

Trinity Management Council Minutes

Date: September 29-30, 2004

Location: Hoopa Wildland Fire Facility

Summary: September 29, 2004

Chairman Mike Ryan called the meeting to order at 9:10 am.

TMC Subcommittee Report: Non-Budget Items

Item 1: Conduct joint and individual programmatic workshops with the TMC, TAMWG, SAB, and AEAM staff as soon as possible. (V-1, p. 10)

The TMC agreed with No. 1. Yes, the TMC wants to have those meetings and careful development of the agendas, designed for interaction and programmatic review, not daily business; scheduled for winter. Agreed unanimously by the TMC

No 13: The TMC should develop a more formal organization process for coordination among AEAM staff, TAMWG, and TMC technical representatives. ...smaller technical committees to collaborate on specific resource areas (per Figure 3). (M-8, p. 17)

The TMC agreed with recommendation No. 13.

No. 2: Establish lines of communication between the authors of the Flow Evaluation Report, ROD, and Implementation Plan to maintain a consistent and comprehensive understanding of the written documents to Program participants. (V-2, p. 10)

All TMC members agreed with Recommendation No. 2.

#4: Develop a RFP process for assessment of management action outcomes by tying the data to specific models and interdisciplinary analyses. Redesign the RFP process to solicit proposals that support the Program's information needs based on the results of the science framework. (I-S-5, p. 13)

The TMC agreed in concept with No. 4 to implement the RFP process to meet the needs of the TMAG, conditional on clarification of issues.

No. 3: Integrate the SAB and ERPs into the science framework process. (I-S-4, p. 13)

The TMC agreed with recommendation No. 3.

No. 5- Reevaluate the Mainstem Restoration Subcommittee's priority list for the first 25 restoration sites and develop a science-based implementation strategy to prioritize and guide channel rehabilitation projects. (I-R-4, p. 13)

This is already happening anyway. No action necessary

No 6: TMC needs to make a determination on the effects, if any, the litigation has on channel rehabilitation and other non-flow activities. ...the Subcommittee believes that planning, design, and environmental compliance for channel rehabilitation activities should be completed prior to the litigation being resolved. (I-R-5, p. 13)

The TMC agreed that the program should proceed as under the ROD until otherwise instructed by a court.

No 7: The TMC needs to become more engaged in the management of the Program by providing significant oversight and guidance to AEAM staff through the Executive Director. (M-1, p. 16)

The TMC agreed with recommendation No. 7.

No 8: In addition to quarterly TMC meetings, monthly conference calls should be initiated to provide the opportunity for the TMC and Executive Director to discuss Program progress and challenges, and improve TMC guidance and oversight of the program. (M-2, p. 16)

The TMC agreed in concept with No. 8, except it might be a monthly director's report, with phone conference calls as, needed.

No. 9: The TMC, TAMWG, and the AEAM staff should develop the strategic plan with the Flow Evaluation Report, ROD, and Implementation Plan as its foundation. (M-3, p. 16)

Mike Orcutt will head up subcommittee to deal with long-term funding issues. It helps prioritize funding.

Doug will meet with some members of the TMC subcommittee who helped write the TRFE and Implementation Plan to look at the strategic plan. It may identify shortages in out-year funding and will identify places to fill that gap.

No. 10: The science component of the AEAM program must be developed. ...the science framework must be in place so that assessments of current conditions can be made and follow-up assessments resulting from management actions can be completed. (M-4, p. 16)

The TMC agreed with recommendation No. 10.

No 11: The Executive Director should seek TMC help in challenging institutional barriers and overcoming any USBR procedures that may hamper innovation in pursuing Program objectives (i.e., grade level for senior staff, travel ceilings). (M-6, p. 17)

The TMC agreed with recommendation No. 11.

No. 12: The TMC should work with the Executive Director on the rehabilitation site permitting issues, CEQA, etc. and become engaged in development of an overall programmatic permit process. (M-7, p. 17)

The TMC agreed that there should be a meeting by the end of the year to discuss the appropriate environmental compliance and permitting strategy.

No. 14: A plan for future Program review needs to be established. ...via tracking Program progress on implementing the ROD. ...procedure for SAB review of the Program needs to be developed...program participants must be kept more informed of Program's progress, challenges, and accomplishments via increased outreach... (M-9, p. 17)

The TMC answer to this one is???

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:40 pm.

Summary: September 30, 2004

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Mike Ryan at 8:40 am.

Presentation and Discussion:

Monitoring of fall flow releases by Joe Polos

Tim Hayden, Yurok Fisheries: Draft Report on Klamath River Salmonid Health and Abundance in Response to a Proactive Flow Release from Lewiston Dam on the Trinity River, California, 2003

Josh Strange, Yurok Tribal Fisheries and U. of Washington- Radio Tagging of adult chinook

Role of Fisheries Management in TRRP: George Kautsky and Dr. Dave Hankin

Draft Action Plan: TRRP Science Program: Andreas Krause, TRRP, Curtis Anderson, TMC Subcommittee

Science Framework and ESSA Contract: Dave Marmorek, President, ESSA Technologies

Discuss and Finalize FY 05 Budget

Stokely made a motion to defer \$224k from ESSA until 2006.

All voted yes, except Orcutt No

Motion by Stokely to change TMC participation to 2004 levels 607,500, except \$40k for Trinity County permitting work and funding for USFS and DWR; a \$271k savings

Motion died for a lack of a second.

Motion by Neil Manji to cut a specific percentage of all programs and projects, excluding the July 27 projects approved. Second by Stokely.

Motion and second withdrawn.

MEM made a motion for 6.0% across the board reduction in the remaining items not yet approved (excluding July 27, 2004 approved projects and ESSA which is already removed). Motion seconded by Stokely.

All were in favor, except Orcutt who voted no. Irma Lagomarsino was gone, so 6 of 7 members voted affirmatively. Motion passed.

The TMC agreed to consider sending a letter to the TAMWG in response to their letter regarding coordination with the Klamath Project. Doug Schleusner will draft a letter for the TMC to consider.

Motion to adjourn by Stokely, second by Manji, unanimous approval. Meeting adjourned at approximately 4:45 pm.

Trinity Management Council Minutes: September 29, 2004

Location: Hoopa Wildland Fire Facility

Chairman Mike Ryan called the meeting to order at 9:10 am. Mike Orcutt welcomed everyone to Hoopa.

TMC Members Present: Chairman Mike Ryan, *USBR*; Vice-Chair Mary Ellen Mueller, *USFWS*; Bill Brock for Sharon Heywood, *USFS*; Irma Lagomarsino, *NOAA Fisheries*; Mike Orcutt, *Hoopa Valley Tribe*; Dave Hillemeier for Troy Fletcher, *Yurok Tribe*; Neil Manji, *CA DF&G*; Ralph Modine, *Trinity County*.

Others Present: Executive Director Doug Schleusner, *TRRP*; Tom Stokely, *Trinity Co. Planning/Minute taker*; Ed Solbos, Andreas Krause, Rod Wittler, *TRRP Office*; Joe Polos, *USFWS*; Arnold Whitridge, *TAMWG Chair*; Randi Perris, *NRCS*; Curtis Anderson, *CDWR*; Serge Birk, *CVP Water Assn.*; Tom Weseloh, *Cal-Trout*; Tim Hayden, *Yurok Tribe*; Harry Rectenwald and Wade Sinnen, *DFG*; George Kautsky, *Hoopa Valley Tribal Fisheries*; Glenn Yoshioka, *The Public*; Warren Carlson, *Trout Unlimited*

Agenda:

- Approval of 6/29-30, 7/27 and 8/2 minutes
- Open Forum
- Reports
- TMC subcommittee reports
- Adjourn for lunch
- Continue TMC subcommittee reports
- Adjournment

Regular Business:

Introduction:

There are no minutes; Stokely will produce final draft minutes for all the meetings and, members will send comments on Doug's 2 draft minutes for the 7/27/04 and 8/2/04 TMC meetings.

Open Forum:

Comments from the public: None

Reports:

TMC Chair Mike Ryan: Mentioned that the plaintiffs asked the court for a rehearing at the 9th circuit. The court hasn't ruled whether they are accepting a rehearing. The 9th Circuit has asked DOI for comments. The Hoopa Valley Tribe (HVT) was notified. The deadline is October 5, 2004 to respond to the filings.

He also reported that the funding for the additional water that was acquired for late summer flows this year came from appropriated dollars other than the Trinity River Division. The Regional Director took \$675,000 from another budget and put it in the Trinity River Division budget to pay for the water.

Orcutt asked if there is any unused water from the late summer flows to be carried over to next year. There was 25,000 AF purchased and 11,300 AF carried over from last year. None was carried over from the previous year. Purchase price does not include foregone hydropower revenue. Some CVP power interests are less than happy about it and the use of non-reimbursable funds associated with the waters use. Reimbursable means water and power customers pay a portion of it, non-reimbursable means the taxpayers pick up the bill.

TAMWG Chair Arnold Whitridge: He said the TAMWG charter and membership expires in October. They met on Sept. 8, 2004 and made 2 formal recommendations. TAMWG wrote an authorized letter to TMC recommending that the TMC work to obtain adequate water releases from the Klamath Project to make sure that additional Trinity releases are not the only line of defense.

Also recommended a budget which would restore 4 lines from B-Team proposal; 2 are watershed coordinator and reforestation in GVC. Also larger amounts for other projects are recommended to be restored; something like \$690k in Canyon Cr. implementation and \$50k from Lewiston implementation.

The TAMWG continues to be interested in watershed work and riparian fauna. A comprehensive restoration solution is necessary which includes watersheds. If you don't understand the riparian processes and watersheds, you can't understand the entire system; and may be "bitten on the back" by future listed species which inhabit and riparian zone.

The TAMWG is a diverse group with differing priorities and objectives, but the TAMWG has worked well in a collaborative manner. Others may share some of the frustrations of the group in terms of the slow start of the program related to litigation, the science framework, etc.

We haven't succeeded in developing a collaborative relationship between the TMC and TAMWG. The ROD says that a collaborative relationship is necessary, yet we haven't done so. There isn't much dialogue. Never been a response or discussion of TAMWG recommendations to the TMC. There is not really much communication other than Chair reports to TMC. It is not satisfactory to the TAMWG as a whole, he believes.

The TAMWG cannot function as intended. He does not assign blame, but we can all share responsibility. The TAMWG and TMC both need to work on it. There is no mandatory issue for a collaborative relationship, but he asks on behalf of the TAMWG that it would be better if there was more of a sense of collaboration. All parties need to work on how to accomplish that. Making more information available to the TAMWG is desirable, without it, the TAMWG feels marginalized. He asked for suggestions from the TMC on how to make it work better.

Neil Manji said he was surprised about the perceived lack of coordination. Are there things identified in the TMC subcommittee that could help it work better? Are there specific instances of non-communication and non-collaboration? Is the TAMWG's Designated Federal Official, Mary Ellen Mueller (MEM) there as a TMC member? No.

Mike Ryan said that it is a challenge for him to represent the TMC when he works for Reclamation. Sometimes it is hard to make the distinction.

Arnold said there were a couple of recommendations from the TAMWG to the TMC that he never knew of a response from the TMC. More communication is needed.

Serge Birk agreed with Arnold's summary of the TAMWG. It is important to note that the last meeting of TAMWG was the LAST meeting of THIS TAMWG (due to charter and memberships expiring). It would be beneficial to have the TAMWG meet one more time to deal with this topic. It's good to synthesize and summarize what has been accomplished for the next TAMWG. There is concern that this is the last stand of the TAMWG as it currently exists.

Whitridge: There is no time for a TAMWG meeting to occur; it expires in less than a month, but it takes 6 weeks to advertise a meeting.

Irma Lagomarsino: She is hearing that we need to deal with it, not today, but deal with it on the next agenda on how we can better collaborate. The TMC subcommittee report identified a need for more collaboration, but not internal dissatisfaction. She would like to hear other ideas from TAMWG on how to fix it, such as having TAMWG issues on the TMC agenda.

Whitridge: They need the scientific framework.

Tom Weseloh: TMC subcommittee report identified several recommendations for better coordination; the chart on page 21, arrow from TAMWG to TMC only goes one way, it should go both ways. The TMC and TAMWG have worked well in subcommittees on flow issues, but it's not official.

Dave Hillemeier: The Sept 14, 2004 letter from TMC is a good letter it should be discussed and a consideration put forth for acting upon it. If we don't act upon it, the TMC should let the TAMWG know.

Lagomarsino: There is a Conservation Implementation Program at the Arcata Community Center 6-9pm tonight, then one in Klamath tomorrow night. Do we need such a program and what should it look like? It is required of the NOAA Fisheries BO. It recommends attendance at one of the hearings. She agrees there is a lack of integration of science between the Klamath and Trinity. There is no answer yet on how to do it.

Arnold Whitridge: The TAMWG believes that the TMC should look out for Trinity interests, but there may be conflicts with various members' parent agencies. There is a sense in the TAMWG and the public and stakeholders that TMC should be advocating for Trinity interests.

Whitridge was asked about the wide array of interests represented on the TAMWG. How many are represented at each TAMWG meeting?

Whitridge: There are 18 members, they usually have 13 or 14 present. A few have “retired” early. The charter says a majority is required to have a meeting. It requires 10 affirmative votes to do anything.

This letter was unanimous among the members present. 12 were present on Sept. 8.

Orcutt: The ROD was a starting point and not meant to be static and the issues raised are valid. There is unfortunately a segregation of how the 2 sides of the Klamath basin were set up. The emergent issue for the TMC is we have flow regimes from many years of study to enhance the fish in the Trinity River; but the recent fish passage problem through the Lower Klamath is a concern and it should be collaborative. Will that water come out of the Trinity ROD, or is it beyond that? They could use Humboldt County’s 50,000 AF. Where will water come from and how will it be managed?

Arnold articulated the TAMWG’s concern about impacts to the TRRP from the additional releases of water for late summer/Klamath fish-saving flows to meet temperature requirements in the Trinity River for that year and following years.

Weseloh articulated increased costs to the TRRP to deal with the fall/summer fishery releases, which are substantial and listed in the letter. Financial and staffing costs, the cold water pool, there is an inequity between how much the Trinity is contributing to solve the issue compared to the Klamath contribution.

Hillemeier reiterated concerns with the ecological implications of such an unnatural flow regime at that time of the year. He suggested that the TMC forward the TAMWG’s concerns to the Regional Director of BOR.

Mike Ryan: We could have somebody talk to the TMC about this issue at the December TMC meeting.

Lagomarsino said it is not guaranteed that these releases will be necessary every year. She agrees there needs to be work on the Klamath side, but not sure about how to get there.

[The TMC Agreed to touch upon this at tomorrow’s TMC meeting.](#)

MEM said the charter is in the process of being renewed, but if there is a change in administrations, it could be halted. They have received all nominations.

Lagomarsino: The need for TAMWG to meet one more time, is that practical?

MEM said it can’t happen as a chartered group, but could meet on their own at their own cost.

Manji: That has happened with ad hoc groups meeting in place of the Klamath Fisheries Management Council. There was general discussion of the limits of this way of dealing with the TMC and TAMWG.

Doug suggested a letter from TMC to the administration to expedite new chartering of TMC, ASAP. MEM said it's being expedited, but there are just lots of new question about it.

Executive Director's Report

Doug Schleusner said there is no written report. He will send it out something in a week or two. He mentioned verbally:

He introduced Rod Wittler as the new acting TMAG leader. Last month the office focused on year end closeout, funding agreements and the FY 2005 budget. They hired one engineer to replace Rich Miller; Joe Riess from CH2 Mill Redding will start on Oct 18, and a second offer is pending for a second engineer. There have been recent interviews for the fisheries biologist position. He contacted GSA to expand the office.

Bridge construction is well advanced. Abutments and piers are being placed, and are still on track to have 4 bridges completed in Dec/Jan open to traffic.

Mid-October is the science framework workshop in Eureka. If you want to go and have not received the packet, please contact Rod Wittler.

Regarding the budget, keep it open in front of you as other presentations are made. No details at all, but please review it this evening. This package has been scrutinized as closely as anything we've done so far. There is \$10.8 million in FY 05. The budget is \$11.6 million.

Biggest difference between 2004 budget and 2005 is about \$2 million from DFG/CSRP through Trinity Co. in 2004. In 2004 they also had \$2 million from the CVPIA Restoration Fund and \$2.2 million from USFWS and prior year moneys.

Orcutt said he wanted more refined numbers for the upcoming fiscal year and future years, it skews the numbers to include the state funding. He wants to know the amount necessary for full restoration and how much federal money can be obtained. The Hoopa Valley Tribe is placing their emphasis on the federal funding.

Mike Ryan suggested a page showing where the funds are coming from.

Weseloh said he sits on the state advisory committee that reviews proposals. If you don't submit a proposal, you don't get funding. The bridges are the only proposals received of a larger magnitude. Most Trinity proposals are smaller watershed proposals.

Modine: The state advisory committee has been sympathetic to Trinity River proposals in the past.

Lagomarsino: The need to identify funding sources specifically in the budget issues.

Stokely: As a member of the DFG subcommittee, he feels that the DFG funds should go to watersheds and tributaries as opposed to mainstem projects (except bridges); because BOR is less likely to fund watershed and tributary work, but will fund mainstem work. That being said, the minimal funding available for watershed and tributaries through the TRRP budget is being used to leverage other funding sources such as the state funding.

Weseloh agreed with Stokely and noted that whatever funding is made available through the TRRP budget will be matched with other outside funding sources such as the DFG grants program.

Break 10:45- 10:55

TMC Subcommittee Report: Non-Budget Items

Curtis went through the non-budget list.

Item 1: Conduct joint and individual programmatic workshops with the TMC, TAMWG, SAB, and AEAM staff as soon as possible. (V-1, p. 10)

The TMC agreed with No. 1. Yes, the TMC wants to have those meetings and careful development of the agendas, designed for interaction and programmatic review, not daily business; scheduled for winter. Agreed unanimously by the TMC

No 13: The TMC should develop a more formal organization process for coordination among AEAM staff, TAMWG, and TMC technical representatives. ...smaller technical committees to collaborate on specific resource areas (per Figure 3). (M-8, p. 17)

Hillemeier thinks there should be a technical team from the TMC, this is a shortcoming of the report.

Doug agrees in concept, but we may need to look at the finer details on how it can be made to work.

Curtis Anderson: TMC and TAMWG members could have an opportunity to participate in the coordination meetings, but would not be required to attend. The subgroups would meet at least once a year, more if specific issues came up. Goals, objectives and monitoring needs all must be coordinated. If TMC technical representatives participate, then it increases TMC overall participation.

Mike Ryan would like to see notes/minutes of the various subcommittees' meetings.

Weseloh: Need staff from the program to head up each of the groups/issues.

The TMC agreed with recommendation No. 13.

Whitridge noted that some TAMWG members would like funding to pay for their own staffing for the various disciplines, and this is an unresolved issue.

Weseloh said there should be consideration for per diem and travel for TAMWG members' expenses to cover these meetings. Nobody is asking for salaries for TAMWG members.

No. 2: Establish lines of communication between the authors of the Flow Evaluation Report, ROD, and Implementation Plan to maintain a consistent and comprehensive understanding of the written documents to Program participants. (V-2, p. 10)

All TMC members agreed with Recommendation No. 2.

Mike Ryan said he didn't want too many subcommittees, however.

#4: Develop a RFP process for assessment of management action outcomes by tying the data to specific models and interdisciplinary analyses. Redesign the RFP process to solicit proposals that support the Program's information needs based on the results of the science framework. (I-S-5, p. 13)

Mike Ryan expressed concerns with an RFP program that can be implemented in a timely manner.

There was a general discussion of how to determine necessary tasks in a timely manner and how it might relate to Tribal Self Governance.

Schleusner: Using an RFP process for the entire program; is this the entire budget or just portions of the budget like the TMAG? Others say an RFP would be for non-routine data collection. What are the expectations? Once we identify that, we can move on it. Some research and study designs are going to take 18 months to get contracts, if you want to get competitive. They also need flexibility to deal with ongoing issues such as water year type and water year objectives. We are being imprecise to discuss an across-the-board RFP process.

The TMC agreed in concept with No. 4 to implement the RFP process to meet the needs of the TMAG, conditional on clarification of issues.

Doug said we won't figure this out all now and fully implement it in FY 2005. We don't have a completed science framework and the new fiscal year starts this Friday. It will probably be a process for FY 2006 and 2007. It won't happen instantaneously.

Weseloh said TMC subcommittee has specific language on the Scientific Framework that will address this issue.

No. 3: Integrate the SAB and ERPs into the science framework process. (I-S-4, p. 13)

Curtis: Expert Review Panel is a group of experts to review a particular set of proposals for adequacy. The SAB critically reviews the RFP's before they go out to see if they meet scientific muster.

It was noted that this is part of the ROD that isn't being implemented yet.

The TMC agreed with recommendation No. 3.

*No. 5- Reevaluate the Mainstem Restoration Subcommittee's priority list for the first 25 restoration sites and develop a science-based implementation strategy to prioritize and guide channel rehabilitation projects.
(I-R-4, p. 13)*

It was noted that this group will meet when the 2 new engineers are hired (channel rehab subgroup).

The TMC agreed that this is already happening. No action is necessary.

*No 6: TMC needs to make a determination on the effects, if any, the litigation has on channel rehabilitation and other non-flow activities. ...the Subcommittee believes that planning, design, and environmental compliance for channel rehabilitation activities should be completed prior to the litigation being resolved.
(I-R-5, p. 13)*

As a group, if we are under litigation, we need to know how to proceed.

The TMC agreed that the program should proceed as under the ROD until otherwise instructed by a court.

*No 7: The TMC needs to become more engaged in the management of the Program by providing significant oversight and guidance to AEAM staff through the Executive Director.
(M-1, p. 16)*

Curtis: A project management Gantt chart was suggested by the group to track progress on certain aspects of the TRRP.

Mike Ryan said he uses these GANTT charts a lot on other projects and they are helpful, if updates are provided. It can become outdated quickly.

Orcutt: What accountability does the TMC have if things don't work out right? What ability does the TMC have to work this out?

Schleusner: For instance, the schedule to complete 24 channel rehab sites is in jeopardy and the TMC needs to make decisions to be able to meet the schedule, if not able to achieve it, TRRP office will provide reasons on why it will be affected.

Doug asked how the TMC envisions becoming more engaged in program oversight through the Program Director. He tries to provide information on a timely basis through e-mail, phone calls, etc., but all are very busy and it is difficult to get a sense of what the mood of the TMC is on what directions to take. There are many things his office does on a daily basis that can't wait for a TMC meeting. This one is at least as complex as the RFP question because it's not clear how to make it work. He agrees with the intent, but doesn't know how to do it.

Brock and MEM said that by implementing other recommendations, it might resolve this issue, especially once the science framework is completed.

Irma would also like to know what has happened, in addition to what hasn't happened.

Doug thinks the GANTT charts are a useful tool, but he doesn't want his staff to become a slave to the charts. Is it too much, not enough, or the wrong kind of information?

The TMC agreed with recommendation No. 7.

Lunch from 12:30 to 1:45

No 8: In addition to quarterly TMC meetings, monthly conference calls should be initiated to provide the opportunity for the TMC and Executive Director to discuss Program progress and challenges, and improve TMC guidance and oversight of the program. (M-2, p. 16)

There was a general discussion of need for monthly conference calls, and how to best do that. Should the calls be general or specific in nature?

Doug said he can find a happy medium that has a small impact on staff time, but provides adequate information to the TMC.

Whitridge said that there is not a lot of public attendance at meetings; if there are decisions made, it's important for the public to have a way to keep track of what is going on.

Doug said he already sends most information to the TAMWG that goes to the TMC. He said public announcements for TMC meetings would be useful.

Mike Ryan suggested organizing the monthly report similar to the ROD. Doug agreed.

Curtis Anderson said TMC members should be aware of the issues when they come up and take some time to help the program when a problem occurs.

Schleusner asked what is it that each TMC member can contribute to the overall program? He said his office will come up with some examples.

The TMC agreed in concept with No. 8, except it might be a monthly director's report, with phone conference calls as, needed.

No. 9: *The TMC, TAMWG, and the AEAM staff should develop the strategic plan with the Flow Evaluation Report, ROD, and Implementation Plan as its foundation.*
(M-3, p. 16)

Doug said the Strategic Plan has been relegated to the back burner because of other priorities. We need a resolution on the mission statement. It would be helpful to finalize it, but what will it do to help us that other documents don't already do?

There was a general discussion of budget estimates for future years beyond the next fiscal year.

Doug wants a strategic plan to get a more proactive and predictive funding mechanisms. What drove him the most was the big philosophical differences on where the program should be headed. There are widely divergent views on where we should be focusing the resource. They haven't been totally resolved yet.

There was a general discussion of the development of a TMC funding subcommittee in order to obtain other funding sources.

Mike Orcutt will head up subcommittee to deal with long-term funding issues. It will help prioritize funding.

Doug will meet with some members of the TMC subcommittee who helped write the TRFE and Implementation Plan to look at the strategic plan. They may identify shortages in out-year funding and identify places to fill that gap.

No. 10: *The science component of the AEAM program must be developed. ...the science framework must be in place so that assessments of current conditions can be made and follow-up assessments resulting from management actions can be completed.*
(M-4, p. 16)

Rod stated that the new TMAG leader position has been filled (temporarily by himself). The Science Conference is scheduled for Oct 13-15. Now we need a baseline assessment, but there isn't a good definition of that. By the end of the calendar year, he wants a description of what exactly it is. They are also hiring 2 fisheries biologists and the Science Advisory Board (SAB) is fully staffed with 5 scientists. Mike Marigliano from Montana State University was recently appointed to the SAB.

The TMC agreed with recommendation No. 10.

There was a general discussion of the upcoming Science Conference.

No 11: *The Executive Director should seek TMC help in challenging institutional barriers and overcoming any USBR procedures that may hamper innovation in pursuing Program objectives (i.e., grade level for senior staff, travel ceilings). (M-6, p. 17)*

Curtis said the subcommittee recognizes that this is not a typical USBR program and will run into various barriers; it will need help from others to overcome the USBR bureaucracy.

MEM said these issues are very difficult for the federal managers to resolve.

Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA's), alternate duty stations, moving compensation and other issues are ways to resolve them. IPA's are used to hire persons employed by other agencies to do work for a federal agency with a higher pay scale or benefits package than what the feds can offer.

Schleusner: It is also important to recognize that they will be Reclamation employees and subject to those regulations.

The TMC agreed with recommendation No. 11.

Doug said that a personal commitment from TMC members and others to help recruit the open positions at the TRRP office would be beneficial. He also said other issues such as children in school, spousal careers, and elderly parents are issues that prevents potential candidates from applying or accepting a new position.

Rod will work on these issues as the acting TMAG branch chief. Doug has done a good job thinking outside the box to get some of these candidates hired.

No. 12: *The TMC should work with the Executive Director on the rehabilitation site permitting issues, CEQA, etc. and become engaged in development of an overall programmatic permit process. (M-7, p. 17)*

Schleusner: Information changes over time. This is one of those situations that is a NEPA/CEQA issue and not really a permitting issue. Brandt and Ed put together a meeting with the various regulatory agencies and it has been a positive process. He isn't minimizing the permitting issues, but it's not a limiting factor in implementation; it's the environmental studies and realty issues that are slowing things.

Curtis: When they first looked at this, they looked at the schedule for the Hocker Flat project and applied it to 24 sites, and realized that it would take a long time to get all the permits.

Ed explained the philosophy behind the permitting and NEPA/CEQA for the channel rehab site. It may be that a Master EIR under CEQA would also streamline subsequent permitting. Permits and NEPA/CEQA will cost the same as the actual construction at Hocker Flat. They need more design on some of the sites to get 50% design for NEPA/CEQA. It's hard to get that information for the Master EIR.

Solbos suggested that a meeting be held to work on NEPA and CEQA issues to expedite permitting issues. It would include appropriate NEPA/CEQA experts to chart a path through the environmental compliance aspect.

Solbos: We don't need any help on permitting at all. We need help on the environmental documentation of NEPA and CEQA. The time factor and cost factor are a big issue.

The TMC agreed that there should be a meeting by the end of the year to discuss the appropriate environmental compliance and permitting strategy.

Neil Manji said he'd like to see this on the agenda for the next TMC meeting with a recommendation on how to proceed.

No. 13: Already done. See above.

No. 14: *A plan for future Program review needs to be established. ...via tracking Program progress on implementing the ROD. ...procedure for SAB review of the Program needs to be developed...program participants must be kept more informed of Program's progress, challenges, and accomplishments via increased outreach... (M-9, p. 17)*

This item is related to item No. 1. This is more of an external review. This could be done through a federal Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART). Can get external reviewers to do the PART.

[The TMC answer to this one is???](#)

Bill Brock extended thanks for Curtis Anderson for leading the subcommittee effort. He noted that DWR has a long history of participation and leadership in the TRRP.

Meeting adjourned at 4:40 pm.

Trinity Management Council Minutes: September 30, 2004

Location: Hoopa Wildland Fire Facility

Chairman Mike Ryan called the meeting to order at 8:40 am.

TMC Members Present: Chairman Mike Ryan, *USBR*; Vice-Chair Mary Ellen Mueller, *USFWS*; Bill Brock for Sharon Heywood, *USFS*; Irma Lagomarsino, *NOAA Fisheries*; Mike Orcutt, *Hoopa Valley Tribe*; Dave Hillemeier for Troy Fletcher, *Yurok Tribe*; Neil Manji, *CA DF&G*; Tom Stokely for Ralph Modine, *Trinity County*.

Others Present: Executive Director Doug Schleusner, *TRRP*; Ed Solbos, Andreas Krause, Priscilla Henson, Rod Wittler, *TRRP Office*; Joe Polos, *USFWS*; Arnold Whitridge, *TAMWG Chair*; Randi Perris, *NRCS*; Curtis Anderson, *CDWR*; Serge Birk, *CVP Water Assn.*; Tom Weseloh, *California Trout*; Tim Hayden, *Yurok Tribe*; Harry Rectenwald and Wade Sinnen, *DFG*; George Kautsky, *Hoopa Valley Tribal Fisheries*; Warren Carlson, *Trout Unlimited*; Mike Stutsman, *Yurok Tribal Fisheries*; Josh Strange, Dr. David Hankin, Anita Andazola, *USFS*; Mike Long and Nick Hetrick, *USFWS*; Rick Rogers, *NOAA Fisheries*; Susanne Nelson and Joel Green, *HVT Fisheries*; Sherri Miller, *USFS- PSW*; Glenn Yoshioka, *The Public*

Agenda:

Presentation and Discussion

- Fall Flows Monitoring Results; Fish Run Data
- Role of Fisheries Management in TRRP
- Draft Action Plan: TRRP Science Program
- Science Framework and ESSA Contract

Working Session

- Discuss and Finalize FY05 Budget

Regular Business

- Open Forum
- Calendars

Presentation and Discussion:

Fall Flows Monitoring Results: Fish Run data

Neil Manji mentioned the Trinity River Hatchery, Junction City weir counts, the Shasta River weir, the Willow Creek Weir, the chinook harvest numbers in Lower Klamath River, and the Iron Gate returns. No carcass surveys on tributaries yet, but have counts on the Bogus Creek weir.

It appears that the run is a few days later than on average, and is smaller compared to past years; it appears that the jack count is much higher than last year. It doesn't appear that there is a problem from the 2002 fish kill, but we can't be sure right now. Jack numbers are up considerably from last year, but total fish numbers are down.

Last year 1.3% of the run were jacks, which 10% is normal, based on creel surveys. We've seen 2,000 jacks so far, but overall numbers of fish in the river are down.

DFG will run the Junction City weir thru mid October; the Willow Cr. weir will operate longer through the season.

October 12 is cutoff for spring run at Trinity River Hatchery, with Oct 25 being the start of the fall run.

There are some concerns about hybridization between fall and spring run fish. DFG has been studying this subject for 5 years; they feel that there is not a problem there, based on CWT returns. 2% to 6% hybridization occurs at the hatchery.

Bogus Creek and Shasta weir runs are considerably smaller this year, though there is not concern, because the run is a bit later, and we knew the run was smaller. If the numbers do not increase over the next few days, there could be low run. Trinity River is running "gangbusters" and the Willow Cr. weir is in operation. There are approximately 200-275 fish/day. Mostly Chinook with some steelhead coming in, and it's looking good.

Initially, it looks like the run on the Klamath may be reduced, with Trinity doing OK. There is a 50/50 division of the run this year; often there is 60%+ of the run, favoring the Klamath side.

They are seeing 60-70% tagged fish at TRH hatchery that is a general increase in hatchery fish.

This year, out of 502 fish, 95 were marked; 95×4 (25% fractional marking) = the number of hatchery fish. There were mostly hatchery fish.

Monitoring of fall flow releases by Joe Polos

PowerPoint presentation- please see handout.

A weather front came in that coincided with the higher flows. There was a Yurok Boat dance for the flow release.

Temperatures were high at Terwer before the flow release. There was a significant drop in temperature at Terwer due to the release (and the weather).

The temperature migration barrier is at 22° C.

There was stranding of juveniles, including coho, steelhead, brown trout, lamprey and stickleback; which were relocated, mostly at Site A near the Lewiston Cableway.

Disease monitoring

Ich incidence and severity usually increases through the season. It goes up to 80-90% at Weitchpec, which is typical. Severity is generally low, despite the high incidence.

Scott Foote: If there are more than 15% of the fish with severe infections, then there should be something done to correct the situation. Incidence is going up, but severity is really low.

Can ramping alleviate stranding?

Answer: No.

Is Site A potential bank feather site? Maybe.

There might have been some stranding due to the gravel injection at that site. Andreas disagreed, and said it was riparian vegetation that was the culprit.

Tim Hayden, Yurok Fisheries: PowerPoint Presentation on the Draft Report on Klamath River Salmonid Health and Abundance in Response to a Proactive Flow Release from Lewiston Dam on the Trinity River, California, 2003

There were few unintended consequences in 2003, with very little straying of Klamath fish into the Trinity River, little evidence of premature attraction of Klamath fish into potential adverse conditions above Weitchpec; which there may have been some spring/fall chinook mixing at the Trinity River Hatchery.

There is higher use of refugia areas when the river is hot; lower use when it's not. 22° C is the temperature barrier.

No major disease outbreaks in 2003 and 2002, no major mortality in either year.

Presentation by Josh Strange, Yurok Tribal Fisheries and U. of Washington on radio tagging of Chinook.

There is an effort in radio tagging of Adult Chinook Migration Study; the goal is to get 100 fish, with 90 being tagged so far. Tagging is being done mostly in the "blue hole" and Klamath estuary. The estuary is important holding habitat. There is a salt wedge that goes up to 3 km in the estuary. Temperatures range 13-15° C in the wedge, and over 20° C in river. Radio tags cannot send a signal through the salt water. Fish move into estuary, up river, then back to ocean.

The salt wedge went 1 km downstream from the increased Trinity flows, at most.

Mike Deas expressed concerns with DO (**Dissolved Oxygen**) reduction from stirring up organic materials only at depth in estuary. Did DO change significantly?

There were no Chinook observed in the Blue Hole at the mouth of Blue Creek. He found a shallow water barrier from low flows in the river. It was a behavioral barrier, not a physical barrier. Fish are nervous about going into shallow water (less than knee-deep).

Josh explained 3 distinct patterns of chinook: 1) tagged into June, migrated in June. Moved before the temperature got hot and low flows happened. 2) July tagged- moved in response to cool weather in early August. Fish are not just holding or going to the hatchery. 3) Tagged in August and moved in response to the pulse flow. Mixed stocks from Klamath and Trinity were both holding in blue hole on 8/18.

The June tagged fish won't get to the hatchery. Yurok tribal fishery included August harvest of tagged spring chinook from TRH.

Took genetic samples of each fish to determine spring vs. fall run issues.

Mean daily temps of 22° C constitute a migration barrier. Fish also respond to trends in temps, not just temps. Fish are more aggressive when temps fall, more timid with temps rise. This trend is reported in literature for sockeye as well.

There was a group of fish that moved upstream of Weitchpec and stalled in Orleans. Iron Gate releases were important for the Klamath stocks. Just because fish don't die doesn't mean they will be successful in reproduction.

Preliminary conclusions

- Holding habitat is important
- Migration threshold is 22 degrees C, depending on rising or falling
- Run timing issues- 3 distinct runs, spring, summer and fall
- Higher base flows vs. pulse flows- down side of pulse flows could be ameliorated by higher base flows
- Non-lethal effects
- Future studies and trends will look at estuary and sonic tags. Switch from research to monitoring. Run timing issues.

Presentation on Role of Fisheries Management in TRRP: George Kautsky and Dr. Dave Hankin

\$3 million/year is spent on monitoring by the TRRP.

Other agencies such as ODFW and CDFG spend a \$1 million/year for associated Coded Wire Tags (CWT) recovery programs.

Junction City weir is for spring chinook ; whereas the Willow Creek weir is fall chinook, coho, and steelhead.

There are concerns with mixing in spawning grounds and hatchery of fall and spring chinook from artificial fall pulse flows.

Hatchery goals may need to be revised under an AEAM program because they may be impacting natural production with hatchery production.

Scales and coded wire tags help determine age, origin, and race

CWT: 4-5 years, constant fractional marking at 25%. This program costs about \$300k-400k/year. Dividends to return to TRRP.

It determines mix of TRH (Trinity River Hatchery) vs. IGH (Iron Gate Hatchery) fish in fisheries. Trinity fish return later, which were nailed harder in the 2002 fish kill more than the Klamath fish. Would like to see IGH constant fractional marking similar to Trinity's.

George: Under Harvest Rate Management, a portion of each run, 34-35% is reserved for escapement. There should never be less than 35,000 natural spawners.

Allocations are enforced in-river as quota fishing, ocean allocations are based on time and location fishing.

In recent years, we haven't fallen below the escapement levels.

George: 50% of fish will spawn in hatchery and 50% in the wild.

Manji: An average of 21% of the overall run going back to hatcheries over the last 25 years.

Serge: In recent years, the percentage of hatchery fish has increased.

Kautsky: No longer are gates shut at hatcheries to exclude surplus hatchery fish that would spawn in the wild.

Stokely: In 1991 there was fishing allowed, even though without any fishing, escapement wouldn't have been met. GK: True. In the future, they could allow an increase in size limit in ocean troll fishery to preserve more fish for following year (3 year olds)

Currently there is 100% marking of steelhead and coho at TRH. This allows fishing to continue for both and no listing of steelhead.

Regarding fish kill in 2002. The 2002 brood year is returning through 2007 as 5 year olds. Most fish return at 3 years of age, then some at age 4. 2-Year-old fish returning this year would be that brood year. They will return at 3- year olds in 2005.

"Fisheries Monitoring informs both harvest and habitat management."

Well over \$2 million is spent in monitoring of ocean fisheries in OR and CA. Fisheries monitoring in marine as well as freshwater areas, contribute to our overall understanding of fish population trends.

The complex life histories of salmon and steelhead require rigorous, annual monitoring to adequately inform AEAMP as to restoration.

Dr. Hankin: Involved in an attempt to restore fishery in Battle Creek that is a tributary to the Sacramento River. One of those recommendations was to develop a full life cycle model of fish in Battle Cr. This venture failed to account for the life cycle of fish outside of the stream. For example, these fish have a problem getting to the ocean due to fishery impacts and salt-water

transition. There must be an effort to look at all aspects of salmonids life history to get adults to come back.

Quality of the data that has been available from the late 1970's on the K-T system has allowed us to develop full life cycle models. Mass marking and adipose fin clipping of fish should allow protection of wild fish, but if there is no CWT marking, then it "falls apart". We have a full cohort reconstruction. Other areas don't know escapement levels, so we don't know fishery impacts.

Regarding hatchery practices, they shouldn't be used to replace wild fish. In order to study the problem, you must identify the wild fish. With budgetary problems, constant fractional marking allows tracking of hatchery fish. 75% of the Trinity system is hatchery fish. It's a nice fact to know. There is an emerging concern; Eric Loudenslager is heading up an independent scientific advisory panel looking at the Columbia River's performance of hatchery fish in the wild. When a hatchery fish goes to natural spawning grounds, we assume that it has the same performance characteristics, but we need to learn more about this.

Trinity is way ahead of most hatcheries. No marking at Nimbus; fish are released in the Delta and get lost.

Presentation on Draft Action Plan: TRRP Science Program: Andreas Krause, TRRP
Andreas gave an overview of the AEAM program.

The problem is that there are vacant positions on TMAG, with no time for modeling and analysis; little focus on AEAM coordination, lots of effort is required on project management and administration.

Independent Review Panels have not been formed.
SAB just recently had 5th and final member appointed.

Looking at causal vs. trend monitoring. Causal is where we want to go.

Contracting: We need to put out an agreement with the full scope of whatever we need to do. Need to revamp and clarifying it. Project management workload need to be looked at because different people are doing overlapping work with numerous contracts with numerous contractors.

Need:

- Direct control and oversight by TMAG
- RFP's with single/comprehensive scope
- Strategically aligned
- Multi-year
- Open and competitive bid process
- Bids peer reviewed and ranked by external review panel
- Single point of contact
- Deliverable submitted on time; data submitted in pre-designed format

Action Plan

- Fill TMAG vacancies
- Revise TMAG workload to focus on science
- Finalize strategic plan
- Finish integrated monitoring plan
- Develop science based multiyear workplan and budget
- Implement open and competitive RFP's
- Fully involve SAF and Independent Peer Review Panels
- Document baseline.

Bob Sullivan: Need both causal and trend monitoring to be able to tell the difference between trends, and cause/effect.

Science Framework and ESSA Contract: Dave Marmorek, President, ESSA Technologies

Dave said North State Resources is also involved. He presented a PowerPoint;

A key finding is that more effort is required to compile existing data.

Question from Stokely: Have you received the Klamath Resource Information System (KRIS) and if so, is there anything useful in there for you?

Answer: Quite broad, but useful. Science Framework is must narrow in focus more than KRIS.

Strategy is to develop small blueprint and implement. If they try to do a large blueprint, it never seems to get implemented.

Lunch from 12 to 1 pm

Discuss and Finalize FY 05 Budget

Doug Schleusner discussed the PowerPoint presentation

- Available funding has declined slightly
- Two major projects no longer require funding
- TMC approved 17 first quarter projects
- TAMWG recommended critical fall funding projects on Sept. 8
- Existing DFG multi-year agreement is in place
- Tribes negotiated initial agreements with BOR
- New information on floodplain structures and more work is involved
- TRRP staff has reviewed/updated all costs

There is \$10.8 million available. No signs of change right now in terms of getting more funding.

No appropriation as of now for FWS or BOR. November 20 is the deadline for the continuing resolution.

\$1.545 million in savings from Bridge contract (\$900k) and \$645K for SEIS compared to previous draft budgets.

TAMWG recommendations did include GVC trees funding for \$40k and TCRC Watershed Coordinator for \$25k; but didn't include \$740k for channel rehab sites.

An interesting development of the past several months is the floodplain structures new information.

There are more large structures at risk than what was previously thought from extremely wet year releases of 11,000 cfs in May. Another 8 to 10 structures will be impacted by higher flows than previously thought.

Realty issues are more complicated; impacted areas range from structures to raw land, wells. There are 529 parcels with over 40 miles of the river under private ownership. Researching issues with the Solicitor's office to determine magnitude of this issue.

Primary emphasis for FY 05 is to deal with the 8,500 cfs structures in the floodplain.

Stokely asked if we will be able to have 8,500 cfs by next spring if it's a wet year?

Answer: Not sure, depends on whether or not we can deal with floodplain structures before next May. There will be a concerted effort to concentrate on the Little Yellow House, upstream of Salt Flat, and Cooper's Bar which are affected by 8,500 cfs flows.

Staff priorities are: complete final bridge actions, correct other infrastructure issues, develop integrated mainstem baseline.

Continue development of Science Framework, accelerate rehab site design/construction, simplify streamline regulatory, realty and planning requirements, implement needs-based RFP process with independent review panels, simplify funding process with multi-year agreements, where possible; require single consolidated proposals for multi-agency activities/studies; identify/pursue matching funds by TMC members and other program partners; and sorting out sediment monitoring;

\$11.571 million is current draft budget, though only \$10.8 million will likely become available.

Raising 1 mile of roads in Poker Bar and associated driveways is very complicated.

The proposed budget includes increased costs for floodplain structures NEPA/CEQA is now \$150,000 for NEPA/CEQA; solutions include removal of material in channel, rip rapping banks in front of houses near Indian Cr.

There have been contract modifications for the bridge projects, costing approximately \$250,000.

Neil Manji said he will be notifying the State Lands Commission and Resources Agency to discuss the issue of Flowage Easements and related floodplain issues.

Mike Ryan reported that he did a short briefing to Kirk Rodgers and Solicitor's Office on the floodplain issues.

There was a general discussion/explanation of Mainstem Baseline Assessment needs for \$655,000.

Rehab Site Implementation Costs = \$1,519,000

There are wildlife that have special state and federal listings as sensitive species for NEPA/CEQA and monitoring. Gathering baseline information and monitoring are necessary components of NEPA/CEQA at sites that they construct. This information will be gathered at all sites in the long run, but there will be more of this necessary for construction of all potential sites. Geographically, this work will be done at the first 6 sites, followed by the next sites, and then the remaining sites. This also includes surveying the entire 40 miles for avian species to produce a baseline.

Hillemeier: Is this a Cadillac or a Chevy?

Ed: These costs are a bit less than previous estimates.

Hillemeier: The TMC needs to determine how this information will be used in the future.

ESA consultation costs are included in these line items

Watershed Costs are based on the 2003 recommendation from TAMWG for \$500,000 in watershed restoration to bring in another \$1.5 million. Still using that approach here.

A comprehensive approach to watershed restoration is needed for the USGS Sediment source analysis at Rush Creek.

Orcutt: Are there any matching funds tied to this that are related to the Interior Solicitor's opinion that funds cannot be spent in the South Fork? Is locale out of policy direction or necessity?

Andreas: Target area for next 3-5 years is the watershed in the upper 40 miles. After 5 years, we might be able to expand outside of that. The South Fork may or may not be part of that. It can't come out of BOR's funding.

Ryan: Source of funding should have appropriate authority to do so.

Stokely: Did USGS get \$52,600 this year?

Answer: Yes, just 2 weeks ago.

Stokely added that the \$200,000 for the watershed grants program this fiscal year was never approved by Reclamation and it shouldn't show up in the budget as having been provided.

Schleusner said other recommendations include GVC planting; it's the 10th year of the 10-year plan; there is \$40,000 for that in the Trinity County Grant program.

Andreas discussed stream gagging and sediment monitoring costs.

There was a general discussion of models, fisheries costs and other budget items.

It was noted that the 7/27/04 meeting, that some highlighted areas are items that were either approved then, or were multi-year agreements.

Areas of concern:

- FY 05 Budget is \$800k greater than available funding, even after extensive scrubbing
- Need to resolve before preparing and awarding contracts and agreements
- FY 06 and 07 programs of work are about \$1.2 million greater than FY 05 budget to \$2 million more than FY 05 funding
- Deferred FY 05 tasks may impact critical path for rehab sites, e.g. mercury impact study (\$110k).

Options:

- Reduce or defer filling TRRP staff, \$500k
- Reduce TMC program support costs- would save \$312k
- Do not fund ESSA Task 8- \$224,800
- Apply 6.7% reduction to all line items
- Find other funding for rehab site
- Extend coarse sediment augmentation \$50k-500k
- Find other sources of funding for fish harvest mgmt activities

Shortfall is \$771,200

Ed: Can't cut construction contracts.

Rod: Happy with this budget for science, but if there are cuts, he will compromise.

Orcutt: Is there more CVPIA Restoration Fund money?

Mike Ryan: President's budget for 2005 had identified \$1 million in CVPIA RF for TRRP.

When they saw the shortage of millions, Mary Ellen and Mike Ryan went to Kirk Rodgers and Steve Thompson to appeal for more funds. They came up with \$1 million extra. They asked for \$1.7 million.

USFWS reimbursable funds have a 2-year life span, which have been carried over from 2004.

Mike Ryan: O&M at the Coleman NFH, BOR pays for marking of ESA-listed species. TRRP is paying for some hatchery marking that should be O&M for \$98,000. Currently funds are being used to mark Coho at a cost of \$26k, and \$72k for steelhead. Shortfall is now \$771,200 minus \$98,000 equaling \$673,200. CA Fish and Game code now requires marking of all steelhead; and coho are listed, which are required to be marked.

At Coleman, chinook are marked with similar funding to TRRP for late fall chinook.

MEM suggested that she and Mike Ryan go back to Kirk Rodgers and Steve Thompson to ask for more CVPIA RF dollars.

Rod: One of the strong needs is informational management, such as ESSA and IIMS. It would be helpful if some projects such as the ESSA contract could come from BOR funds (Science and Technology) and Klamath Project funds.

There was a general discussion of dropping ESSA Task 8, operational database and deferring it to 2006 and if unsuccessful to fund it, it'll be on schedule for 06, which is a no cost time extension. There were also discussions about curtailing TMC member agency participation costs.

Stokely pointed out that \$140k for TMC participation for Trinity County is actually \$100k + \$40k for floodplain and other project implementation CEQA and permitting.

Stokely made a motion to defer \$224,000 from the ESSA contract until 2006.
All voted yes, except Orcutt voted No. Motion passed

Motion by Stokely to change TMC participation to 2004 levels 607,500, except the \$40,000 for Trinity County's CEQA and permitting work on the river, and funding for USFS and DWR; a \$271k savings

MEM doesn't think it's the right thing to do. She will abstain from it.

Stokely said he really could use the \$100k for his program, but he wants the cuts to be fair to all. TC only received \$50k in FY 2004 and brought \$2 million to the program. One of the reasons he doesn't have the minutes done is because he ran out of money under this agreement.

Brock said he'd abstain from this vote.

Motion died for a lack of a second.

Motion by Neil Manji to take specific percentage to all programs and projects, excluding the July 27 projects approved. Second by Stokely.

\$3.3 million already approved \$7.5 million, would be about 7% reduction (6.7%). 6.24%

Motion and second withdrawn.

MEM made a motion for 6.0% across the board reduction in the remaining items not yet approved (excluding July 27, 2004 approved projects and ESSA which is already removed).
Motion seconded by Stokely.

$\$771,200 - \$98,000 - \$224,000 = \$449,200 = 6\% \text{ of } \7.5 million

All were in favor, except Orcutt who voted no. Irma Lagomarsino was gone, so 6 of 7 members voted affirmatively. Motion passed.

Mike Orcutt voted no in principle to get more money, rather than slicing up the pie in smaller pieces.

Public Comment: applause

Response to letter from the TAMWG:

Hillemeier asked for discussion on this, whether or not to respond.

Orcutt said the TMC needs to consider this.

Mike Ryan said how could the TMC oppose “improvements in Klamath River management”. This is a fluffy letter and nobody could oppose it.

Manji: We could say we agree, but how do we write it in a letter to the TAMWG or DOI? What does Arnold Whitridge have to say?

Whitridge: It could be a letter up the line, participating in annual flow coordination meetings, weighing in with Klamath managers about how TMC feels about costing money and discombobulating the TRRP. There is a unanimous sense of TAMWG members that the TMC is in the position of trying something. Encourage it actively. There are many avenues, not limited to writing a letter to the Secretary of the Interior to solve the problems using Trinity water for Klamath help.

Ryan: There is the potential to invite the Klamath project office to come to TMC meeting to talk about Conservation Implementation Program.

Hillemeier: He thinks the CIP addresses everything except flows in the lower Klamath River.

Ryan: We could at least find out about it and see if we can include flow issues in the CIP.

Orcutt: Many problems exist in Klamath, when you look for solutions, it has to be addressed. You can't just refuse to release the water and then have the fish die.

Hillemeier: Thinks that this letter means improve conditions on Klamath so that Trinity water isn't necessary.

Arnold said that TAMWG is not saying don't use water above the ROD. The TAMWG is saying, please recognize this is an emergency measure you may need, but it's not the only measure to be used to prevent using expensive and inequitable measures like using Trinity water.

Hillemeier: He wants Dave Sabo (Klamath Project Manager) to talk about water management in the Klamath River, and send a brief letter to the TAMWG about it.

Mike Ryan suggested writing to the TAMWG to thank them for their involvement and respond to the letter.

Arnold said he thought that would be a step in the right direction. He also said his personal fear is that the need will arise and there won't be money to buy water and they will "order" the water to be taken out of the ROD.

Doug will draft a letter to the TAMWG, thank you, etc., describe and invite Klamath Project to discuss CIP and water management issues.

5 agenda topics for next meeting:

1. Klamath CIP and water mgmt.
2. TAMWG and TMC collaboration
3. Developing proposals for CSRP grants, and others
4. Prop 50
5. Path for channel rehab/NEPA/CEQA permitting, etc.-Wildlife/Herpetological
6. CDFG report on 2004 salmon run, timing, migration and numbers
7. Update on Strategic Plan

First 2 weeks of December are time for next meeting. TAMWG scheduled Weds. Dec 8. December 9 and 10 meetings are in Weaverville.

Motion to adjourn by Stokely, second by Manji, unanimous approval. Meeting adjourned at approximately 4:45 pm.