated that they were asking for more regulatory information. A discussion of the coho consultation happened at the recent IDT meeting where many of the partners learned that the Trinity was not included in the OCAP ROC. Callejo responded that yes Reclamation provided a number of additional technical analyses of modeling and data analysis and reporting that have Reclamation staff working with the document in real time for as much coordination as possible.

Ly stated that NMFS engaged with Reclamation to get clarity and inclusion of the Trinity ROD flows, and Reclamation had agreed to include Trinity ROD flows, but then Reclamation changed their mind a week later. The modeling effort subsided because the Trinity was pulled out. When the Trinity is reengaged, they will ask for the best science done for the river. Naman stated that there was an IDT discussion on where things were at with the consultation, and he informed the IDT that Reclamation was not seeking consultation on the Trinity.

Callejo discussed NEPA and development of the EIS with Reclamation as the lead agency. First, they will provide an administrative draft for cooperating agency review, which will be distributed on Monday. The agencies and Tribes are encouraged to review the draft. The second administrative draft is coming in May. The public draft will be in June. The draft will be refined through coordination and have a 45-day public comment period. Reclamation will have public hearings in late July. They will have public meetings in the same locations as the scoping meetings but have not nailed down when and where they will do that. They anticipate the Final EIS in November 2019 and the ROD in Dec 2019.

Orcutt commented that he is upset that the Trinity River is not being considered for ESA ROC and feels that policy decisions are being separated from regulatory compliance and it continues to happen. Now he is hearing that it was not included and is thinking there should be more room for improvement to include in future consultation.

Ly stated that NMFS made concerted effort to work with Reclamation on the ROC and they said they were going to include the Trinity and then they changed their mind. They cannot do a whole lot to make them include the Trinity. He has scheduled a meeting with Hadley to discuss further. Kautsky stated that he attended the IDT meeting and learned there for the first time that Trinity would not be re-consulted upon as part of the CVP. He was wondering why he did not hear about it sooner? Callejo stated that it was never Reclamation's intention to have a proposed action inclusive of the Trinity. It was intended for the BA to have the Trinity be considered as input for the Central Valley, but not be reviewed for impacts on Trinity River for coho and green sturgeon. Kautsky thought it would be part of the Reclamation BA; at last word that it would be included in the OCAP ROC.

Ly stated that Katrina Harrison from Reclamation had hosted a brainstorming session in Weaverville, and at the time Reclamation was going to include the Trinity. The Presidential Memo expedited the process, which put Reclamation on fast-track. Because of the fast-track, the Trinity was not included. Hadley concurred with Ly's chronology and stated that the decision was made from the Regional Director at Reclamation.

Naman stated that the Trinity was going to be involved, but the decision by Reclamation was made not to include the Trinity and they were not consulted on for this decision. People are finding out through technical work group meetings. What tools are they using to show effects on Trinity River fish populations? TRRP has tools that they could use.

Ly stated that for the consultation there will not be much effects analysis for coho, eulachon, and sturgeon. Kautsky stated that it is mind boggling that while the Trinity provides significant flow to the Central Valley, effects upon Trinity are not developed in the EA. Where do ROD flows in the Trinity and flow augmentation in the Klamath get looked at? Ly agrees that it should be one integrated projected, and that consultation on the CVP needs to look at the effects on the Trinity.

Naman said NMFS will be doing an effects analysis on orca as a result from the CVP. They are looking at Klamath and Trinity chinook input but there is no analysis on effects of ROD flows on orca as it relates to production of chinook on the Trinity.

LUNCH

Water Year 2019 Flow Schedule Technical Recommendations (Todd Buxton and Connor Shea)

Buxton stated that it has been more challenging than normal to determine the flow recommendation due to the turbine considerations, Carr Fire effects, and winter flow effects. Deadwood and Hoadly are distributing lots of fine sediment into the Trinity with muddy sediments in most of the channel, which is a significant issue because of heavy spawning in that area that will likely be unsuccessful. The February 27 flood event was 18,600cfs at the Junction City gage this year, the highest recorded in 15 years that gage has opera Trinity be considered as

input ted. Rivers Acres house predicted to inundate around 19,000cfs and water got within a few inches of the house. Full fishery flow is 23,400cfs so house needs to be moved.

A big issue is dam releases are mistimed so deposited fine sediments from upper tributaries stay in channel longer. If they were released earlier then the fines would be flushed out.

The Flow workgroup evaluated 2 proposed hydrographs each for a Wet WY and a Normal WY. CA Nevada River Forecast Center prediction is for a wet water year, but B120 range includes normal so they have to consider both wet and normal hydrograph years. The Flow WG started in November to consider objectives for flow release and start work on hydrographs. Two types were modeled and then a recommendation was made at the March 22 IDT meeting. Tomorrow the Flow WG will meet to make any changes requested by TMC, and April 9 will be the water year determination. April 14 begin flow release.

The Flow WG considered many things, including adult spawning and rearing habitat, safe rise of the river for recreation, peaks for geomorphic purposes to move bars and channels, and to increase soil moisture and recharge ground water elevation to support riparian plants. He walked through the aspects of the hydrograph in the presentation that met each of the primary objectives.

Additional Objectives in derived hydrographs include:

- Deposit fines on the floodplains with rapid rise to peak then decrease stage below surface targeted for deposition.
- Schedule diurnal changes in flow released from Lewiston dam based on diurnal flows on local, unregulated streams.
- Inundate off-channel rearing areas to provide optimal temps for fish growth
- Increase flow after April 15 and before the first full moon to disperse steelhead from TRH.
- Disperse TRH Chinook released the week of first full moon in June
- Provide 28d inundation to establish biofilm, pioneer macros after 35d, peak macros after 63d.
- Variable flows before hydrograph to delay foothill mountain-legged from breeding until after the peak. If frogs breed before peak they will be washed downstream.
- Rapid decrease in flow from peaks to promote bank collapse.

There was a question on how to accomplish the sediment deposition objective? Todd stated that sediment deposition occurs when the flow rises above the surface to deposit sediments on that surface. As the flow decreases it deposits sediment on the surface and fines are needed to help riparian plants survive.

The different ROD recommended wet and normal year hydrographs and pre-dam flows at Lewiston were discussed. The proposed hydrograph does a good job at replicating unimpeded flows in Trinity Basin. But we are in flat line territory before and after, which has implications for the river.

The different hydrographs showed when tributaries deliver sediment. If a lot of sediment is delivered to mainstem Trinity from tributaries when fish are spawning sediment can suffocate redds. There is little availability of drift feeding at early stage of development. They are studying drift macroinvertebrate sampling to help learn to manage flows to feed fish.

The recommended Wet hydrograph has three peaks with a bump in late fall and the main peak on April 30 at 9,000cfs. Then there are troughs that follow the EIS up-ramps. Flow variability provides hydraulic and thermal diversity for juvenile rearing, recruit leaf litter and other nutrients, provide variable water table for off-channel wetlands, and variably activates off-channel rearing areas for juvenile salmon. Three opportunities for occupation off channel habitats occur. The riparian flow peaks help with seed dispersal in cottonwood, shiny willow, narrow leaf willow, and discourage germination of riparian plants on bar flanks.

Orcutt was curious about the flow peaks timed for TRH releases. The intent is that they do not want to overwhelm native fish with the TRH fish release. Naman stated that the TRH consultation requires that Reclamation time TRH fish releases with high flow releases from Lewiston Dam. TRH releases should be within certain timeframes for steelhead and chinook that are outline in the ESA Section 7 consultation. Orcutt asked if TMC changed their flows would Reclamation have to adjust TRH release? Naman stated that given current permits that if it changes, they will reevaluate timing of release, and there is a mechanism outlined for that in the ESA Section 7 BO for TRH.

Orcutt stated that in response to the BO terms and conditions, release of TRH steelhead after April 15 should be coordinated with restoration program. If released earlier, they will have to reevaluate, so fish are released with high flows.

Buxton continued with discussing the wet year hydrograph, including the bump in the fall to attract adult salmon to the TRH, distribute spawning spring Chinook, and aide in salmon migration.

The different methods for hydrograph modeling was discussed and a results table was shown. It was acknowledged that there is a data gap for FYLF to understand the cut-off date of metamorphosis. They say earlier is better to cover the cutoff date. Diurnal fluctuations in hydrographs coincide with diurnal flows observed on Rush Creek. Diurnal fluctuation is caused by tree/sun evapotranspiration and snow melt. Timing of fluctuation changes with calendar day.

Orcutt inquired about the coarse sediment transport part of the hydrograph, which had a longer duration under the ROD than what is recommended. Todd replied that the ROD increases up to a peak and then it stays there. Recommended hydrograph has short peaks. Bed load transport hysteresis influences transport rates. Right now, they are not using hysteresis effect in developing recommendations. They are using 2016 data. Monitoring flow releases is an experiment. The modeling considers sediment, temperature, and discharges.

Buxton displayed a table of the monitoring that will take place during the spring flow release. The funded projects include: bedload, temperature, turbidity, riparian recruitment, Chinook

emigration, Chinook spawning, large wood, and habitat monitoring at rehabilitation sites. A question was asked if they have tied monitoring to the key objectives? Are these one for one (funded monitoring for each objective) or from a different list? Buxton responded that they are conducting trend monitoring and not objective based (effectiveness) monitoring.

Kautsky asked a question about whether the scour of 2-year old seedlings will be monitored? Buxton responded that riparian recruitment will be monitored but the scour will not. Recruitment will show that riparian plants will not be established but the mechanism for death will not be known. Kautsky asked if there is a water year specific budget item for monitoring? The proposal to do this has not gone anywhere.

Buxton continued with the presentation discussing the ROD objectives and Technical Recommendations for the Normal Hydrograph. The normal hydrograph has to be recommended by the TMC. Bill Brock noted that the normal hydrograph has the same aspects as the wet. Todd ran through the objectives for that hydrograph as well. The Normal year hydrograph will start releasing flows on April 14 and the peak will be on April 30. The alternate normal hydrograph was not recommended, and the recommended normal was the best.

Hadley asked what was the maximum peak? She stated that there are potential challenges to release more than 10,000cfs. Buxton answered that peak flow with the normal and wet is 10,900cfs. Hadley said that there may be issues reaching this discharge since one turbine is not available. Buxton stated they will request the best they can get. Hadley stated that we can confidently release 9200cfs maximum but beyond that it is uncertain. Keith Groves asked if they can keep the peak a little longer since there is less flow? Buxton stated that he would recommended stay on flow schedule. Receiving the flow allocation has never been a problem they always release more. Groves asked if they could charge up Lewiston and release from there? Hadley stated that there have been significant problems with flooding in public areas so they are not considering this. There is a foot of free board to play with which is not enough (1400 acre-feet).

Groves stated that a couple years ago, they had the same double peak for geomorphic movement rather than different height peaks. Todd responded that data showed that with double equal peaks, the first peak transported more sediment than second peak. The bed was stabilized during down ramp. Because of this, there is decrease in efficiency in sediment transport. Want to mobilize bed and wet wood during first peak and second peak mobilize the bed and keep sediment transport high without removing the wood, and the smaller peaks are for fish. Groves asked if the hydrograph change is based on natural flows? Buxton stated no. They did consider all sediment in the river, there is a paper that states if you alter some duration of time baseflow jiggles rocks around and stabilizes bed. There is a large amount of fine sediment in channel it is hard to know if there will be more.

Orcutt said that the SSS model is usually used, but not this year. Would this have been different if it was used? What would be the difference in the recommendation? Kyle DeJuilio or Seth Naman stated that there would have been no difference in the recommendation. They found in

past with modeling these scenarios that the difference in fish production in SSS output is not large enough to sway decision either way. Som added that the difference in the hydrographs is that it provides more fish habitat, but not enough of a difference. Also, flows will come after fish have gone by.

Orcutt asked if there were other alternatives considered? DeJulio said yes, in February several hydrographs developed, DeJulio and Buxton's hydrographs were accepted for review. DeJulio wrote up description of hydrograph for TMC. John Bair reviewed and provided comments to the report.

Hillemeier asked if the Fall of 2014-2015 peak flows were successful for bringing fish in the hatcheries? These were not scheduled peaks but 3500cfs lower than Klamath augmentation for fall flows. Answer was that gates were not opened in the hatcheries during that time. During 2014, the high was on the 23rd close to 3500cfs so we should look at data to see if it worked. Groves said that they would see a change in the hydrograph from the dam, since they were dam flows. It was a 6-day event for emergency flows. Buxton confirmed that they should look at the 2014 flows. Brandt Gutermuth stated that there is a boat dance flow in odd years-can be August 18. Do use these flows in the hydrograph? Ly stated that there are three fall flow schedules (i.e., boat, augmentation, and the proposed ROD pulse) that can all happen in the fall.

Gravel augmentation Recommendation

Connor Shea discussed the 2019 gravel augmentation that was developed by Physical WG and reviewed by IDT. The annual coarse sediment introduction is to maintain coarse sediment balance. The dam traps material from upstream so there is a need to replace gravel that dam has trapped. There is a need to support geomorphic processes into the future and enhance habitat and create habitat into the future.

Their estimates were based on observed transport rates at Douglas City, which has a somewhat natural supply of sediment from Indian and Weaver Creek. They then scale transport to the upstream reaches. Below 6000cfs there is not much transport of sediment.

Capacity estimate includes a daily average for the Normal OffCHinundations potential hydrograph at 2,500yd³, Wet OffCHinundations at 3,500yd³, the Normal ROD is 1,750yd³, and Wet ROD is 5,150 yd³.

Under current permits there are 5 locations where gravel can be placed. Weir Pool, Cableway, Sawmill Reach, and two sites in Lowden Ranch area above Grass Valley Creek. The diversion pool at Weir Hole is the easiest site for program to add gravel, because it is easy access and it is a high transport area where sediment is carried downstream immediately. The Program has added gravel there every year for many years. Gravel is ending up on the floodplains building bars at 6000cfs when added during peak transport rates. Recommendation is not to augment this site but to see if flows will re-suspend it and erode the bars. They are in the third year of three-year study looking at radio tagged rocks, and they are ending up on high bars. Want to see if they remobilize and move out of system.

The two sites they are recommending to augment include the Sawmill and Lowden Ranch sites. The Sawmill site was last augmented in 2009. In that year, oversized material was dumped off a high bluff on the right bank and has not moved out, resulting in the nearby hole partially filling. They recommend a treatment on the left bank to push flow over to the right bank and push the material out. Additionally, nearby habitat features are considered to be poor and they would like to augment gravel for habitat. The approach is to move in and place material on the bar before big flows arrive to carry out material. Monitoring will occur to see changes in downstream channel.

The upper Lowden Ranch site is another site with many years of augmentation. The first couple of years had good habitat development and increased channel topography. The last couple of years, material has been added and was not moving out. It is losing topography and habitat features so the physical workgroup recommended to stop adding at upper site. The lower site is sediment deficient, and it is a recommended site to add gravel.

The schedule would be to add gravel before water starts rising. Gravel augmentation requires river access so they would not be able to add material when flows are high. They do not want to add it too early because it will increase turbidity, so they want to get it out there when the river rises.

Ly asked where does gravel come from? Dixon stated that all gravel is processed on site, at these two locations, and there are stockpiles.

Teresa asked if the group considered the issues with Mr. Wellock in the past at the downstream Lowden site? Shea said that this was discussed in the work group, but Hillemeier commented that they will hear from him even though his well was relocated.

Hillemeier asked an elaborating question regarding whether hysteresis was accounted for in the proposed sediment augmentation volumes? Shea answered that it does.

Kautsky stated that the total gravel recommendations were substantially different from those proposed in the ROD. Answer was that numbers are different because we have many more years of monitoring data than during the flow study, and data suggests that transport rates are not that high. Kautsky stated that the rates are not that much different between the normal and wet hydrograph. Shea stated that the peaks are similar, but the ROD flows are very different. The normal rod provides less transport because it only goes to 6000cfs and the wet ROD is only 9000cfs.

Orcutt asked what the scale difference between the proposed 3500yd³ and the tributary input from the tributaries in Lewiston and Douglas City? Shea answered that there are higher flows in Douglas City and it is scaled upstream. It was predicted that there was 28 times more gravel coming in. Orcutt asked what is the target rate of transport? They target matches transport rate where they want to build habitat and if they receive additional input from tributaries it is a bonus.

Ly commented on the 5 permitted locations for gravel. Are those optimal or should there be more? Connor said this is a question being examined by the physical WG, in part because this is

the last year they are permitted for those locations. The study by Scott McBain had recommendations of where to place gravel and how it moves downriver but it must be balanced with where they physically can add gravel due to access and feasibility.

Public comments

David Steinhauser (public), a local rafting outfitter, had no specific comments on adaptive management and appreciates the thriving river. His comments on the hydrographs are 1) glad that peak flow did not get moved forward into June as had initially been proposed. Family friendly flows are good in June and river safety needs to be considered 2) they are going to have 200 Outward Bound students on the river so June 13 for one of the peaks is not good timing.

Motions

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to accept the recommendations of the IDT for flow and gravel augmentation.

Teresa Connor seconded the motion.

The motion was passed unanimously.

Groves had a quick comment that the restoration program has had aggressive people come through the door. Would recommend that they put in security. Employee safety should be number one. Hadley stated that security is their responsibility, is a priority, and the issue is being worked on. The sheriff contacted the person and Reclamation was worried about repercussions. Connor stated that CA Department of Water Resources have key cards to get into the building and that may be a good way to go. Dixon stated that because of the incident they have taken action this week to limit access by having a locked door so the public cannot casually enter; in the short term, the public has to make an appointment to get into the building. They are looking at longer term physical security options.

Hetrick asked if there were specific areas where they are warning crews not to go? Dixon stated that this individual who lives off of Dutch Creek Rd. does not want people parking by his house. He does not have authority to do so, but for security issues they do not have crews use pull-outs and turn arounds in the middle portion of Dutch Creek Rd. Orcutt asked if the roll out of public information on flow will limit public participation? Hadley stated that Reclamation will have security staff at the event.

2019 Budget Discussion

Mike Dixon stated that during the December meeting, the TMC authorized the Executive Director options for reprogramming funds if necessary. The TMC approved funding items for FY19 but \$1,867,260 was reduced from the original budget due to reasons listed in the accompanying handout.

The \$1.86 million was reallocated into CDFW, NOAA, Resource Conservation District, DWR, Annual Report, Large Wood, and Gravel Processing in FY20 as per Appendix III 2019 Budget

Discussion. Gravel is being purchased in FY19 and not FY20, because it can be held on site and not go bad.

The Hatchery Run Size estimates and Coded Wire Tags (CWTs) were additional items funded in the FY19 budget that was not presented or approved by TMC. They were unaware that TRRP funds were paying for these items. The \$421,377 will remain in the budget and will pay for the TRH and CWTs for FY19, and so that cost was added back into the FY19 budget. It is up for discussion whether those items should be removed from the future budgets in FY20 and FY21.

Dixon is not proposing to change funding for FY19, because they think they will zero out budget. However, TRRP received a \$1,920,000 reduction in funding for FY20 in the President's budget from previous years' amount.

Simon-Jackson asked why the State Lower Klamath budget item go up 50%? Dixon responded that they spent less during 2018 and carried over the funding to 2019.

Due to the overage from things falling through for 2019 they had to obligate money. Unfortunately, they still cannot do multi-year AFAs. The surplus has all been accounted for in the FY19 budget and the budget breakdown shows how it is being reallocated, and the yellow highlight in the budget breakdown shows what has changed since the December meeting. We were authorized to pay forward the tasks that are in green.

Orcutt asked if there were budget reductions in the TRRP office? Dixon stated that yes, the budget accounts for the funding reduction for the two open positions in the TRRP office.

Bader had previously told TMC that he would look for outside funding to fund TRH operations but was not able to find the funding. Therefore, this item was billed to the TRRP but had not been included in the TMC budget.

Orcutt stated that the TRH coho Genetic Management Plan (HGMP) identifies a need for a coho segregation Weir near Junction City that Reclamation set aside \$100,000 for operations. Hillemeier stated that this is something that the program has funded for many years. Should the items proposed for removal be discussed with the TMC program? Should TMC keep these items in their budgets? TRMP pot of money should this be taken out? Dixon replied that the TMC could recommend to Reclamation to remove these items from the TRRP budget.

Simon-Jackson-Jackson stated that in 2020 TMC will take a hit and will have to prepare for that hit in the budget.

Hetrick asked how is it appropriate for TMC to vote on an item that Reclamation is required to fund either way? Groves wants to pull the hatchery tasks out of the TRRP budget, but they do not have the authority to tell Reclamation where to get the money. Everson agrees that these items should be pulled from the budget.

Hillemeier wanted to take a closer look at Tasks 1 and 5, and then they could make a decision. Dixon went to look for a description of the hatchery tasks.

Meanwhile Hillemeier asked who tracks the budget? Dixon replied that Lindsey Walker tracks the budget and meets routinely with the ED to discuss.

Refinement Meeting Date

Ly heard from Smith, the facilitator, that May 6 from 9:00am – 5:00pm at the TRRP office in Weaverville works for the Refinements Meeting. He asked who would be available to attend?

Attendees include, Tony LaBanca, Bill Brock, Keith Groves, Mike Orcutt, Kyle DeJulio, Jenny Norris, George Kautsky, Dave Hillemeier, Seth Naman

The meeting does not work for Don Bader.

Dixon passed out a copy of the NCAO hatchery tasks descriptions and the conversation returned to the FY19 budget.

Dixon stated that the purpose of the PSMFC grant was to purchase CWT (Coded Wire Tags) and to maintain the tagging trailer. These tasks are not involved in restoration of naturally produced fish in the Trinity. However, they do need to know status of tagged fish for restoration. Maybe better left for the discussion tomorrow.

Simon-Jackson asked the question: Who does TMC work for? Who do they write to say that they are not happy about taking out this money? Hadley replied that TMC would write to the Secretary of Interior or Regional Director.

Dixon stated that the cooperative agreement costs vary every year and accounts for about \$400,000 in FY19. Simon-Jackson stated that if TMC vote on this, the money should be taken away from TMC's discretionary budget for the TRRP. Hadley stated that there is not a separate authorization budget. Simon-Jackson countered that once the money is earmarked for Trinity River restoration it is TMC's responsibility.

Orcutt stated that handout passed out talks about the JC weir (coho segregation weir) and the PSFMC – Coded wire tag purchase (the brown items in the budget). The coho segregation weir was part of the TRH coho HGMP. Part of these tasks are also to evaluate spring-run Chinook Salmon. At the HGMP meeting, they said there is money for coho Salmon studies required for the HGMP tasks at the JC Weir.

Dixon stated that the Hatchery Task Summary was pulled from agreements for FY19. These descriptions do tie the tasks together. However, they are excerpts from the original documents.

Orcutt stated that he thought that the coded wire tags were already purchased. Simon-Jackson stated that they were purchased with this money for this year. Groves stated that Reclamation has the discretion to fund the objectives they want, and it is not up to TMC review or decision. Ly asked if someone wanted to make a motion for separating out the discretionary funds/projects?

Groves stated that the FY19 budget was already set, and they should change for FY20 budget since it was an add-on for FY20 budget.

Hillemeier commented that it was evolving into a bigger issue and was concerned about TMC funding it. Should be only standard TRH operations. He views the task as having grown from just coded wire tagging. It is an HGMP requirement, it gets funded and the TRRP funding is getting smaller. Orcutt would just like the hatchery tasks in the correct place. Groves would like to discuss FY20 budget.

Ly asked if everyone will be there tomorrow to continue the budget discussion. Everyone concurred that they would be present to continue the discussion

Meeting Adjourned

Day 2, Thursday April 4, 2019

Attending Members

Member	Representative Seat
Mike Dixon	Trinity River Restoration Program
Justin Ly	National Marine Fisheries Service, Chair
Elizabeth Hadley	Bureau of Reclamation
Mike Orcutt	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Teresa Connor	California Department of Water Resources
Dan Everson	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Vice Chair
Dave Hillemeier	Yurok Tribe
Terri Simon-Jackson	U.S. Forest Service
Keith Groves	Trinity Council

Other Attendees: Jennifer Norris, Nick Som, Nick Hetrick (USFWS), Logan Negherbon, Eric Peterson (TRRP), Trevor Morgan (DWR), Jeremy Brown (Trinity County Supervisor), Bill Brock (USFS), Kyle De Juilio (Yurok Tribe), Seth Naman (NOAA), George Kautsky, Justin Alvarez, Fred Meyer (Hoopa Valley Tribe)

Attending by Phone: Paul Zedonis (USBR), Tony LaBanca (CA DFW), Lindsey Walker (TRRP)

Notes: Heidi Trathnigg (EPP)

Regular Business

Welcome and Introductions

Ly opened the meeting with introductions for TMC members and audience members in attendance for the second day.

Public Forum

Ly opened the meeting to public comments, but there were no public comments.

Rehab Projects Design Update

Dixon introduced the design presentations and Fred Meyer presented first.

Chapman Ranch Phase A (Fred Meyer)

Meyer is a consultant to Hoopa Valley Tribe. He started as early as 2009 on the project as it was developed in concert with Sheridan Creek and Deep Gulch, which were constructed in 2017. They are in the first phase of Chapman Ranch. The river goes through old tailings washed downstream and is still confined by tailings on left bank. The idea at Chapman Ranch is to restore the alluvial processes, scour and deposition, to create habitat for juvenile salmonids. There was an overall increase in habitat change, where in all cases they will increase habitat by 100% up to 500% in medium flows. The land owner meeting and design reviews are complete. The project was split into two phases to accommodate additional work and partner agency projects on the main-stem and side channel components. They worked with mine claims on the

property and FEMA flood requirements. They would like to lower the floodplain so all blue areas (on the map) are accessed by normal water year flows, which would quadruple access to the river. In their design, they have preserved some of the existing tailings as a cultural resource and some of the mature vegetation. Upland features include areas where spoils will be placed when material is excavated from the channel. They are not going to armor the bank; wood will be placed to shoal water around. Some floodplain lowering will occur to allow water to access during winter and ROD flows. Wood will be used to build hydrologic features to redirect water to new channels, provide habitat for juvenile salmonids; and whole trees placed in channel for local scour and deposition. All construction done, and restoration will occur with vegetation to promote long term recovery of the site, including upland, wetland, shrubs, and trees planting and willow trenches and clumps. Willow trenches will be used as heads of bars where they see the river migrate. Next steps include HVT Fisheries wanting a design stamped next week and all the reporting to make sure that everything is where it needs to be.

Chapman Ranch shows how the restoration will change the river channel. Kautsky asked if it is possible to look at preexisting conditions, and to say what is wrong with the site. Meyer answered that it is 100ft wide and the banks are over 30ft tall and the channel is straight. Wood does not recruit from banks and it is channelized. Kautsky asked if it is a legacy from mining? What is unique about this site? Meyer stated that it is not any more unique than other sites, but it scored poorly as worst potential habitat for juvenile salmonids.

A remaining problem with the site is the existing mining claim. The owner of the mining claim has to sign a mineral materials waiver because Reclamation will move gravel around the claim. They will process gravel and fines and he will not have access to use roads and gates after five years without getting further permission from the BLM. Mining claim holder does not have legal drive-in access right now. BLM is looking at the minerals on site. The miner does not have a plan of operation, and if BLM determines that the project would not impact a viable mining operation, the project will proceed. The miner is willing to sign the claim over to anyone for \$100,000.

Kautsky asked if the miner will have the right to extract minerals from the spoils? What will be our source for fines? Dixon stated that there are other areas of excavation to get fines; only fines within the mining claim boundary would have to stay there. Kautsky asked if there will be an ample source? They are in Phase A now and relative to Phase B how much more is going to be restored? Meyer stated that Phase B is small relative to A. It consists of a one-mile long side channel that will restore off-channel habitat. The majority of the project is on FS land. The plan is at 90% status and it will not take much to move it through. Hillemeier asked if it overlapped with what is being done this summer? Meyer answered that yes it connects with the project. Hillemeier restated that Chapman Ranch Phase A increased habitat from baseline. Meyer replied that the project increased quantity of channel length overall. On the site image, the dotted line is the new channel that will be wet and there is currently little to no habitat there. They will push

into mine tailings to help recruit that material into the river downstream. Groves asked if the claim is in the middle of the site. Meyer responded that it was hard to see on slide but yes.

Hillemeier asked when they analyze what the percentage increase of habitat would be system-wide upon completion of the project? Meyer replied that they were focused on Chapman and were working with Nick Som and Aaron Martin to evaluate habitat using R-script and equations to run analysis.

Naman asked when Phase B is supposed to be done? Meyer would like to meet with FS and land owners to discuss how to move the project forward. Dutch Creek is the focus now and if there is no problem, Chapman Phase B is ready to go. Naman also stated that some experiences with side channels in this program were not working out and functioning as designed. How would this side channel maintain itself? Meyer responded that they are not focused on the low-flow surface water connection. They have two low-flow connections and one high-flow connection following on old river alignment from 1944. This is low hanging fruit and the hope is to have winter rainfall and maybe beaver will keep water in that area year-round. Meyer acknowledged that many side channel entrances fill in enough to disconnect at low flow.

Ly asked what is up with the meander? Meyer responded that they would like to see meander move around and adjust over time. Want river to maintain more sinuous path but needs flows. Ly asked when was a good time for TMC to check it out? Dixon suggested that they could go out during the September TMC meeting. He asked if they have gone down to Deep Gulch? Terri Simon-Jackson responded that no, it got canceled. Hillemeier reminded the group that the September TMC meeting is in Weitchpec. Naman suggested that in the past there have been joint meetings between TMC and TAMWG in August. Simon-Jackson suggested that they could do an extra day at the September TMC meeting and people could choose to go or not.

Dutch Creek Project Update (Trevor Morgan, DWR)

Morgan talked about the latest and greatest design for Dutch Creek. The project is located between Douglas City and Junction City. The existing condition is a straight and narrow “runway bar.” Project area is largely on BLM managed lands with a little Forest Service and private but there is no proposed construction on private land. The design-IC2 meander channel complex-bar pool riffle mid-channel bar plug to overtop at 11000cfs flow. The side channel captures 10% of the flow. R1 is the scour channel and should hit ideal habitat values in the 700-3000cfs range. R2 polygon is lowered floodplain targeting at 400-4500cfs. RC7 downstream green feature is a channel expansion feature that will carve away at right bank to slow velocity and have deposition. U2 spoils location right bank and will handle all spoils. Contouring indicates the water depth at 700cfs in existing vs design. At 4500cfs R2 is activated. They have completed the 80% design and 80% grading plans and submitted to TMC. They are waiting on wind design.

Naman asked Trevor to return to the Design drawings and describe the R1 scour channel for further discussion. There will be wood features to assist with moving flows. Naman asked when

it will be engaged? Trevor responded that it will be engaged 68% of the time in the winter but not much in summer.

Oregon Gulch Update - Yurok tribe (Aaron Martin)

Oregon Gulch is in the 30-60% draft phase. Oregon Gulch is located in a sequence of sites in the Junction City valley area. Oregon Gulch is messed up - 1940s lots of mine tailings and turned water off not long after. River is in the same place as the dredgers left it in 1940s - little change in river in last 20 years and no place for river to spread out. They are designing a new approach for restoration. The ownership consists of BLM land in the upper half and private land with the best landowners who want to take advantage of this partnership. Tailings are 35-40ft above river. The objectives for this project are to reconnect river to valley, increase floodplain, and promote dynamic processes.

The proposed design is nothing we have tried in the Trinity. It will eliminate the decrease in habitat between low and high flow. The site does not approach base flow habitat until as high as 7300cfs and it almost never gets that high when fish are there. The current design consists of excavating 400,000yd³. They will create an emulated landslide and keep some material on site. There will be a single channel with two floodplain elevations. They want to make the river uncomfortable and will assume constant valley grade. Oregon Gulch comes in below the site and that area has been stable. At Stage zero you spread the river out at lowest flow availability, in this case with the consideration of having navigability for boats. Above 450cfs the idea is to spread out across the floodplain to decrease the power of the river and make it depositional, which will force dynamism. They have an opportunity to place a lot of the spoils on site. There will be aggradation and deposition and the river may spread out and it will be hard for a boat to go through. The river will create a new channel; however, there is uncertainty as to where and when it will happen.

They will increase habitat by 500% at low flows. This is not based on side channels or ponds it is just water spreading out on the floodplain. They would like to integrate ponds, beaver activity, and springs.

Hillemeier asked if the floodplain was inundated at 300cfs? Martin responded that it is inundated at 450cfs and at 600cfs it will spread out, which is a common flow during winter.

Ly talked about including this site in the field trip. Martin stated that TMC should come out August 1st to see that it is not a great place. Not good for plants, animals or humans. The 60% design is coming out in May. They will do sediment transport monitoring to see what is happening with deposition. There are a lot of rocks. A lot on private land and there is opportunity. Cannot move it just in the July-September window and it must be done in a cost-efficient manner. Many of the rocks can be moved before in-channel work happens.

Hillemeier asked how does 400,000yd³ compare to other projects? Dixon responded that it is about three times the size of Deep Gulch and Sheridan. Simon-Jackson stated that they are storing rock for other uses such as for Caltrans. Can use alongside of highways. Martin said that

there was a gravel quarry close by to hold for other projects. Orcutt asked if there was a similar kind of philosophy across all restoration projects? Martin responded that no, it is the only time this type of design has been considered on the mainstem Trinity.

DeJulio asked about the landslide feature and how many cubic yards could be used for this? Martin responded that 90,000 cubic yards maybe.

Naman asked if this new idea was in line with ROD objectives to maximize juvenile rearing? Martin responded that yes, just the design approach is different.

Hillemeier stated that the preference for the channel is to use as much valley as possible. How does that relate to roughness? Martin responded that they are not doing anything too rough. Want to move the channel. Force it to the most uncomfortable place. Fines would get to where they would go, but nothing aggressive with big boulders and log jams. Everson's preference is one channel but maybe as a moving channel. Simon-Jackson asked if there were examples of success stories for this design and what is the worst-case scenario? Martin responded that they do not have examples of a success story for this design. There is a guy on east coast who is doing something like this, and he is working on trying to contact him. Simon-Jackson asked if someone had done this design 10-years ago? Martin responded no. The worst-case scenario would be if the water is really spread out and a boat cannot pass through, but the hope is that the channel will be scoured out by high flows. DeJulio asked what would be the worst-case scenario for fish? Martin stated that it will be great for fish and that it will look similar to rivers on the Olympic peninsula that spread out and braid.

Justin Ly asked if there was an outreach plan to educate guides and others about this approach? Martin responded that Dixon started email correspondence with someone who had just done a stage zero project in Oregon on the South Fork McKenzie River, the river spread out 800ft wide and there were trees in the middle. It was great habitat for spring Chinook spawning but was not navigable. Simon-Jackson asked if this was the only place on the Trinity River that there is potential to create this habitat? Dixon replied that anywhere in Junction City area would benefit from this approach. Connor stated that many landowners do not want that type of restoration, and asked what is construction timeline? Dixon replied that it likely would not be initiated until at least 2022. It is a huge project and would not be built in one year.

Hillemeier asked what was the material in the floodplain? Are the constraints the tailing piles? Martin responded yes tailings piles are difficult. The emulated landslide on the floodplain is going to be piles of rock.

Ly asked if they were anticipating an EA and FONSI or EIS? Dixon replied that they do not know because they have not explored this in detail yet. The biggest potential impact is to recreation.

Groves asked if there was a higher mercury rate in the tailings? Martin stated that USGS did sampling for mercury. However, if there is flow through the rock and it is not stagnant it is not a big concern. It is something on their radar and is being considered, but they think it is something

they can deal with. Water is already connected to the tailings now. Dixon added that when the ponds are disconnected and stagnant, methylation of mercury happens and that is when it is absorbed in the food chain. The USGS report states that it can only get better by putting flow through it. Elemental mercury cannot be absorbed into the food chain.

Groves commented that 400,000yd³ of material will cost a lot to move. Dixon replied that they have not tried to figure it out. Martin said they will have to find a place to move it. Dixon stated that this project should not be directly compared as three-fold the size of other projects. Other projects involve much more of their excavation connected to the river, requiring turbidity controls, but $\frac{3}{4}$ of this project will be outside the effects on the river.

Simon-Jackson commented that this should be included in the public outreach and discuss if the channel is cut off for recreational users. Should a channel be maintained for recreational users?

Martin thinks that there will be a channel for boaters and that they will not have to carry their boats across the whole thing and thinks it will be an easy fix. Simon-Jackson suggested that they should present scenarios to recreational users to not get them excited about something that will not happen. DeJulio stated that it will likely be navigable at 300cfs. He is worried that if outreach is done and the plan changes, people will think they (TRRP) do not know what they are doing.

Sky Ranch TMC Presentation – (Logan Negherbon)

Negherbon provided an update on Sky Ranch Project. He started on this project after the 30% review. They are currently moving into the 60% design. Sky Ranch is upstream of Junction City, where Sky Ranch Road and Hwy299 intersect.

Most of the high tailings piles at the site have been worked. On the upstream edge of Junction City and downstream of Oregon Gulch there is a high terrace on the right bank, which does not inundate at all. During a February flow event, there was light wetting of low pockets that ponded water, but it did not reach the bank. There is a uniform channel that runs along the left bank bedrock. Course substrate exists evenly throughout from an upstream sediment supply. A heavily used boat launch is located within the site. The floodplain is high and there are legacy side channels that have filled in or grown in but are engaged at high flows.

Groves asked if the big flat area had been tailings? Negherbon responded that some is tailing worked by high flow events. Some has been processed off site. Dixon responded that historic aerials show heavy equipment working it. At 8500cfs nothing gets on the floodplain.

The proposed design features include looking at floodplain lowering. In part, they would like to get better riparian habitat by taking substrate out of the channel and build more habitat. They would like to take advantage of sediment input from Oregon Gulch to try and force the river a little over onto the floodplain. They do not expect to get the river out of the bedrock side of the valley wall. The land ownership of the proposed spoils area is not public land, which can be challenging for moving material to. A land transfer to BLM is in the works, but the transfer is still uncertain. So, they have to put more thought into it.

Modeling showed that at 350cfs they would see additional engagement at downstream section due to bar influence and upstream influence at large bar. At 750cfs there would be additional inundation and activation. It would start to get the first backwater on the floodplain. At 3000cfs most of the floodplain is activated, but you would not get sheet flow. At 8500cfs all earthwork is inundated.

The project design layout was conceived prior to knowing the issues with land transfer. There is a need to relocate the boat ramp upstream. If the land transfer does not come through private land will intersect a small portion of riverine and upland placement. There is an opportunity to place the spoils and the boat ramp parking lot on the tailings piles, but it may affect cultural resources. If that is the case the boat launch would need to be relocated on Sky Ranch and the parking site enhanced.

In summary, this is a highly visible site off Hwy 299. The design is to lower the floodplain and install in-channel modifications. There are challenges about the land transfer timeline and location of upland placement, as well as the status of a mining claim on a portion of the BLM land in the project. Dixon said that the geologist from Chapman will survey the mining potential, similar to what was discussed for Chapman Ranch.

Groves stated that this project and land trade has been in the works for a long time. Is current land owner on board with the project if trade does not happen? Dixon responded that he was all for replacing the boat launch there. The bigger issue would be SMARA (Surface Mining and Reclamation Act) because of the spoils pile location. They want to avoid having piled up material near the floodplain. DeJulio commented that there is a pond in the tailings with bass in it. Is the plan to isolate the feature to maintain for public-use fishing? Negherbon responded that the pond is primarily untouched. DeJulio asked if any flows get to the pond? Negherbon responded that no, even at 17,000cfs in the big February flow, no surface water reached the pond.

Orcutt stated that he appreciates the update and opportunity to provide input. He can learn more about the changes and different approaches and would like to comment on couple of things. He asked is there a legal standard about navigability? Dixon responded that guides have provided a lot of feedback on real and perceived areas where we have caused the river to get shallower. Design teams are open to input from this group. Orcutt is a little concerned about emphasis on boat ramps and preserving specific holes, and how these types of issues should fit into the outreach and education program. This program exists to restore and recover fish populations to pre-dam numbers. The education part has always assumed that having more fish should make the public happy. He would like to maximize the opportunities here.

BREAK

Ly started the meeting again after the break and asked everyone to make sure to sign in. Also, TMC members should check for availability in June. Forest Service can't make it but has alternate so they are going to leave it.

2019, 2020 and 2021 TRRP budget discussion

Dixon informed the group about the two handouts on the budget. They hit the high points in handout yesterday. The budget handout has the projects that they think they want to fund for the 2020 budget. The Science Projects are ones that have already been funded in the past. TRRP met with each stakeholder over the course of the last several weeks to discuss the cuts.

Reclamation is going to reduce the Restoration Program budget by \$1.92 million. The 11x17" budget has a summary of all sources of funding. Blue is money from USFWS that is transferred to the TMC budget. FWS salary positions are included in the budget as an informational item but the funds are retained at FWS. Left over money at the end of the FY can be spent in the next year specifically for monitoring. Therefore, some FY19 project dollars will be used in FY20. The FY19 budget will be zeroed out and the projects will be funded, but what will it look like in FY20 and FY21 when there are additional reductions? Currently, the FY20 budget shows that TMC is in the hole about \$500,000 with the additional reduction from USFWS. To make the budget balance, a starting point could be reducing the watershed funding from \$1 million to \$500,000.

Simon-Jackson asked if they should take in consideration the money from hatcheries if the hatcheries are not funded? Dixon responded that the FY20 numbers do not account for the TRH funds. Lindsey is on phone and can help clarify the budget.

There was a question about the relative budget reduction of FWS and Reclamation as it relates to the reduction in what each agency is providing. Hadley stated that the \$4.2 million reduction is for the overall Northern California Area Office and the \$1.9 is directed at the TMC-managed Restoration Program budget. Hetrick stated that USFWS does not have their FY19 budget yet. Their values come from FY18 actuals and is decreased by 5% and FY19 is decreased by 8% for 2020. There is a lot of assumptions in numbers.

Norris stated that budget estimates that the Service AFWO have been provided to TRRP have only included AFWO fisheries monies. As Hetrick stated, Norris re-confirmed these are estimates based on the Service's estimated budget. When the USFWS provides this money to the TRRP, it is done through an interagency agreement with specific tasks at the end of the USFWS fiscal year for funding for TRRP's next fiscal year. Dixon stated that Reclamation is sure what they get for the Reclamation budget 2020, and 2021 is likely to be similar to 2020. With the increased projects costs and USFWS estimated budget, it is estimated that for 2021 TRRP could be in the hole of \$1.5 million. So, there needs to be big discussions of what to cut in 2021.

Orcutt wanted to know if they are discussing FY19? Dixon responded that they had bookmarked the TRH budget conversation yesterday. Reclamation has already obligated funds for the TRH in FY19. Orcutt responded that we are wasting our time if we (TMC) are just going to be told what the budget is. Why do we not have input in there? Groves responded that TMC has always been told that we have to fund the hatcheries there is no change. Should we write a letter to

Reclamation to ask for more money? Orcutt has some understanding of the reclamation budget. TRH has been in TMC and TRRP budget. Does the funding in the FY19 CDFW tasks for the Junction City weir have to do with coho? Dixon replied no; it was spring Chinook.

Hillemeier stated that it has been years that he felt some of projects are not appropriate for TMC. He thought it was taken care of elsewhere. HGMP additional TRH work and funds were taken out and Reclamation was going to find funds for it. It raises a big concern about the pot of money for fishery and also who does what.

Paul Zedonis said that it was in an item that was sent as a financial agreement with the state. Derek Rupert set up a meeting to talk with HGMP to dovetail into the agreement for that possibility. Hillemeier has two issues 1) the effectiveness of Trinity River restoration budget to implement activities, 2) to implement HGMP we need to discuss what needs to be done and who does what. Using restoration program funds is concerning and where does it stop. Certain obligations for running TRH should not take from river restoration funds.

Orcutt would like to propose a motion to make request for making our voice heard.

Simon-Jackson heard the input from Reclamation yesterday that there is a pot of money and it gets reduced straight across the restoration program. Hadley stated that they got directed to cut funding for restoration activities. Simon-Jackson said that the Trinity River Division was reduced and same with TRRP. She is assuming the budget reductions will continue in FY21. Will it be reduced by the same number? Hillemeier stated that the \$1.9 million is the reduction from \$11.9 million reduced out of Reclamation's budget.

Orcutt stated that FY19 as it relates to FY20 may or may not materialize. Input for FY19 as he understood that funding would be shifted to O&M function and it didn't and it is coming back to our budget. It is regulatory ESA and NEPA requirements. Would like to make a motion on this?

Mike Orcutt made a motion that TRH related activities, such as the Hatchery Run Size Estimates (CDFW) and coded wire tags (PSFMC) which were added as additional costs to the FY19 budget and future budgets, amounting to \$421,477 in FY19, should be included in budgeting of Reclamation's appropriate funding authority for mitigation and regulatory (ESA) requirements associated with the TRH rather than being included in the restoration program budget. This would be conveyed in a letter to the USFWS and Reclamation Regional Directors.

It was seconded by Dave Hillemeier.

Simon-Jackson asked if the motion was to write a letter? Hillemeier stated that potential Hatchery Tasks associated with HGMP mitigation should not be funded out of the Trinity restoration program. Orcutt stated that NMFS staff had said the TRH coho HGMP will be finalized and approved in September. Reclamation needs to plan for it in their budgeting process.

Hadley stated that in the past that the letter was addressed to the Regional Director. Simon-Jackson stated that she was happy the letter would not go to the Secretary of the Interior. She can sign a letter to the regional directors.

Connor asked what are the other TRH items? Tony LaBanca answered that he understood the appropriated funding source. The other coded wire tag (Hoopa Valley Tribe 2018-34) tasks. Is it clearly a Hatchery Task or other task?

Orcutt made a point that he understands that the funds have been shifted to the CDFW agreement. During the time when looking at focus and scope of Trinity Restoration Program, Review said that hatcheries were not necessarily an approach for this program, but it is a responsibility for the fishery. Mitigation for fish lost. Also, ESA functions related to coho are filtering into the program budget.

Simon-Jackson clarified that the mitigation was for fish habitat loss above the dam. Groves stated that all funding to hatcheries should be funded outside of the restoration program and it inflates the money spent on restoration even though it is really going toward mitigation.

Ly asked if we should make an amendment? Hillemeier asked if we are saying that the motion pertains to FY19? Ly asked if he would like to make a friendly amendment? Hillemeier stated that he does not think it needs to be in the amendment but would like to give the letter writer direction on how to write it. Add in additional cost to FY19 and future budgets.

Connor stated that with the brown items they should put in that it goes in without reduction to TMC's budget to the program. Hadley stated that is correct. The result would be to have smaller pot of money. That funding would be removed and not available to the program.

Walker stated that she knows mitigation costs are unfunded needs. Send letter to RD, who would look at unfunded needs. Hadley stated that the RD decides what to do with the funds.

Orcutt is working from the assumption that money has already been obligated. Connor is thinking this applies to future budgets. Orcutt stated that Reclamation needs to be planning for it. Walker said they are now talking about 2020. Hadley stated that the office is about \$2 million short for FY19 so it will be unlikely to find that funding.

The abovementioned motion passed with 7 votes in favor and one abstained (Elizabeth Hadley).

FY2020

Hillemeier looked at the substantial shortfall because money is being advanced from FY19. Trying to understand the Reclamation and USFWS reductions. Everson stated that the \$749k figure came from not having a lot of staff onboard. This number will not likely be carried forward. Hard to make an estimate on percent difference for next year and the following. USFWS have remained flat except for other costs such as increased salary costs. TMC should look at those trends. Hillemeier asked if USFWS staff would be going to support this program? Norris answered that in addition to the USFWS FAC program financially supporting the TRRP

budget, there are several USFWS funds that support restoration within the Trinity watershed. Additionally, Norris provided that there are several USFWS (AFWO) staff outside of FAC (fisheries aquatic conservation) that participate actively in workgroups that are not accounted for on the TRRP budget worksheet.

Hillemeier wants to tell leadership that the program is taking a cut and would like to know the percent? We have a lot of work and we cannot fund what we need. Norris responded that the partners program has allocated over \$300,000 in watershed work which is not accounted for in the budget. Dixon would like to focus on this budget over which TMC has discretion, not other funding outside the program. Orcutt stated that these other funding sources are larger and more stable anyway.

Connor stated that the Science Coordinator for USFWS is shifting into Reclamation. Where is that cost saving going? Hetrick responded that money the Service doesn't spend during a fiscal year, gets allocated to the TRRP, through an interagency agreement for the following year with specific tasks to fund the tribes in partnership projects with the Service. Regardless, the Service will be paying our costs first which includes permanent staff costs and our overhead costs (e.g., supplies, building costs). Connor asked if the salary will go up or down? Even though the total money will go down.

Dixon asked if there were any further questions on funding page? On the admin page of the budget, the cells marked in yellow indicate what was changed from the December approval of the FY19 budget. Red text indicates changes from forward funding. At the bottom of admin page, there is \$3.6 million for admin this year. There is \$2.6 million for next year because of forward funding.

Orcutt asked if the \$402,447 under CDFW on the admin budget is the number we were talking about for the workgroups in FY19? Dixon stated that no, there is separate funding for participating in workgroups. Connor added that those tasks are included in the science budget page.

Dixon referred to the implementation page and stated what each color represented (same as above). All proposed budget changes were addressed during individual agency meetings. They are holding off on putting funding on additional agreements. JC House is not funded in FY19 so it was bumped to FY20. Geophysical support will be an IDIQ and there is no need to use current fiscal year funds to pay for it. Funds cannot be obligated up front for this kind of contract. There is a change in yellow because it was approved to spend \$300,000, but they can't obligate funds for project starts at end of FY19. Orcutt asked why the budget item increased from \$89,000 to \$300,00? Dixon responded that they do not know what types of surveys they will budget for until they have flows. With an IDIQ contract there is more flexibility, but they have to put a placeholder in.

Walker stated that the geophysical support services contract was based on water year, some years anticipated wet and some dry; funds were not needed so they look lower for previous years. The

funds look higher for FY20 because these funds are available from previous years. They can spend the money based on need.

Orcutt is concerned that in the past they had a description of the projects that were funded and contingent on annual hydrology. Dixon replied that it is the same thing. A firm-fixed price contract has the not-to-exceed price already calculated. But with an IDIQ contract they can ask for the types of products that they need and can implement for a whole suite of purposes. The \$300,000 is assuming we are doing all of those things, but it is unlikely we will do all of them. They are not obligating the money they are just holding it. Since the money is not obligated, if they have not already spent the money, they would need to find a way to spend the money. For example, if next year is a critically dry year TMC will have to make a decision on how to re-obligate funding.

Hillemeier stated that the budget used to be \$400,000-\$500,000 not listed in the parentheses. Why do we not do it now? Dixon responded that we will talk about it during the science discussion.

On the Implementation page, the BLM technical assistance for NEPA support and enterprise team program is paid for, therefore no cost is associated with that line item. The Large Wood Supply design for Dutch Creek will be spent in FY20, and it was decided that no additional dollars are needed for FY21. Simon-Jackson added that the reason is because they are not doing as large of instream structures.

Orcutt asked why there is the funding in FY18 for HVT Design Support Services a difference of more than \$100,000? Walker and Dixon responded that the previous number included more indirect rate costs, which are no longer applied to sub-contractors.

In the budget, value engineering is zero for FY19 because there are no designs that require it, but they do need it for FY20. The Yurok Tribe has processed a lot of coarse sediment for FY19 and have enough so the funding is not needed for FY20.

Watershed FOA is in yellow because of initial proposal to reduce by \$500,000 for FY20. Groves asked why there was an increase in FY21 from FY20 for the Construction Projects? Dixon said they know the construction costs for FY20 because we know the project and have completed a cost estimate; FY21 is just the long-term average.

Simon-Jackson wants to discuss the \$500,000 allocated for watershed. She is frustrated that the Synthesis Reports are not done because they could look for efficiencies and then adjust money based on those. She also did not agree to drop \$500,000 in 2019 it was just done. Orcutt recommended that this funding should streamline and be administered through NFWF.

Hillemeier said that based on presentations we are looking at large construction costs needed to start applying for other sources of funding. If the projects are shovel-ready it would be a good time to go after funding. Ly stated that a lot of grant programs look at the Trinity and think they are already funded through program funding. Hillemeier commented that there is less funding than in the past.

LUNCH

Dixon started the meeting after lunch discussing the Science Budget. Simon-Jackson was concerned that TMC approved watershed in 2020 and is wondering why is it at bottom of barrel? She suggested that they go through the Science Budget first. Dixon stated that the Science Budget is bare bones for 2020 same as 2019, clarifying that the macroinvertebrate study would happen in 2020 with but with FY19 dollars.

Connor had a question why they are dropping funding for one of the gages? Dixon replied that they are dropping funding to USGS as recommendation from a workgroup review of what different gages were used for, though USGS cost goes up because of salaries increases, so the savings go away quickly. Simon-Jackson stated that the Program Office Personnel goes up by \$150,000. Walker replied that the increase is because of hiring the Science Coordinator. The budget also accounts for the decreased salaries of not having a geomorphologist and Dixon as the ED in temporary promotion.

There is enough funding for the 3 remaining SAB members, but it will expire so the cost will come back in FY21. Norris asked if they were planning a change in the SAB for FY20? Dixon responded that there are two agreements up in early 2020 and other is up in 2021. Need to try to get an interagency agreement this time next year because that is when to pay them. Norris stated that she should provide the TMC with the SAB survey results. The results suggest that the Program was not using SAB appropriately and they should be used more in science decisions.

Ly asked why there is no funding for SSS Model in FY19-FY21? Dixon responded that the SSS task on the spreadsheet was a one-time project for the science workplan. Turning knobs to find optimal flows money went to USGS to optimize the SSS model. Hetrick stated that the funding came out of USFWS budget and they paid directly through interagency agreement. Will need to pay if we further refine the model. Ly said that there is still a need to model the downstream areas of the Trinity River. DeJulio stated that it was funded and it is in process; all data collecting is done and exploring options on how to apply it to downstream.

Everson stated that having no money in habitat monitoring for 2020 is a concern for USFWS and would like to know why there is no funding? Dixon responded that the Full Science Work Plan ranking selected effectiveness monitoring for funding in 2018 and in 2019. If there is additional money it could be put toward that line item; the program found it important and funded it in FY19. At present, even with a status quo budget, there are no funds in 2020 to do the work. Dixon emphasized that the Design Team has found this habitat monitoring to be useful, but was not his place as design team coordinator to directly advocate for this project to the TMC. Norris wanted to clarify that the habitat long-term monitoring has directly informed TRRP's restoration projects implementation and there was a misunderstanding that this monitoring was not a long-term project. The Habitat Team wanted to make a shift to work on assessing the habitat work and so, in 2017 when the proposals were initially developed, they only provided a one-year budget for FY18. The Habitat Team believed they should continue beyond this year and the USFWS

agrees. Norris' position is that it should be considered a long-term project as long as construction is going on.

Everson stated that there is a site-specific component and a systemic evaluation to evaluate cumulative effects of all projects. USFWS views this project as the highest priority. The funding that is typically transferred to TRRP at the end of the year (i.e. \$749,392 in FY19) could be used to make sure the project was funded. Dixon asked to clarify if Everson meant that, if TMC did not identify funding for that project, would the USFWS unilaterally choose to fund it and withhold that money from the TMC budget? Everson replied that yes, that is possible.

Hetrick stated that there are great changes in between efforts with gravel and they should evaluate systemic changes through manipulation of flows and gravel operations. The title of that project indicates that it is just channel rehab, but the Habitat Team has worked on systemic and project evaluation which should be in the synthesis report. This work may be ready to present at the next TMC meeting.

Hillemeier thinks it is important to look at shortcomings of evaluation of current restoration approach, like using baseflows, with more of a modeling exercise. Ly stated that habitat effectiveness monitoring was the number one science priority for the program. However, this monitoring does not need to be multi-year, because the scope would change based on the differences in what sites were being visited; but, effectiveness monitoring should be long-term.

Dixon stated that sediment transport monitoring does not have annual funding. It was not recommended for funding when presented to TMC for funding in the FY18 science workplan by the Science Coordinator. A little work will happen this year, but the physical workgroup would like some monitoring but no IP for it. There are no funds for it without freeing funds for other parts of the project. Does the TMC have recommendations of where to reduce budget elsewhere to fund it? Norris stated that the program wanted to revise protocols for this monitoring. Dixon agreed that the Physical WG needed to identify objectives to spell out what we are trying to accomplish with sediment transport monitoring, and then draft a monitoring protocol accordingly.

Orcutt asked when they are recruiting for the new Science Coordinator? Dixon responded that the position should open in spring and hopefully someone would be on board by the end of summer.

Ly asked if they should shift the 2020 budget discussion to the June meeting? Dixon stated that he and Caryn discussed passing at least portions of the 2020 budget to get all agreements into place. If there are aspects that we cannot pass today, we could talk again in June.

Simon-Jackson noticed that the Science Synthesis Reports have no funding. Does that mean that the money out there will be spent? Dixon replied yes.

Groves stated that they should obligate funds now rather than June to get the agreements in place. Orcutt stated that he has seen it done closer to September. Follow-up meetings would

work well, and conditional approval is not that hard to do. It will become clearer as the fiscal year approaches.

Hillemeier likes the quarterly updates to understand where funds are needed and where they are at. He would like to approve the budget at this meeting.

Ly is concerned about not having effectiveness monitoring. Has IDT commented on this? Dixon replied that the IDT reviewed the two proposals (Channel Rehab and Macroinvertebrate Drift) and decided to fund them. There was an external review of the protocols. Ly asked isn't there a need for other effectiveness monitoring? Dixon replied that they gain knowledge of monitoring every year but what is the timeline that we need to look at? Some monitoring must happen every year. They should see how short they are in 2021, review what has come out of synthesis reports and do some statistics to figure out if they have to do monitoring at the frequency that is currently being done. DeJulio commented that the IDT is soliciting proposals related to effectiveness monitoring so if funding becomes available, they could fund them.

Orcutt asked if funding was only for one year? Dixon replied that the FY19 projects only qualified if they had multi-year agreements. Dixon continued saying that it was Caryn's understanding from the December TMC meeting that the council approved all items on list to be funded for one year and no projects were looked at after that. There is balanced FY19 and FY20 funding and no additional money. Connor asked if it was possible that they will not spend FY19 prefunded money that could carry over to FY20? Dixon replied that for USFS technical services there was funding in FY18 and no more money for that line item in FY19, FY20 and FY21. The money is not being spent fast enough, and it gets carried forward each year until the agreement expires.

Ly asked if the group wanted to entertain a motion for the FY20 proposed budget?

Simon-Jackson stated that she believes that the \$500,000 needs to carry over for watershed. There is a 16% cut in FY20 and she is wondering how they are they are going to add more important work with the cut? It is 4% of the budget for watershed. She is not willing to vote for the FY20 budget as it is. Hillemeier asked what would she propose? Simon-Jackson suggested that it should come from the \$970,000. If we do not have to pay for the TRH, then maybe that is where it comes from. We also need money for SAB and effectiveness monitoring. She suggested that they write a letter to the regional director to take out the TRH tasks and leave the money for those tasks in the budget so it could go toward watershed. Connor agreed that it is not fair to the Watershed WG to remove the funding. Why include the line item in the budget if it is not funded? The Watershed WG should set a bar if they need to score higher to get funding. Dixon said that they had discussed and adjusted the ranking sheet and it ranked projects based on scoring but they could still choose to recommend or not recommend the projects

Hetrick stated that there are several synthesis reports coming out. Should they send them out for external review? He felt the cost for doing that is not in the budget and it is important for the SAB especially in the refinements process. Hetrick and Norris feel like the SAB is incomplete,

and it is not in budget to perpetuate into future. SAB plays a critical role in advancing science program forward. Hillemeier stated that the SAB is funded now. Hetrick stated that three members are funded right now, and two members do not have a contract. Dixon said that he would put in a placeholder for \$115,000 for new SAB member agreements for the development of the FY21 budget. In the meantime, they could leverage the SAB to facilitate review of synthesis reports and other program products. Dixon mentioned that USFWS can withhold funds to pay reviewers because they have a mechanism in place to do that, while Reclamation does not. He said that the make-up of the SAB was formerly diverse, and now there is a geomorphologist and two fish biologists. Norris stated that she would like a diverse make up and wants more involvement of the SAB, but that could be a higher cost if occupying more time from members.

Hadley stated that she was concerned with the timing of the letter to the Regional Director and the fact that they have not been able to look at the budget.

Hillemeier asked Simon-Jackson if she would accept the \$500,000 budget in watershed if TRH funding goes elsewhere? Simon-Jackson replied yes, but the caveat would be if there is any savings that watershed group gets first crack at it. She does not like how the pain was distributed, and feels they need to see the synthesis report. Connor stated that other groups have also lost funding, and Watershed was not the only one to take a hit.

Groves asked that since we are pre-funding wood and gravel, how many years does that pre-fund? Dixon responded that gravel is two years ahead, wood will need money in FY19 to use in FY20. Groves asked if there was a stockpile of large wood? Dixon responded yes, by Dutch Creek Bridge. In FY2019 they are going to build the Chapman Ranch project and there is no large wood on the site so they will use the wood from Dutch Creek. Groves stated that they could cut gravel and not harvest or process as much. Dixon responded that the money for FY20 is specifically for gravel augmentation, not processing; no funds are proposed for processing in FY20.

Hillemeier stated that it would be nice to move ahead with some of the FY20 proposed budget especially with Tribal items. He would like to make a motion to provide solutions. Orcutt stated that there are deficiencies on all budget categories FY19 and FY20 of \$400,000. Should have a category in the budget that lists the reduction. Hillemeier stated that it was because of the USFWS reductions. Dixon stated that he scaled from cost \$2.5 in 2020, which is the cost for the Dutch Creek project.

Everson stated that the \$300,000 in the Physical Support Services is a loose number that could be moved to effectiveness monitoring. If that happened what would the effect be on physical support services (boundary survey, lidar, aerial photography, topographic surveys)? Eric Peterson responded that the \$300,000 is a robust estimate and the movement of some of that money could be reasonable. Hillemeier stated that we already approved as part of FY19 and moved to FY20. Dixon confirmed yes. Ly stated that they can re-approve a budget item. Hillemeier stated that they could reduce the methods on the as-builts, which might be able to

accommodate movement of some of those funds. Hillemeier confirmed that the funds adjustment for Caryn's salary has already been factored in.

Keith Groves made a motion to accept program administration portion of budget.

Teresa Connor seconded.

Hillemeier stated that he would rather pass the whole budget. Ly asked if he wanted to make a friendly amendment. Orcutt would like the TMC to consider spreading the pain and feels there is a disproportionate higher reduction in the admin budget than in implementation and science. Dixon stated that there is not an actual reduction in the admin budget as it was already paid for from prior years. Groves stated that public education is overspent. Is that because it was paid for in FY19? Dixon stated that yes, the money is already in the Admin budget.

Dave Hillemeier made a competing motion to approve budget with exceptions:

- **Any savings received from not funding TRH tasks or other funds that become available be redistributed following prioritization assessment by IDT and recommended to TMC**
 - o effectiveness monitoring and
 - o watershed restoration.
- **And we move \$100,000 from geophysical support services monitoring to channel rehabilitation effectiveness monitoring**

Teresa Connor seconded both exceptions.

Hillemeier stated that the SAB is still \$100,000 short, and he hopes that more funding will become available. Ly asked if they should include a friendly amendment to add SAB as an item for funding to be prioritized by IDT motion that was proposed by Hillemeier.

Dave Hillemeier accepted that amendment.

Teresa seconded the amendment.

The amendment was accepted.

Groves asked how it was going to be written so that Dixon can explain it to the IDT. Groves stated that he interprets it that the IDT decides where to spend the money and makes a recommendation. Groves thinks that they should get rid of the \$500,000 watershed restoration. There are bigger projects, but they can't bid them because the projects are too big. People are not going to design other projects. DeJulio suggested that they could put out a solicitation for up to \$1 million so it does not exclude proposals that are \$490,000. Dixon replied that the FOA is for projects up to \$2 million, however there is only \$500,000 available for this year.

Orcutt stated that he would like to do a friendly amendment to include in the review of the video weir at Willow Creek, because this is something the IDT said they would review. He would like more clarity from the USFWS. He is skeptical about the solicitations in the watershed and is unconvinced that this funding should go to the projects in the whole watershed, particularly the

South Fork. Simon-Jackson stated that she is the new advocate for the upper watershed and is talking about \$500,000. The fires in the upper watershed have created siltation and sedimentation in the creeks and there is no watershed restoration money for this.

Hillemeier stated that TRRP has a limited watershed grant program. If they have NFWF manage the grant there would be \$420,000 because of overhead. The funding should go into planning, permitting, seed money to go to bigger funding opportunities out there. Simon-Jackson asked if they get extra points for including planning in these grant proposals. Dixon said that they give bonus points (5) to projects that do implementation, rather than just planning.

Hillemeier stated that it is challenging to get additional funds. There may be sources through Prop 1 and maybe they can put more money into the watershed program. Ly stated that there may be grant opportunities with the Hoopa Valley Tribe, because they want more coho benefitting from program. Watershed funding specifically goes to the tributaries where coho can benefit.

Lindke stated that at the CDFW coordination meeting they agreed that their intent was that it was multi-year project but that a report from the first year would be prepared before they asked for further funding. They will collect video recordings, which can be archived and possibly analyzed later.

Orcutt stated that the Hoopa Valley Tribe leadership directly stated that the Restoration Program is not producing the fish they need to. The priority is for coho and a large part of the budget is going to marginal projects in the South Fork. Kautsky added that the FY 20 budget would have been acted on in June and feels there is an urgency to get out the budget. The IDT meeting pre-dates the meeting with State. They are excluding videography so there will be no benefit of that analysis.

LaBanca stated that CDFW leadership's position on the video weir is consistent with Ken's statement. DeJulio said that he does not think it excludes the weir just that it will come at a later date, and that people have not identified where additional funds would come from to pay for it. Orcutt stated that the funds come from the hatchery tasks. Reclamation falls short at the Regional level, and if the funds are de-obligated in FY19 those funds would be swept up for other purposes.

Norris said that TRRP is not the only program that contributes to watershed level projects. The USFWS Partners Program had contributed \$320,000 in recent years. There should be recognition of contributions to the watershed outside of this program, but within the footprint of this program. Simon-Jackson stated that she would like a presentation of the Prop 1 funding of projects from the State of CA. Dixon stated that the difference between the Prop 1 programs and the TRRP is that the TRRP does not require a match. Norris stated that the Partners money does not require a match.

Terri Simon-Jackson proposed a friendly amendment to the watershed restoration bullet above to add "with a goal of up to \$500K."

The motion passed with seven in favor and one absent.

Dixon will take a stab at writing the letter and Ly will submit.

Public Forum

No comments

Meeting Adjourned.