

Final Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
 June 13-14, 2018
 Humboldt Bay Aquatic Center
 921 Waterfront Drive, Eureka, CA

Day 1, June 13, 2018 9:00 am

Attending Members

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

¹ Replaced by George Kautsky on Day 1 during Item 10; ² replaced by Chris Laskodi after Item 14; ³ non-voting member.

Others that attended: Jenny Norris, Mike Dixon, Kevin Held, Kathy Martin (TRRP); Robert Franklin, George Kautsky, Winnie Carpenter (Hoopa Valley Tribe); Kyle De Juilio and Chris Laskodi (Yurok Tribe); Bill Brock (USFS); Ken Lindke, Wade Sinnen (CDFW); Hank Seemann, Craig Tucker (Humboldt County); Dan Everson, Bill Pinnix, Josh Boyce, Damon Goodman (FWS); Seth Lawrence (DWR); Seth Naman (NMFS); Andy Colonnade and Vivian Helliwell (PFFCA). Dr. Alison O'Dowd and Master's student Thomas Starkey-Owens (Humboldt State University).

Attending by phone: none.

Notes: Kim Mattson (ENW).

List of Motions

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the March minutes.

Tony LaBanca seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion that an entity that submits a proposal for the Watershed Workgroup process must only recuse themselves from ranking of their own proposal and not be present when such proposal is discussed and ranked.

Tony LaBanca seconded the motion.

The motion failed with a 4 yes votes, 3 no votes, and 1 abstention; voting no were the Forest Service, Trinity County, and NOAA Fisheries; the FWS abstained.

Terri Simon-Jackson made a motion to obligate available FY18 funding per table “Options for obligation of surplus FY18 Funding,” funding the purple first, orange and green next, as the Executive Director deems appropriate.

Justin Ly seconded the motion.

The motion passed with seven yes votes and one no vote; the Hoopa Valley Tribe voted no.

List of Action Items made during the Meeting

Action item: Caryn Hunt DeCarlo will draft a letter of appreciation for his Program support to Regional Director David Murillo.

Action item: Caryn Hunt DeCarlo will get more information on what to expect at the August 29 Refinements workshop.

Regular Business

1. Introductions

Welcome

Don Bader, Trinity Management Council (TMC) Chair, opened the meeting and asked the attendees to introduce themselves. Dan Everson introduced himself as the new FWS Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office (AFWO) Field Supervisor. Bader went over the agenda for the meeting.

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

Approval of TMC March Meeting Minutes

Keith Groves made a motion to approve the March minutes.

Tony LaBanca seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

CVP Operations Update

Bader made this CVP report at the end of Day 2. He said there were a lot of numbers and he would send these out in an email. Some of his comments were as follows.

Trinity Lake was at 2329 feet or 1.9 million acre-feet or 76 % full; Shasta Reservoir was at 1052 feet or 3.9 million acre-feet or 86 % full; but both were above historic averages.

Trinity at the end of month in September is predicted to drop down to 2290 feet or 70 feet below the crest which is about half full or 1.35 million acre-feet. Shasta will drop down to 970 feet.

Carr Diversions just started two Fridays ago. Diversions are 85,000 acre feet for June and will drop to 62,000 acre feet for September. This should be less than 50% of Trinity flows being diverted.

2. Public Forum and Comments from the Public

Vivian Helliwell with the PCFFA passed out a copy of a letter regarding the Trinity River and Klamath River Acts. She noted these were passed during Republican administration with bipartisan support.

3. Report from the Executive Director

Caryn Hunt DeCarlo, Executive Director of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP or Program), walked the TMC through her written report and touched on the main points. She noted the major activities between March and June as flow release and gravel augmentation, a public meeting, a special meeting for watershed projects, and continuing work on permitting of restoration rehab projects. She went over recent personnel changes.

Jennifer Norris next reviewed the Science update which included defining and refining the programmatic metrics within the workgroups and schedule status for the synthesis reports. She referred to the handout titled Timeline for Synthesis Reports and noted the project schedules.

The synthesis reports generated some discussion. Mike Orcutt asked for basic information on the synthesis reports. Norris noted that the Program is “data rich” and the synthesis reports will explain this data and help to show whether the Program is meeting the metrics and goals. Terri Simon-Jackson said she would like to have some documents such as the workgroup briefings before the TMC meetings so she could prepare better and confer with her staff that attend the workgroups. Norris said that the Program partner staff do not always respond to deadlines. Don Bader responded that it is reasonable to ask for material ahead of time and he asked that the TMC have their individual staff be more responsive to these requests. Tony LaBanca presented the alternative that they ask their staff to do their regular jobs and also the extra things such as synthesis reports, metric development and others. So he asked how do they avoid over-taxing the staff. Simon-Jackson noted that it was important for her to be able to come to the meetings prepared and know what the action was expected of the TMC. Caryn Hunt DeCarlo noted that the agenda has marked in red those items that are decision-requiring and the others are informational. George Kautsky commented on the synthesis reports and noted that some reports are not due until 2020 but these still may not answer direct questions about the Program. Norris explained how the synthesis reports will be used for the Decision Support System (DSS). Orcutt hoped that the DSS will be explained during the workshop in August.

Mike Dixon next gave the Implementation update and reviewed eight implementation items in Executive Director’s report. He noted that the house “sold out from under” the Program during their negotiations; but the new owner is interested in raising the house. The Program is pursuing this option. He went through the recent TMC motion regarding the house has latitude for removing the house from the Program’s flow regime but perhaps not the 100-year flows. Dixon noted Hamilton Pond is underway for dredging of sediment from Grass Valley Creek, pending a section 7 consultation with NMFS. DWR is developing the Dutch Creek 80 % design report and is planned for 2019. Chapman Ranch is nearing the 90 % design report. Sky Ranch and Oregon Gulch are at 30 % design. Value engineering studies have been completed. The 2018 Flow Release has matched the intended flows; but there have been temperature exceedances in the river. Dixon noted some of the compliance work. He noted that the BAs are still in contracting in Sacramento with a solicitation for a contract expected to be issued in July.

Nick Hetrick asked about any problems with the temperature exceedances. Dixon said the only way to reduce temperatures is to release more water and that would be out of compliance with the ROD or they would need to bypass the electricity generation. Kyle De Julio noted that these temperature requirements are not regulatory, but are self-imposed from the Record of Decision (ROD). Permitted requirements for temperature at Douglas City do not start until July 9. Jennifer Norris noted the Program has never met the temperature targets.

Hunt DeCarlo continued the remainder of the Executive Director’s report. She commented on revegetation compliance and completion of the vegetation monitoring plan. She noted public

outreach events and notification for flow releases. The Program had an article in the TCRCDD Spring 2018 Conservation Almanac, an information booth at the Weaverville Art Cruise, made presentations to schools and colleges, and held meetings with landowners. Hunt DeCarlo noted the Program Refinements project has completed tasks 1-4 with a draft report. She noted new publications and reports on the hydraulic model, sediment monitoring, and Deep Gulch as-built.

Mike Orcutt asked about the reference to the Trinity River Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG) on page 10 of the Executive Director's report regarding the Refinements. Don Bader thought the TMC should not be acknowledging the TAMWG based on their new directives. Nick Hetrick thought that Tom Stokely's input would be extremely valuable, but it would have to be as an individual and not as the TAMWG.

Information / Decision Items

4. Progress on Winter Flow Variability

Caryn Hunt DeCarlo reviewed that Reclamation is discussing the SIR (Supplemental Information Report to an EIS) with the Solicitor, Steve Palmer, regarding the status on potential use of ROD waters for winter variability flows and restoration and, specifically, if it is already covered in the EIS/ROD.

Robert Franklin referred to a handout on Winter Flow Variability white paper regarding the scientific review of variable flows for environmental uses. He noted the primary focus of the report will be to assess whether the current invariable flow of 300 cfs in late winter should be switched to variable flows. A review draft will be available in August. Tony LaBanca asked about the schedule of the product and whether it would best serve their needs. Mike Orcutt questioned whether they would be able to adopt the variable flow with regards to authorities, legal reviews, and approvals; he noted that the Hoopa Valley Tribe is opposed to taking ROD water for the winter variability flows. Franklin said their paper will address only science.

Hank Seemann of Humboldt County gave a slide presentation on the County's plan to exercise its 1959 water contract and call for the release of 50,000 acre-feet of water into the Trinity River to provide variable winter flows in 2019. The County convened a technical working group (Yurok Tribe, Hoopa Valley Tribe, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service) earlier this spring to discuss the proposal. He presented a hydrograph showing releases from March 16 through April 27, 2019, with the primary purpose of increasing rearing habitat for juvenile Chinook salmon and a secondary purpose of stimulating invertebrate production and foraging opportunities for salmon. The hydrograph contains five peaks to simulate a series of storm events, up to a peak flow of 1,500 cubic feet per second (cfs), in contrast to the normal winter baseline flow of 300 cfs. He showed a figure depicting the proposed hydrograph against the record of pre-dam flows to demonstrate that the proposed flows would partially deliver a component of the natural flow regime that is not accommodated by current flow management. He showed a summary of modeling results indicating the percentage of increased juvenile habitat that would result within the 40-mile restoration reach of the TRRP, which demonstrates that the release would provide a beneficial use. Humboldt County is coordinating with the Hoopa Valley and Yurok Tribes on a potential coordinated letter calling for delivery of the water, based on their shared interests.

Mike Orcutt noted this proposed hydrograph appeared to shift the timing from the original concept developed by the flow workgroup in 2017; he asked where this came from and if there is

a change in objective. Seth Naman said the shift is really not very different from the original concept, but places more focus on increasing access to habitat, which was more readily quantified. The time period is only a few weeks different from earlier proposals. Orcutt asked about the implications for the sufficiency of the ROD flows. Naman responded that it has become evident that 60 % of the juvenile salmon typically have left by the time the spring ROD flow releases are initiated (late April). Nick Hetrick clarified that the juveniles are still in the river, but the majority are not in the TRRP project area. Dave Hillemeier said that if they are modifying the flows, it is positive step in implementing adaptive management. Keith Groves noted it is fine that Humboldt County is using water for the benefit of fisheries, but it would be good to include Trinity County in these discussions since the flows pass through Trinity County.

Seemann said the next steps are coordinating with the Hoopa and Yurok Tribes to develop a letter to submit to the Bureau for a water call in July.

5. Cannabis Cultivation Regulatory Process in Trinity County

This item was considered after Item 6. Keith Groves, Trinity County Supervisor, gave a presentation on Trinity County as it starts to regulate the cannabis industry now that it has become legalized in California. The County currently has 300 individual with provisional licensees. Licensees also have to comply with the State Water Board regarding water and chemical use. The Water Board does not visit all sites. The County is increasing the number of their staff on their inspection teams; and by July all sites will have had a site visit and a check if there is compliance with the Water Board. Groves estimated that last year Trinity County had about 4,000 growers but some are leaving due to a drop in prices and difficulties in state regulations. Groves noted the Sherriff's Department is not yet fully staffed to regulate the black market side. Groves thought the County has "crested the peak" and are getting control of the problems. He noted a subdivision called Trinity Pines had an estimated 800 growers on the 1200 lots and this year there is only about 500. A long-term problem is what is going to happen when these properties are abandoned. He thought the market itself will cure most of its problem and he noted that Oregon has produced and stored nine times more cannabis than it can consume in a year.

Kyle De Juilio asked about the grading ordinance. Groves said they have raised \$1 million for their update to their general plan and it will include a grading ordinance. Dave Hillemeier asked about assessments of impacts to water use in the South Fork. Nick Hetrick noted that Humboldt County is being sued by Friends of Eel River for issuing too many cannabis permits. Andy Colonnade asked about an assessment of carrying capacity of the tributaries for cannabis. Groves said the County is planning an EIR and acknowledged the State EIR was poorly done. But overall, Groves said they are moving in the right direction and things are better than six months ago.

6. Riding the Adaptive Management Loop: Habitat Assessment Informs Restoration

Josh Boyce of the FWS, Arcata gave a slide presentation on habitat monitoring on the Trinity River. Habitat quality has typically been mapped based on depth, flow, and distance to escape cover. He reviewed the rationale for monitoring habitat and noted that habitat is related to juvenile production. Boyce noted that they can look at three different spatial scales to assess changes in habitat area. The largest scale was systemic scale, then site, then individual features. He noted a recent publication about their work in Restoration Ecology 23:179-185 describing their monitoring.

Boyce described a variety of tests they conducted to see if habitat was increasing following rehabilitation/construction and to see if there were continuing increases since rehabilitation. When examined at the systemic scale, they saw approximately 50 % of the systemic sites showed increases after rehabilitation. When examined at the site scale and at 450 cfs of flow, they saw significant increases in habitat following immediately rehabilitation. When these sites were followed for several years after rehabilitation, about 50 % of the 19 sites showed continued increases in habitat. Boyce described one example of habitat loss at Lower Bucktail where the top end of its side channel filled in causing loss of the side channel area. The Lower Bucktail site was reconstructed a second time in 2016; the side channel entrance was repaired and they measured a doubling of habitat and the side channel has continued to work since then. When examined at the feature scale, they examined natural versus constructed side channels and found that natural channels worked better as only 12 % became disconnected over time, with 2 % reconnecting later versus 31 % of constructed becoming disconnected with 0 % reconnecting. Boyce noted that disconnected side channels often became alcoves and were not entirely lost. In another survey features, they could show that of counts of wood by size classes showed large increases following placement. Boyce reported that they are moving towards using hydraulic models to map habitat instead of mapping habitat.

Mike Orcutt noted there was a debate over habitat assessment years ago, and asked if the debates been resolved and have they arrived at a final method. Boyce said the hydraulic modeling is more of an experiment and it will better match the design efforts as they use of hydraulic models. Damon Goodman noted that traditional habitat monitoring was not always repeatable and there was an attraction to go to hydraulic models to predict habitat. Andy Colonnade asked why they don't cable their wood as lost wood was expensive. Boyce thought the relative costs of wood are not very high and eventually there will be natural additions of wood. Wade Sinnen asked if the restoration sites provide sufficient wood on site or whether wood was brought in. Mike Dixon said both, but watersheds are not recruiting wood as they used to and will not for some time. Terri Simon-Jackson asked about the rationale of completing the currently planned projects versus going back to reconstruct failed sites.

Lunch

7. Overview Program Status Channel Rehabilitation Projects

Mike Dixon, TRRP Implementation Branch Chief, gave a slide presentation on channel rehabilitation and future plans. He reviewed that the Record of Decision (ROD) identified 44 channel sites and 3 side channels and mapped them. Dixon said, to date, they have done 29 sites and all 3 side channels. But since the ROD, they have added some new sites, they have discovered that not all sites are functioning fully, and not all of the sites are available for access due to landowner concerns. Dixon projected a map showing the most current set of completed and planned sites. In the remainder of his presentation, he walked the TMC through the sites from top of the Program reach to the bottom of those sites that still need rehabilitation or needs a second visit.

Sawmill was the first site Dixon presented and he noted it may need some repair of a side channel that breached and entered back to the river at about the middle of its original length.

Upper Rush Creek was added as a rehabilitation site after the Flow Evaluation Study, but here a landowner was previously resistant to work and thus it is on a lower priority list.

Lower Rush Creek was an original Flow Evaluation site. This site has a lot of dynamic change and has not been prioritized for rehabilitation.

Poker Bar Suite is a set of four Flow Evaluation sites. This site has FEMA issues with private property near the river and will not likely be prioritized as a rehabilitation site.

McIntyre Gulch is also low on the list and is not in the current rehabilitation queue due to an uninterested landowner.

Dixon next moved downstream of Douglas City to describe sites. Upper Steiner Flat has some potential for floodplain work and is on BLM land but is not ranked high on the list.

Middle Steiner Flat was a Flow Evaluation site, has good in-channel complexity but is also not highly ranked.

Lorenz Gulch was constructed in 2013 with two side channels. Deposition blocks the entrance of one side channel at lower flows but the river seems to be re-cutting an older side channel. The larger side channel downstream and on river left is thought to be in need of more work and that is would be relatively expensive.

Dutch Creek suffers from a uniform and straight channel with a high flood plain. This site is planned for rehabilitation next year to get the river out of its banks and to activate the floodplain.

Evans Bar is a high priority site that also has an entrenched channel with a high flood plain. It will be in queue soon.

Soldier Creek is has its main channel up against a valley wall channel and interacts with bedrock. It is not in the queue but is considered to be intermediate priority.

Chapman Ranch has the main channel constrained by mine tailings and is planned for construction in 2019. The design is to create meanders in the first phase and a side channel in second phase. There is a danger that the side channel could fail as a low-flow side channel but would likely still flow at 1,000 cfs and Dixon noted that 1,000 cfs occurs fairly often.

Oregon Gulch is the most heavily mined and altered reach of the Trinity. Designs here are at 30 %. They want to take a straight reach with an 8,000 cfs activated floodplain and change it to a meandered channel with floodplains that activate at 1,000 cfs. Up to 400,000 cubic yards of excavation is planned, but much of the gravel could be used on site during the rehabilitation.

Sky Ranch is similar to Oregon Gulch but was mined for aggregate and now has a large isolated floodplain that is not activated until 15,000 cfs. The plan is to remove an enormous amount of mine sediment out to allow the floodplain to be activated at lower flows. Keith Groves suggested the aggregate be transported to Eagle Rock Aggregate.

Upper Conner Creek offers a significant opportunity to improve floodplain connectivity. Designs will follow after Chapman Ranch.

Dixon summarized that implementation over the next 7-8+ years will take a “cafeteria” approach of multiple projects being designed, permitted, and being built based on funding.

Responding to questions, Dixon noted that designs of project are shared by the different groups based on availability and interest. The hatchery reach (Bear Island) has a range of opinions of the value of rehabilitation and the peril of encouraging hatchery fish to spawn in river. They do get briefings from the habitat monitoring team regarding ideas for design.

8. TRRP Accomplishments Summary from 2016 and Draft 2017 Annual Reports

Caryn Hunt DeCarlo gave a slide presentation on the summaries from the annual reports from 2016 and 2017. The 2016 report is final and the 2017 is in draft form. The TRRP partners all contribute to the report; the Denver office does the technical editing. The ROD states that

progress reports shall be submitted to the Department of Interior and Congress; the IAP requires a report; water quality permits require an annual report. Hunt DeCarlo described the format of the report as organized into a budget, restoration accomplishment highlights for the year, hydrographs of the water year type flow release, gravel augmentation and transport, channel rehabilitation projects, habitat monitoring, fisheries monitoring, riparian monitoring, environmental compliance, and public outreach. Suggested changes are to shorten the report, add an executive summary, include watershed efforts, and keep the other sections. Remaining questions are whether it should be a technical report or more user friendly general information, and whether it should be electronic.

Terri Simon-Jackson complimented the report and thought it was too technical for the public and too long for a Congressional report. Justin Ly asked that the drafts of the reports be provided to the TMC for review. Nick Hetrick appreciated the report and agreed that they need to know who the audience is. He also asked about how the Program is doing and that relates to metrics. He noted the report on how the National Parks are doing as a good example. He also noted the Elwha Adaptive Management Report and NOAA's report to Congress. Vivian Helliwell noted the value of the hard copy format, thought there may be too many graphs, and suggested they use more links to the more detailed reports. Tony LaBanca thought of the report as an administrative task and he did not think the TMC would need to do a formal review. Don Bader noted those deciding on funding would need only a very high level report with how many sites have been completed, the funding, and how successful was the Program. Simon-Jackson said two reports may be needed and asked how they would report across-year syntheses. Jennifer Norris noted the synthesis reports are being prepared. Mike Orcutt noted the Central Valley Project reports as a good template; Wade Sinnen said it was the CPAR report. Andy Colonnade thought the evaluations of the success of the projects were missing. Others noted overall goals, monitoring and progress should be included.

9. FY19 Watershed FOA and Ranking Process

Mike Dixon gave an update on the Watershed Workgroup meeting and how they responded to the 10 suggestions by TMC on the preparation of the funding opportunity announcement (FOA) and the process for review and ranking of proposals.

Dixon noted the Watershed Workgroup agreed with that most of the suggestions of the TMC and they were adopting them.

Regarding scoring, the Workgroup did not agree with a minimum point threshold. They would rather score and rank projects and then place the projects in categories of recommendation to award along with a narrative of the pros and cons of the project. Dave Hillemeier suggested they adopt a minimum score to avoid reviewers that give very low scores having an undue influence on the overall project score.

Regarding conflict of interest, Caryn Hunt DeCarlo reported that she had consulted with their contracting office on suggestions for evaluating watershed projects. She noted that no written guidelines were able to be provided, but recommendations for evaluation of federal awards were given. She suggested to the Watershed Workgroup that any reviewer associated with an entity that submitted a watershed proposal should not rank any of the proposals, but they could participate in review discussions. She said the Workgroup agreed with this suggestion. She also noted that this is for competitive type solicitations, such as the Watershed FOA, rather than sole source awards. She stated that she was advised if there are questions on the proposals, the same question could be emailed to all submitters. She also said it was suggested to her that all submitters could present their proposal, which opens it up fairly to specific questions on

individual proposals by the WGs and possibly IDT. These questions can better inform decisions. She noted that the suggestions are in no way a reflection on the integrity of the involved staff, rather recommendations from Reclamation Regional acquisitions on appropriate ways to evaluate proposals for funding by involved entities. She stated that there was a lot of staff with expertise in the Program to participate in the WG proposal rankings. Dave Hillemeier disagreed and thought submitters of projects should still be able to review and rank other's projects and that significant expertise was in the WG to evaluate proposals. Terri Simon-Jackson agreed with Hunt DeCarlo that a submitter should not be on the review panel of other proposals. Nick Hetrick noted that recusals are not used for science or implementation projects. Hunt DeCarlo stated that the science projects went through internal and external reviews. Vivian Helliwell noted the need to be viewed as avoiding conflict of interest.

Dixon completing his presentation, noted two other issues. One was to ask for a project purpose to the proposal template. A second was to adopt elements of the NFWF process such as scoring criteria and use the SONCC recovery plan.

Dixon summarized that noteworthy changes to the process were a modification to priorities; low flow was kept as a priority, but specific focus on Browns or Weaver Creeks was dropped. Also they were going to ask for additional explanatory language regarding such as proximity to anadromous streams, limiting factors, and past performance.

Dave Hillemeier did not support prioritizing the coho habitat per the SONCC as there were many programs focused on listed species. There were comments about the ranking criteria. Terri Simon-Jackson noted that the ROD addressed sedimentation as important to address, and this should not be dropped. Jennifer Norris said she would like to see watershed work being one of the actions of the Program and this should be one of the ranking factors. Justin Ly said he was glad to see stream restoration of the coho habitat. He thought use of the SONCC model to benefit coho would also benefit other species. Dixon pointed out the need to stay on schedule with a RFP on Grants.gov by October 1 and associated need to submit the Funding Opportunity Announcement the next week.

Hillemeier again emphasized they should not have to choose between submitting a proposal and providing input on proposals, but he could go with the coho priorities as long as they did not use the temperature mask. Mike Orcutt noted ambiguity about the conflict of interest. He thought they need to find out if there is a regulatory requirement about conflict of interest.

Hillemeier asked if the TMC needs to have a vote on the policy of recusals on reviews and a motion was crafted.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion that an entity that submits a proposal for the Watershed Workgroup process must only recuse themselves from ranking of their own proposal and not be present when such proposal is discussed and ranked.

Tony LaBanca seconded the motion.

The motion failed with a 4 yes votes, 3 no votes, and 1 abstention; voting no were the Forest Service, Trinity County, and NOAA Fisheries; the FWS abstained.

The TMC then concluded that they will submit the FOA and continue following previous review and rankings.

10. FY18 and FY19 Budget Updates and Recommendations for Surplus Funds and/or Funding Cuts

Caryn Huntt DeCarlo referred the TMC to a handout in their packets. She noted an additional \$944K of funding that still needed to be obligated in 2018. She explained how she calculated the FWS amount of funding in the Program to be obligated and how that affected the calculation of the \$944k amount. In order to stay on schedule, this item was left for further discussion tomorrow.

The TMC returned to this discussion at the start of Day 2.

Huntt DeCarlo reviewed the TMC had \$944K to allocate for spending. Her handout listed four areas that contributed to the extra funding. She went over the areas she was allowed to allocate the extra funding to at this time of the fiscal year. She noted that the TMC had already approved \$100K for more large wood in the December meeting for the priorities for unobligated funding, and she is already pursuing this. Mike Dixon noted that both Tribes have requested an additional combined \$75K funding for technical services regarding the designs of rehabilitation sites. Huntt DeCarlo noted there was another \$1.31 million of possible items that were already approved for FY19 funding that could be funded in FY18 with this extra funding. She suggested the TMC to make a motion to let her work through this list until the \$944K was exhausted. Keith Groves asked if she wanted the TMC to rank the items in the list. Huntt DeCarlo said no, ranking would constrain her flexibility. George Kautsky noted that additional funds could be spent on the 2018-24 Science workplan large wood investigation proposal. Jennifer Norris said in June of last year she presented on the projects. There were four that were not recommended for funding based on reviews—there were two wood projects, one sediment project, and a bird project and the one Kautsky suggested wasn't recommended for funding. She also noted it was work being done in the Habitat Monitoring study. Nick Hetrick noted that the savings to FY19 gained by funding these Huntt DeCarlo's list of items could be used to fund Kautsky's project or other unfunded projects. Huntt DeCarlo estimated there may be an additional \$550K available for FY19. She wrote on the board this number comes from expending \$944k of FY18 funds, minus the new tribal design work projects of \$75k, minus the planned FY19 expenditure of an estimated \$200k for the JC House raise. There was discussion about Huntt DeCarlo's list of FY19 items. Do we need more wood and can we handle up to \$500K of wood this year? Wood is often acquired from small clearings from private parties or firebreak work. Wood from clearings for cannabis operations are not purchased by the Program. These types of sources often have attached root wads. AFAs can be paid forward into the next year. Hetrick said he thought it would be good to let the Executive Director some latitude in making decisions on the funding. Terri Simon-Jackson made a motion to allow the Executive Director to spend the additional funds. Mike Orcutt wanted to amend the motion to still keep in mind Kautsky's request to consider the wood project. Simon-Jackson thought the motion as made would allow consideration of that project, particularly since a motion made at the March meeting addressed this budget updates by the Executive Director at each quarterly meeting.

Terri Simon-Jackson made a motion to obligate available FY18 funding per table "Options for obligation of surplus FY18 Funding," funding the purple first, orange and green next, as the Executive Director deems appropriate.

Justin Ly seconded the motion.

The motion passed with seven yes votes and one no vote; the Hoopa Valley Tribe voted no.

Terri Simon-Jackson wanted to thank Hunt DeCarlo for doing the extra work on the budget to find ways to utilize the funding for the Program late in the fiscal year and ensure it isn't lost and working with the TMC members.

Mike Orcutt asked the TMC to consider sending a letter to Regional Director Murillo before he retires, thanking him for his efforts in keeping the Program fully funded. He also requested a plaque with a picture of the Trinity River.

Action item: Caryn Hunt DeCarlo will draft a letter of appreciate for his Program support to Region Director Murillo.

Don Bader said they should have a new Regional Director on board no later than November.

11. Public Forum: Comments from the Public

No comments.

Adjourn for Day 1; 5:00 pm

Day 2, June 14, 2018; 9:00 am

Don Bader opened the meeting the second day. He first turned to Public Comments, and finding not asked the TMC to return to the budget discussion, Item 10 of yesterday.

12. Public Forum: Comments from the Public

No comments.

Information/Decision Items

13. Presentation on Run Size, Stock Projections and Harvest Monitoring for Fall Chinook Salmon

George Kautsky, Hoopa Valley Tribe, gave a slide presentation on fall Chinook management. He wanted to explain how they determine ocean abundance and how they do the monitoring. One use of the data was to assess how well they are meeting the objectives of the Program. He referenced the life cycle of salmon and noted that by the time that adults return to the river, they are down to percents or tenths of percents of the fry that hatch. The management objective is to have a sufficient number of adults returning to spawn. He noted several ways they collect data on fish numbers. They use of coded wire tags as a way to track individual adult fish and creel surveys to assess recreational harvest. Tribal harvests are also monitored to estimate the total harvest by species. Escapement after fisheries can be estimated at the Willow Creek Weirs by tagging 5- 10 % of the fish and using that with recapture information. Collections are also made on scales to assess age structure. Other monitoring is spawning ground surveys and monitoring is done at the Lewiston Hatchery by collecting code wire tags and scale samples.

Kautsky noted that 25 % of juvenile Chinook released from the hatchery are marked with coded wire tags and adipose fin clipped. (100 % of hatchery steelhead are fin-clipped but no coded wire tag.) Klamath River fish range in the ocean from central Oregon to central California in a predictable number. This can be used to estimate ocean harvest probabilities.

Kautsky stressed that not just total fish numbers were important, but numbers by age cohort are important in order to track numbers by brood year. He showed a graph of the fishery

exploitation rate versus number of expected adult returns for the Klamath River. The exploitation rate increased up to a maximum of 66% with increasing estimates of potential spawning escapement of fish. There is some fishing at low stock size. He showed a table that showed the estimates of river returns of fall Chinook to the various locations in the Klamath River. He showed regressions of age 2-year-old fish river run versus 3-year-old ocean fish. In 2017 there were 21,903 river fish and this corresponded to a prediction of 330,049 3-year-olds in the ocean in 2018. Three-year-old river fish of 23,187 in the river correspond to 28,415 4-year-old ocean fish. Wade Sinnen pointed out that of the 330,049 ocean fish may have 50 % natural mortality in the ocean due to predation, disease, or lack of food.

2018 PFMC objectives are to maintain a minimum of 40,700 natural spawners for maximum sustained yield for the Klamath with 50 % of harvestable surplus allocated to non-tribal ocean troll, ocean recreational, and river recreational and the other 50 % of harvest for Yurok and Hoopa Tribes.

2018 projections are 40,700 natural returns to the river, 27,900 hatchery returns to the hatchery, 12,000 ocean troll capture of natural and hatchery fish, 18,000 tribal harvests with the remaining, or 2,810 for ocean and 3,490 river recreational harvests.

Bill Pinnix asked how the 40,700 returns to the Klamath fit into the TRRP objectives of 62,000 returning spawner to the Trinity River. This generated some discussion of the non-realistic goal of 62,000 spawners in the Trinity but it could possibly be met without harvests. Vivian Helliwell noted that the fish are limited by habitat and best returns have been observed with low adult returns but good spring rains. Kautsky noted that they don't regulate harvests to try to meet the 62,000 goal. Dave Hillemeier noted according to the Ricker Curve that low adult abundance have better cohort returns than high abundance and this has sometimes been observed in the Klamath basin.

14. Introduction to Cohort Reconstruction for Trinity River Naturally-produced Fall Chinook Salmon

Ken Lindke, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, gave a slide presentation on what cohort reconstruction are, what are they used for, and why it is important for the TRRP.

Cohorts are groups of fish born in the same year. Chinook may return as a 2-, 3-, 4- or 5-year-old fish. A cohort reconstruction gets at the fish from individual brood years and this is a better way to assess effects on fish populations and adult production, contributions to dependent fisheries, or assessing smolt to adult survival.

Lindke noted they may soon start to use the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model (KOHM). They are attempting to separate out the Lower Klamath effects. They will be able to estimate the production, contributions to fisheries, smolt to adult ratios, and evaluation of the trends.

Justin Ly asked if they can also calculation the adult to smolt ratios as a way to assess the effects of freshwater habitat. Keith Groves asked if they can separate hatchery and natural cohorts. Lindke said their efforts focus on natural fish.

Lunch

15. 2018 Flow Release Drift Monitoring

Chris Laskodi, Yurok Tribe, gave a slide presentation on the just-initiated invertebrate drift monitoring on the Trinity River. He contrasted measures of drift versus benthic measures. He noted that drift is what the juvenile salmonids feed on. Increased food supply can increase

growth rates of juveniles at higher temperatures. They sampled the river from February to April this year and measured insect drift with drift nets and sampled the substrate with Surber samplers. They seined for juvenile Chinook to see their diets. The samples are being processed and there were no results to present.

16. TMC Identification of September TMC Meeting Topics

Caryn Huntt DeCarlo referred the TMC to the list of potential September TMC meeting topics. These included:

An assessment of past Solicitor reviews of landowner well property issues by Huntt DeCarlo.

TRRP Science objectives/metrics by Jennifer Norris.

Site Revisit Overview by Mike Dixon (may be delayed until December).

Strategic Plan for the Program by DeCarlo, Norris and Dixon (may be delayed until December).

Klamath Dam Removal by Dave Meurer (may be delayed until December due to meeting location).

SAB selection process and Program SAB needs by Norris.

Program Peer Review process by Norris.

Update on DSS and Adaptive Management by Norris (Jenny stated may not be timely for September).

Assessment of Flow effectiveness (may be addressed through the synthesis reports, how effective are ROD flows, improvements). Bill Pinnix may be able to present something on outmigrants.

The TMC suggested these additional topics:

Jennifer Norris could present on potential science projects that may be funded. Terri Simon-Jackson said this discussion should include the balance of administration, implementation, and science. She also suggested it prudent to avoid a long discussion on funding new science projects without a look at the synthesis of the science. Mike Orcutt wanted to keep focus on the restoring the trust responsibility for tribal fishing.

Other suggested topics were the winter variable flow (Robert Franklin will be presenting on the White Paper and Huntt Decarlo on SIR), a possible field trip while at the Weitchpec meeting site in September, a suggestion was made of maybe to Mill Creek or Supply Creek on HVT reservation, an update on the refinements (Huntt DeCarlo noted Chad Smith said this wouldn't occur at TMC only days after the August 29 workshop), fall flows augmentation update by Don Bader, KBAO Project update water ops for the 2018 year, Terri Simon-Jackson asked for an update on budget and any updates on the BAs, Reinitiation of Consultation on LTO, process for FY19 Science proposals, and a presentation by NOAA on HGMP.

17. Discussion of TRRP Science

Huntt DeCarlo noted there was a lot of discussion about this item on the recent teleconference, but there were no specifics asked for staff to prepare. She suggested this be an open topic that TMC could lead discussions on topics they wanted addressed.

Tony LaBanca stated he would like to see a timeline for Adaptive Management plan, how can TMC help, wants to see a vision, a logical order, process. Mike Orcutt said the discussion he recalled on the conference call was larger in scope and he felt when they had a full assessment of the Program, they needed to understand where they wanted to go. He said he was in favor of

moving slowly and given the change of personnel they need to take a look at where they want to go. Terri Simon-Jackson asked about the August meeting on the Refinements. Justin Ly commented on the adaptive management process. He said metrics and synthesis reports are part of process, asked what is next after the synthesis reports and what are we going to do with them, sees a gap that needs to be filled. Jennifer Norris said it is challenging to think out too far and the adaptive management is not just a science issue, but also a programmatic issue and is a multi-step process. Tony LaBanca said he agreed with Ly and was looking for a strategic vision. Norris thought that the structural issues also need to be addressed along with adaptive management. Terri Simon-Jackson said it might be okay to leave this open-ended and that it is possibly okay to proceed without a clear vision of the path forward at this time, because we have a clear vision of success. Ly agreed with inclusion of the whole program as part of the adaptive management, but he thought it should be spearheaded by the Science Coordinator. Tony agreed a lot of responsibility is with the Science Coordinator. Nick Hetrick agreed that adaptive management is much greater than just Science and Science needs to be working alongside the Implementation and giving feedback to Implementation and Implementation needs to have equal role with Science in adaptive management. Simon-Jackson also said the public is an important part of the Program and it is disheartening that they may not understand some of the risks taken and not value the Program.

Huntt DeCarlo gave some more information on the August 29 Refinements meeting. Task 5 will be presented in a workshop. LaBanca asked for more clarity on what is expected of them.

Action item: Caryn Huntt DeCarlo will get more information on what to expect at the August 29 Refinements workshop.

18. Public Forum: Comments from the Public

Vivian Helliwell thanked the TMC and its hard work. She wants the Program to be successful, but is concerned about outside criticisms. She talked about effect of actions to community fishing groups. She thought it important to pay attention to legal staff to avoid conflict of interest and stressed the TMC give reports to Congress and the public.

Adjourn for Day 2, 3:00 p.m.

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
June 2018 Quarterly Meeting
Location: Humboldt Bay Aquatic Center
921 Waterfront Drive, Eureka, CA

Agenda for June 13-14, 2018 (*WebEx info on page 2*)

Wednesday June 13, 2018

<u>Time</u>		<u>Discussion Leader</u>
	<i>Regular Business:</i>	
9:00	Introductions and Meeting Business:	Don Bader, Chair
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Welcome and Introductions ▪ Approval of Agenda ▪ Approval of March TMC Meeting Minutes ▪ CVP Operations Update 	
9:30	Public Forum: Comments from the public	Don, Chair
9:45	Report from Executive Director	Caryn Hunt DeCarlo
	<i>Information / Decision Items:</i>	
10:15	Progress on Winter Flow Variability	Caryn/Robert Franklin/ Hank Seemann
10:30	Cannabis Cultivation Regulatory Process in Trinity County	Keith Groves
10:45	Break	
11:00	Riding the Adaptive Management Loop: Habitat Assessment Informs Restoration	Josh Boyce/ Damon Goodman
12:00	Lunch	
1:00	Overview Program Status Channel Rehabilitation Projects	Mike Dixon
2:00	TRRP Accomplishments Summary from 2016 and Draft 2017 Annual Reports	Caryn
2:30	FY19 Watershed FOA and Ranking Process	Mike Dixon
3:00	Break	
3:15	FY18 and FY19 Budget Updates and Recommendations for Surplus funds and/or Funding Cuts	Caryn
	<i>Decision Item</i>	
4:45	Public Forum, Comments from the public	Don, Chair
5:00	Adjourn	
6:30	TMC Dinner Wed. June 13 Jack's Seafood, 4 C St, Eureka, CA (707) 273-5273	

Thursday June 14, 2018

<u>Time</u>		<u>Discussion Leader</u>
	<i>Regular Business:</i>	
9:00	Public Forum: Comments from the public	Don Bader, Chair
	<i>Information / Decision Items:</i>	
9:15	Presentation on Run Size, Stock Projections and Harvest Monitoring for Fall Chinook Salmon	George Kautsky
10:00	Introduction to Cohort Reconstruction for Trinity River Naturally-produced Fall Chinook Salmon	Ken Lindke
10:30	2018 Flow Release Drift Monitoring	Kyle De Julio +
10:45	TMC Identification of September TMC Meeting Topics	Caryn
11:00	Break	
11:15	Discussion of TRRP Science	TMC
12:15	Public Forum: Comments from the public	Don, Chair
12:30	Adjourn	

WebEx and Call in Information:**TMC - Day 1 - June 13**

Call-in number: 1-408-792-6300

Passcode: 805 049 993

Web Link: <https://trrp.webex.com/trrp/j.php?MTID=mb6c26dd43e68dcd1d02f3af6fca98e54>**TMC - Day 2 - June 14**

Call-in number: 1-408-792-6300

Passcode: 803 646 502

Web Link: <https://trrp.webex.com/trrp/j.php?MTID=mdb01a483313b503c6fd1aa9cdab90844>**TMC 2018 Quarterly Meetings**March 28 – 29, 2018 – **Weaverville, TRRP Office, 1313 South Main Street****June 13 – 14, 2018 – Eureka, Humboldt Bay Aquatic Center, 921 Waterfront Drive**September 5– 6, 2018 – **Weitchpec, Yurok Tribe Weitchpec Office, CA-96**December 5 – 6, 2018 – **Redding, Forest Service, Shasta-Trinity Headquarters, 3644 Avtech Parkway****Remaining 2018 Monthly Teleconference Calls: 10:00-noon**

July 26, August 23, October 25, November 15

TMC Refinements Workshop:August 29, 2018, 9:00 to 5:00 – **Weaverville, TRRP Office, 1313 South Main Street**