

Final Meeting Notes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
Quarterly Meeting
July 21-22, 2020
MS Teams Video Conference

Day 1, July 21, 2020 8:30 am

Attending Members

Member	Representative Seat
Justin Ly	NOAA Fisheries, Chair
Dan Bader	Bureau of Reclamation, Vice Chair
Dan Everson	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Michael Dixon	Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director
Mike Orcutt	Hoop Valley Tribe
Tony LaBanca	California Department of Water Resources
Dave Hillemeier	Yurok Tribe
Lois Shoemaker	U.S. Forest Service
Keith Groves*	Trinity County

*Trinity County was not present on July 21 due to a conflict with the Trinity County Board of Supervisors meeting.

Additional attendees: Teresa Connor (CDWR), Scott Russell (USFS), James Lee (TRRP), Seth Naman (NMFS), Nick Som (USFWS), Ken Lindke (CDFW), Kyle DeJuilio (Yurok), George Kautsky (HVT), Elizabeth Hadley (Reclamation), Kevin Held (TRRP), Nick Hetrick (USFWS), Dominick Davis (NMFS), Justin Alvarez (HVT), Edgar Hernandez (NMFS), Elizabeth Sandoval (Trinity County RCD), Robert Franklin, Ann Lubas-Williams (Reclamation), Bill Pinnix (USFWS), Kelly Gant, Thomas Schlosser, Kristen Hiatt (Reclamation), Josh Israel (Reclamation), Trent Tuthill, Scott McBain

Notes: Sabrina Kleinman (EPP)

Motions

Tony LaBanca made a motion to approve the meeting agenda.

Lois Shoemaker seconded the motion

Motion passed with 7 votes in favor. Trinity County was absent.

Dan Everson made a motion to approve the March TMC meeting minutes.

Tony LaBanca seconded the motion.

Motion passed with 7 votes in favor. Trinity County was absent.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the Executive Director shall convene a budget sub-committee to work with the IDT and RIG leads to identify a three-year budget planning and justification tool effective FY22. A frame of reference should be the Feinstein budget developed in 2008 (for years 2008-2012) by the DOI lead drafting service. The objective would be to refine the 2008 Program costs to better reflect today's and future needs.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

Dave Hillemeier made a friendly amendment to note the indexing from the original Feinstein budget.

Motion passed with 7 votes in favor. Trinity County was absent.

Motions (cont.)

Keith Groves made a motion to accept the amended members list for the Science Plan Drafting Committee.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to direct staff to pursue a sole source grant/contract with the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation to administer TRRP's Watershed Grant Program. If sole source is not possible, then issue a competitive request for proposal for this purpose. If the Watershed Program does not exceed \$500,000 in a given year, including administrative overhead, then no more than 50% of funds shall be awarded in the South Fork of the Trinity River in that year. There are no limitations on how any additional funds to the \$500,000 can be apportioned.

Keith Groves seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to adopt the budget recommendation proposal under the hybrid approach for Status and Trend Monitoring with the caveat that if additional funding becomes available, the first priority will be to make the Technical Assistance Funding whole.

Keith Groves seconded the motion.

Mike Orcutt made a friendly amendment to include Science Monitoring to receive funds.

Dave Hillemeier did not accept the amendment

Mike Orcutt made a friendly amendment to add "including another IDT review of the 40-mile hydraulic model data collection" after "funding becomes available."

Dave Hillemeier did not accept the amendment.

Motion failed with 5 votes opposed and 3 votes in favor. NOAA Fisheries, USFWS, and Yurok Tribe voted in favor.

Dan Everson made a motion to adopt the budget recommendations under the hybrid approach with the caveat that if additional funding becomes available, those funds would be redistributed to the Status and Trend Monitoring projects that are not cut under the hybrid approach.

Mike Orcutt seconded the motion.

Motion passed with 7 votes in favor, and 1 vote opposed. The State of California voted against.

Action Items

- Josh Israel will send Justin Alvarez the modeling appendix for the LTO of the CVP and SWP to send to the TMC.
- Chad Smith will set up the MS Teams for the Program Document and Science Plan Drafting Committees
- Chad Smith will send out a Doodle poll to schedule the first few Drafting Committee meetings.
- TMC members should send their ideas on what they want to learn from other programs and where they are looking for other ideas. Those ideas should be sent to the Program Document Drafting Committee.
- Michael Dixon will determine how much TRRP spends processing the watershed grants.
- TMC members will review and report potential COVID-19 costs savings from their budgets.
- Tony LaBanca will compile and send the TMC members the run size numbers for the hatchery

Regular Business

Welcome and Introductions

Ly opened the meeting with roll call of all participants. Due to COVID-19, the meeting was held over MS Teams. Tony LaBanca announced this would be his last TMC meeting as he is retiring a few days before the next meeting. Teresa Connor will serve as the primary for the State of California until a new representative is selected at CDFW.

Approval of Agenda

Mike Dixon noted the discussion with Headwaters on Day 2 would be shorter than planned. Anyone wishing to join for the budget discussion should join the meeting earlier as a precaution. Tony LaBanca asked that the agenda note what decision is needed for the Decision Items as some may be more discussion items. Ly explained that for some items, a decision is not required but the TMC may decide to take a vote on information presented and discussed. Dixon added that some designations are based on suggestions from TMC members, such as the KBAO discussion, where a decision may occur after members get direction and clarity on a topic. The items are noted to let members know what items they should be present for.

Tony LaBanca made a motion to approve the agenda.

Lois Shoemaker seconded the motion.

Motion passed with 7 votes in favor. Trinity County was absent.

Approval of March TMC Meeting Minutes

Dan Everson made a motion to accept the March TMC Meeting Minutes

Tony LaBanca seconded the motion.

Motion passed with 7 votes in favor. Trinity County was absent.

Public Forum

No comments were given.

Report from the Executive Director

Construction on the Dutch Creek Channel is underway. The design for this project was long coming, with designs in 2012, NEPA starting in 2014, and a variety of cultural and FEMA roadblocks between the Reclamation and USFS processes. Dixon credited the NEPA team for their work on this project. Construction of Dutch Creek crossed the river this week. Don Bader noted that the teams were well ahead of the approval process during the last few projects. Dixon added that the team finalized their permits and clearances a few months ahead of construction and that they have nearly finished environmental compliance work for Chapman Phase B, almost a year ahead of schedule. However, COVID-19 has caused disruptions for some required monitoring work.

Organizational Updates

Chad Abel has been hired as the Implementation Branch Chief. He will start at the end of August and had recently served as the Administrator of the Treaty Natural Resources Division for the Red Cliff Tribe in Wisconsin. Oliver Rogers has been selected as the Civil Engineer. Dixon

noted his broad experience from serving in the smaller Northwest California Resource Conservation and Development Council. Dixon is planning to only hire one of the two vacant engineering technician positions.

Implementation Update

Dutch Creek is in full construction mode. Communication with the crew has been a challenge as they have little radio coverage, even with a satellite phone and radio repeaters. TRRP is looking for solutions in case of an emergency. They are getting more satellite phones and will take down the repeaters next week, so there will be no radio coverage for about four days. Staff will have satellite phones but may need to travel a good distance to get a signal. Construction is planned to continue through the fall.

The Chapman Phase B FONSI is due for release at the end of the month. Project will be large and will exceed annual budget funding. The budget proposal is for \$2.5 million. Much of the construction is planned for outside of the channel, so it will not be constrained by the in-channel seasonal restrictions. Out-of-channel tasks will provide some cost savings and will allow the project to span two fiscal years. Dixon will be working with DJ Bandrowski and Justin Alvarez on a build-out plan for the two fiscal year project.

Design on Sky Ranch has paused until the land exchange is finalized. There is a land swap that still needs to happen. Shoemaker added that the USFS portion of the land exchange is done.

The Yurok Tribe has applied for state funding for the Oregon Gulch project, which will be the largest project built since it is at valley-scale. The project is the next one in the NEPA queue once Chapman Ranch Phase B is completed.

California and Yurok design teams will consolidate and work on Sawmill and Evans Bar projects. The BLM permit for Sawmill is running out of time and they need FEMA floodplain modeling. It will be fast tracked by the joint team.

Hoopa Valley is working on the Upper Connor Creek design. The 30% report is expected in September and may be presented at the September TMC meeting. The site is a heavily impacted mine site near the Junction City campground. There are constraints with private property and an active boat launch area. Alvarez confirmed that the team was trying to get the 30% design done to show the TMC team in September.

Orcutt asked if the average of \$3 -3.5 million was for construction or if it included design work. Dixon explained it was for actual construction. Orcutt asked how the list of projects related back to the original 47-site concept and metric. Dixon answered the metric has changed from the original list as some sites have grown, been combined, or removed. Of the original 47, 33 are done and the list of current projects it would bring it to 37-39. Dixon noted that two sites on the original list are currently functioning and not likely to be restored. Four sites in the Poker Bar reach are limited in what can be done because of how close houses are to the river. That leaves about 45 of the 47 sites. The list is missing Lower Rush Creek and Middle Steiner Flat. Soldier

Creek is also uncertain because there is not consensus regarding whether or not a project should be designed there.

Orcutt mentioned the 47 sites because there was discussion in the past about how long the program would last between the construction and monitoring phases. He asked about Reclamation's thinking on how long construction would last. Dixon said that the Design teams and Work Group were concerned that many of the sites didn't meet their habitat objectives. There is no functional floodplain at many early sites. The TRRP may need to revisit some sites using adaptive management and science to evaluate how they are doing and alter course.

The TRRP received the letter of concurrence for the BA on northern spotted owl, gray wolves, and marbled murrelet. They expect the BO at the end of August for the fisheries consultation on non-flow related activities. The consultation provides broad coverage to partners to avoid re-consultation. USACE, USFWS, USFS, and the BLM are seeking participating agency status under the BO. Kyle DeJulio asked if the August deadline was firm as one of the projects is scheduled to start 7 days after the letter. Dixon and Ly confirmed that since the BO had already been extended from the original timeline, the August 30 deadline was firm. Ly explained there were a few items they needed clarification for their analysis which was the reason for the delay.

Public Outreach

Kevin Held reported that COVID-19 had canceled many public events. The team is working with Elizabeth Sandoval at the Trinity County RCD to develop environmental education kits and materials for students and schools. They've created some videos for schools and the community. The annual report is completed and hard copies will be distributed in a few weeks. They are working with a videographer for the Dutch Creek Project. They are conducting interviews with partners and staff and the final product should be done in December. They are still working on regular newsletters and information for the Trinity Journal for monitoring updates and articles to showcase scientific news.

Orcutt asked if there was a way to expand their media coverage to the Times Standard and Redding Searchlight. He thought expanding the information to other areas would provide a broader base of support to buffer the response from local communities. Held stated they were working with Reclamation to reach broader news outlets.

FY20 Budget Updates

Due to salary savings this year, all the items on the TMC's ranked funding list from December were funded. Construction materials for next year has also been funded and are proposing to not fund gravel processing and large wood line items since they are funded this year. Based on the March TMC vote, the pool stratification study has been funded as well as the joint Yurok-California Design team for the Sawmill gravel site. LaBanca asked if other savings had been identified from COVID-19 reduced costs. Dixon answered that they have not identified Program Office Savings and hadn't seen anything from travel reductions and monitoring work. LaBanca noted that with the budget discussion on Day 2, they may be able to solve some problems if they know about those savings. Ly asked all agencies review their current monitoring budgets for

potential savings for the FY21 discussion. Orcutt noted that each entity has different regulations and protocols and contractor requirements that affect their Cooperating Agreements and other funding mechanisms. He was not sure if that was the best way to look for budget savings.

Science Update

James Lee reported the Trinity River Effectiveness Monitoring synthesis report was now in peer review. There are a number of reports in final edits. The synthesis report on salmon habitat at summer base flows from 2005-2015 has also been completed. It is a concise report and Lee encouraged all TMC members to read it. The review of habitat improvements was mixed with short-term gains and declining rearing over time. GMA Hydrology also finished the gravel implementation monitoring report and data package.

Work Group Updates

Fish (Ken Lindke) – The group met once in the last quarter. They adopted Capacity based on a paper by Nick Som as a metric fish habitat. The WG recommends that the metric be used across the program to quantify physical habitat. They finalized three other targets (juvenile fish habitat, Spring Chinook harvest, and reduced predation and competition by brown trout). There are a few targets they have left to finalize but are waiting for results from the synthesis reports. They discussed the application of the S3 model for hydrograph development and will revisit the discussion in the coming year. The group plans to look at juvenile outmigration temperature targets at Weitchpec and compare it with other developed temperature targets. They will also look at future management of Hamilton Ponds with DWR. They plan to continue development of targets and objectives.

Design (Justin Alvarez) – The group is trying to schedule a float for the Design teams to look at sites and see how they've done with flows. Their next meeting is scheduled for the beginning of next month when they will discuss the Dutch Creek site.

Flow (Seth Naman) – Seth took over for Todd as coordinator in April and they have met once in the last quarter. The group went through updates on the macroinvertebrate study and juvenile off-channel rearing. They discussed major objectives work for the next year. The group is interested in pursuing some winter flow variability and they developed a strategy to synchronize accretion flows with dam flows. They can provide an update on that work at the September meeting or one of the conference calls. The group will develop a briefing paper to support their ideas, which will be their focus for the next year.

Watershed did not meet.

Physical (James Lee) – The group met in March and last week. They are working on a list of gravel augmentation sites. They are also working on objectives and metrics.

Riparian and Aquatic Ecology (Lee) – Chis Laskodi is the new coordinator. They have had some challenges scheduling a meeting but have one planned in the next few weeks.

Eric Peterson is conducting a pilot study on algae monitoring to see what species are present and their distribution. He can provide an update on his findings in the fall. Algae has been found in the river in the last decade. TRRP has received calls from the public due to concerns about blue-green algae and public safety. There is a gap in the Program's knowledge about algae and there is not a clear explanation of what is going on. Eric is working to characterize those patterns and he has applied for a Reclamation science and technology grant to do some water sampling. One thought is that it is linked to nutrient run-off. Another is that they are disturbance driven or that macroinvertebrate herbivores may influence it.

Ly asked about the color coding for the Synthesis report table. Lee explained green means the project is on track, blue is finished, and orange is overdue. Ly asked that the flow synthesis report be added to the table. Lee agreed and noted that there had been issues with finalizing the AFA that included the report.

George Kautsky asked for a brief overview on the targets development. He thought the progress on the targets should be celebrated and TMC should be able to review and discuss them once they are finalized. Hillemeier agreed and added that they would like a presentation on the flow variability paper at the next TMC meeting rather than on a conference call. Nick Hetrick added that the streamflow and habitat rehabilitation synthesis report was finished and would be available by the end of the day. Lindke offered to answer any other questions members may have for the Fish WG since they did not have the opportunity for in-person discussion.

COVID-19 Impacts

Lee reported that most partners have worked remotely and travel is almost non-existent. CDFW did start work at the Junction City weir but there are concerns about how to safely shuttle boats. Yurok started with a 1 person per vehicle policy but have loosened it for shuttling boats. Hoopa Valley is still shut down, which has made travel difficult. The Pear Tree Gulch rotary screw trap started in May, which is later than normal and may affect data quality as it did miss the main outmigrant pulse.

Orcutt clarified that Hoopa Valley Tribe has reviewed protocols from different entities and been progressively doing work such as essential fisheries programs. He requested that the IDT review the protocols in place for different projects as there are several integrated projects with varying degrees of coordination. He asked why their protocols were not listed. Lee agreed to meet with Alvarez to look at the protocols used by Hoopa Valley Tribe. Lee noted that Hoopa Valley Tribe did install an irrigation system at Chapman Ranch Phase A and are working on revegetation details so they can hit the site quickly when the planting window opens. Dixon explained that the COVID impacts listed in the ED report were based on response to a June 18 email to TMC members. The list was not to imply that members did not have protocols in place.

Hillemeier asked if there had been a level established for the spring Chinook harvest and if it accounted for conservation measures and harvest management activities that may minimize the population. Lindke answered the target was developed similarly to the fall Chinook target and that an actual number of fish defines the target. In terms of conservation and harvest practices, all

targets are designed for a recovered system. For spring Chinook, they have an escapement target. The harvest target considers what the harvest would look like under a fully recovered population and doesn't take the status of the current population into account. It is designed to provide a quantitative target for a recovered population. Hillemeier asked if they looked at recruitment and carrying capacity as it relates to other parts of the basin. Lindke answered they hadn't and that they were looking at fall Chinook as a surrogate as they did not have that data for spring populations currently. The stock recruitment model is used for the fall Chinook harvest control rule and it may not apply to springs. Since spring Chinook are monitored loosely, there is not nearly as much information as for fall Chinook. They had coded wire tag recovery from the ocean and freshwater, but is not as much information.

Orcutt asked if the Fish WG received the information and data needed to separate cohort, harvest, and escapement for harvest spring Chinook. Lindke noted that it wasn't a Fish WG project and that the cohort study was only for fall Chinook. Lindke recently received the R cohort reconstruction model from the CDFW Ocean Salmon Project and Southwest Fisheries Science Center and is learning the code to test and finalize the model. They are behind schedule on the study as there were challenges getting the data and the model. The study should inform targets by comparing the cohort reconstruction against the harvest and escapement targets to reframe the information based on cohort rather than by returns each year, as annual returns are comprised of multiple cohorts.

Trends in Water and Power Funding

Ann Lubas-Williams presented funds collected by CVPIA from water and power customers. The data was from 2000, when the ROD was signed, to 2019. During dry years, they made up declining collections from water users with higher collections from power users. However, due to litigation, what would be changing in FY21. Lubas-Williams noted that the totals at the bottom of the table included collections from as far back as 1993. Orcutt asked if there was a cap on collections. Lubas-Williams stated there was a \$30 million cap on mitigation and restoration going back to 1992. Inflated for 2020 numbers, it's about \$54.8 million in collections. Each year Congress appropriates the amount of money they can spend from the fund, even though more may be collected. Orcutt asked if the table reflected only the restoration fund. Lubas-Williams confirmed it was and that if more than the allocation is collected, the remaining goes into a reserve fund. Orcutt asked about the cost allocation table (which was not shown) and how that relates to how restoration funds are used and other funding sources so the TMC could get the whole picture.

Lubas-Williams continued that the TMC uses the water-related funds along with CVPIA authority. Fisheries restoration uses that appropriation because it's the most specific to CVPIA and they have direct authority to reimburse CVPIA under P.L. 101-575. Hillemeier asked if the collections declined during recent years. Lubas-Williams answered it had gone up and down each year. In 2021, they will use a proportional number due to litigation. Reclamation sets up collections at the beginning of each calendar year. CVPIA collections are based on the previous

year and Western Area Power Administration is done mid-year based on March/April based on the current fiscal year. In dry years, power typically made up the difference, but that will change in the future. Kautsky asked if power customers and agriculture were losing interest in hydropower and how that affected conservation funds. Lubas-Williams answered CVPIA provides \$1.5 million directly and approximately \$10 million is provided to TRRP through water-related funds that use CVPIA authority. Kautsky asked if contributions from these sources were reimbursable to taxpayers. Lubas-Williams explained that 85.6% is reimbursed from water and power and 14% goes to taxpayers. Kautsky asked how reimbursements would be affected if users pull away from water and hydropower. Lubas-Williams answered that Western is working on its renewal now with Power customers and they are unsure if they will renew. She was unsure of what would happen if they did not renew. Kautsky asked the TMC to discuss further at the next TMC meeting.

BREAK

TRRP Environmental Education and Outreach

Elizabeth Sandoval (Project Coordinator for the Trinity County Resource Conservation District) reviewed work RCD has completed with the TRRP. The RCD is a special state district that provides collaboration on natural resource issues for public and private landowners. In addition to education and outreach, RCD also assists landowners with native vegetation planting, road work, GIS mapping, and other technical assistance. As COVID-19 has impacted 2020 activities across the board. Sandoval reviewed their work with the TRRP in 2019 and years prior. Overall, the RCD and TRRP have worked together to build community support and trust through strategic messaging, meetings, and events, built awareness of the benefits of restoration, and enhanced the TRRP's identity in the community. In the future, RCD and TRRP hope to provide more concise messaging through volunteer opportunities, project videos, formal watershed curriculum, and better incorporation of native cultures in education materials. They are currently working on the 2021 Trinity River survey and hope to complete the survey distribution and analysis by next year. They are working to transfer many of their brochures into an electronic format. Dixon noted that RCD was asked to present today to showcase their work with TRRP as their funding is up for renewal in FY21. Orcutt offered to provide Sandoval with contact information for Hoopa Valley's RCD to explore ways of partnering with neighboring counties to better address cultural issues and more direct outreach to the Klamath-Trinity Unified School District. For additional information, Elizabeth can be contacted at esandoval@tcrd.net or 530-623-6004 ext. 10. Her presentation can be found on the TRRP website.

CVP Operations Update

Don Bader reported that the projected reservoir elevations for September are low. Elevation at Trinity River is 2,317 ft and is projected at 2,276 by end of September, down another 40 ft and representing 1.2 million acre-feet of volume. Overall, Trinity Reservoir would be at about half capacity (full is 2.4 million acre feet). Shasta Lake today is at 1.9 million acre-feet, which is at the cold-water pool. Both reservoirs will need healthy winters to refill.

Work at Spring Creek has been precarious because there is no bypass. Reclamation is getting the second unit completed to start diverting water. They will mobilize in August at Trinity Power Plant to install the other new runner for Unit 2. The work is timed to get it ready for service for healthy ROD flows in April and depends on the stop in construction on Hwy 299, which can cause delays in getting crews out.

The Lower Klamath has hit the driest year on record with 2,430 cfs, which is way below the 25% exceedance. The long-term ROD plan calls for roughly 2,800 cfs target flow and they are currently below that. Paul Zedonis is leading the technical team and is looking for input from entities and believes there will be extremely low returns for fish, which will impact augmentation of flows. The team will continue to look at conditions on the Lower Klamath. The accretions are dropping off the table as they were at 2,800 cfs less than a week ago. It is not looking good and they are keeping an eye on it.

Orcutt asked why Shasta had been drawn down less than Trinity? Bader answered that Shasta is under 2 million, which is 40% of capacity. Draw downs depend on how much they can draw through Buckhorn and Whiskeytown Lake, with the primary goal of maintaining a sufficient cold-water pool. Orcutt asked how the corresponding diversion rates for the reservoirs relate to the 50/50 balance in critically dry years. Bader answered it bounces around annually. This year is an outlier with a total at 60,000 acre-feet, which is above ROD flows for critically dry volumes. Orcutt agreed to work with Paul as the Tribe is concerned about spring fish and the potential for *Macrosystin* and other concerns when flows are below the 2,800 cfs needed for fish to enter the system. Dixon added that several tributaries were also disconnected at their deltas and river temperatures are very high. Kautsky noted that there could be a large amount of variation from the salmon escapement forecasts, which while unbiased, aren't highly precise as some years have had 30% to 6-fold differences from the preseason forecast when compared with post-season abundance estimates. He suggested looking at the overall ecology and determining other ancillary variables to inform the the need for action, because forecasted run size is not highly precise. The run size is known with more precision only after the fish have arrived. By then, it may be too late to take action.

LUNCH

Discussion of TRRP Three Year Budget Process

Kautsky discussed how a three-year budget forecast could inform the future of the Program given the federal budget process and the current outlook for diminishing resources. He recalled a three-year budget process at one point to conform with how federal partners built their budgets through appropriations. He suggested adding two additional columns to the existing budget spreadsheets to show the trajectory for projects in FY22 and FY23, which could provide a more comprehensive road map for the federal budget process, influence decision makers, and provide budget development for the Program.

The reality for 2020 and beyond is figuring out how to fit a decent sized science program in the budget. The program has evolved over time and we can anticipate some of its needs, but we are

being told to reduce our budget which risks the TMC paring down science, administration, and implementation programs until it does not get what it needs. Kautsky wanted to build a budget planning process that forecasts outyear expenditures so the federal government can anticipate what's coming and have a comprehensive picture of where the Program's going. That information could make it easier for NCAO to inform the Mid-Pacific Region of BOR [sic; California-Great Basin Region] and, in turn, strengthen the appropriations process at the national level to promote a more successful program.

Orcutt asked how the program would make a 3-year budget request. He noted that there had been a history of shifts in the Program's budget from Reclamation. Initially Reclamation prepared a skeletal budget of major costs that ranged from \$11 to 18 million, but they were only obligated to provide \$7 million. Hoopa Valley and others pushed for a hearing and Congressman Michael Thompson introduced a bill to rectify the difference and make the Program a priority. In a 2007 table from DOI and Senator Feinstein, estimated the Program needed \$16 million for construction and around \$11 million for monitoring. Then construction was estimated at \$200,000 to \$250,000 per site, which evolved over time. Orcutt noted that the amount was based on 2007 dollars and hadn't been indexed to current amounts. Ly asked if the Program was supposed to receive \$20 million+ based on an estimate of \$16 mil for construction and \$11 million for monitoring. Orcutt answered that under Regional Director Don Glaser they got close, but never received \$20 million.

Kautsky showed the table developed with Sen. Feinstein in 2007 that showed the difference in funding between the Construction vs. Monitoring phases of the Program, where costs were reduced to \$11-11.9 million. He noted the costs have shifted from 12 years ago and need to be indexed to current dollars. Kautsky thought that clearly stating the long-term needs of the Program can better influence the process rather than taking uniform cuts across the board. He believed the work groups and IDT should be involved.

 **Trinity River Restoration Program**
Projected Costs for Construction and O&M: FY2008 to FY2030¹
(all dollars in millions)

	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	Average Annual FY2015-FY2030
Construction	6.6-6.8 ²	6.6-9.8	5.9-6.6	6.2-7.8	3.1-4.3	0.0-0.2	0.0-0.2	0.0-0.2
First 5-Year Construction Average ³	6.4							
Operations and Maintenance⁴	9.5-10.2	10.1-10.3	9.5-9.5	9.6-9.9	10.4-10.8	11.7-11.8	11.0-11.6	10.8-11.0
First 5-Year O&M Average	10.0							
Total Costs	16.1-17.0	16.8-20.2	15.3-16.1	15.7-17.6	13.6-15.0	11.8-11.9	11.2-11.6	10.8-11.2
First 5-Year Average All Costs	16.4							

Lee asked if the approach should be done simultaneously with Refinements or with discussion on cuts to monitoring. Kautsky suggested that the Refinements could leverage better adaptive

management. The process could help the Program better incorporate changes it sees coming in Science, so they're reflected in the future budgets. Orcutt asked DOI agencies if they would use this information in their internal budget processes. Dan Everson explained that USFWS would be happy to work on the planning exercise but they could only hold money for two years, as they can hold over money for next year from the current year. Hetrick added that this year, USFWS will be unlikely to carry over money. Anything they do not spend will be lost but was unsure if it would apply to future years. Everson added that USFWS is used to getting their annual appropriation and then speculating for the upcoming year based on previous year. Planning two years out is harder. Bader supported the idea and thought communication on the needs of the Program is needed. Looking at FY22 would get more visibility on the needs of the Program. Orcutt added there was value in developing a target based on the budget to provide strong advocacy for the budget planning and give the Program a target to shoot for. Kautsky proposed making a motion to memorialize the support for a 3-year budget process.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the Executive Director shall convene a budget sub-committee to work with the IDT and RIG leads to identify a three-year budget planning and justification tool effective FY2022. A frame of reference should be the Feinstein budget developed in 2008 (for the years 2008-2012) by the DOI lead drafting service. The objective would be to refine the 2008 Program costs to better reflect today's and future needs.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

Hillemeier made a friendly amendment that the motion should begin in FY22. LaBanca asked for clarification on the "frame of reference" and what aspect of the document should reference as the figures did not reflect cost of living or operation increases or changes in spending. Orcutt explained that the terms in the table are based on categories in the Green Book, BOR's Congressional budgeting document. . In the table, they provide annual estimates for 5 years and then a long-term average. Kautsky noted the budget has become more protracted as costs for construction have increased and therefore the pace of construction has slowed down. The sub-committee would use the budget as a planning tool under the context that the Program is still in the construction phase and pushing the Science and Monitoring phase to FY27 or FY30. Hillemeier noted that the Feinstein budget was for 2008-2012

Dave Hillemeier made a friendly amendment to note the indexing from the original Feinstein budget.

Motion passed with 7 votes in favor. Trinity County was absent.

IDT Discussion and Recommendations for FY21 Monitoring

Lee worked with the Project and Principal Investigators for nine projects in the Status and Trend Monitoring Program. After talking with the IDT, there are four options to reduce the budget, however the IDT could not reach a consensus recommendation and they have asked for a TMC decision. A recommendation could not be given due to policy concerns that affect the long-term planning on the budget. The technical trade-offs are also murky. Science was asked to reduce their budget by \$460,280 from Status and Trend Monitoring. Most of the Science budget is

inflexible and there are no cuts to the Effectiveness Monitoring budget. Lee's full presentation can be found on the TRRP website.

The projects under Status and Trend Monitoring have been ongoing and predate FY18 when the Science Program was overhauled. All the projects approved in FY18, were peer-reviewed by the SAB, and have a history of funding. To determine how reductions would change the budget, TRRP projected the FY21 Status Quo budget (FY20 + 3% increase) and then estimated that the cuts would reduce the budget to \$2,027,734.34. Each agency ranked the projects to determine their relative value (Trinity County and USFS were not present). Sport Harvest/Trinity Creel received no votes, the State's Lower Klamath Harvest was the second lowest with 2 votes, there was a tie for 3rd place between the HVT Harvest and the redd/carcass monitoring projects. Based on ranking, the four budget alternatives are:

1. Rank and Cut A: based on ranking, the two lowest projects would be cut, and then cut the redd/carcass monitoring project. This would leave \$21,994 on the table.
2. Rank and Cut B: The two lowest projects would be cut along with the HVT Harvest project. This would still leave a \$94,623 deficit to cut.
3. 18.5% Proportionate Reduction: Originally, all principals were asked to cut 15% from their budgets. Most could, with the exception of outmigrant monitoring and coded wire tagging at the hatchery as they have fairly fixed costs. However, a 18.5% was less feasible. While most projects could operate at 85% of their initial budgets, most could not at 83.5%.
4. Hybrid: The two lowest projects could be cut and the remaining projects would take a 10% cut.

The Science Program still has several activities planned for FY21 including work on the synthesis report, developing and finalizing the Work Group Objectives and Metrics, reconstituting the SAB, working on the Science and Monitoring Plan for the Refinements process, and developing a new Science Work Plan based on the adjusted funding environment. Because of Josh Israel's scheduled agenda slot and limited availability, Ly asked to revisit the discussion after the CVP presentation.

BREAK

Long-Term Operations of CVP – Trinity Impacts

Josh Israel presented the modeling for the Trinity Reservoir in the Long-Term Operations for the Central Valley Project re-consultation in 2019 (full presentation is on the TRRP website). The goal of the re-consultation was to better balance water needs with fisheries management objectives. Israel discussed how the cold pool management at Shasta affected the Trinity River modeling results. Overall, operations are very similar to current operations and could result in improved storage in drier years over the 2008-2009 BO by increasing storage in the winter. To manage the cold-water pool at Shasta, Reclamation developed a four tiered system that allows for flexibility in temperature management based on egg/fry temperature needs. Tier 1 is the best as the cold-water pool can be easily maintained below the 53.5 F target. Under Tier 2, the 53.5 F

temperature target is met during the temperature management period (May to October) , and allowed to increase outside of that. Under Tier 3, the 53.5 F target cannot be met, so the temperature is increased to 54.5F during a portion of the temperature management period. Tier 4 is the worst case scenario and requires temperatures be maintained at 56F.

This approach allows for better basement temperature management and takes advantage of temperature thresholds and facility improvements. Under the new plan, Reclamation has implemented a variety of survival targets for each tier. If they are unable to keep survival below 15% for two years, they will reopen consultation.

Ly asked if the No Action Alternative was the same as the Without Action Alternative in the BA. Israel said that it wasn't as the No Action Alternative was about the current operating scenario while the Without Action Alternative only looks at flood control mission and objectives rather than the current operating scenario. Thomas Schlosser asked why there was more water preserved in Shasta storage under the LTO action and if that was related to lower releases to the Sacramento River or higher tributary contributions. Israel answered that tributary inflow stayed the same but the change was due to Reclamation no longer doing the X2 Delta smelt habitat actions and improved refill operations.

Hillemeier asked if the 600,000 AF carryover storage on the Trinity River was analyzed for the LTO alternative or both alternatives. Israel stated it was for both as both options end up below the 600,000 ac-ft carry-over in 10-15% of years during severe multi-year drought. Israel explained that the Trinity River will see occasional minimal flows related to late fall-winter spills and slightly higher storage in the winter and very small differences in temperature during critically dry years. In terms of releases, the LTO action would have slightly higher temperatures in the fall during critical years, slightly higher in April, slightly reduced in the summer with more diversions in July and fewer in August. Flows during critically dry years will stay mostly the same with slightly higher temperatures in the fall and winter. In the summer, the LTO action would have lower temperatures during the management period.

Kautsky asked why the Lower Klamath fall2017 flow augmentation ROD was not expressed as a volume and why the Proviso 2 water was not included. Israel answered that he was not part of the modeling and did not know why the modelers didn't use volume for the ROD flows. For the Proviso 2 flows, CALSIM uses a monthly timestep, but there is not enough information on when or for how long the Proviso 2 flows would be used. Kautsky noted that there are examples such as the Trinity ROD which are modeled as a function of annual volumes without specific release schedules. Why then could not a volume of not less than 50,000-acre feet of water be similarly modeled on an annual basis demonstrating the retention of this volume in Trinity Reservoir for Humboldt County and downstream water users? Kautsky asked if the July period was driven by management of Trinity River temperature objectives and if Lewiston would affect Trinity River temperatures as the TRRP is looking at alternatives to managing temperatures, such as passing water through Lewiston? He also asked if changing the elevation at Shasta Reservoir would affect Trinity storage? Israel was unable to answer those questions as he did not do the modeling

work. Hillemeier asked if the differences between the LTO and NAA actions in critically dry years for diversions at Clear Creek tunnel had been quantified. Israel said that information was in tabular format in the modeling appendix. He said he could send it to Justin to distribute.

IDT Discussion and Recommendations for FY21 Monitoring (cont.)

Lee continued his discussion of the Science Budget cut alternatives. With the rank and cut alternatives, the remaining projects would remain whole. All of the projects have been peer-reviewed and their scopes would remain unchanged. However, all the projects are not entirely independent. The harvest projects enumerate fish before the weirs and are used in estimating the overall run sizes, which is important to the Program and its partners for making decisions. The link between TMC decision-making and the harvest monitoring is also vague, which makes it hard to cut one harvest project but not the others. Lee sees the projects as part of three larger efforts on run size estimate, cohort analysis, and outmigrant monitoring. Kautsky commented that the projects were more complementary or interdependent than overlapping. He noted that removing some projects may be concerning based on how they build the science program. While effectiveness monitoring may provide an immediate feedback loop, status and trend monitoring is important for providing a long-term evaluation of achieving the overarching goal of restoring pre-dam fisheries.

Lee noted that under the 18.5% reduction, the projects were initially asked to take a temporary 15% cut to buy time to restructure status and trend needs for FY22 and based on their projected work goals for FY21, but then the amount increased to 18.5%, of which he was less confident of doing. The IDT also had serious concerns on how cuts would affect the rotary screw traps. For example, Pear Tree would use day trips instead of having the technicians operate them on travel, which could allow debris to accumulate. The coded wire tagging is also rigid in terms of the number of fish that need to be tagged. The PI could get the costs down below 12% with reduced supervision. For the other projects, most of the cuts were accommodated from reduced efforts, but it is unclear how it affects data quality and power. For the State-run Project at Lower Klamath, the State proposed transferring funds from other projects to make up for the HVT portion to maintain the same level of effort with a reduced budget. The benefit of the proportionate reduction is that up-funding projects would be easy as technicians would be available and partners could need to increase efforts as money became available. Lee noted that some projects may need to resubmit their projects for peer review with their reduced scopes of work. Under the hybrid approach, however, it is more likely that the projects could absorb that cut. Some projects may need a new external peer review as their SOW are adjusted, but it would depend on the project.

Everson noted that determining how to cut the projects was less about whether the projects are providing something of value and more about whether the remaining projects provide what they need since the reductions are out of TRRP's control. It would be better to fund projects that provide good quality information rather than eking out projects over long periods of time. They

should consider what these projects look like over the next few years. Lee agreed and said that would be one of the benefits of the 3-year budgeting process

Kautsky thanked Lee for his extensive look at the projects. In response to Everson, Kautsky believed that the TMC was being forced to make value judgements. The TMC tends to think categorically when thinking about the larger question regarding the status and trend of fish populations. He expressed concern that the TMC was moving towards a project-focused approach that only provides partial information rather than a holistic approach which links multiple projects for resolving uncertainties. He suggested that they consider the problems and key uncertainties and then identify the types of assessments and supporting projects that will get us there. Much of this work has already been done once if not twice within the program. However, the pending action before the TMC today will serve to disrupt the foundations for comprehensive assessments.

Lee suggested that a Decision Support System (DSS) could shed light on the Program's higher priority needs. There is a suite of models that rely on the Flow Work Groups and there is a gap there. A programmatic DSS, as originally envisioned, would provide a basis for their modeling and help with flow scheduling. Connor asked which option would benefit the most from COVID-19 cost savings. Lee thought the 18.5% reduction, or the hybrid would allow funds to be put back.

BREAK

KBOA NFWF Experience/FY21 Watershed Restoration Business Model

Kristen Hiatt discussed the Klamath River Coho Restoration Grant Program's partnership with NFWF as a potential model for the Watershed Restoration grant program. Hiatt's presentation is available on the TRRP website, which reviews their grant process and requirements.

The biggest challenge they have is completing environmental compliance within the grant time frame. They identified a few ways to streamline the process. The biggest issue is that documents must go through Reclamation's process, which requires a substantial amount of time and backs up their priority list. Cultural resources also take time as documents must comply with Reclamation standards and reviews by the SHPO and Reclamation. They have started working with their grantees early on to ensure that the work starts sooner rather than later.

NFWF was selected through a competitive process based on their qualifications, experience, and organization. They have streamlined the grant administration process. Grant awards are bulk processed as a single award rather than having each grant proposal go through Reclamation's review. Hiatt reviewed a list of the grants that have been awarded since 2016. NFWF also hosts the website for the grant program (<https://www.nfwf.org/programs/bureau-reclamation-klamath-coho-habitat-restoration-program>) and provides brief summaries of all the awarded projects.

Ly asked if the Program was funding NEPA compliance. Hiatt responded that compliance is part the overall budget and project costs and allocations. Ly asked if Reclamation had considered a programmatic NEPA document for the activities under its program. Hiatt said they discuss it

annually but found it didn't speed things up as there was still site-specific NEPA needed. While a programmatic may speed-up the NEPA process, a written document to demonstrate compliance was required. For cultural resources, compliance work will always need to be done. One idea is to make a Programmatic Agreement, which takes a lot of time with the SHPO. We are working on a Klamath-specific PA which may speed things up, but it's taken many years and has a narrow scope.

Shoemaker noted that the USFS has partnered with NFWF and had good success getting matching dollars and increased investment on the ground. Their funding is only for projects with existing NEPA compliance and for specific treatments and objectives. NFWF has been good at making sure the partners spend the money appropriately. She noted that their evaluation process has taken much of the bias out of the system. Hiatt agreed that they have been very helpful with grant administration and workloads. They are working to become more focused on where they may have the most effect on salmon or where partners, tribes, and key stakeholders have needs. Connor asked if Reclamation was obligated to funding grants each year or if it could change annually. Hiatt said that Reclamation only obligates each year's funding. While the contract is for 5 years, there was a delay in Reclamation issuing the grant funds in 2015 and the grant won't end until FY21. They do a modification of the contract each year, which is fast and easy.

Connor noted that for the TRRP's grant program, the Watershed Work Group reviews and ranks the grants and then the TMC decides what to fund. She asked how NFWF would help with the evaluation given concerns that TMC members may be applicants. Hiatt explained they had not run into the issue and noted that there are ways to recuse members when evaluating projects and the TMC would need to individually tailor their evaluation committee. Hiatt added that they have templates and documents that the TRRP could use in its work with NFWF so they would not have to start from scratch.

Hetrick asked how NFWF estimate their costs. Hiatt answered they provide an administrative budget. Their program put out a full FOA for grant administration and NFWF replied with their documentation and a budget. A portion of the grants goes to NFWF for travel, labor, overhead, and per diem. Dixon noted that the TRRP does pay for grant administration costs outside of the \$500,000 grant amount. They have to annually route packages for review before and after they solicit grants, and then there are reviews in Sacramento and Denver that charge TRRP for that work. Using NFWF could free up some of that administrative costs. Hiatt explained that Reclamation requires a review of all grant awards. Under NFWF, they do one grant review each year and then they're done. Hetrick added that USFWS' work with NFWF has been positive and that stealing from the Klamath program would be a big help for the TRRP. Hiatt suggested that they may also have some environmental compliance they could use as well. Their program uses TSC to do some of the compliance as an option if additional funding is available.

Public Forum

Trent Tuthill (Friends of the Trinity River) commented that Friends has been trying to reorganize and continues to stand 100% behind the TRRP's restoration work and seeing fisheries restored.

The TRRP has had management challenges as noted in 2004, 2008, and now noted in the Headwaters report. Friends is encouraged that Chad Smith has been selected to implement the recommendations and they are 100% behind his work. They believe the recommendations are doable and will take collective effort by the TMC and the TRRP. It will likely take 18 to 24 months for changes to take place. If you look at adult fish returns, they have been going in the wrong direction and we are in worse shape than when the Program started. You could make some arguments about young fish returns that show higher number of small salmonids. But without adults to spawn, the river will become sterile in our lifetime, which is not what anyone wants. The TRRP, in relation to others, has a healthy budget and a decent amount of federal dollars to spend and it's a shame that more projects have not been done in the tributaries rather than just the mainstem. Because there has not been real adaptive management, there are no assessments about whether those projects have been beneficial to the river. The mainstem projects have not been beneficial and the Program should focus on tributary projects and get out of the mainstem river. Friends' desire for the program is to embrace the change Chad recommends and make some hard changes and decision on how the Program is made up. This is crucial and must happen if the Program is going to meet any of the ROD goals, and to increase the number of adult fish in the river to prevent a sterile river. Friends is unable to make the meeting tomorrow so they have provided comments today.

Kautsky appreciated Tuthill's remarks and underscored the significance of the adult fish and the need for acknowledging adult objectives in Program documents. The Program needs certain information to drive adaptive management and demonstrate the success of the Program. Overall performance of naturally produced fish and the monitoring used to answer that question such as escapement estimates, river and ocean harvest contributions brings that all together and informs all the stakeholders. Tuthill understands that each of the items are necessary to get the science needed for informed decisions. Prioritizing projects to get the appropriate data is critical. Hillemeier thanked Tuthill for his comments and offered him an open invitation to meet with Yurok Tribe staff and the TRRP to discuss items so they are operating on facts. Dixon added that the TRRP has been communicating with the Friends group and encouraged the Weaverville staff from the Yurok Tribe to join them the next time.

Adjourn for Day 1: 5:08 pm

Day 2, July 22, 2020, 8:30am

Welcome and Public Forum

Ly conducted roll call of all TMC members and the public. He opened the meeting to public comments. No comments were given.

TRRP Refinements Kick-off/Drafting Committees

Chad Smith, Headwaters, presented his approach and thoughts on starting the Refinements process for the TMC. Smith has been conducting one-on-one calls with TMC members over the past few weeks to hear about their individual needs and goals for Refinements. He asked the

TMC to describe what Refinement success looks like, what do they want to get out of the process, and what would be a successful endpoint.

Orcutt: For me it's pretty simple. It relates back to how I've seen my job and career and that's to leave the Trinity River that our elders and this tribe depended on for my youth. I have two daughters and one grandchild. My hope is that we leave a Trinity River that is something as close as we can in contemporary times to what our elders experienced. I've also said that the river meant survival to our Tribe. Our community and tribe takes that to heart. We see ourselves as that protector. The way I see the Restoration Program, we've had a three-legged stool we've been pursuing for as full funding as we can. We have a fairly full water supply. We have one remaining 50,000k Proviso 2 water that still needs to come in. In terms of adaptive management, we know a lot. We continue to evolve and yet, I'd observe, in recent time, we've seen major reductions in Chinook and the most in managed fall Chinook. In 2017, we had 814 fish available for 8,000 tribal members. It's not hard to see the tide turning on that. The Trinity River is the largest tributary in the Klamath basin. It's my hope that adaptive management will help, but we may be at status quo for all I know. My hope is that we're functioning and we can get more fish in the future.

Hillemeier: An overarching goal is a restored fishery for the Yurok Tribe to have a meaningful harvest. Having a fully functioning program that is less contentious than I have personally experienced, that has a successful adaptive management program that leads to thinking outside the box to address the issues that are limiting the fish since 2013; that's a high personal priority for myself and the Yurok tribe. The adaptive management component is really important and that is really a core issue that is limiting the abundance.

LaBanca: What I would add is that the TRRP and the TMC, is that we get transparent governments and administrative processes, specifically when the TMC meets we could work effectively towards the science and implementation goals rather than spinning out on controversial issues. So we're more in the background than in the forefront. That would be a specific success.

Dixon: I'll throw out that in addition to everything that's been said, a very specific thing if we're looking for success, is taking the progress with the IAP and the success of developing quantifiable objectives, and crafting a science program that is structured around our objectives and informing what we do. I'm pretty excited about the possibility that the Science Plan and DSS could push us over the hump toward being an adaptive management program.

Shoemaker: I think we really need to look at the efficiencies on how we operate on the TMC where the right folks are spending their time on the right things and there is a clear distinction on what be taken out so we can be more strategic and more tactical and more efficient use of our time on the science and implementation rather than the governance.

That can mean a lot of things to a lot of people and getting clarity on how to get there. Really just clarity, transparency, and that each group spends our time on the right things to make the best use of our time and energy.

Groves: One of the things I'd like to see in the TMC is a broader viewpoint, a wider scope, and not be so narrow to the long-term goal of more fish in the river. Trinity County gains benefits from water in the lake, in the river, and fish in the river. I've seen very narrow thinking out of this commission that we don't care about what happens on any other thing, we just want what we want. I think that's a mistake, if we look with a broader scope, we'll have more success.

Connor: For me, it'd be nice to get a system in place so there is a formal group of stakeholders either on the TMC or another group to get together and share their thoughts with us. We have a few folks that are supportive, like the Friends of the Trinity. We need a way to get the stakeholders back and involved.

Everson: I can't add much other than to reinforce the idea that success to me focuses on an efficient and effective management structure, or a more efficient and effective one.

Ly: From my end, having an end product and process that allows us to effectively achieve our goals of restoring and recovering fish and habitat and being able to prioritize projects and funding towards projects that help us to achieve those goals the quickest.

Smith thanked everyone for their thoughts and welcomed continued dialogue during the sessions. He liked that everyone was thinking big and jumping right into the discussion. Chad and his team would do their best to guide the team to a successful place and they have a good platform to build from. The Refinements team includes himself, as Project Manager, and several folks from ESSA, including Darcy Pickard, Dave Marmorek, and Caitlin Semmens. Headwaters teamed with ESSA to help link the effort back to the IAP, which ESSA helped prepare. This team offers the TMC the people with the most relevant experience with the document governance and science plan sides. They believed it would be the most cost-effective strategy to get the effort done effectively.

Smith will serve as Refinements Coordinator and will take charge of the program document and all meetings under Task 2 (comparison of restoration programs). Pickard will help co-facilitate virtual meetings on program comparisons. Pickard will also lead development of the Science Plan. Smith will help co-facilitate meetings for that task, but Pickard will build on the IAP and the objectives to get the science priorities in place. Marmorek will serve as a senior advisor for the Science Plan given his work on the IAP. Caitlin Semmens will develop visual and graphical crossovers for both documents.

Smith stressed that the team would be enabling the TMC to do the work needed. Both documents are the TMC's and the contractors will help put words together, facilitate discussion, and help phrase things, but they will also be asking a lot of the Drafting Committees as a whole for language and to negotiate items so they are readable and understandable. The TMC will need to

be engaged at all times to provide feedback, and communication is critical. Smith reviewed Headwater's proposed Plan of Work and schedule. He pointed out that while the contract is until 2023, there is a considerable amount of work that needs to get done for the Program Document and the Plan. He noted that the current Scope of Work includes Task 5, where Smith will work with TMC members to implement the recommendations and work with Directors, Tribal Councils, elders, and chairs to gain high level support for the changes.

Orcutt strongly counseled that if there are legal or policy barriers, they be flagged early on so the TMC understands their implications. During the last effort, there were issues that were caught later during a solicitor/policy review. Smith agreed and advised that they keep returning to that question to allow time to work out quirks or potential landmines. While work on Task 5 wasn't indicated to start until February 2022, its schedule could be flexible and allow them to spend time on it earlier than proposed. Hillemeier noted that identifying potential hurdles would be good to discuss early in the process, such as regulatory processes. Smith suggested taking advantage of meetings this year and MS Teams discuss them and noted that they would likely continue to pop-up during the process.

Smith explained that if the TMC approves the Terms of Reference for the Drafting Committees, he would create MS Teams for the Program Document and Science Plan. Using Teams will allow them to share information and keep a record of those conversations. He encouraged members to start the conversation right away by using the tools. If members had issues with any of the tools being used, let them know so they can figure out how to make everyone comfortable. Many meetings will likely be virtual given current travel restrictions and meeting constraints, in-person meetings are planned as they were valuable for communication and input.

Program Document Drafting Committee

Smith reviewed the goals for the Program Document Drafting Committee.

Purpose: To do the hard work together on behalf of the TMC with the Trinity River Refinements Coordinator to develop language for, edit, and negotiate the content of a single foundational documents for the TRRP.

The Drafting Committee would be comprised of one member from each of the TMC entities. Smith asked that all members commit to participating as the schedule for the Program Document is short and aggressive and they will be relying on members to get it done. The expectation is that meetings would have the full list of members participating. While other people may attend, he asked that conversation with those additional folks take place at breaks or separate sidebars. The goal is to have a small, nimble group that can move together through the process and are invested in the outcome. While there may be contention between members, the point of the group is to build trust through the process. Members may be given writing and thinking assignments, and everyone needs to be committed to the process. The proposed members are:

- Justin Ly – NOAA Fisheries
- Don Bader – Bureau of Reclamation

- Dan Everson – U.S Fish and Wildlife Service
- Lois Shoemaker – U.S. Forest Service
- Mike Orcutt – Hoopa Valley Tribe
- Dave Hillemeier – Yurok Tribe
- Teresa Connor – California Department of Water Resources (for the State)
- Keith Groves – Trinity County
- *Staff Support:* Mike Dixon – Executive Director

Smith noted that Teresa had been swapped for Tony even though Tony is the primary member at this point. Ly asked if the Committees would be focused on things like live edits or on big picture aspirations and goals, with Smith and Pickard filling in the language. Smith explained that their expectation was the Committees would help with all of it, but with less of the live editing and more big picture thinking. There will be some group editing sessions, but Pickard and Smith would do a lot of the writing and getting ideas on paper, as live editing sessions can get tedious and wearisome. His expectation was for meetings to be more discussion heavy, especially on sensitive issues that require group discussion or thinking that can't be done individually. Ly asked what would happen if members could not attend meeting and if there was an expectation that alternates would be present. Smith's preference was to work with the main people as a team. If something comes up, they may need to reschedule. However, if members consistently bring another person with them who is familiar with the discussion and can easily serve as a proxy, that may be something the group can handle. However, Smith did not want to get into a situation where members were constantly swapping people out as that could disrupt the flow.

Pickard added that live editing sessions would be kept to a minimum and only at critical junctures, especially in virtual meetings. It may be appropriate for Committee members to draft certain sections and that meetings focus on getting agreement for outlines and bullet points and having discussions on key issues. Pickard recognized that with the pandemic, there would be challenges for meetings, especially as some will have kids at home. Overall, they want the development of the documents to be a team effort with members making every effort to participate so they don't have to repeat conversations with folks who aren't in the loop.

Ly asked what governance there would be for instances where a few of the members do not agree with the majority of the group. Smith explained that they would like consensus but hope that through communication, working through barriers and challenges and trust building and team efforts that there would be ways to avoid those disagreements. His thought was that if there is an issue that a member cannot go with the group, then it will require extra elbow grease to resolve. Smith committed to providing a consensus program document that doesn't leave someone as an island. While that may seem impossible, this would be an exercise in trust building. Pickard added that the process for resolving conflicts would be something the team needs to figure out early on in the process.

Keith Groves made a motion to accept the names presented for the Drafting Committee.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

Connor noted that at the last meetings there were 8 members plus support staff, which increased the meeting size to 20+ members. She asked how large the meetings should be. Dixon clarified that support staff would just be himself. Smith explained that it would be 8 TMC members, Dixon to represent the staff, Pickard, and himself. While other people can attend, discussions with those members should be done during breaks. While it may seem draconian, the goal is to facilitate smaller, more nimble committees. Hillemeier asked if a member cannot attend but an alternate is available, could they attend instead. Smith explained that if the alternate has been present and up to date on the discussion that may be permissible. But if there is a discussion that will be difficult and that member should be part of it, they would likely reschedule to get the right people there. Scott Russell asked if there was an option for members who were fine with where the group stood, would they be able to communicate that. Smith affirmed it could be.

Motion passed unanimously.

Science Plan Drafting Committee

The Science Plan Drafting Committee would be a smaller group of technical-level members. Orcutt noted that the original list did not include representatives from Trinity County or the U.S. Forest Service and asked if they were intentionally left out. Groves explained that they currently did not have a person with the expertise to participate, which was a County issue. Kim Hunter, whom Dixon suggested, had a science background but was overwhelmed with cannabis issues. Groves agreed to leaving a space open for the County in case they identified a candidate in the next 5-6 months. Shoemaker explained that the USFS is in the same place as the County. Given the level of commitment needed by the group, they did not have a staff member available. Their approach is to provide guidance and direction through the TMC. She asked why the members were approved now when the committee wouldn't start for another year. Smith clarified that the Science Plan would start in January of next year. While there would be some delay in starting, but they will start communication before then. Shoemaker agreed to leave a spot for USFS with the understanding that they may not fill it. The list of members was updated to:

- Paul Zedonis – Bureau of Reclamation
- Seth Naman – NOAA Fisheries
- Nick Som – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- George Kautsky – Hoopa Valley Tribe
- Kyle DeJuilio – Yurok Tribe
- Ken Lindke – California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- *Vacant* – Trinity County
- *Vacant* – U.S. Forest Service
- *Staff Support* – James Lee – TRRP Science Coordinator

Keith Groves made a motion to accept the list of amended members for the Science Plan Drafting Committee.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Kautsky asked if a motion was needed to change the membership list over time. Ly suggested that the TMC formally address changes in membership as they go, with the understanding that some of the representatives may change with staffing changes. Ly suggested it would be appropriate to handle membership changes within the committees themselves.

Smith went over the next steps. He and Pickard would set up the Teams for discussion. The next meeting is planned for mid to late August. He will send out a Doodle poll to book a few virtual Teams meetings.

Smith reviewed work he has completed on compiling information on various restoration programs, which he reviewed and ground truthed with program supervisors. One aspect he is looking at is how tribes/First Nations are involved with the governance and structure of other programs, noting the rich and deep involvement Hoopa Valley and Yurok have with the Trinity. He will look through each program's adaptive management and science portions. Hillemeier asked the TMC to think about what members would like to learn from other programs and what areas they were looking at for ideas. Pickard asked members to consider that and send them to the Committees. She noted that the delay in getting the Science Plan Drafting Committee up was to get the Program Document Committee up and running first. Scott McBain commented that it would be helpful for Headwaters to prioritize the information from other programs to mine for consistent questions and use that as a guide. He recommended looking for potential solutions to the TMC's biggest concerns and questions.

BREAK

FY21 Budget Proposal

NFWF Grants Administration Business Model

Dixon asked the TMC to decide what business model they would like to pursue for the Watershed Restoration Grant program. Most of the delays in the Watershed Grant program were due to new administrative steps the Program needed to follow. Using a third-party grant administrator would reduce such impediments and reduce the amount of attention on the Program. Hillemeier supported the business model but was concerned that the 20% administrative cost would mean less money for grants. Orcutt agreed and noted he was not aware of the upper level concern about the grant program. Following the model that Klamath would lessen some of the scrutiny and regulation the TRRP complies with. He was willing to pay the 20% cost to allow for more work on the ground. Dixon added that the TRRP pays quite a bit on the backside out of the administrative budget for all stages of review for the grants and that it may be comparable to what they would pay NFWF to manage it. Russel echoed Shoemaker's views of the USFS partnership with NFWF noting that NFWF was really inclusive and involved and had brought matching funds much more successfully.

Kautsky asked how the model would work given that funding for the grant program varies from 0 to \$500,000 in any year. Dixon explained that in the solicitation, the TRRP would have a cap

that would be at their discretion. The challenge is implementing a floor and in most grants he's seen it written as an option year allocation. He explained that the TMC cannot legally obligate government funds in an outyear, and that the grants do not have to be funded if funds aren't available. Hillemeier asked if they could see savings to the TRRP office budget reflected in future budgets and if they could retain that money in the Watershed grant. Dixon explained he did not know what the savings would be but could account for it when they built their budget. Dixon will determine how much the TRRP spends on watershed grant processing.

Ly noted that the TMC does not have to partner with NFWF but could use the Klamath-NFWF partnership as a model. Shoemaker added they could use other agreement processes other than a grant to provide different avenues depending on agency authorities. Dixon added that NFWF is a congressionally-chartered NGO so there may be other vehicles they can use. Under CVPIA, there are a variety of tools they can use to carry out their legislative authorities, but he wasn't sure how they applied to NGOs. Hetrick noted that the TMC's ability to use KBAO's grant templates could justify a sole source award to simplify the process, and there could be significant government savings by tiering off KBAO's work. Dixon explained that the contracting office was reluctant to sole source anything but he would explore it.

Orcutt voiced support of the idea but was curious about if the TMC and technical agency staff would develop the review committee and process. Dixon explained NFWF would be required to be part of the review panel but each TMC agency could designate a representative. NFWF does require a prioritization scheme and the TMC could pilot that process. With the shift in workload, it would likely change the Watershed WG to an ad hoc group, but the TMC representatives would likely still be on the review committee. Hillemeier noted it could free up additional time from the IDT as well. Dixon thought the savings would be small but could result in shorter work group meetings and less IDT time.

Connor asked how the grant review process would change, as the Watershed WG reviews the grants, presents them to the IDT, and then TMC votes on them. Would NFWF still come back to the TMC to decide? Dixon explained the grantee would be responsible for making the decision, which would shift TMC's level of control. Each TMC agency would need to make sure they trusted their review committee representatives. Connor noted that when the Watershed WG couldn't reach a consensus, they would come to the TMC to make a decision while under the NFWF arrangement the grantee would make the decision instead. Orcutt was concerned that about how the process wouldn't prevent a lot of the funding from going towards the South Fork, as the TMC has had discretion on fund allocation. He asked that they put a cap on funding there. Connor asked if the TMC could terminate the agreement after 1 or 2 years if they weren't satisfied. Dixon said yes, that the TMC is only obligated to fund the first year after it was awarded. Hillemeier suggested that a proportional limit be set on all parts of the Trinity River and that there may be additional funding designated to the South Fork which could bring other funds through the grant program. Orcutt asked that the TMC get an update about the legislation on the Wilderness bill for that funding. Ly agreed, noting that the TMC could still rank criteria

and implement caps on certain tributaries. He suggested ranking and vetting proposed projects and encourage the TMC to trust the ranking system they use to give them the best projects and results. He also reviewed his emails with Hiatt from when they set up the NFWF contract and that overhead costs for NFWF were around 17.5%.

DeJulio commented that there would be substantial involvement when the Watershed WG develops the prioritization criteria for the solicitation, and asked if proposals don't rank to a certain level could the funding not allocated by NFWF roll to the next cycle. Dixon replied yes, as long as that was specified in the solicitation and contract. LaBanca agreed adding that outreach and developing restoration partners through the pre-proposal process had been the best way to get a broad mix of projects. Orcutt asked the TMC to retain the ability to vet the prioritization criteria. Dixon thought the grantee may agree and the TMC got into hot water for doing that on their grants. Reviewers signed a conflict of interest statement to be on the review committee. When Reclamation found out that people who weren't on the review committee were making changes to the criteria, the review committee selections were highly scrutinized. For the NFWF process to work, TMC would have to be part of the grant selection committee. Orcutt suggested the TMC be part of the review committee but was not comfortable with signing off the \$500,000 grant budget and just getting notified what would be funded after the fact.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to direct staff to pursue a sole source grant/contract with NFWF to administer the TRRP's Watershed Grant Program. If sole source is not possible, then issue a competitive request for proposal for this purpose. If the Watershed program does not exceed \$500,000 in a given year, including administrative overhead, then no more than 50% of funds shall be awarded in the South Fork of the Trinity River in that year. There are no limitations on how funds *in addition to the \$500,000* can be apportioned.

Keith Groves seconded the motion.

Dixon asked if there could be unforeseen consequences of constraining funds available for each watershed as there may be projects that use most of the funds but address a major need. For example, the reservoir enlargement in Hayfork has the potential to be one of the single most important potential projects in the South Fork but would spend more than the 50% limit. He noted another key project in Weaverville to reduce the community service district's reliance on East and West Weaver Creek intakes during low flow periods that could be ineligible for funding if they had the grant limitation. Orcutt asked if they could retain specific guidance for NOAA's Southern Oregon Northern California Coastal (SONCC) Coho recovery plan. Dixon affirmed they could since they come up with the prioritization scheme. Shoemaker added that the USFS has had opportunities to break down their prioritization schemes with NFWF and TMC can discuss those detailed components before the solicitation goes out. Orcutt explained the TMC would be joining their funds to Klamath Coho funds and if they're allowed to continue their past work, it might be a better for the group.

Ly asked if the \$500,000 included overhead costs. Hillemeier explained that the \$500,000 included administrative and on-the-ground costs, unless the TMC increased funding for the

program. Groves recommended the motion indicate that additional funds meant funding over the standard \$500,000.

Motion passed unanimously

COVID-19 Monitoring Savings

Due to COVID-19, partners have not been able to carry out monitoring as originally envisioned, and were asked to review potential savings. Ly asked each agency to discuss to what monitoring work had change and if there reductions.

Hetrick (USFWS): USFWS has been affected in different ways with increased transportation costs as they are sending crews out in multiple vehicles. There have been some savings and they have estimated that USFWS can provide an additional \$100,000 in their Interagency Agreement with BOR this year. Additional savings are not anticipated for the rest of the fiscal year as their budget is close to being zeroed out.

LaBanca (CA): The State has seen some savings from less travel but increased costs for vehicle use. He can review the numbers for changes in costs savings. The Junction City Weir did go in on time and staff has not been scaled back. Any costs covered by the State's 5-year agreement should not be a problem to transfer to other FY21 projects and LaBanca can work with Reclamation on the modification.

Orcutt (Hoopa Valley): Understanding the contracting regulations for each entity is needed since they are all different. Reviewing monitoring savings may lead to a slippery slope and Orcutt had questions about the funding from construction that was moved to the geophysical work. He explained he opened the discussion about coordination of monitoring work among partners, primarily for the coded wire tags, but that coordination and cooperation had not happened as each agency ended up implementing different protocols. Hoopa Valley did not get guidance on when to stop or start work at the rotary screw traps. He believed there was other money that needed to be on the table.

Ly agreed with Orcutt's concerns and noted one obvious area where project budgets changed was monitoring, which could be applied to other areas in the FY21 budget to lessen the impact. He hoped that deliverables that could not occur because of restrictions would not result in the same level of spending and that those savings could be applied to other projects. He clarified that the money may not go back to the larger pot but could be used to reduce the budget reductions that impact monitoring and other projects.

Kautsky suggested revisiting the discussion in September once the partners have more information and have had a chance to meet with their CORs. While there might have been substantial savings, there were other increases to keep staff safe. He thought it might be more productive to revisit this discussion on monitoring savings in the fall when they had firmer numbers. Ly explained that he was not looking for each agency's numbers but more an idea of how flexible the agencies were with putting potential savings towards FY21 projects.

Hillemeier and DeJuilio (Yurok): Yurok implemented all of their monitoring project and will likely incur additional costs for solo driving, which they have not asked for compensation. Most work went on without interruption. They reduced staffing for screwtrap projects but increased effort for projects where partners were unable to participate. Habitat effectiveness monitoring did not move forward. Water surface elevation and point velocity data was collected for the 2D model development at Deep Gulch and Chapman Ranch Phase A, but the partnership has not moved forward with any other data collection and there were lost opportunities due to restrictions during the high flow release. Yurok has not received some of their modification funds and incurred costs this fiscal year without compensation. DeJuilio was unsure of where their budget stood.

LUNCH

FY21 Budget Proposal Decisions

Dixon reviewed the budget constraints proposed for FY21. The proposed budget was prepared with all TMC partners and Lee. Previous Program budgets had been flat over the last few years, but FY21 is the first substantial reduction in several years. With cost of living increases and inflation, the budget is a de facto reduction though the overall budget total was held relatively flat. While some agreements will not need funding in FY21, they will need funding in FY22, which will present hurdles in the future. Annual costs have increased for most agencies in the absence of reductions and the TMC will need to make some decision now as there will likely be actual or de facto reductions in FY22. Dixon asked the TMC to identify priorities now so they can redirect funds if they become available. The Refinements process would also take a hard look at changes to funding paths and monitoring work to better measure the Program's progress towards their objectives. Dixon's presentation highlights the main budget changes and is available on the TRRP website.

Dixon explained that the 18.5% reduction to monitoring was the result of reductions in all the other areas and that any proposed increases to Technical Assistance funding would be offset by reducing Construction and Monitoring. Orcutt asked how much of the budget proposal was at play, highlighting the increase in the Geo-Physical Support Services budget from \$89,000 to \$641,000, which was a substantial increase. Dixon explained that Appendix III of the Executive Director's report provided a line-by-line explanation of each change. The legacy Geophysical line item was for GMA to provide support for imagery and topographic data collection. The amount in FY21 Status Quo is based on a new suite of data needs, specifically aerial imagery, construction as-builts, and 40 mile topography/bathymetry for a new hydraulic model. Orcutt asked how the decision to increase the amount for FY21 occurred or if there was a large amount of money with contingencies on how to spend it. Dixon explained that using the line item may not have been clear, but that the cost estimate was for aerial imagery and topography/bathymetry work to update the 40-mile hydraulic model.

In reviewing the Summary Table for the FY21 budget, Dixon noted the following:

- FY19 Approved amounts are actual expenditures for that year

- FY20 Approved is what TMC approved for spending
- FY21 Status quo are the routine costs for the Program given known adjustments to agreements or 3% increases to FY20 numbers.
- FY21 Proposed represent the Executive Director's thought on how to get the FY21 budget to meet the funding target of \$12,091,000, when the typical budget would be around \$13,773,979.05.
- FY21 TMC Approved will change based on TMC decisions. The current total of \$5,030,586.67 is based on non-discretionary totals for office staff, contracts, and other items that the Program is obligated to fund in FY21.

Looking through the Admin Budget. There was some reduction in the Office Personnel line as Lindsay Walker is no longer on the TRRP Org Chart. There are modest reductions from COVID based on reduced use of fleet vehicles. Office costs were high in FY19 due to the office remodel. The costs for the annual report is cut as Kevin Held and Kathy Martens have the capacity to produce an electronic-only version of the report, which would save the Program \$25,000. The Notetaker's budget is held consistent and Dixon noted that the TMC does receive substantial value from the notes. The budget for TRRP's work with RCD has been reduced to focus on work that promotes solid outreach and education.

For TMC funding, Dixon noted that many members were judicious stewards of their funds and had overbudgeted for their needs, so they did not require additional funds for FY21. He noted that the State agencies had changed the way they did their agreements. NOAA and Hoopa Valley both took 20% cuts to their agreements. Yurok was set at FY20 funding and Dixon noted they took at 20% reduction in their FY20 AFA and asked that the TMC honor that agreement. The reductions are cause for concern because they are a huge hit to each group and brings down what was, in essence, base funding. Hillemeier added the cut was substantial for their agency as they use those funds to pay rent. He asked the TMC to consider adding funds to the Program and Technical Assistance line items if they become available. The Refinements task has been zeroed out since the contract was fully funded in FY20. Bader asked if agencies had other FY20 savings in travel costs since they were conducting virtual meetings. Dixon agreed that costs reductions would not just be in monitoring but in other places as well and that members may be able to use those to restore some of the Technical Assistance funds.

For the Implementation budget, all line items are explained in Appendix III of the Executive Director's report. The costs for NEPA are for permitting work at Oregon Gulch and plant materials. The amount is based on Reclamation's contract with Ironwood Consulting, which covers NEPA compliance, native seed/plant material, and a whole suite of other compliance activities. Some of the activities currently covered under the contract could be assumed by Reclamation and Program Staff, which the TMC could review for outyear reductions. For the geophysical line item, Dixon explained that the 40-mile hydraulic model underpins a lot of the technical work done for fish production, flood modeling, design rehab projects, and project evaluation. Currently, the Program is using data from 2016, but there have been several high

flow events and they have built some of their largest construction projects. The Work Groups and the IDT agreed the model should be a high priority. Dixon expected the cost estimate to go down as there has been little change in the canyon reach, so they're thinking of excluding it from the data collection. The high cost is reflective of having an accurate hydraulic model for implementation. To fund it, they moved \$500,000 from the construction budget.

DeJuilio asked if the budget line item supported the development of the 40-mile 2D model. Dixon explained the costs included collecting 40 miles of LiDAR data and 40 miles of bathymetry data plus the costs for infilling, which is labor intensive due to overhanging vegetation. Hetrick noted that Nick Som suggested there may be bigger savings by only collecting imagery at sites where there were large changes rather than the entire 40-mile stretch. Dixon explained that it was discussed at the IDT meeting, but was viewed as being impractical, but he would have to review his notes as to why they wanted a wholesale survey instead.

Orcutt asked which Work Groups reviewed the task. Dixon explained that the Physical, Fish, Flow, and Design Work Groups reviewed it along with another conversation with the IDT. Orcutt noted that the data and information used for the flow decision was not always used or followed. While the model was last updated in 2016, he wondered how often the Program used it and if it would fit into the DSS. Dixon explained that the model does not directly feed into the DSS, but that a hydraulic model of the river was essential for much of the implementation and science work. Currently, the model is updated roughly every 5 years and it should be on a recurring cycle. Orcutt asked what the value of the model was given that the flow synthesis report had not been completed. DeJuilio explained that the flow synthesis report does not explicitly state it will use the hydraulic model, but only because the 2016 model represents a single data point, but having updated version could allow them to make comparisons over time.

Orcutt asked the TMC to reconsider the modeling until Refinements provides direction on whether to do it. He suggested it would not hurt to hold the modeling work back another year. Dixon explained the funding came from the construction funds for Chapman Phase B, which would span two fiscal years, with the approval of the IDT. Hetrick commented that it would be helpful to know all the potential uses of the data for planned investigations. Dixon explain that the model is not an investigation but a tool used to do a variety of different tasks. The data isn't testing hypotheses but are topographic data. He explained that the uses he mentioned are currently uses by the Program. He supported discussing the topic again at the next IDT meeting.

For the Design and Support services, Dixon noted that the budget for Yurok does not reflect money needed for Sawmill and other construction-specific design work which was funded during FY 2020. DWR and USFS do not need funding in FY21. The proposed funding for TSC would be a moot point if the TMC decided to not fund the 40-mile model. Without the updated model, costs for design and development would increase as teams would have to do additional site survey work as there are several areas where the sites do not match the current model and new models would be made for each site. Som asked if the 40-mile model would replace the current 2D model. Dixon explained it would because the current hydraulic model does not look like the

river. Som explained that even with recent 2D models, separate models were still prepared for the post-construction comparisons and asked if they would stop making rehab-specific 2D models at all rehab sites. Dixon asked that they defer the conversation until later.

For the construction budget, \$500,000 was taken from the FY21 construction budget for Chapman Ranch Phase B as the project is anticipated to receive additional funding in FY22. Large wood and coarse sediment processing is zeroed out due to forward funding in FY20 based on TMC priorities due to not hiring two implementation position, which allowed salary savings to fund those tasks. Gravel augmentation will not be done this year due to flow; Dixon suggested rolling it over to the following year.

Orcutt returned to the geophysical funding as \$500,000 was taken from construction and the total budget was around \$651,000. Dixon explained the costs reflects three different tasks, and that all the Work Groups saw it as a high priority. The IDT discussion focused on if the effort should capture areas with the most change or the entire 40-mile reach. Orcutt asked if they knew how much the work would cost. Dixon said the teams knew it would cost over half a million.

For the Science Budget, all Program staff salaries are built out, with the Program staff down one position and anticipating Hoopa Valley filling their ecologist position at Weaverville. Other priorities include reconstituting the SAB and maintaining the Interagency Agreement with USGS for stream gaging. Funding for effectiveness monitoring would support the Habitat Team to work on the 40-mile model, which would be eliminated if the modeling work is not approved.

Orcutt asked what happened with the wildlife and regulatory monitoring for construction. Dixon explained herpetological and avian surveys fell off the project list in FY18 with the updated Science Work Plan. Hatchery costs are fixed until the funding can be assumed by the hatchery's O&M budget since they do not support restoration efforts. Based on all of the proposed cuts and adjustments, that left around \$460,000 to cut from the Status and Trend budget.

Ly asked if coded wire tagging had been conducted this year. Dixon explained the costs in the budget were related to the purchase of the tags and annual maintenance and use of the trailer. While this year, fewer tags were purchased, the budget remainder was used for trailer maintenance. Kautsky added that the tags had not been applied but that the tag totals came from NCAO. The run size was unknown but was related to the operation of the Junction City Weir. LaBanca agreed to review and provide those numbers.

BREAK

Ly asked if there could be savings if tagging was not completed this year. Orcutt explained that there have been ongoing discussions on how to do tagging with the restrictions in place. In reality, Chinook would probably not be marked even though it is included in their FY20 AFA. Orcutt suggested the TMC not focus closely on entities' funding as there are differences in how they are managed. Instead, that discussion should be between the Hoopa Valley and Reclamation. Bader agreed that they could negotiate anything that needed to be refunded out of the AFA at a later time. Orcutt recommended that such negotiations be done with all the

agreements. Bader agreed and thought the TMC could move forward with the FY21 budget and get consensus on the proposed monitoring alternatives to get the Program in budget rather than focusing on reprogramming funds, which could be more fluid. Dixon agreed adding that the Program needed a budget that gets them in the black based on the worst-case scenarios. Budget savings from COVID can be added back based on TMC priorities.

Hetrick asked how the funding for redd/carcass monitoring was determined as the work is conducted from Sept to Dec, across the fiscal year cut off. Lee explained that funding pays for the current work in that year (ex. Sept monitoring is paid for in the current fiscal year, while December monitoring is paid for in the next fiscal year). He explained that the tribes typically do not have their AFA's settled until well into the current fiscal year, leaving them to front the cost and get reimbursed later. DeJuilio explained that if the project is cut, they would have to renegotiate use of the funds for the September surveys.

Orcutt noted that there was a fair amount of uncertainty about the geophysical modeling work and suggested that the IDT review the recommendation again, noting that it may not have been fully vetted and that he wanted to know the realistic number for it given the potential options USFWS raised. Dixon explained that the cost is based on a current estimate, which would go down once the work for the canyon is removed. If the TMC wanted to reprogram the money, it would go back to the Construction budget. The cost presented was based on where the IDT landed on for the modeling. DeJuilio added that the Design and Physical Work Groups both recommended the modeling based on the understanding that the money come from construction. If savings were found, the funds would go back to construction.

Dixon explained that the original budget recommendation from Reclamation was for the entire reduction to come out of Science. This proposal spreads out the reduction to make it less impactful. The hit to Science will still be painful, but not as much as originally intended. Everson noted that the 10% reduction was important for USFWS, as they could hang on to enough of the projects to pass muster with the peer-review policy. Hetrick added that the TRRP spent a tremendous amount to get the projects through peer review to comply with DOI, Services, and TRRP policies. Maintaining that compliance is not something they can overlook.

Orcutt commented that Hoopa Valley's representation on the IDT does not mean that they are in support of a given recommendation. His role is the policy representative and he can express what he thinks will be important for Hoopa Valley's constituents. He suggested that he attend IDT meeting with their representative in the future. While everyone is discussing belt tightening, and the discussion on the project may have been overlooked, but he was not aware of it. He recommended looking at a few options for the modeling and ideas on how to do it differently than currently proposed.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to adopt the budget recommendations as presented under the hybrid approach with the caveat that if additional funding becomes available, the first priority will be to make Technical Assistance funding whole.

Keith Groves seconded the motion.

Everson asked for clarification on Technical Assistance. DeJulio explained it is different for each agency, but Yurok's covers their participation in Work Group Meetings, and other activities that support the Program, such as analysis, report writing and reviews, and supporting operations at the Weaverville office. Hillemeier expressed concern that slimmer budget would substantially impact tribal participation as federal budgets remain constant. Cuts to tribal budgets would mean they are expected to lay people off and thought the TMC was going down the wrong path. Orcutt suggested the TMC consider the budget recommendations in blocks since each approach had implications, especially for the Science part of the budget. It is ambiguous how they would address additional funding. He thought they should prioritize adding funds to science rather than Technical Assistance. Orcutt asked if Hillemeier would consider proportional funding to Science, Admin, and Construction. Hillemeier stated that he did not think it would be worth it to give a project 5% more of its funding as it become available, unless they were already funded.

Mike Orcutt offered a friendly amendment to include "Science monitoring to receive funds."

Hillemeier did not accept the amendment.

Groves explained that he would go along with the group consensus but believed that the reductions were avoiding the hard decisions they needed to make. A 10% cut would not be the best thing and would not help get fish back in the river. He was disappointed that the TMC was not cutting things that were least valuable to the fish while fully funding things that were the most valuable. Orcutt added he would like to reconsider some of the options for costs savings and re-discuss the modeling project.

Mike Orcutt made a friendly amendment to add "including after another IDT review of the 40-mile hydraulic model data collection" after "funding becomes available."

Orcutt explained that if the funding for the hydraulic model was not approved, it would be part of the "additional funding." He would like to see the eliminated monitoring projects whole. Hillemeier explained the IDT met a few times about the hydraulic model proposal and that the Design WG thought it should be an expected cost every 5 years. He thought the TMC received their recommendations and did not want to second guess them. Additionally, the 20% reduction in technical assistance was arbitrary and did not provide them with enough money. He noted that technical assistance was related to science as their staff attend Work Group meetings and support the Science program.

Dave Hillemeier did not accept the friendly amendment

Motion failed with 5 nay votes and 3 votes in favor. NOAA, USFWS, and Yurok Tribe voted in favor.

Dan Everson made a motion to adopt the budget recommendations as presented under the hybrid approach with the caveat that if additional funding becomes available, those funds would be redistributed to the Status and Monitoring projects that are not cut under the hybrid approach.

Mike Orcutt seconded the motion.

Kautsky explained that there were consequences to cutting projects, as they would impact the cohort reconstruction work. Skipping a year in collecting harvest data for fall Chinook in the recreational fishery would have four year's consequences in this modeling work. and asked that funds be used to restore the cut projects first. He added that the remaining projects could survive at 90% of their funding and 10% in additional funding would make less of a difference than restoring cut projects. Shoemaker added her concern about the timing of adding funds as there may not be a reasonable opportunity to redistribute funds when they become available. Dixon explained that he would have to assess those additions on the fly as funding available in March would not help redd/carcass surveys conducted the previous September. DeJulio added that if efforts were cut, it would not be reasonable to back fund it if it hadn't been conducted. Everson explained that his motion was based on Lee's explanation that this was an interim approach and that there would be other opportunities to reassess in a year or so. Groves recommended reassessing where funds should go as they become available rather than trying to forecast potential amounts. LaBanca added that the two cut projects would essentially come to a close this year, so adding funds may not be beneficial.

Everson explained his concern was addressing how long the motion would bind the Executive Director on deciding how to spend additional funds. Dixon noted there was a reasonably good chance for savings from COVID and salary savings. Direction on how to reprogram money would be helpful as some of the projects are time sensitive. Kautsky noted that cutting the two projects would affect reporting from the previous biological year. He suggested looking at FY20 savings to make the projects whole as they could function at 10 or 15% budget reductions. Kautsky expressed concern that the hybrid approach did not comply with science informing the program and could have a legacy effect in the future. The TRRP is down to a single species, fall Chinook, for which comprehensive monitoring of juvenile to adults is being observed. If we eliminate a harvest sector from the suite of monitoring projects, we'll have incomplete information for which to complete cohort analyses across four years of Chinook maturation. Orcutt suggested they vet such impacts by going through each budget line item to determine if they need to take prioritized action to find some relief. If surplus funds are found, then the TMC can take a look at it at a later date.

Motion passes with 7 votes in favor, and 1 vote opposed. The State of California voted against.

Topics for September TMC Meeting

- Upper Connor Creek Channel Rehab 30% Design
- Updates on Objectives Exercise from each Work Group
- Bedload Transport Monitoring
- Update on Synthesis Reports and Schedule
- Review of FY20 funds due to COVID-19
- Overview of Dutch Creek project (Dixon recommended waiting until December due to the project timeline)

- Flow Synthesis Report Update – Naman noted that there should something from the Flow Work Group at the next monthly meeting.

Other topics can be sent to Michael Dixon or Justin Ly for consideration.

Bader asked if the next meeting in September would be in-person and if the Yurok would be able to host the group. Hillemeier explained that it would be hard to plan for an in-person meeting and to plan for a virtual one instead.

All the TMC members wished Tony LaBanca well and that he would be missed. LaBanca will be retiring a few days before the next meeting.

Public Forum

No comments were submitted.

Adjourn Day 2: 4:24 pm