DRAFT MINUTES OF THE TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
OCTOBER 29, 2003

TMC Members Present: Chairman Mike Ryan, USBR; Mary Ellen Mueller, USFWS; Executive Director Doug Schleusner; Bill Brock for Sharon Heywood, USFS; George Kautsky for Mike Orcutt, Hoopa Valley Tribe; Tim Ramirez, California Resources Agency; Ralph Modine, Trinity County; Dave Hillemeier, Yurok Tribe.

Others Present: Joe Polos and Vina Frye, USFWS; Glen Yoshioka; Daryl Peterson, Andreas Krause, Rich Miller, Lori Kleifgen, Brandt Gutermuth, and Bob Sullivan, TRRP Office; Neil Manji and Harry Rectenwald, DFG; Loren Everest, USFS; Curtis Anderson, DWR; Scott McBain, McBain and Trush; Tim Hayden and Seth Naman, Yurok Tribe; Serge Birk, CVP Water Assn; Arnold Whitridge, TAMWG Chairman; Janet Clements and Tom Stokely; Jeff Phipps, CVP Power Customers and WAPA; Tim Viel, NRCS; Don Ashton and CJ Ralph, USFS- Redwood Sciences Lab;

Introduction

Chairman Mike Ryan called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m..
Dave Hillemeier requested that a review of ROD implementation be added to the agenda. Tom Stokely requested that a discussion on the EPA's Watershed Initiative Program be added under Open Forum. The agenda was approved as amended.

Approval of the June 26th meeting minutes and the July 3rd conference call minutes.

Ralph Modine moved to approve the minutes from the June 26th TMC meeting and the and July 3rd conference call with no amendments. Mary Ellen Mueller seconded motion. Motion carried.

TMC Bylaws

The following changes to the final version of the TMC bylaws were discussed:

- Page 3, Section 401, Article 4, Bill Brock asked that the word offices to officers.
- Section 606, Bill Brock asked if the TMC wanted to maintain the 15 day cap for a rescheduled meeting after a postponed meeting. He suggested 30 days or between 15-30 days. Mary Ellen Mueller agreed that 30 days would be good. Doug Schleusner pointed out that if the TMC continues to schedule meetings on a quarterly basis, we may decide to skip a meeting if the time period is extended too far. Ralph pointed out that this last delay was about as fast as we could get it scheduled. He is not opposed to 45 days. Doug stated that this last delay was due to a fire, not postponement. George suggested that it be no less than 30 days prior to the next meeting. Mike Ryan stated he would agree with 30 or 45. Ralph Modine moved to extend the maximum time period for rescheduling a postponed meeting to thirty days after the original meeting. The motion was unanimously approved.
- Section 300 (f), Dave Hillemeier noted that a semi-colon should follow "Yurok Tribe"

- Section 607 (i), Dave Hillemeier suggested that the TMC have public comment period before each agenda item. Mike Ryan noted that a public comment period is scheduled at both the beginning and end of each meeting. Dave thinks comment before each action item works well. The bylaws were not amended to reflect that suggestion.
- Section 604, Doug stated that Jim Monroe had rewritten Section 604 as shown.

Ralph moved to approve the bylaws with the suggested changes. Mary Ellen seconded. Motion was unanimously approved.

Election of Officers

Mike read from Article 4 of the bylaws regarding officers and officer elections. There was a brief discussion on officer positions and the voting process. The implications of a USBR employee remaining as chair were also discussed. Mike Ryan does not want to give the impression that the TMC is a USBR program and not a cooperative effort. However, he is willing to remain chair. Irma Lagomarsino and Bill Brock both stated that they would be unable to serve as chair at this time, however, they did agree that NOAA and USFS would one day be able to take that position. Tim Ramirez stated that it would be great to have a different federal agency as chair. He thinks it would give the perception of the program truly being cooperative effort and it would give other agencies a chance to take a greater leadership roll. Mike says there are no extra authorities, but there are additional responsibilities that come with being chairperson.

George Kautsky stated that he does not have any problem with leaving things as they are. Ralph stated that the perception of the TMC would be different if the TRRP were seen as a reflection of the TMC and program, not as a USBR field agency or as having its own office agenda.

Dave Hillemeier agreed with Tim that it would be good to have a different federal agency serve as chairperson.

Mike Ryan explained that the term for chairperson is two years. The position actually expired in February but a new election was postponed because many things were happening at that time. Mike stated that there is a portion of the restoration program that is mitigation for CVP, but it is also more than that. The program has to be seen as more than a USBR program.

Tim suggested that USFS and NOAA can prepare for the next two years to serve as chairperson the next term.

Mary Ellen stated that something to consider is how to make TRRP more than a USBR program.

Doug passed out the ballots for chairperson and vice-chairperson. After the ballots were counted it was announced that Mike would remain chairperson and Mary Ellen would remain vice-chairperson.

Open Forum:
Tom Stokely gave a brief explanation of the EPA Watershed Initiative Program. He asked that one of the Tribes or the State nominate the Trinity River as one of the 20 watersheds nationally to be selected in order to open the possibility of further funding. Nominations are due in December 4, 2003. He recommended that the TMC ask the Tribes or the State, to nominate the Trinity River. Tom offered to send information to anyone interested.

Mary Ellen asked Dave and George if they were aware of the program and whether nominating the Trinity would pit it against the Klamath. Dave stated that they had been thinking of submitting something for the Lower Klamath as well as some of the upper Klamath. However, it is possible to submit for the entire watershed to include the Trinity. Tim stated that the program is very competitive, but he thinks the tribes have a good shot, especially for the Trinity.

Tom volunteered to work with tribes on the application. Bill asked if anyone had ideas for a market-based approach, as it seems important in application. There was general agreement that the Tribes would work with Tom to come up with a proposal. An action item will be added to the agenda for the December meeting. Tom agreed to check whether non-federal funds are required and where they would come from.

Ralph stated that this seems like a good opportunity to address the watershed component of the Restoration Program. If the Tribes were unable to do the proposal, Trinity County could ask the Governor for a nomination, although he feels that would be a long shot.

Report from the Chair
Dave Hillemeier would like an evaluation of the TMC and TRRP and how the program has worked to meet its original goals. One flaw that he sees with the program is that there is no technical committee for the TMC itself. He knows that the other agencies are very busy, and it would help to have a technical committee.

Mike Ryan suggested preparing an annual report that gauges the program's progress and measures it against its original goals and objectives.

Doug stated that he hopes to have a progress report for the past two years completed for the December meeting. It will look at what has been accomplished. It will not necessarily look at organizational dynamics.

Dave explained that he is looking for more of a step back approach of what was intended and how it has been followed up. He is not looking for an accomplishment report.
Irma stated she would support the kind of effort Dave is talking about.

Tim thinks that the TMC needs to meet on a more regular basis. He does not see much happening besides the quarterly meetings. He agrees that a technical team would help better communication. He also thinks it would be a good idea to have an annual meeting for the higher level people who make decisions. As an example, he pointed out that the TMC is absent from the ROD litigation efforts. He believes that it would help the agencies if the TMC had a voice. The TMC should be able to play a role in supporting the ROD. The TMC should be more visible in that context.

Mary Ellen agreed with Tim. She likes idea of an annual meeting. She stated that Doug has offered to meet with each TMC member individually to discuss how he or she feels about different issues. She feels it would be easier to target an evaluation that way, but the TMC cannot evaluate itself.

Dave stated that his original intent was to have an independent evaluation of the whole process that includes the TMC and the TRRP. He would like an evaluation of how the program is functioning and how they are working toward the TRFE recommendations. He suggested the TMC form an independent group with a representative from each TMC member.

Mary Ellen is concerned that a technical work group can evaluate everything except the higher tier political issues. Dave is thinking more of an assessment of how the program is following the TRFE recommendations, which is different from higher political issues. Doug agrees there is no formal technical team, but he feels that the TRRP staff serves as technical representatives.

Dave would like the formalization of a technical team. George Kautsky agrees that more people need to be involved as the program tries to conform to its original intent. He feels we need more people with experience with the TRFE, ROD, etc. to keep us on track. He thinks that the technical people should be original architects of those documents.

Doug stated that was one of tasks of the Science Advisory Board. He asked if it would be appropriate for the SAB to complete the evaluation. Mike thinks that the SAB has a critical role to play but they do not have previous involvement. He thinks that each TMC member needs to provide input on how things are working. Doug thinks the SAB could serve as an objective third party. Perhaps they could be the group to look at all the various pieces and make contact with different parties.

Mike Ryan suggested that maybe the TMC put together a list of people involved with the TRFE and the ROD and contact them before the December meeting. Mary Ellen suggested that each member nominate his or her representatives. The appointees will get together to talk about the issues Dave identified, put recommendations together, and then meet with whole TMC. Tim supported Mary Ellen's recommendations.

Mike Ryan asked Dave Hillemeier if he would feel comfortable acting as chairperson. Dave said he would be happy to attend the meetings.

Mary Ellen stated that the intent of the group would be to evaluate the current structure and original intent of the program and compare it to whether we are on the mark. Dave agreed. He said this does not preclude the formation of a technical team in the future.

There was a general discussion about the role of the committee and whether its intent was to form a technical team or to form a technical committee to do the evaluation. Irma supports the role of the committee to evaluate progress but she is not clear on how the formation of tech committee fits into overall program structure.

Curtis Anderson, DWR, stated that the formation of a technical team would be very beneficial to him. He has money from the State to do restoration on the Trinity. He has no source of information other than through the TMC or TRRP. He would like more information on day to day activities in the basin.

Mike clarified that the charge for the ad hoc committee would be to take a look at what was intended in the ROD and to compare that to the efforts of the last three seasons. The committee would report on what is working, what is not working, and make recommendations on how to get where we should be. The TMC would ask Dave to serve as the liaison for that committee. The committee would be made up of technical representatives from the TMC agencies. Dave will present a progress report at the December meeting.

Mary Ellen made a motion to form an ad hoc committee for the reasons Mike detailed. Tim seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Doug and TRRP will assist with information, help facilitate meetings, etc. TMC members will notify Doug and Dave as to who will serve as their technical representatives by the end of the day.

Report from TAMWG Chair
Arnold Whitridge reported that the TAMWG passed a motion endorsing development of the scientific framework and asking that it be merged with the strategic plan. The TAMWG is currently struggling with the role of the sub-committees. It is clearly understood that one person or sub-committee cannot speak for the entire TAMWG. However, if members engage with TRRP staff or the TMC it will be construed that way. Specifically, they see a problem with the members of the science sub-committee meeting with staff in that it could possibly make the science react to stakeholders. Arnold reported that the full TAMWG will not be meeting every month, yet in order to be effective, the sub-committees should be out there doing something, but it is not yet clear how to do that.

Arnold also stated that self-assessment is a good thing but it is not the entire assessment that the public needs. To a stakeholder, self-assessment does not rise to the level of complete analysis. He feels that something more might be desired.

Serge Birk agreed that evaluation is necessary. He asked whether there is anything in the bylaws that precludes participation of the TAMWG members or stakeholders when the TMC chooses its representatives for a technical team. He asked who will serve as the TMC technical reps on this ad hoc committee.

Mike Ryan stated that the bylaws say that TMC sub-committees shall be made up of representatives from the TMC member agencies. He believes that those representatives should be able to talk with the stakeholder committee to get their opinions and advice. Serge thinks that it is a real mistake for TAMWG to be precluded from working directly with staff on this and other committees. He is glad Mike is suggesting there should be more stakeholder outreach.

Arnold also reported that that it seems there is some interest in the TMC being given an introduction and background to topics before the TAMWG is giving advice and making recommendations on them. However, if issues and questions do not come before the TAMWG before the TMC has a chance to discuss them, you risk losing three months of input from the TAMWG due to the quarterly meeting schedule of the TMC.

Ralph noted that the bylaws say that the committee must be made of TMC representatives, however, he does not know if that precludes all others from participating. Mary Ellen does not think it does. Mike Ryan does not see how it can be successful without stakeholders. Arnold cannot represent the TAMWG formally. One person cannot represent the viewpoint of the TMWG members. There was a general discussion of the role of TAMWG members and stakeholders.

Tim does not think that it is appropriate for TMC members to appoint TAMWG members as their representatives on the Technical committee. He thinks that TAMWG members can be invited to attend, but not specifically appointed. Dave agreed with that idea but noted that large groups can be somewhat dysfunctional.

Serge suggested that one representative from each TAMWG subcommittee participate. The TAMWG sub-committees are implementation, budget, science, watershed, and socioeconomic.

BREAK

Tim Ramirez gave an update on the current situation within the California Resources Agency. The new Governor is being sworn in on November 17th and the current cabinet does not expect to stay after that time. Tim will continue to work for the state government. He gave credit to Mary Nichols for all of her hard work. Tim asked that Doug and Mike and others go to visit the new secretary to describe the Restoration Program.

Curtis Anderson thanked Tim on behalf of state employees. He announced that Mike Spear, head of DWR, plans on stepping down on November 1, not related to the new administration; however he will remain until someone else is appointed.

Members of the TMC thanked Tim on behalf of their representative agencies. Tim stated that he will continue to work for the program in any capacity that he can.

Director's Report
Doug Schleusner hit the highlights of the director's report he handed out. He pointed out the TRRP display that was completed in cooperation with the Trinity County RCD through funding for public education and outreach.

In accordance with Section 302 and 303 of the bylaws, Doug would like each TMC member to designate their first and second alternates. Doug reported that a number of items in the NRC report refer to the Trinity and are things we all need to become familiar with. Regarding the strategic plan, he has had a few comments returned. He would like to discuss the plan with each TMC member. He will try to connect with each member to set aside time. He will be working with TCRCD to develop an annual accomplishment report by December.

The contract specifications for the Trinity River Bridges Project are being rewritten for spring and summer construction. The bid will be put out on December 4, 2003. Staff expects to award a contract by February 6, 2004. They are aiming for construction of all four bridges next summer.

Over the last few months, there has been concern over which agencies will serve as CEQA lead agency for different projects. Doug stated that this is essential to all projects and Tim has really helped with this process.

Doug announced 4 of 5 members of the Science Advisory Board (SAB). Additional outreach and follow-up is needed for the 5th member. The SAB will convene ASAP. The Trinity River Bridge Project is on agenda for the Restoration Roundtable on November 6, 2003. Ed Solbos will represent the TRRP and its request for $2 million.

A recent development identified through the bridges project is the FEMA process as it relates to floodplain mapping and projects with TRRP. He briefly explained the process for a "letter of map revision" (LOMR).

Irma asked about SEIS schedule. Mike Ryan stated that the federal government will report to Judge Wanger in January. The public draft is scheduled for completion this February.

Fall Flows Action Plan Preliminary Results
Daryl Peterson, TRRP Staff, gave a power point presentation on the preliminary data and results of the 2003 fall fishery flows. The intent of the fall flows was to reduce risk of a second salmonid die-off, to improve passage and temperature conditions so that the fall run would not be hindered. Releases were timed with the peak abundance of Trinity fall run fish. The objectives of the preventative action were accomplished and the flows did coincide with when fish were in river.

Daryl presented the estimated run timing and disease incidence from the Lower Klamath surveys and Willow Creek weir counts. There was an increasing trend of Ich in the river but really only after the peak of the run. There were not as many fish in the river then and there has never been sampling this late in season. They did not implement the emergency flow releases for those reasons, so only 33,000 AF was used.

The draft results for disease incidence monitoring show for fall 2003 show that although the fish were infected, they were not infected too badly overall. This is another reason the emergency response was not implemented.

In monitoring for Klamath fish movement upstream of Weitchpec, another concern was that there would be unintended effects of the higher emergency flows if they started drawing fish upstream, and then they went into the Klamath where conditions were poor. The other concern was that these flows would impact spring run spawning near the dam. USFS reported that there was not a lot of spawning observed until the flows were ramped down. It does not appear that spring run spawning was impacted and there was no observed dewatering of redds.

There were no apparent negative effects on Klamath fall Chinook. Fall Chinook migration was unimpeded. Water temperatures in the Lower Klamath were reduced by increased Trinity flow. Spring run Chinook spawning was not affected in the Upper Trinity. Disease incidence increased as flows dropped, but disease severity remained consistently low. Anecdotal reports indicate that fish condition was excellent throughout run.

George Kautsky noted that Daryl may want to condition the results he showed for catch compared to flow over time, with effort, which usually increases at peak run time. Also, it was a concern that Klamath fish would go up the Trinity, but it seems that it was a very small proportion.

Fisheries Update: Preliminary Data on 2003 Fish Returns

Neil Manji, CDF&G, presented the preliminary data on the 2003 fish returns. He first went over the Junction City Weir Trapping Summary. He stated that the weir went in a month later than normal due to higher flows this year. The season totals ended October 7, 2003. Season totals were 1,142 compared to last year's 1,734. In 2003, 14, 639 fish returned to hatchery as compared to 11,000 fish that returned last year. We are continuing to see spring Chinook at the hatchery. Last year, the total number of spring Chinook was 38,500. This year the estimated number is 40,000-50,000 total spring Chinook. The Trinity spring run was very strong and late this year. The Willow Creek weir was put in almost two weeks later than in the past. In comparing last year's numbers to this year's, you can see the effects of fish kill on 2002. Almost 80% of the fish through the Willow Creek weir so far are of hatchery origin. Neil explained that in looking at 2003 trapping vs. 2002, the spring run was delayed but CDF&G does not have data for trapping prior to July 16th, when they got the weir in. CDF&G will be looking at previous years to see how to compensate for missed fall run.

Sport anglers will most likely not catch their quota this year. The allocation was 10,800 fish for sport anglers, 5,400 below coon creek falls, and 5,400 above. Neil stated that the chances of hitting the lower river quota this year are very low.

CDF&G does not have an Upper Klamath River creel in place. They saw 32,000 more fish this year at Iron Gate, one of largest runs there. 113,600 adults were estimated at the beginning of the season. The end of season totals could actually be in the 140,000's or 150,000's. Data will continue to come in. Neil will present more data at the December meeting. It should be relatively complete at that time.

TMAG Staffing Update and Science Framework

Lori Kleifgen, TRRP Staff, presented an overview of the framework, summary of the process, a sum of the components, and the timeline for the process.

Lori explained that TRRP hoped to have a series of products when we come out of this process, including the education of the Weaverville staff in truly understanding what adaptive management is and how to implement it in a science based program. The framework will include workshops. Lori reviewed the tasks for the program staff and director; the AEAM team; and conceptual model team needs. She thinks that the TMC might want to consider a communication committee. She noted that a lot of this work is ongoing or in preparation, part of the process has already begun.

Daryl Peterson announced that Glen Yoshioka has left the program, Lori Kleifgen is leaving, and Bob Sullivan has been transferred to the Engineering staff. The role of the TMAG staff in this process is large. Part of the process is the transfer of knowledge from people who have been here for a long time to those who have not. TMAG positions will be refilled and there is now an opportunity to look at those positions and to make changes as necessary. TRRP was hoping to have a science program in place for next year's budget, however, that now seems unlikely. Daryl would like input from the TMC.

Tom Stokely asked how much the science framework program will cost. Daryl responded that it will cost $250,000 to $300,000. Tom asked if it will be put out to bid or done as a sole source contract. Daryl stated it would be done as a sole source contract with Essex Technologies. They have experience with the river and have worked through this type of process before.

Tom asked what the schedule is for the strategic plan because it looks like it is a key part of this process. Doug stated that the strategic plan is something that grows and evolves, he expects to see a reviewed and edited version by the end of the calendar year.
Tom asked what the role of watersheds and tributaries is in this plan. Daryl stated that will come from the management options that the TMC will consider. Watershed restoration is part of the ROD. What that means has to come from the TMC and policy makers.

LUNCH

ESA/Coho Coordination Activities: Preliminary Report

George Kautsky, Hoopa Valley Tribe, gave a brief presentation on ESA and Coho Recovery Process. Both George and Dave Hillemeier sit on the federal recovery team for the SONCC ESU. He wanted to share some ideas about the relevance of recovery work with work on the Trinity. The Central California and SONNC Coho will soon be listed by the State. Anglers have been asking Fish and Game to relax regulations on coho, especially on those of hatchery origin. The federal coho recovery process has been ongoing since 1997. The federal process has two phases. The first is identifying the conditions necessary for the species, and the second is identifying a recovery plan. The State process in phase two will probably be a spin off of the federal recovery plan. In his work with the state process, he was successful in insisting that the ROD be included in the recommendations. The Preliminary Recovery strategy for the State of California was submitted to the Commission in august. The timeline for completion of the state recovery strategy is February 2004.

Irma further highlighted some of the differences between state and federal process. George would like to have more in-depth discussion in front of the TMC about the recovery process. Irma suggested it become a regular agenda item and coordinated with federal meetings to avoid conflicts. She stated that NOAA Fisheries will be looking at the state document when it comes out to see how it might incorporate into their plan. Daryl Peterson asked if there were uncertainties they have identified that we should be identifying in our own program. Doug asked what pieces of it may fit into our strategic plan. Mike suggested that the TMC set some time aside next meeting for an agenda item. Brandt Gutermuth stated that he would like to hear more about the hatchery component. Harry Rectenwald suggested that someone from CDF&G present that at the next meeting.

Irma stated that NOAA is undergoing a review of status of species on the west coast and when to list hatchery fish. The review will include how coho hatchery fish are affecting wild fish. It is a complicated issue and was brought up in the NRC report on the Klamath Project.

Restoration Program Web Page

Mike Ryan stated that thinks that the website will be an important tool in expanding the information base; however, several questions come to mind when deciding how it will be put together. He would like the TMC to decide what kind of a website they would like to have: technical for professionals or more for an audience of lay citizens interested in the topics.

Bob Sullivan went through the website main page and some of the main topics covered in order to start people thinking about what they would like to see on the website. Something the TMC may want to address is whether manuscript type documents need to have peer review. One other issue is whether or not humorous captions/subtitles are appropriate.

Doug thanked Bob for all of his efforts on the website. Mike Ryan would like input from the TMC. He stated that right now there is a lot of information on the site and a lot of it is pretty technical. He pointed out that the TRRP brochure is very simple. He carries it with him to brief people on the program. The TMC needs to decide whether they want to have links to recreation, other research, etc.

Doug stated that the Humboldt website and this website were serving different purposes. One is more technical than the other, although the Humboldt website does have access to some spatial documents.

Mike thinks the page should contain the essence of the program is, who is behind it, what the intentions are, etc. Results and program accomplishments should also be included. He feels that particular attention must be paid to the technical information posted. Doug stated that TRRP is committed to keeping the site updated. The page will be on its own server. The USBR Denver tech center will be able to help with technical issues. Every one in the office will be responsible for updates. Tim thinks that there should be a lot of deferring to other agencies through links. Dave stated that it will be important to give the address of the website to the Klamath Task Force once it is up so they can put it on their website as a link. Mike is concerned about the quality of the technical information posted, and he is concerned about committing to the work load.

Cableway Gravel Introduction Project

Brandt Gutermuth, TRRP Staff, presented a PowerPoint presentation on the Lewiston Spawning Gravel Introduction and Interim Coarse Sediment Solution. The purpose of the project was to restore coarse sediment below Trinity Dam; increase spawning and rearing habitat for juveniles; restore geomorphic materials; and facilitate alluvial processes. Brandt explained the project history, identifying concerns with previous gravel addition projects. He explained the project/contract specifications. The project took two weeks and used 2,000 yd3 (3,000 tons) of 0.5 to 5 inch rounded Trinity Basin rock. Flows were higher than expected, which made a difference for the contractor. Lessons Learned included: prepare for variable flows; maximize contractor access for gravel delivery; CalTrans #227 clean gravel causes short-term turbidity; post project surveys should match AEAM guidelines; dealing with traffic and noise complaints from property owners; it took two weeks to put in 2,000 yd3; how long would it take for 67,000 yd3. They have adjusted specs for future based on what they learned. Redd surveys will be conducted to compare post project Loren Everest, USFS, stated that more fish were spawning this year below the project because the gravel was more compacted last year.

FY 2004 Budget: Update on available funding; new line items: improved procedures; assistance agreements

Doug Schleusner, TRRP Director, presented a power point presentation on the FY 2004 budget. See handout.

Doug agrees with the TAMWG proposal that money should be set aside for watershed restoration. He identified different funding needs and where funds had been allocated. He reviewed the criteria for prioritizing which was used when putting the budget together.

They were able to keep the $1.5 million in bridges funding for 2004. The revised estimate of available funds showed a total $12,600,000 (see handout). Mike stated that the CVPIA Restoration funds were authorized for funding Trinity River Restoration, however, we have to tell them where those funds will be spent, and why it is important. They identified their projects and they are ready to stand behind them. He feels very strongly that restoration in the originating basin for the water, power and money should get some of the money. Irma asked if the Trinity had a higher priority. Mike said no, but Steve and Kirk recognize the importance.

Mike Ryan will be representing the TMC at the meeting on November 6th. Dave said that the Yurok Tribe had talked about writing a letter, but it would be more effective if Mike was actually there. Mike does not think that the CVPIA roundtable will recommend funding Trinity River restoration. However, the Roundtable is not the final decision making body. Ralph asked about the $900,000 from CSRP. Doug said these funds were obligated, we will not know about the $1.2 million that Trinity County applied for until the next round of announcements on Fish and Game funding in late December or January. FWS funds should be confirmed by Friday.

The current FY2004 Budget is broken down into Program Administration, Rehabilitation and Restoration, Monitoring and Analysis. Doug presented a summary of major issues and uncertainties, RFPs and the status of funding agreements.

Tom Stokely asked if a new RFP will be put out. Doug said no, TRRP will work with the agencies/individuals for those projects they know who will be doing. The others will be done through Sacramento in order to meet requirements for competition.
Doug would like to see TRRP do 3-4 months better ahead of schedule.

Open Forum
There were no comments from the public.

Next Meeting
The next meeting was set for December 9th in Weaverville.