

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL SUMMARY

Victorian Inn Restaurant, Weaverville, CA

June 19, 2006

TMC Members Present: Mike Long, Chair, *USFWS*; Irma Lagomarsino, Vice-Chair, *NMFS*; Doug Schleusner, *TRRP Executive Director*; Bill Brock, *USFS*; Lyle Marshall, *HVT Chairman*; Dave Hillemeier, *Yurok Tribe*; Roger Jaegel, *Trinity County BOS*; Curtis Anderson, *DWR*

TMC Members Absent: Brian Person, *BOR*

Others Present: Arnold Whitridge, *TAMWG Chair*; Tom Stokely & Joshua Allen, *Trinity County/Minute takers*; Mike Orcutt, George Kautsky, & Robert Franklin, *HVT*; Joe Polos, *USFWS*; Tom Weseloh, *CalTrout*; Tim Hayden, *Yurok Tribe*; Larry Hansen, *CA DFG*; Gil Saliba, *NEC Liaison*; CJ Ralph & Sherri Miller, *USFS/ Redwood Sciences Lab*; Rod Wittler, Andreas Krause, & Denise Wiltse, *TRRP*

Regular Business:

Introduction: Validate agenda items; approve TMC minutes from March 29-30, 2006

Approval of the March minutes was deferred to the following day's meeting.

Open Forum: Comments from the public

There were no public comments.

Report from TAMWG Chair Arnold Whitridge

The TAMWG had 3 formal recommendations:

- 1. TMC should not approve the final budget at this meeting, so that costs and revenues are more complete to make a final decision later.**
- 2. TAMWG supports the full program funding in full program column, and urges the TMC to seek the funding amount that was received in 2006 (\$12 million +).**
- 3. Fund wildlife at no less than \$150k which is shown this year.**

They were all unanimous recommendations.

Report from TMC Chair Mike Long

Report from Executive Director Doug Schleusner

Information Item:

Flow Schedule Update: *Review implementation of WY2006 schedule; Coordination with CVO, response to unplanned events*

Action Item:

Integrated Monitoring Plan and Habitat Assessment: *Review previous motions; clarify intent; approve schedule*

On May 17 the TMC had a conference call. A motion was made, but it didn't pass; there was an addition to the TMC policy review that would occur after Step 3 in the annotated schedule. The conference call ended before another motion could be seconded and discussed. Afterwards Long sent out an e-mail to TMC members to measure the level of agreement on several key points. He received some responses, so he e-mailed a motion out to the TMC on May 26 regarding the IAP process. Some TMC members felt it needed to be discussed in person, and so a conference call was not scheduled. This motion is now brought forth at today's Meeting.

The motion is as follows:

The TMC directs that the "Annotated Schedule for Completion of the TRRP Integrated Assessment Plan (IAP)" (See May 15, 2006 memo from R. Wittler to Executive Director – TRRP) be implemented with the following modifications, and in accordance with a revised schedule that begins with the date of TMC adoption of this motion:

Modification 1 – Item 4.b. of the Resolution Roundtable section is amended to add the following language: "Subgroups may seek review of unresolved technical issues by an outside expert or panel of experts. Such review must be supported by a majority of the entities represented in the subgroup."

Modification 2 – A facilitated Habitat Assessment Workshop, as previously approved by the TMC at its March 2006, meeting, will be held no later than June 15, 2006. The purpose of the workshop is collaborative development of a Habitat Assessment Study Plan sufficient for outside review by experts. The study plan is to be reviewed by the TMC in preparation for expert review.

The process for resolution of technical issues not resolved during the workshop shall be as described in Item 4 of the Resolution Roundtable section of the May 15 memo. Since technical issues that remain unresolved could be elevated for resolution (e.g., SAB or TMC), the dispute resolution process must also include documentation of alternative technical perspectives or approaches, along with a description of the weaknesses and strengths of the alternatives, so that the entity resolving such a dispute understands the value of each approach.

Modification 3 – Concurrent with sending the revised IAP to the Science Advisory Board, the revised IAP will be sent out for broader peer review. The details of the broader peer review shall be developed by a committee appointed by the TMC, and submitted to the TMC for approval at least 1 month prior to sending the revised IAP to the SAB.

Modification 4 – After Meeting 3 (Science Framework Review) the IAP will be presented to the TMC for policy review and approval and/or modification.

The motion failed due to a lack of a second.

Lagomarsino made the following motion:

The TMAG, working with a steering committee appointed by the TMC, to develop the agenda and meeting format, will hold a facilitated Habitat Assessment Workshop for the purpose of collaboratively developing a work plan for completion of a Habitat Assessment study plan sufficient for outside review by experts. The TMAG, and the steering committee, will complete the draft Study Plan by September 10, 2006 for review by the Trinity Management Council in preparation for expert review.

The move was second by Marshall for purposes of discussion. Marshall then withdrew his second due to the need for a specific date to hold the workshop.

The motion was put up on the screen by Lagomarsino.

Lagomarsino agreed to add the following modification of the motion as stated above:

During the week of August 7, 2006...

Marshall seconded the revised motion.

The vote on the motion was taken:

The motion passed unanimously.

The Steering Committee was appointed with the following people as representative:

- **Tim Hayden, Yurok Tribe**
- **Robert Franklin, HVT**
- **Rod Wittler, TRRP**
- **Curtis Anderson as the TMC liaison**
- **Joe Polos, USFWS**

Schleusner requested that the IAP budget issue be dealt with Tuesday.

The issue was move by consensus to Tuesday morning.

Lunch was taken between 12:30-1:30.

Information Item:

FY2006 Budget Update: *Review recent developments (Indian Creek, Brown's Mountain Road); year-end cut-off dates; carryover*

IMPORTANT DATE TO REMEMBER:

- **August 14-18 is next B-Team meeting to go over changes to budget proposal.**
- **September 12-21 are meetings for TAMWG and TMC, respectively.**

Break was called for at 2:50 to 3:10 pm.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 pm.

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL SUMMARY

Victorian Inn Restaurant, Weaverville, CA

June 20, 2006

TMC Members Present: Mike Long, Chair, *USFWS*; Irma Lagomarsino, Vice-Chair, *NMFS*; Doug Schleusner, *TRRP Director*; Bill Brock, *USFS*; Mike Orcutt, *HVT*; Dave Hillemeier, *Yurok Tribe*; Tom Stokely, *Trinity County*; Curtis Anderson, *DWR*

TMC Members Absent: Brian Person, *BOR*

Others Present: Arnold Whitridge, *TAMWG Chair*; Joshua Allen, *Trinity County*; George Kautsky, *HVT*; Joe Polos, *USFWS*; Tom Weseloh, *CalTrout*; Larry Hansen, *CA DFG*; Ed Duggan, *TAMWG*; Rod Wittler, & Pricilla Davee, *TRRP*

Information Item:

FY2006 Budget Update: *Cont.*

Orcutt moved the following motion for a vote:

Of the \$700-800k unobligated 2006 funds, that at least \$412k be added to the HVT's AFA. Specifically for each project:

- Net harvest monitoring for \$150k
- Coded wire tags for \$60k
- Expert Habitat Mapping for \$160k
- Creel census \$12k
- Genetic stock identification for \$40k

There was no second to the motion.

Motion failed due to a lack of a second.

Hillemeier moved the following motion for a vote:

Fund in full the spawner survey, carcass redd survey, and age composition. The remainder of funds to be obligated in a manner most efficient for program staff and offsets FY07 budget needs.

There was no second to the motion.

Motion failed due to a lack of a second.

Lagomarsino moved the following motion for a vote:

Have the TRRP Executive Director obligate the remainder of the FY06 funds in a manner most efficient for the restoration program which offsets FY07 budget needs.

The motion was seconded by Anderson.

A vote on the motion was called:

Ayes: 6

Nays: 1 (HVT)

Absent: BOR

Motion was approved.

FY2007 Budget: *Discuss Director's proposal to approve final budget at September meeting & Review results of B-Team meetings, TAMWG recommendations, TRRP staff proposal; further discussion on priorities*

Hillemeier moved the following motion for a vote:

Fully fund the carcass redd surveys and fall chinook component of the age composition project.

There was no second to the motion.

Hillemeier withdrew his motion.

Hillemeier moved the following motion for a vote:

Have the B-Team (at its next meeting) to look at first quarter monitoring projects and have the TMC follow up with a conference call to consider funding first quarter monitoring projects.

Lagomarsino seconded the motion.

The next B-Team meeting is August 14.

The vote on the motion was taken:

Ayes: 5

Nays: 2 (USFWS & HVT)

Absent: BOR

Motion failed due to a lack of approval votes.

FY2008 Budget: *Discuss possible improvements to budget process, use of ranking criteria for project priorities; next steps*

Orcutt moved the following motion for a vote:

Have the full ROD level of funding be advocated for the FY 2008 budget in all Interior budgeting processes.

Chairman Long deferred the motion.

Lagomarsino moved the following motion for a vote:

Have a subgroup of TMC entities and the TAMWG to convene to develop the budget development process for FY 2008 for consideration of approval by the TMC in December 2006.

The motion was seconded by Brock.

The vote on the motion was taken:

Ayes: 6

Abstain: 1 (HVT)

Absent: BOR

The motion was approved.

IAP Discussion

Anderson moved the following motion for a vote:

Form a steering committee to work with the TMAG to complete the proposed IAP schedule for TMC approval/consideration of the document by the December 2006 TMC meeting. The steering committee will determine an appropriate place for a high level policy review of the IAP with a findings document sent back to the TMC for consideration. The steering committee will consist of the TMAG Branch Chief, Scott McBain, Joe Polos, Robert Franklin, Wade Sinnen, Tim Hayden, Curtis Anderson, and a TAMWG representative.

The motion was seconded by Hillemeier.

The vote for the motion was taken:

The motion was passed unanimously.

LETTER REGARDING FULL FUNDING OF TRRP AND CVPIA RF FOR TRRP

Hillemeier moved the following motion for a vote:

Prepare a letter to be sent to BOR/USFWS requesting that they assist TRRP in seeking any and all sources of funding for full implementation of TRRP, including use of CVPIA RF for FY 2007, at least at 2006 funding levels.

The motion was seconded by Orcutt.

The vote on the motion was called:

Ayes: 6
Abstain: 1 (USFWS)
Absent: BOR

The motion was approved.

Orcutt moved the following motion for a vote:

Advocate full ROD level of funding for the FY 2008 budget in all Interior budgeting processes.

Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The vote on the motion was called:

AYES: 6
ABSTAIN: 1 (USFWS)
Absent: BOR

The motion was approved.

Orcutt will draft the letter for TMC review.

UPDATE ON CVPIA PAR/PART

APPROVE MINUTES FROM DECEMBER AND MARCH MEETINGS

December Minutes:

The December minutes include the revisions by Person and Orcutt.

Stokely moved the following motion for a vote:

Approve the minutes of December 2005, as amended Hillemeier.

The motion was seconded by Lagomarsino.

The vote was taken on the motion:

Ayes: 6
Abstain: 1 (HVT)
Absent: BOR

The motion was approved.

March Minutes:

Long would like to have the section about Robert Franklin taking over the meeting reworded To read, "At the Chairman's request, Robert Franklin led the discussion". It is found in the summary of second day and on page 30, item 30.

Stokely moved the following motion for a vote:

Approve the minutes of March 2006 as amended.

The motion was seconded by Hillemeier.

AYES: 6

Abstain: 1 (HVT)

Absent: BOR

The motion was approved.

Open Forum: Comments from the public

There were no comments from the public.

Calendars: Confirm next meeting date and location

The next tentative meeting will be held September 20-21 in Weaverville at the fire hall.

Kautsky moved the following motion for a vote:

Have the next TMC meeting held in Hoopa.

The motion was seconded by Hillemeier.

The vote on the motion was taken:

The motion was unanimously approved.

Adjourn

Lagomarsino moved the following motion for a vote:

Adjourn the meeting.

The motion was seconded by Anderson.

The vote on the motion was taken:

The motion was unanimously approved.

The TMC meeting adjourned at 1:22 pm.

5

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MINUTES

Victorian Inn Restaurant, Weaverville, CA

June 19, 2006

10 **TMC Members Present:** Mike Long, Chair, *USFWS*; Irma Lagomarsino, Vice-Chair, *NMFS*;
Doug Schleusner, *TRRP Executive Director*; Bill Brock, *USFS*; Lyle Marshall, *HVT Chairman*;
Dave Hillemeier, *Yurok Tribe*; Roger Jaegel, *Trinity County BOS*; Curtis Anderson, *DWR*

TMC Members Absent: Brian Person, *BOR*

15 **Others Present:** Arnold Whitridge, *TAMWG Chair*; Tom Stokely & Joshua Allen, *Trinity*
County/Minute takers; Mike Orcutt, George Kautsky, & Robert Franklin, *HVT*; Joe Polos,
USFWS; Tom Weseloh, *CalTrout*; Tim Hayden, *Yurok Tribe*; Larry Hansen, *CA DFG*; Gil
Saliba, *NEC Liaison*; CJ Ralph & Sherri Miller, *USFS/ Redwood Sciences Lab*; Rod Wittler,
Andreas Krause, & Denise Wiltse, *TRRP*

20

Regular Business:

Introduction: Validate agenda items; approve TMC minutes from March 29-30, 2006

25 **Approval of the March minutes was deferred to the following day's meeting.**

There was some discussion about attempting to accomplish the day's agenda. There was the thought that group may not be able to complete it in one day.

30 Orcutt asked about CVPIA PAR and PART, and whether it was to be added to the agenda. There would be an update by Stokely, Hayden, and HVT. The topic was added to the following day's agenda.

35 Irma would like a deviation report at the 1:30 information item slot about the 2006 budget and changes made to it.

Open Forum: Comments from the public

40 There were no public comments.

Report from TAMWG Chair Arnold Whitridge

45 Whitridge discussed the TAMWG meeting that took place on June 15 & 16. They spent most of June 15 discussing Tribal Trust issues, which were beneficial, as well as touching upon some budget issues. Some TAMWG members may be helping to increase the budget. A discussion took place about watershed efforts and ongoing challenges; this has been a chronic topic for the TAMWG. The stakeholders are impatient and dissatisfied with progress that has taken place in regards to watershed work. The group is hopeful that the approach by staff and the incipient CRMP will provide an effective means of grappling with the watershed needs. There is some

5 responsibility from the TRRP for watersheds, based upon the ROD, but all the ducks aren't lined up yet.

About the science framework and the IAP/IMEP; TAMWG members are worried about the ongoing difficulties with getting the program together, though they have no recommendations at this time. Members want and urge some action toward getting the science program less controversial and smoother.

The TAMWG had 3 formal recommendations:

- 15 **1. TMC should not approve the final budget at this meeting, so that costs and revenues are more complete to make a final decision later.**
- 2. TAMWG supports the full program funding in full program column, and urges the TMC to seek the funding amount that was received in 2006 (\$12 million +).**
- 3. Fund wildlife at no less than \$150k which is shown this year.**

20 **They were all unanimous recommendations.**

In response to questions about the IAP/Science Framework, there appear to be ongoing disputes that don't get resolved and sometimes keep escalating.

25

Report from TMC Chair Mike Long

Long thanked all who participated in the two budget sessions, including TAMWG members, TMC members, and their alternates. He thanked his staff for helping him get up to speed on these issues and for CJ and Sheri for setting up the meeting room. He thanked TAMWG for their continued interest and participation. He also thanked Schleusner and staff for all the work on the various aspects of the program, including the high flows, etc.

Whitridge: The TAMWG members appreciate the good job that staff and the program are doing to reach out and engage stakeholders through work groups, presentations, etc.

Long said he feels like the HVT has been let down on the habitat assessment workshop (HAW), and the TMC needs to deal with the HAW and IAP.

40 He suggested that the TMC send something to Neil Manji for his service to the TMC. Schleusner said he had something that everybody could sign and frame.

Lagomarsino, as vice-chair, mentioned that she is going to the final KRTF meetings in Yreka on Wednesday and Thursday. She has been a KRTF member for 5 years. The group has been good for getting different people together; however, there is hardly any management authority with KRTF which is a huge dichotomy compared with the TRRP, which has huge budgets and tremendous authority.

50 She attended the IDT meeting and found it to be fascinating; along with a visit to the Trinity Dam Glory Hole spillway during the 10k cfs flows. She also attended the B-Team meeting to get

5 ready for the budget discussions; she found it interesting to hear the discussions between RIG and TMAG. At the meeting it sent a clear message that we need a better budget process for 2008, and she will make a motion to facilitate that new process.

10 Long talked of three program priorities: 1. Get the are IAP done, 2. get the FY 2008 budget process in place, and 3. Define the roles and responsibilities for program entities. Those three items stand far above everything else.

Report from Executive Director Doug Schleusner

15 Schleusner said he'd mail out a written report later. He is very impressed with Randy Brown's performance as the Designated Federal Official (DFO). He has responded tactfully and artfully; it was an excellent delegation to have Randy Brown be the TAMWG DFO.

20 Revegetation requirements for rehabilitation sites is ongoing; primarily with DFG for the Hocker Flat project, but it is also going forward now with the Canyon Cr. and Indian Cr. mainstem projects. There has been some questioning of what an appropriate level of mitigation is and what is the role of DFG when there is no requirement for a streambed alteration agreement? It is related to permit applications from the NCRWQCB 401 certification and ACOE CWA 404 permit.

25 DFG is the State's trustee for fish and wildlife, even if a 1600 permit is not required. Sometimes there is a 3:1 to 5:1 replacement ratio. However, because this is a restoration project with abundant riparian vegetation, they are allowing a 1/1 ratio, via replanting and natural revegetation. The response to the ACOE and NCRWQCB is a revegetation monitoring plan that they will monitor for 3 year; if the sites are not naturally revegetating, then the program will have to replant at a 1:1 ratio at 5 years. He believes that DFG will agree to this approach. Curtis Anderson said that within 5 years, an equivalent amount of riparian vegetations will have been generated by actions of the program. The program can replant using sources at the site, or use natural revegetation anywhere within the 40 mile reach from Lewiston Dam to the North Fork.

35 Brock noted that the Lewiston Hatchery Gravel Project ACOE 404 permit is being held up by DFG's requirements.

40 Jaegel noted that some areas may not need revegetation, so why do it?

Anderson said that DFG, as trustee agency, must ensure there is no net loss of riparian vegetation. Due to the unnatural condition of the river, they are allowing the 1/1 ratio and the 5 year time period, rather than something more restrictive. They can not pass the red-faced test if there isn't some type of replacement. It may turn out that through monitoring the program won't have to do any replanting.

Schleusner: This has been an ongoing issue and I'm glad that there is a reasonable and workable resolution of it.

5 Curtis said any member of the public can go to the Fish and Game Commission to ask for changes.

Information Item:

10

Flow Schedule Update: *Review implementation of WY2006 schedule; Coordination with CVO, response to unplanned events*

Schleusner gave an update via a PowerPoint presentation on the high flows in May.

15

In response to a question about how the 10,000 cfs was released instead of 8,500 cfs, Andreas Krause said the rating curve for releases from the dam was “truncated and outdated”, thereby resulting in the extra release.

20

Schleusner said the staff effort for this showed that his office couldn’t really plan any other activities during the high flow period. The landowner relationships were good and people were not surprised by the high flows.

25

Weseloh also added that the program needs to build in more flexibility for tributary accretions during future flow scheduling deliberations.

Schleusner added that the high runoff and storage into the reservoir subsumed all previous discussions and uncertainties.

30

Wiltse said the fact that somebody would stop by each day and look at landowner concerns was very important in building and maintaining local relationships.

Schleusner also noted that some projects that Joe Riess and others were working on were put on hold for about 3 weeks due to the Bucktail Road blowout.

35

Action Item:

Integrated Monitoring Plan and Habitat Assessment: *Review previous motions; clarify intent; approve schedule*

40

Long gave a summary of past actions related to the issues. There was consensus at the last TMC meeting to have a collaborative development of a study plan in preparation for expert review. The TMC felt that the habitat assessment workshop would move ahead.

45

The IAP is one of the highest priorities for the TRRP. The TMC needs to facilitate its completion. They had a presentation by Rod Wittler, with the TMC giving guidance on who is involved, and to circulate that information to TMC members prior to the conference call. TRRP office did complete the annotated schedule.

5 On May 17 the TMC had a conference call. A motion was made, but it didn't pass; there was an
addition to the TMC policy review that would occur after Step 3 in the annotated schedule. The
conference call ended before another motion could be seconded and discussed. Afterwards Long
sent out an e-mail to TMC members to measure the level of agreement on several key points. He
received some responses, so he e-mailed a motion out to the TMC on May 26 regarding the IAP
10 process. Some TMC members felt it needed to be discussed in person, and so a conference call
was not scheduled. This motion is now brought forth at today's Meeting.

The motion is as follows:

15 *The TMC directs that the "Annotated Schedule for Completion of the TRRP Integrated
Assessment Plan (IAP)" (See May 15, 2006 memo from R. Wittler to Executive Director – TRRP)
be implemented with the following modifications, and in accordance with a revised schedule that
begins with the date of TMC adoption of this motion:*

20 *Modification 1 – Item 4.b. of the Resolution Roundtable section is amended to add the following
language: "Subgroups may seek review of unresolved technical issues by an outside expert or
panel of experts. Such review must be supported by a majority of the entities represented in the
subgroup."*

25 *Modification 2 – A facilitated Habitat Assessment Workshop, as previously approved by the
TMC at its March 2006, meeting, will be held no later than June 15, 2006. The purpose of the
workshop is collaborative development of a Habitat Assessment Study Plan sufficient for outside
review by experts. The study plan is to be reviewed by the TMC in preparation for expert review.*

30 *The process for resolution of technical issues not resolved during the workshop shall be as
described in Item 4 of the Resolution Roundtable section of the May 15 memo. Since technical
issues that remain unresolved could be elevated for resolution (e.g., SAB or TMC), the dispute
resolution process must also include documentation of alternative technical perspectives or
approaches, along with a description of the weaknesses and strengths of the alternatives, so that
35 the entity resolving such a dispute understands the value of each approach.*

*Modification 3 – Concurrent with sending the revised IAP to the Science Advisory Board, the
revised IAP will be sent out for broader peer review. The details of the broader peer review
shall be developed by a committee appointed by the TMC, and submitted to the TMC for
40 approval at least 1 month prior to sending the revised IAP to the SAB.*

*Modification 4 – After Meeting 3 (Science Framework Review) the IAP will be presented to the
TMC for policy review and approval and/or modification.*

45 Marshall: Wasn't the government to government (G2G) meeting regarding the Science
Framework, not the Habitat Assessment?

Schleusner: The Habitat Assessment is part of the Science Framework. A key issue is whether
the habitat assessment be a separate project, or part of the larger IAP and Science Framework?

50

5 Marshall: We should bring in the scientific body and have an open dialogue over the program. The HVT is looking for a way to get focused on the bigger picture. There is a need for scientific review that is independent of the program; the dispute resolution would be over the various projects. In discussing the workshop, must it be that limited or controlled?

10 Orcutt mentioned that clarification of the workshop is necessary. They were told to separate the HA from the Science Framework, but now they are being told to integrate. In the HVT's first comments to Brian Person in the G2G meetings, they asked for a Eureka-Type meeting to integrate all aspects of the Science Framework. When the Flow Study was being developed, there was a direct line to the Interior Secretary's office and it had positive results. However,
15 Brian Person focused only on the HA, not the whole. The HVT wrote a statement to guide the process, then on the conference call the motion was to integrate the HA into the larger Science Framework. Brian had asked if the HVT would bring this G2G discussion to the TMC. Is there specific direction given? Somewhere along the way things changed. Where we are at today is where do we want to go? 1. HVT has questions if directions are given; will we get the product?
20 2. Rather than a specific motion, we need to ponder whether the TMC, at some point in time, wants to engage in a policy level discussion before final approval of the document (IAP) so policy implications will be framed and discussed.

25 Long: Is the policy level review higher than the TMC?

Orcutt: Yes, such as Washington, DC.

Long: Should HA be separated from the larger IAP/Science Framework?

30 Orcutt: On principle, there are questions about a deadline for getting things done.

Irma said there was a discussion at the last TMC meeting, but there was no actual motion, and nothing came up in the documents distributed by the TRRP staff regarding when and if a HA workshop would occur. She understands that there are different methodologies being used for the HA, and there are concerns with both.
35

Anderson said he wondered what the difference is whether the HA and IAP are dealt with separately or together. He doesn't think it matters. The TMC needs to discuss HA.

40 Brock, Anderson, Jaegel and Hillemeier all agreed that dealing with the HA separately is appropriate.

Franklin said the HA work stopped when Wittler put the HA into the IAP process. Franklin didn't agree, nor did the "group." Wittler has been in the driver's seat on that and is steering in a different direction.
45

Wittler said he met in Hoopa following the last TMC meeting. There was some progress made regarding a workshop, and he sensed an atmosphere of tension regarding the process. He discussed it with Schleusner and ESSA Technologies; they decided that the HA is Chapter 6.2 of the IAP, only one of many issues to be addressed. He then decided to identify a dispute
50

5 resolution process for all of the various issues to be dealt with in the IAP. They have been on hold waiting for direction from the TMC since then.

Jaegel: How does the SAB fits in?

10 Wittler: The SAB would be the second level, the first level being trying to deal with it through the various technical teams. Secondly, it would go to the SAB, if not, it would go to the TMC.

Franklin: HVT has a different view of the SAB. You don't wait to ask the SAB for advice if there is broad agreement; all of the questions should be put in front of the SAB. Therefore, you don't choose to use the SAB or not.

15 Wittler: I agree with your view of the SAB. If an agreement is reached, it would still go out for SAB review. However, I wouldn't make the SAB compromised by making them participants, rather than reviewers.

20 Marshall noted that independent science review is also necessary in the event of disagreements.

Hillemeier said he doesn't perceive the role of the SAB as reviewing specific methodologies, but rather to get a panel of outside experts on the issue to review it.

25 Lagomarsino: This issue is not ripe yet for SAB review. We also need to know when to have independent scientific review panels. There is some confusion about the roles of those 2 groups.

30 Marshall: The SAB isn't being asked to review these things, and it should happen. Is the SAB an appeals board, what is its role?

The motion failed due to a lack of a second.

Lagomarsino made the following motion:

35 *The TMAG, working with a steering committee appointed by the TMC, to develop the agenda and meeting format, will hold a facilitated Habitat Assessment Workshop for the purpose of collaboratively developing a work plan for completion of a Habitat Assessment study plan sufficient for outside review by experts. The TMAG, and the steering committee, will complete the draft Study Plan by September 10, 2006 for review by the Trinity Management Council in preparation for expert review.*

40 **The move was second by Marshall for purposes of discussion. Marshall then withdrew his second due to the need for a specific date to hold the workshop.**

45 **The motion was put up on the screen by Lagomarsino.**

Anderson: I would like to hear from Franklin and Wittler on how they feel about the motion, and if September 1 is enough time to prepare for the workshop?

50

5 Schleusner noted that there are a number of other work items to be completed between now and the next TMC meeting, including contractual issues.

Wittler: HA is only a part of the IAP/Science Framework. There will be a symposia on the various issues in the IAP, not just the HA. The time frame is workable, but I would like ground
10 rules contained in the draft Resolution Round Table.

Jaegel: I would like to hold the workshop by Sept 10.

Marshall: I would like it by the end of July.
15

Wittler: Realistically, the first available date that the workshop could happen is in August.

Orcutt: The TMC subcommittee report spoke strongly of the TMC becoming more involved & engaged as policy decision makers. Now the TMC steps up and had a motion at the last TMC meeting, and we're now finding out that something was pushed to the side at staff's discretion. I
20 feel that it's a matter of principle to move ahead with the workshop, and that the USFWS might want to help facilitate it.

Hillemeier noted from the minutes that there wasn't a motion at the last TMC meeting about this
25 issue.

Lagomarsino affirmed that statement.

Long: This was an issue brought from the G2G discussions.
30

Marshall: August 10 for the workshop would be acceptable, and that would provide 30 days for a report.

Schleusner: The week of August 7 would be a good one for the workshop.
35

Lagomarsino agreed to add the following modification of the motion as stated above:

During the week of August 7, 2006...

40 Anderson: Having a facilitated review will be difficult to contract for by the dates in the motion.

Wittler noted that the HA work will be completed by the time this workshop is held.

Anderson: The TRRP needs to still hold the workshop and take a step back.
45

Marshall seconded the revised motion.

There was no further discussion.

5 Whitridge: I find it of concern that a group is responsible for the report; I would feel better if a single point of contact were responsible for the process and report.

Anderson: This effort is by no means trivial. The TMC needs to stay involved and be sure that it gets done.

10

Lagomarsino: I would like to know the areas of agreement or disagreement; minority opinions should be reported.

15 Wittler: Doing science by vote is indicated by the issue of minority reports and I am very uncomfortable about that.

Marshall: We should see if consensus can be reached through open dialogue.

20 Brock: Should the TMC have a membership on the steering committee?

Jaegel: The TMC Chair can appoint members to the steering committee.

The vote on the motion was taken:

25 **The motion passed unanimously.**

The Steering Committee was appointed with the following people as representative:

- **Tim Hayden, Yurok Tribe**
- **Robert Franklin, HVT**
- 30 • **Rod Wittler, TRRP**
- **Curtis Anderson as the TMC liaison**
- **Joe Polos, USFWS**

35 **Schleusner requested that the IAP budget issue be dealt with Tuesday.**

The issue was move by consensus to Tuesday morning.

Lunch was taken between 12:30-1:30.

40 **Information Item:**

FY2006 Budget Update: *Review recent developments (Indian Creek, Brown's Mountain Road); year-end cut-off dates; carryover*

45 Schleusner gave a presentation on the 2006/2007 budget update; information is included in his Memorandum dated 6/13/06.

50 In order to be able to accommodate extremely wet year flows for next year, the Indian Creek Rehabilitation Project and the Browns Mountain Road repairs must be completed by spring 2007.

5

Riess explained that the Indian Creek project has been divided into 2 phases. The portion downstream of the former Tullis house is the most important from a flood elevation perspective. If the project can be awarded in October, a good percentage of the work can be achieved by December before the winter rains begin. However, the upstream phase of the site will likely require a river crossing, so it must be done during the summer.

10

In regard to spawning activities, if they can get access across Weaver Creek when flows are still low, a lot of work can still get done before the winter rains begin.

15

Orcutt: What kind of assurances have been given to property owners about the possible success of the proposed project and what contingencies are being planned in case the project doesn't reduce the water surface elevations?

20

Schleusner: A substantial short-term benefit will be gained by the project, but it's unknown what the longevity of that benefit will be. If this project isn't done, several millions of dollars worth of property would have to be purchased.

Orcutt: But what if it doesn't work 10 years later and you still have to buy the land?

25

Riess: There is a lot of uncertainty about the actual impact to the homes; it may not be a problem.

Orcutt: What assurances have been given to the landowners?

30

Schleusner: There have been none specifically, but they are well-informed.

Wittler: Every year will be just like this year; we will always approach the upper flows with a high degree of safety for the landowners. It is essentially a rehab project with flow benefits.

35

Orcutt: The TMC should consider writing to the Regional Managers/Area Managers of BOR and USFWS to ask for carryover funds.

40

Schleusner: I don't feel it's a good use of time to argue over details of the budget. I do recommend, however, that the TMC make preliminary recommendations on the Tribal Annual Funding Agreements (AFA) for the two Tribes in order to facilitate the Hoopa Valley Tribe's and Yurok Tribes AFA's.

45

Dave Hillemeier noted that some projects (such as weir counts) will require more work and skill and need to have project staff identified ahead of time. He also noted that the zeroed CVPIA RF funding allocation is inadequate. The TMC should write letters to others asking for more funding from the CVPIA RF.

IMPORTANT DATE TO REMEMBER:

- **August 14-18 is next B-Team meeting to go over changes to budget proposal.**
- **September 12-21 are meetings for TAMWG and TMC, respectively.**

50

5 TAMWG recommends full program funding of \$14 million+, or seek a 2006 level of \$12.5 million, and that wildlife be funded at the TRRP staff proposed level of \$155k.

A general discussion followed about the wildlife program and budget costs. Also discussed was how to display funds from other sources such as the State.

10

Orcutt objected to showing the State funds in the budget as a source.

Lagomarsino also noted that those funds are soft money and should only be footnoted but not counted in the budget.

15

Stokely stated that additional funding should be shown as a footnote to the overall budget because it is unreliable and what will happen is exactly what happened last year during the budget discussion; it was considered as a guaranteed source, when in fact there is no guarantee that it will be distributed. Those funds were then taken from the implementation side of the program and put into studies. The County seeks funds for implementation and when those funds are put into more studies, it is a real deterrent to seek more, if all that is being done is to study the river and not implement the ROD.

20

Weseloh suggested that funds be shown as such:

25

- Show federal funds available
- Show outside funds available
- Show funding available to be actually spent
- Show footnote for outside funds

30

Break was called for at 2:50 to 3:10 pm.

The question at and is what to decide on 2006 budget And what to do about 2007 budget for now?

35

Brock: The TMC should put off the 2007 budget until the September meeting, unless the Tribes need 90 day review for AFA's.

Hillemeier I agree, we can start Tribal AFA review with just a couple of projects. Doug, will there be more info available in August/Sept?

40

Schleusner: It's possible that the Senate may also have an appropriations bill by then and then we would have a better idea of how much money we would have; plus we'd have more time to review the proposed budget. Other discussions about Klamath funding, technical discussions about rotary screw traps, etc. would be better known by then. There are two spread sheets floating around. It has A/B/C options from the B-Team meeting. However, the latest spread sheet shows a recommendation.

45

Anderson said that he is willing to move ahead with a budget.

5 Marshall: I would also like to move ahead with a budget so I can know what the HVT has to budget for so we don't have to carry the funds. I am unhappy with the distribution of the \$2.5 million that the HVT obtained through Congress for the 2006 budget. It should have all gone to the HVT. He will be in Washington, DC tomorrow talking to Mark Kadish of Senator Feinstein's staff talking about more funding for the TRRP. I am willing to punt until September.

10

Orcutt added that the reason for June approval of the budgets is due to a mandatory 90 day Congressional review/waiting period. Over the years, \$9.2 million of Tribal dollars has been fronted to do the work for the river before the federal government signs funding agreements and provides funding. The faster that review is done, the faster the money can be put to the work for the river.

15

Secondly, he expressed concern that the HVT spends \$300k-400k dealing with Trinity issues each year, yet the federal government should be doing that work, as part of its funding agreement with the HVT to perform the ROD. The long-term solution is to talk to the beneficiaries about what a base level of funding is. Maybe the TAMWG is the place to start those conversations to build a base budget that creates some stability.

20

Lagomarsino: I don't think we can pass a budget over the next day, even though we participated it in the B-Team meetings. There were 3 recommendations at the B-Team meeting and there isn't enough time to review it now. I would also like to see a deviation report on how the 2006 budget is being spent and will be spent.

25

Stokely: I would like to see a recommendation to spend the remainder of 2006 funding; but at this time we're not ready to adopt a 2007 budget. I would also like to see the Tribal AFA's move ahead so they don't have to wait on the funding.

30

Long: I would like to get the 2007 budget done so it is off of the plate of things to do. However, there are some areas of controversy that might be settled by September, but we still might not have enough information that meeting to adopt a budget.

35

Hillemeier also added that the projects which start October 1 need guidance now for planning, even though those projects would therefore get a priority.

Schleusner: The budget will be on our plate through November, regardless of what we do today.

40

Long asked Schleusner to state justifications for the 2007 budget proposal.

Schleusner: The main item causing uncertainty for 2006 is the Indian Cr. project. Since it's not likely to be funded, what do we do with the \$700k-800k dollars to accomplish the 2007 projects, which would then allow funds to be spent in 2007 on the Indian Cr. project.

45

He spoke about the deviation report: line items from spreadsheet, description, amounts approved by TMC, the year end balance, the variance between the two, and why it's different. If it's a very small amount of money, they might not report on it, but if it's bigger, they would report. He is not sure of the threshold for reporting. For instance, SAB is about \$100k behind because they haven't expended last year's funds yet, but they may still renew for more funds, and the

50

5 difference may go down. For staff, there is less money being spent than allocated due to staff
vacancies and later arrival dates. Another project not accounted for is the Browns Mtn. Road
repair, but they have to do design with these funds now. For HEC-RAS there are no
expenditures this year, even though \$60k was allocated.
Anderson said DWR has a 2004 agreement with BOR for the project, but they also get
10 environmental license plate funding, which they spent first, so didn't have to use TRRP funds for
calibration of the model during high flows.

Schleusner: This is an example where a project is extended for another year. Do we need to
fund the equivalent amount for the next year? Another example is watershed grant program
15 through Trinity Co., whereby funds haven't been fully expended.

Lagomarsino requested that the report be made available by the next B-Team meeting.

Hillemeier asked about the \$80,445 for mercury monitoring at the Hocker Flat project. It was
20 required as part of the permit approvals from the NCRWQCB. It should allow a protocol that
shows that mercury isn't a big issue. For floodplain structures relocation there was \$1.3 million,
now its \$600k. It was originally thought that a house might be bought, but it wasn't, which
included the Chancellor garage and the Teunissen property. The best estimate is \$700k-800k will
be available to spend by the end of the fiscal year, though that might be taken by another BOR
25 program manager if the TRRP isn't prepared to spend it. For instance, \$200k has already been
added to the Canyon Creek project. The sediment monitoring contract had about \$355k
projected, but went to \$584k for this year. The base figure is for normal water year, though there
are adjustments needed for other water year types; there are more monitoring days for an
extremely wet water year. The TMC could obligate funds this year for 2007.
30 Bathymetry/topography may be a possibility, but there is some discussion about whether that is
an appropriate use of funds; it could use up \$420k on that project as well.

Stokely suggested that the recommended \$275k for gravel placement be spent this year.

35 Wittler said they are trying to start stockpiling gravel for future projects.

Orcutt said he's having concerns with how much discretion the TRRP staff has to move funds
around. He has questions about the latitude allowed. He would like to see a filtering process for
modifications. He's concerned being that when he was asked as a TMC member to approve an
40 increase in the sediment monitoring project, it was found out later that the increase had already
allocated. On the other hand, for riparian encroachment at Hocker Flat, the HVT requested
approximately \$54k, but the SAB advised only using \$20k. He didn't feel it was the same level
of scrutiny; though it was raised up to \$35k. It was supposed to be on the agenda for this TMC
meeting to discuss the process, but it's not. People should know what to expect in these
45 situations.

Schleusner: Some decisions seemed hasty, but in the case of the sediment monitoring, it was pre-
negotiated, and peer reviewed a couple of years ago. When a project has gone through that type
of process, it's pretty straightforward. We didn't have a similar discussion about what type of
50 riparian monitoring would occur. There were two different approaches for two different projects.

5

Orcutt responded that Indian self-determination allows flexibility in contracts, technical assistance, and there should be some allowances for that. It seems that the program is affording more latitude to private contractors, over the Tribes who are subject to self-governance. Lagomarsino had requested that the Executive Director's discretion be put on the agenda, but it's not.

10

Schleusner said that it might be discussed at the following day's meeting.

Lagomarsino: The TMC needs to take formal action on in it eventually.

15

Orcutt: \$800k was reallocated last September on the grounds that it's easy to do and uses large amounts of funding. The gravel placement project then suddenly appeared as \$300k without prior discussion. The rules are unclear.

20

Schleusner said it was recommended by the technical group, it was reviewed, and approved. There is a need to have more of those conversations.

Lagomarsino: We could get quarterly report on divergence from the budget.

25

Schleusner would like a program of work approved, rather than a specific budget. He doesn't believe the ROD requires a line by line budget approval by the TMC; it provides for flexibility and discretion.

30

Stokely would like to see direction given regarding use of remaining 2006 funds; i.e. sediment monitoring contract, gravel stockpiling, and adult fish monitoring

Kautsky mentioned the genetics study on hybridization of spring and fall chinook. For three consecutive years of collection of tissues, signature standards on genetics on fall and spring chinook was done, and the hybridization study was done for \$65k.

35

Weseloh suggested TMC participation would be very easy to fund in advance as well.

Schleusner mentioned that the Tribal AFA's don't have the opportunity for multi-year funding. It may not be possible to use 2006 funds to pay for 2007 projects.

40

Long is worried about funding science projects without having them fully vetted.

Lagomarsino agreed.

45

Orcutt said he isn't prepared to vote on how to spend \$600-700k in 2006 funding. (maybe \$500k-600k).

Anderson asked if there is any opposition to funding TMC participation with the 2006 budget.

- 5 Weseloh suggested that the TMVC mull over the alternatives. With TMC participation, fall monitoring of fish (harvest, carcass surveys, age composition).

Hillemeier said he needs to do research on the weir work and harvest monitoring.

- 10 Long suggested that everyone think things over regarding the budget overnight and be prepared to discuss it at the following day's meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 pm.

5

TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL SUMMARY

Victorian Inn Restaurant, Weaverville, CA

June 20, 2006

10 **TMC Members Present:** Mike Long, Chair, *USFWS*; Irma Lagomarsino, Vice-Chair, *NMFS*;
Doug Schleusner, *TRRP Director*; Bill Brock, *USFS*; Mike Orcutt, *HVT*; Dave Hillemeier, *Yurok*
Tribe; Tom Stokely, *Trinity County*; Curtis Anderson, *DWR*

TMC Members Absent: Brian Person, *BOR*

15 **Others Present:** Arnold Whitridge, *TAMWG Chair*; Joshua Allen, *Trinity County*; George
Kautsky, *HVT*; Joe Polos, *USFWS*; Tom Weseloh, *CalTrout*; Larry Hansen, *CA DFG*; Ed
Duggan, *TAMWG*; Rod Wittler, & Pricilla Davee, *TRRP*

Information Item:

20

FY2006 Budget Update: *Cont.*

25 Long: We are dealing with a \$600-700k deficit in 2007, due to lack of Indian Cr. obligation in
2006. Funds that could be obligated this year that wouldn't have to be obligated in 2007 include
TMC participation, sediment monitoring, and 1st quarter monitoring work. Are his preference to
do being that they are the easiest. I am hesitant about 1st quarter work due to ongoing debates and
uncertainty. If there is no decision made in 10 minutes, Doug will make a decision anyway.

30 Orcutt : I have a two pronged approach. Lyle Marshall is meeting with Mark Kadish, chief of
staff for Senator Feinstein to discuss the \$2.5 million that was supposed to go to the HVT in
2006 and the \$700k deficit in FY 2006 AFA. I would like to get that, but if not, I would like a
recommendation from the B-Team. I'm concerned that this wasn't discussed at the B-Team and
that we'll set a dangerous precedent on allocation of funding. I would like prioritization; we
shouldn't cherry pick.

35

Anderson: I would like to discuss funding that isn't under debate by the B-Team. Sediment
monitoring is one item that's got a multi-year contract; you can separate funds from that entity.

40 Orcutt: That's exactly what you're doing. 2006 has an impact on 2007; I would like more
thorough discussion.

Lagomarsino: I hear that Mike wants a process and criteria for use of year-end funding.

45 Schleusner: BOR doesn't agree that there was a \$2.5 million earmark specifically for the HVT in
the 2006 appropriations language. Regarding the process for this year, it's not amenable to a
process this year. It's going to change year to year. It's my responsibility as a BOR line officer
for spending the funds, one way or another. I am asking for the TMC's advice, while meeting the
best needs of the program within my legal constraints. A pre-approved list of projects with
ranking criteria would help us make these choices, especially if we get additional funds, or get
50 some cuts. It would be a useful tool to have.

5

Orcutt: I've met directly with Senator Feinstein several times and I believe her direction was to provide the \$2.5 million to the HVT. A start on a process is a good thing, but this isn't it. You could convene the B-Team; if they don't want to take it on, that's fine. If we start today, it's not perfect.

10

Schleusner: Keep in mind that the role of the B-team is NOT decision making. It's not a voting forum. I'm not sure how productive they would be in this situation. I don't want to have his staff develop additional scopes of work and extra paperwork if it's not currently in place. It takes time.

15

Long: Perhaps during the FY 2008 budget process, maybe that would be the place to try it.

Lagomarsino agreed that the FY2008 budget is the place for it.

20 **Orcutt moved the following motion for a vote:**

Of the \$700-800k unobligated 2006 funds, that at least \$412k be added to the HVT's AFA. Specifically for each project:

- Net harvest monitoring for \$150k
- Coded wire tags for \$60k
- Expert Habitat Mapping for \$160k
- Creel census \$12k
- Genetic stock identification for \$40k

30 **There was no second to the motion.**

Motion failed due to a lack of a second.

Hillemeier: I still have my concern about 1st quarter fisheries projects; we stand the risk of not having those projects implemented. If we can't get folks to agree to some bare bones projects, then I guess that I'm willing to make motion. Otherwise Doug can do what is most efficient to offset costs incurred in 2007.

40 **Hillemeier moved the following motion for a vote:**

Fund in full the spawner survey, carcass redd survey, and age composition. The remainder of funds to be obligated in a manner most efficient for program staff and offsets FY07 budget needs.

45 **There was no second to the motion.**

Motion failed due to a lack of a second.

50 **Lagomarsino moved the following motion for a vote:**

5 Have the TRRP Executive Director obligate the remainder of the FY06 funds in a manner most efficient for the restoration program which offsets FY07 budget needs.

The motion was seconded by Anderson.

10 Lagomarsino says she has faith in Schleusner.

Orcutt: You have committees on top of committees. When I asked for input from b-team, I was told it's not appropriate, so what is the appropriate committee?

15 Schleusner: I'm not saying that the B-team doesn't play a significant role in this. However, I don't think you can get it into a voting situation because there are multiple representatives of various agencies and participants who aren't TMC members. It's to provide information to the office to allow them to formulate a budget proposal, similar to other groups like the flow group.

20 Long: The TMC would be the most appropriate place for the process.

Orcutt: This reflects the need for roles and responsibilities definition. There are problems with the roles and there is ambiguity. I have no problem with votes being cast at the B-Team. I'd rather have that than having one person having total discretion. There is a need for policy
25 guidance.

Long agreed.

30 Stokely said he interprets that to mean it's projects that would be funded for sure in FY07 and have existing means to do so.

Schleusner agreed that new projects being funded wouldn't help.

35 Long: What about the possibilities of funding fry density?

Schleusner: There is no way it can be done.

A vote on the motion was called:

40 Ayes: 6
Nays: 1 (HVT)
Absent: BOR

Motion was approved.

45 **FY2007 Budget:** *Discuss Director's proposal to approve final budget at September meeting & Review results of B-Team meetings, TAMWG recommendations, TRRP staff proposal; further discussion on priorities*

5 Schleusner went through a brief description of the various options considered and their justification.

10 A breakdown was given about current levels of general staff funding, it showed 50% of each of branch chief costs with the remainder of their times shown as salaries in those specific project areas; it included all office operations expenses.

15 Public information/outreach was zeroed out, but based on input he received it was reinstated at \$40k. TMC & TAMWG funding is the same as FY06. SAB and independent review are the same as FY06, but it won't fill the vacant SAB space.

15 Orcutt: I would like more public education, how much is being spent on it? Also, I did not see notice of this meeting, was the information circulated?

20 Schleusner: There was notice given in the Redding Searchlight, Eureka Times-Standard, Willow Cr. Klamath Kourier, and the Trinity County Journal; though there has not been an outpouring of attendance as a result of that. Face to face contact with landowners along the river is one way we make information available. The TAMWG is another great forum, the TRRP website continues to be used more and more, and the TCRCDD newsletter has information as well; but we could always do more.

25 Orcutt: We're a little localized, we need more public support, and need to get in the limelight.

Several TMC members agreed and generally discussed how to do that.

30 Anderson: I worked on Battle Creek Restoration and also received the comment that there was not enough public outreach. So I developed brochures that were distributed every 6 months to highlight what's new. We could do the same thing with the Trinity River by giving such brochures to TMC members to distribute.

35 Lagomarsino really likes the website and believes that the TAMWG could help as well.

40 Whitridge: There is a lot of energy on the TAMWG to do this, but it's wrapped up in the strategic planning process. TAMWG may separate strategic planning from public information and education so more effort can be focused there.

Brock: In the Dark Ages of the TRRP, there was an assumption that if we did good things, we'd be appreciated; but that wasn't so and we were caught short.

45 Hillemeier: If we had and agenize public outreach in the future; are we going to do this level of detail or move on quickly?

The answer was that it should move on quickly.

5 For the RIG, there are no big surprises here. The priority within the RIG is to be sure that the NEPA/CEQA permit compliance schedule doesn't slip. Environmental Review, Project Design, permits are the key. Other RIG costs:

\$100k for Browns Mountain. Rd improvement

- 10
- New RFP for NEPA/CEQA consultant is estimated at \$200k.
 - Site design for Lewiston 8 which is similar to past years.
 - Canyon Creek Suite of Rehabilitation projects is mostly funded.
 - The Indian Creek Rehabilitation project is fully shown in 2007.
 - There is a push to proceed on NEPA/CEQA for coarse sediment injection.
- 15
- There may be separate a contract for NEPA/CEQA documentation on gravel vs. bank feathers.
 - Watersheds funding is close to last year.

TMAG budget:

- 20
- For the Science framework, there have been comments that more funding is needed for the IAP,
 - Stream gaging has received a slight increase
 - Temperature monitoring; there are some new models wanted, though there will be no
- 25
- new funding with such a short budget.
 - Sediment monitoring is less than the full cost of \$400k; instead \$300k has been allocated.
 - TMAG would like to get bathymetry funded at \$300k.
 - Wildlife studies have been cut down to \$155k from the \$309,200 full program amount.
 - Habitat assessment has been funded with \$50k, with an addition of \$20k, which is subject
- 30
- to the HA conference.

Wittler explained an ongoing coho research study by the Denver Technical Service Center of BOR.

35 Weseloh would like to hear more about it at the B-Team meeting because it will look at how to build bank feathers

Anderson asked that Wittler send out the scope of work. Wittler agreed to do so.

40 Hillemeier said he wants to hear more about the bathymetry at a future TMC, technical group, or B-Team meeting.

Schleusner said he'd bring it to the B-Team.

45 Lagomarsino: Shouldn't this go to the Physical Work Group?

Schleusner discussed the rationale for the bathymetry study by the B-Team.

5 Long said it's not clear why it's so important or what questions it's answering. For instance if we have five extremely wet years in a row, do we have to do it each year? Sediment, fisheries, IDT should review it before B-Team.

Lagomarsino; There needs to be linkages from work groups before going on to the B-team.

10

Anderson: Line item 73 is too low. DWR doesn't want to do aerial photo ground control again.

Schleusner agreed and said it's under review.

15

- Fry density is budgeted for \$90k. There are different interpretations of what Sam Williamson is recommending that is still being fleshed out. It is a component of the baseline, not just for SALMOD. It's a place holder for more conversation.
- Juvenile salmon health and adult salmon health were increased, because the KBAO cost share is unsure at this time, but may still get it.

20

Orcutt: There have been lots of effort for disease monitoring but I am unsure that management opportunities to alleviate diseases have been missed. There is a need for strong leadership. For instance, Scott Foote doesn't make this a priority. Co-managers should identify a lead person in the basin who deals with this issue. I believe that juvenile survival is the biggest issue, even bigger than the 2002 adult fish kill.

25

Long agreed.

Wittler cautioned involvement in all efforts in this regard due to time constraints.

30

Anderson: If Trinity fish are dying on their way to the ocean, we need to know about it.

- Rotary trapping has a reduced amount; the intent is to do a competitive RFP for it. Staff is doing comparative costs for similar activities.

35

Orcutt noted that the change in process for the rotary trapping has significant implications in regard to federal laws and regulations. At this point in time it's premature to put \$350k in 2007 budget for that line item. The third party report hasn't been provided to the HVT. It hasn't been vetted or discussed. Policy/legal implications related to Tribal Self-Governance, among other federal laws and policies. This undermines credibility and intent of this project. Put an asterisk there.

40

Brock wondered how the full program is less than the TRRP proposal.

45

Orcutt: SalMod isn't sacrosanct.

Run Size/angler harvest is 80% of 2006 funding at \$923k. However, angler harvest is down substantially because smaller number of fish expected back this year. There are other points of view on that, when looking at a budget that's this small, we need some tradeoffs. It's easy to add line items and increase dollar amounts, but what we need is other specifics regarding priorities of

50

5 the TRRP. Not necessarily appropriate to make up one branch's funding shortfall by taking it from the other branch. Here may be a need to look at deferring some projects, or doing them every other year. Look at the choices and tradeoffs.

10 Larry Hansen noted that the smaller number of fish doesn't mean a lesser effort. It's required to get numbers of grilse for future year fishery predictions. DFG isn't happy with this proposed reduction.

15 Orcutt noted an inconsistency with the B-Team process. There are new projects such as fry density shown, but then tribal harvest on Hoopa Valley Reservation isn't even shown. If the Field Office wants something, it gets put on the table, but if a co-manager wants it, it's optional

Hillemeier noted that the age composition for 2006 is \$89,357, not \$18k.

Hillemeier moved the following motion for a vote:

20 **Fully fund the carcass redd surveys and fall chinook component of the age composition project.**

Hillemeier mentioned that to expect agencies to be on call with a 1 week notice to get out in the field isn't reasonable.

25 Schleusner asked if this is related to the need for a letter from the TRRP office to the Yurok fiscal office in order to be able to hire persons.

30 Orcutt asked how this budget motion could be procedurally made. It should be negotiated later and be vetted through the B-Team. Sometimes the HVT fronts up to \$1 million through the fiscal year, up to the last days of the fiscal year.

Long agreed.

35 Hillemeier said when he agreed to defer voting on the 2007 budget, he wanted assurances regarding the first quarter 2007 monitoring projects.

40 Kautsky said accountability is a reasonable standard. Monitoring of the net fishery in Hoopa isn't reflected in the budget, despite his request at the B-Team meeting. Even though Schleusner says he doesn't want to transfer funds from RIG to TMAG, he had asked for a \$500k transfer to TMAG from RIG because the TMAG budget is too low. This isn't reflected anywhere in the proposed budget and it should be.

45 Schleusner: There was a \$500k shift from RIG to the TMAG. I took responsibility for the net harvest not being included and I'll follow up on it.

Kautsky, the third issue is the paradigm of third party reports on the reduction in funding for the rotary traps that they have yet to receive the reports on. He can't find his submittals for the project compendium in the proposal

50

5 There was no second to the motion.

Hillemeier withdrew his motion.

Hillemeier moved the following motion for a vote:

10

Have the B-Team (at its next meeting) to look at first quarter monitoring projects and have the TMC follow up with a conference call to consider funding first quarter monitoring projects.

Lagomarsino seconded the motion.

15

Orcutt spoke in opposition to this motion. It's inconsistent with our previous decision to not be specific on 2006 funding.

20

Curtis: This is about adult weirs, creel census, etc. recommendations to the TMC from the B-Team.

Hillemeier: This relates to the 2007 budget in order to plan for crews.

25

Hansen noted that these projects will not 'start' October 1; they start earlier. The August through December period is when it's being done.

30

Schleusner: We would be discussing this project anyway at the B-Team, but the extra step is the conference call to get a subset of the total. It wouldn't change the AFA's, but would be more of an expression of intent regarding the approval of the budget in Sept. so folks can go out and hire staff to do.

Orcutt: But you are deferring a portion of the budget and this front loads the pain in September.

35

The next B-Team meeting is August 14.

The vote on the motion was taken:

40

Ayes: 5

Nays: 2 (USFWS & HVT)

Absent: BOR

Motion failed due to a lack of approval votes.

45

FY2008 Budget: *Discuss possible improvements to budget process, use of ranking criteria for project priorities; next steps*

Long discussed the relationship between the IAP and the budget.

5 January 1 2007 is when RFP's would start being written to trigger the chain of events, so the IAP needs to be done by 1/1/07, and approval needs to be no later than December TMC meeting. There is no need for detail here, but may need to establish a process for the 2008 budget.

10 Orcutt: I am hopeful about reprogramming dollars into the TRRP from the 2006 budget. What would happen if that were to occur?

15 Schleusner said he'd send a note to all about what the TMC needs to look at, which can be executed in a short time frame, and how it benefits the TRRP. He hasn't heard anything like that yet. He'll pass the word on if it occurs and a conference may be scheduled. He is frustrated with conference calls, so a special meeting might be better.

20 Schleusner suggested no new committees. He suggested a core team member from the B-Team and TAMWG, and uses that group under the TMC's designated leadership to ensure all individuals that are involved are represented.

Orcutt moved the following motion for a vote:

25 **Have the full ROD level of funding be advocated for the FY 2008 budget in all Interior budgeting processes.**

Long said the motion is not about the agenda item which is about process, not budgeted amounts. He asked that it be deferred.

30 Orcutt said that the TMC never makes this statement and sometimes they can't due to budget embargoes, and the TMC needs to in order to provide stability for the TRRP.

Chairman Long deferred the motion.

35 Curtis: I support what Irma has laid out such as the expert review panels, RFP's etc. and counting backwards. One would then know the lead time to do these things.

40 Schleusner said it's more like an 18 month time frame. Also, what parts of the TRRP can be put out to bid? Some aspects won't fit into that, so you'd have to identify which activities can be done one way or another.

Lagomarsino moved the following motion for a vote:

45 **Have a subgroup of TMC entities and the TAMWG to convene to develop the budget development process for FY 2008 for consideration of approval by the TMC in December 2006.**

The motion was seconded by Brock.

50 Orcutt said that without enough money in the budget, he suggests that full program funding be fully considered during all of these deliberations.

5 **The vote on the motion was taken:**

Ayes: 6

Abstain: 1 (HVT)

Absent: BOR

10

The motion was approved.

The first meeting will be in August.

15

IAP Discussion

An e-mail motion was sent out, but not acted upon because of the need for more discussion.

20

Orcutt: HA now has a process to resolve disagreements. Now the IAP is a key issue. There have been high level discussions in DC with folks like Jason Peltier, who are advocating a similar approach as used in the TRFE. They are requesting a series of workshop-type efforts to integrate policy and science, but where there is policy overlap and guidance, there would need to be high level involvement with Interior officials and TMC members. Up front, the policy people should be engaged. More thought could be put into the dispute resolution process. There is a lot of uncertainty still.

25

A general discussion followed about the relationship between RFP's and Tribal Self-governance.

30

Wittler: The first two meetings will be Eureka-type meetings. The issues document is being completed. We are just waiting for the process to start, once the schedule is adopted.

Long: We need to get the issues document out right away.

35

Anderson: There also needs to be a policy level review soon so we don't go down the wrong path.

40

Schleusner: I agree that policy will come into play, but do we do policy first, then science, or do we have a stand alone technical recommendation for policy implications? It makes a difference in the schedule.

Orcutt: Regarding the steering committee for HA; is it the one here for IAP?

45

Schleusner: No. It's a case by case basis for policy implications. It should be sooner, rather than later, but it shouldn't drive the science.

Lagomarsino supports the type of conference workshop recommended by the HVT, but she's not sure when would be the proper time to hold it. The document should be of a certain maturity before unveiling it to policy folks.

50

Wittler has a draft issues document and comments keep coming in.

5

Lagomarsino would like to see what's in it now.

Schleusner: I agree. Maybe the TMC should designate an end date for the comment period. If other things come up along the way, they can be dealt with.

10

Long said he preferred to have the policy input later on so it doesn't drive the science.

Orcutt said he'd like to see policy input on an as-needed basis.

15

Whitridge: It's disconcerting to have people involved with policy concerns to review science issues.

Wittler: I agree; to allow politics to dictate science would be a mistake.

20

A general discussion followed concerning policy vs. scientific/technical issues.

Orcutt: This is the opportunity to resolve issues we've had simmering for years; but perhaps at the second or third meeting.

25

Anderson moved the following motion for a vote:

Form a steering committee to work with the TMAG to complete the proposed IAP schedule for TMC approval/consideration of the document by the December 2006 TMC meeting. The steering committee will determine an appropriate place for a high level policy review of the IAP with a findings document sent back to the TMC for consideration. The steering committee will consist of the TMAG Branch Chief, Scott McBain, Joe Polos, Robert Franklin, Wade Sinnen, Tim Hayden, Curtis Anderson, and a TAMWG representative.

30

The motion was seconded by Hillemeier.

35

Schleusner: Is this to complete a schedule or actually complete V 1.0 for TMC approval?

The answer was that it is the latter.

40

Hayden mentioned that it may be more appropriate to have a representative from each TMC member agency.

Schleusner: When would policy review occur?

45

Orcutt: What is the end product?

Anderson: An approved version 1.0 of IAP.

50

Wittler: The pre-V 1.0 versions are drafts. V 1.0 will be the final functionally operational version.

5

A general discussion followed about the possibility of rushing the product. There was general agreement that if it's not ready, the TMC won't approve it. The steering committee would not speak for the TMC, but would be liaison to the TMC.

10 **The vote for the motion was taken:**

The motion was passed unanimously.

LETTER REGARDING FULL FUNDING OF TRRP AND CVPIA RF FOR TRRP

15

Hillemeier: We are facing tough budgetary decisions this year. Portions of CVPIA Restoration Funds are generated from the use of Trinity River water. We should be able to access some of those funds. It's also important to seek full program funding and we should try to fill gaps with the CVPIA RF.

20

Hillemeier moved the following motion for a vote:

25 **Prepare a letter to be sent to BOR/USFWS requesting that they assist TRRP in seeking any and all sources of funding for full implementation of TRRP, including use of CVPIA RF for FY 2007, at least at 2006 funding levels.**

The motion was seconded by Orcutt.

30 **The vote on the motion was called:**

Ayes: 6
Abstain: 1 (USFWS)
Absent: BOR

35 **The motion was approved.**

Hillemeier will work with Schleusner to develop a letter and it will be sent to TMC members for review prior to signing it.

40 **Orcutt moved the following motion for a vote:**

Advocate full ROD level of funding for the FY 2008 budget in all Interior budgeting processes.

45 **Hillemeier seconded the motion.**

A general discussion followed about the consistency of full program funding. It was generally agreed that it's the full program funding developed through the B-Team meetings.

50 **The vote on the motion was called:**

5 AYES: 6
ABSTAIN: 1 (USFWS)
Absent: BOR

The motion was approved.

10

A discussion followed about how to transmit the letter. It was agreed that it would be a separate letter.

Long said he would put in the letter how the vote came down.

15

Orcutt will draft the letter for TMC review.

UPDATE ON CVPIA PAR/PART

20 Stokely gave overview of the CPVIA PAR process. Comments are due on a draft by July 5. Many of the comments on other sections of CVPIA besides Trinity are the same in that there is a lot of disagreement and/or uncertainty about what the actual goals of CVPIA are. There will be a public draft available for review and comment soon.

25 APPROVE MINUTES FROM DECEMBER AND MARCH MEETINGS

December Minutes:

The December minutes include the revisions by Person and Orcutt.

30

Stokely moved the following motion for a vote:

Approve the minutes of December 2005, as amended Hillemeier.

35 **The motion was seconded by Lagomarsino.**

The vote was taken on the motion:

Ayes: 6
Abstain: 1 (HVT)
Absent: BOR

40

The motion was approved.

45

March Minutes:

Long would like to have the section about Robert Franklin taking over the meeting reworded To read, "At the Chairman's request, Robert Franklin led the discussion". It is found in the summary of second day and on page 30, item 30.

50

5

Stokely moved the following motion for a vote:

Approve the minutes of March 2006 as amended.

10 **The motion was seconded by Hillemeier.**

AYES: 6

Abstain: 1 (HVT)

Absent: BOR

15

The motion was approved.

Open Forum: Comments from the public

20 There were no comments from the public.

Calendars: Confirm next meeting date and location

The next tentative meeting will be held September 20-21 in Weaverville at the fire hall.

25

Kautsky moved the following motion for a vote:

Have the next TMC meeting held in Hoopa.

30 **The motion was seconded by Hillemeier.**

The vote on the motion was taken:

The motion was unanimously approved.

35

Adjourn

Lagomarsino moved the following motion for a vote:

40 **Adjourn the meeting.**

The motion was seconded by Anderson.

The vote on the motion was taken:

45

The motion was unanimously approved.

The TMC meeting adjourned at 1:22 pm.

50

