

**TRINITY RIVER RESTORATION PROGRAM  
PRINCIPALS CONFERENCE**

Victorian Inn Restaurant,  
1709 Main Street, Highway 299 West  
Weaverville, CA  
July 13-14, 2005

**Purpose and Organization of the Conference**

Upper level agency and tribal leaders representing the Trinity Management Council participated in a two-day panel-oriented conference. These “Panelists” listened to presentations on the progress of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP). They also participated in celebrations of recent Program accomplishments and provided feedback on issues that are especially relevant to the program. These issues are: 1) the rate of implementation, especially modification of structures in the floodplain, 2) flat or declining levels of funding for the program relative to identified need, and 3) identification of type/degree of coordination between Klamath–Trinity restoration efforts.

The conference was structured as a series of presentations made by the staff of the TRRP interspersed with remarks by the Panelists and representatives of the two key groups for the TRRP. These included the Trinity Management Council (TMC) and the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG). Other interested members of the audience also provided feedback.

The following notes are summarized in two formats. The presentations of TRRP staff regarding program status are summarized into short paragraphs. The remarks by the Panelists are essentially abbreviated summaries of their statements. Many of the comments, remarks and statements given by the non-Panelists are shortened into “bulleted” statements that capture their main points. Most summary comments are given in the first-person tense.

**Trinity Management Council Principals—the “Panelists”**

- Ryan Broddrick: Director, California Department of Fish and Game
- Roger Jaegel: District 3 Supervisor, Trinity County Board of Supervisors
- Dwight Russell: Northern District Chief, California Department of Water Resources
- Mike Orcutt: Fisheries Director, Hoopa Valley Tribe
- Troy Fletcher: Yurok Tribe
- Rod McInnis: Regional Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service
- Kirk Rodgers: Regional Director, Bureau of Reclamation, Mid-Pacific Region
- Steve Thompson: California/Nevada Operations Manager, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Bernie Weingardt: Regional Forester, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region

**Wednesday, July 13, 2005****Introductory Remarks by Participants**

Doug Schleusner, Director of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) welcomed the group and recapped the purpose of the meeting. He presented the Hoopa Valley Tribe an honorary award for their tireless efforts in securing higher flows for the Trinity River. Schleusner then asked for introductory remarks from members of the Panelists, the Trinity Management Council, and the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group.

**Introductory Remarks by Panelists**

Dwight Russell: I support the program and look forward to its success.

Ryan Broddrick: We need to celebrate success of the TRRP. We also need to maintain our coalition.

Kirk Rodgers: I want to commend the Trinity Management Council on this “new experiment.” The working trust amongst members in the group is greater than other restoration groups. The program hasn’t let us down.

Steve Thompson: The TRRP is undertaking a unique and adaptive experiment. There has been good progress and will be more in the future.

Mike Orcutt: The Hoopa Tribe supports the agenda and intent of meeting. The biggest element facing restoration is water—we need prudent and efficient use of water. Fifty years from now we need to say we did the right thing and have restored the fisheries. The Tribe’s position is to find solutions. It takes a good carpenter to build a barn, but any jackass can kick it down.

Rod McInnis: I have a “feel” for the length of time for restoration. I have worked for 25 years in the area. I am working hard for solutions and I want to avoid “barriers.”

Bernie Weingardt: I want to be a good “carpenter,” but am somewhat new and am still getting up to speed. I offer the expertise of the PNW Laboratory research personnel such as Jim Sedell. I am looking forward to strengthening the partnership.

Roger Jaegel: I am somewhat new to the program but I have fished the river for 50 years. I see the river as a very important resource.

**Introductory Remarks from the Trinity Management Council (TMC)**

Mike Long (acting chair of TMC): I hope that the panelists will continue to advocate the program. The program is costly but important. It is important to continue and perhaps increase the funding support for the program.

**Introductory Remarks from the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG)**

Arnold Whitridge (chair of the TAMWG): The TAMWG has broad coverage with varying levels of enthusiasm. But the stakeholders want success and significant progress is beginning to be seen. There are still several potential obstacles such as continued funding or increased funding to what the Record of Decision (ROD) requires. The Klamath is a looming issue. Failure to fix the Klamath jeopardizes the success of the Trinity. The TRRP has not yet come to grips with tributary watersheds.

**Overview of the Trinity Restoration River Program (TRRP)**

Douglas Schleusner provided a summary of the TRRP including the accomplishments, status, progress, and work remaining. He restated the goal of the program—to restore populations of naturally spawning salmon and steelhead. He noted the history of impacts and mitigation to the Trinity River—1964 was the start of the major water diversions, year 2000 was the Record of Decision (ROD) to restore flows, and in the spring of this year, the 7,000 cfs release to the river occurred. He restated the premise of the program: increased flows and mechanical restoration should remove encroaching vegetation, help to mobilize gravels, and remove sediment. Based on the flow study the restored fluvial processes should help to create a new channel form over the 40 miles downstream of Lewiston Dam. The new channel should provide a three- to four-fold increase in rearing habitat. This increase in rearing habitat should produce a two-fold increase in smolt production.

Schleusner explained that the program is not being funded at the levels anticipated by the ROD. The average level of funding for the TRRP has been \$10.3 million per year. Current funding needs for full ROD implementation are estimated at \$14 million per year. This level of funding is a major theme of many program issues. Schleusner offered three policy options to address the reduced funding: 1) grow the pie (increase the funding), 2) change the mix (shift funding within the program to prioritize certain tasks), 3) extend the time for the program (rate of implementation).

**Comments from Panelists**

Dwight Russell: Is the \$10.3 million the true cost (investment) of the program? Don't in-kind contributions increase the funding of the program? What can be done to restructure the program via adaptive management?

Mike Orcutt: Has the Fish and Wildlife Service decreased their funding?

Steve Thompson: There has been a 5 % per year cut in the Fish and Wildlife programs.

Ryan Broddrick: For certain aspects of the program, extending the time could be perceived as a failure.

**Listening Session: Comments from Program Partners and Audience**

This session provided an opportunity for those in the audience to speak about the program, to address the Panel, or to address a specific issue.

Byron Leydecker (Friends of Trinity River and California Trout):

- Floodplain modifications require \$5-6 million; this funding is not secure. Failure to make the floodplain ready for higher flows places the TRRP program in jeopardy.
- Lack of appointments to the TAMWG hurts progress.

Gil Saliba (North Coast Environmental Center and the Redwood Region Audubon Society):

- We offer our support and service for the program.

Serge Birk (Central Valley Project Water Association):

- The concept of reimbursability needs to be addressed. Who pays for the restoration program?
- We need to address the Klamath issues and how Trinity water should or should not be used as a Klamath solution.
- What is the best course of action to solve the issue of property damage from an 11,000 cfs flow combined with a 100-year flood event?

Tom Stokely (Trinity County, Planning Department):

- The slow appointment process for TAMWG members is a continuing problem with Program credibility and hampers action by the TAMWG.
- Lack of funding of TAMWG travel and reimbursement of costs is an issue.

Jim Spear (Natural Resources Conservation Service):

- Watershed restoration in the tributaries needs more attention.

Christine Karas (US Bureau of Reclamation, deputy area director):

- We need a basin-wide forum for the entire Klamath. Such a forum has high-level support, but there is distrust of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Troy Fletcher: We need to take a holistic approach on restoration. The Klamath has often been avoided for various reasons--bureaucracy or politics. The Yurok Tribe is not opposed to a basin-wide process but there has been years of discussion. The Federal agencies will not solve our problems by pushing the Conservation Implementation Plan down our throats.

Dwight Russell: After listening so far, the general consensus of the public comments is that the program is "on track, but continued progress must be maintained."

To Russell's comment, Birk and Leydecker both restated that problems still exist:

- The tributary watersheds have not had received the investment originally envisioned.
- The ability of the floodplain to handle the higher flows is not solved. Lost opportunities for higher releases cannot be carried over to future years.

## **Working Lunch and Presentation of the Field Tour Overview by Ed Solbos**

Ed Solbos, Branch Chief of the Rehabilitation and Implementation Group (RIG) of the TRRP gave a presentation of the projects along the river and overview of field tour stops. This included some of the habitat restoration sites, bridge construction, and some the flooding issues at Indian Creek.

### **Field Trip**

#### **Hocker Flat**

At the Hocker Flat Rehabilitation Site, Joe Riess of the TRRP described the project to remove vegetation, reshape cobble bars and lower elevated floodplains. These actions will allow higher flows to create even more rearing habitat in the floodplain. Environmental compliance, engineering designs/specifications, vegetation removal and revegetation plan are already completed. The construction contract for excavating and shaping new floodplain structures is to be awarded next week.

Steve Thompson asked how the TRRP is balancing the uncertain schedules of higher flow releases with the ongoing plans to create new habitat that utilizes the higher flows. Should trees be removed now if higher flows are uncertain?

Response: The floodplain will be ready to handle 11,000 cfs flows plus 10-year event from the tributaries by next year. The Hocker Flat site is designed to work at only 6,000 cfs flows.

#### **Floodplain Structures at Indian Creek**

At the Tullis house, some of the complexities of dealing with private landowners were described. The house was the lowest of all the houses in the floodplain. It couldn't be moved and still be on the property. Raising it would require it to be elevated by seven feet. Tullis, an elderly man, agreed to move to a modular in town. It was purchased and will be resold and likely moved off site. Denise Wiltse of the TRRP mentioned her past experience as a waitress (serving others) has come in handy in dealing with the personal issues and needs brought up by the various landowners. Ed Solbos, responding to questions, said that eminent domain isn't being used to acquire properties. Instead, he works slowly and steadily on property owners, seeking a balance between what they want and what the government can legally provide.

Tom Stokely of Trinity County Planning Department described some issues that allowed this level of rural development within the floodplain. He cited inaccurate floodplain maps and FEMA ordinances against floodplain building being adopted only in 1988.

#### **Poker Bar**

At the Poker Bar Bridge some of the landowner issues were again described. This project went relatively smoothly due to the existence of landowner associations and the positive relationship that was established. A good level of communication and responsiveness seemed to be the key to its success. This relationship did not develop at all bridge sites.

The Executive Director presented awards to Ed Solbos and Tom Stokely for their efforts in the bridges. Several of property owner association representatives participated with the TRRP in an informal ribbon cutting ceremony for the Poker Bar Bridge. Afterwards, refreshments were enjoyed at the home of property owner Jim Casebolt.

**July 14, 2005.**

**Panel 1: Key AEAM Science Program Components**

Rod Wittler, Branch Chief of the Technical Modeling and Analysis Group (TMAG) of the TRRP presented the major elements of his program:

- The TMAG embraces the principles of Adaptive Environmental Assessment and Management (AEAM).
- The goals are to restore dynamic fluvial processes that lead to increased habitat and more fish.
- We expect a system response in 5-7 years and a fish response in 10-15 years.
- To date, we have seen improved temperature conditions, possible signs of increased growth rates for juvenile fish, and improved sediment conditions.
- Areas still need work are habitat assessment and database development.
- Limiting factor in Trinity is rearing habitat—a three- to four-fold increase in rearing habitat is thought necessary to create doubling of smolt production.

**Remarks by Trinity Management Council**

Mike Long (acting chair TMC):

- It is now recognized that the science framework should have been established quicker.

Pablo Arroyave (Bureau of Reclamation):

- We should consider changing the mix of funding for RIG versus TMAG. Trinity County has helped obtain extra funds; other groups also need to look for extra funding.

Neil Manji (Resources Agency):

- We are not using the Science Advisory Board as much as the ROD recommends.

Tom Stokely (Trinity County alternate):

- This is not a research program but a restoration program. Science is being done at expense of restoration. A better strategy is to use dollars for ground restoration activities or for leveraging as opposed to monitoring.

Irma Lagomarsino (National Marine Fisheries):

- Do we need “Cadillac science?” What about performing spot-checking?

**Remarks by the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group**

Brian Leydecker (Friends of Trinity River and California Trout):

- Implementation got started more quickly than the science side of the program. The science basis for implementation is critical. Future RFPs will be quite specific and will provide specific data by which to adapt management actions.

Arnold Whitridge (TAMWG chair):

- The TAMWG is diverse but strives for consensus. There has been good progress so far. Decisions need to be backed by competent science and the science program has broad TAMWG support. Lack of key information leads to dissention within our group.

### Remarks by Panelists

Roger Jaegel: What are the contract procedures for performing science activities?

Wittler's response: Grants and Agreements are most common, particularly with tribes or with other agencies. Sediment monitoring contract was an open and competitive process.

Bernie Weingardt: Budgets and priorities are always difficult to establish. Failures are often due to lack of a "big picture look." One needs to define strategies; how clear is the strategy for the TRRP?

Schleusner's response: These questions are being considered—but emphatically yes, we have talked a lot about balance between implementation and sciences.

Rod McInnis: Monitoring that can show the value of a project is important and it helps to get continuing support for the program. NMFS budget for restoration appears to be shrinking by 60 %. Strongest defense of program is to show more fish and that restoration is benefiting local economies. Science is a tool to focus on supporting the overall program. On searching for other sources of funding—tapping other sources that are already funding restoration would jeopardize restoration elsewhere. I am very concerned about coordination between Klamath and Trinity.

Mike Orcutt: I must diverge a bit from commenting on the science program to make some overall comments. There appears to be no clear objective for the Principal's Conference. I heard one principal (Russell) voice that he hears "no problems." There are problems. For example, the Tribes have sent letters to TMC stating that it is illegal to endorse delays in program. The TMC report has recommendations that they are wrestling with. Juvenile fish are not getting out of the system. Disease is not being adequately studied. Only passing reference to Federal Trust responsibilities —this is why the tribes are so concerned. The tribes ceded vast territories for hunting and fishing rights. The Federal government has responsibility to protect those rights through government to government relationships—i.e., Federal to tribes.

Steve Thompson: Congressional aids ask me whether the program has "doubled" fish. We really need this sort of data—science is important. How well can the program assess fish? This is the critical question for continued support.

Wittler's response: We have a lot of juveniles but little rearing habitat.

Troy Fletcher: We need to know how many fish coming back. Another critical question is how the TMC makes a clear decision...money is short. What sort of accountability of funding exists?

Kirk Rodgers: Is this a pioneering effort or has this sort of program been done before? If it is truly new, then the investments made here may have utility in other systems. For example the lessons learned here may benefit the San Joaquin.

Wittler's response: The Everglades is one example of a large restoration program. In the Trinity, we are trying to work with natural adaptive processes. Many other projects do design and monitoring. This

program has a greater element of testing hypotheses, and more integration between restoration and science. Groups from the Platt River, Gila River, and San Joaquin River are interested in our progress.

Christine Karas (Bureau of Reclamation): Consider setting a small budget aside for publications. Data may also need to remain proprietary to the scientist during the publication phase.

Ryan Broddrick: We cannot pay for publication if it cannot support policy for informed decisions in a real-time response. Science is necessary, but is not for science's sake—it must support policy decisions. The main obligation is ROD flows; we cannot squander these.

Dwight Russell: Are there interim milestones being achieved? If the smolts are not doubling each year, it may sound like failure. Interim goals that lead to long-term goals may help with the perception of success. DWR has spent considerable funds in Robinson reach of Merced River—consider their story.

George Kautsky (Hoopa Tribe, deputy director of fisheries): Douglas Schleusner cited three options for the program as growing pie, changing the mix, or extending time. The Hoopa support growing pie, but the time should not be extended. The TMAG and its focus on science are good, but we need to count fish. The TRRP needs to consider its other partners that have long histories of monitoring. I encourage TRRP to work with partners to monitor things that are cost effective and can produce the answers. TRRP should tie in with other efforts such as ocean counts and hatcheries.

Andreas Kraus of the TRRP gave these “parting thoughts”: The science program is designed to achieve increased fish production. The key number will be number of returning adults compared to smolt production. But there are other numbers needed to run the program and make decisions—such as how much water needs to be released. Studies of sediment mobility are important to building rearing habitat. Science is not competing with implementation. Implementation actions are needed to modify the system and produce the signal for science to show its working through monitoring and evaluation.

## **Panel 2: Funding and the Rate of Implementation**

### **Preparing the Floodplain for Higher Flows**

Ed Solbos of the Rehabilitation and Implementation Group (RIG) of the TRRP summarized the floodplain structures modifications:

- The ROD requires that floodplain structures to be modified as necessary to handle higher flows.
- Legal requirements have been identified. Individual landowners have different perceptions of fairness.
- We now have accurate inundation elevations and dam flow studies (LIDAR channel bathymetry; HEC-RAS models). Landowners are being contacted and inventories are being completed for a variety of structures (houses, wells, driveways). The 11,000 cfs plus 10-year flood event will flood two houses in Indian Creek; the 11,000 cfs plus 100-year event could flood up to nine houses.
- A major problem exists in that there is not enough funding available to address all these issues and build all of the rehab sites at the same time. The ROD estimated floodplain costs to be \$350,000—projected costs are closer to \$5 million through FY 2008.

### Remarks by the Trinity Management Council

Mike Long (acting chair of TMC):

- It is a high priority that the floodplain be ready for 11,000 cfs by next spring. Failure to handle 11,000, if available, would raise questions about the program.

### Remarks by Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group

Arnold Whitridge (chair of TAMWG):

- TAMWG wants to seek a supplemental appropriation fund to floodplain structure mods. I believe ROD did anticipate varying flows in the tributaries and it is appropriate to address 100-year events.

Serge Birk (Central Valley Project Water Association):

- We haven't decided on whether preparation for a 100-year event is worth the cost. We should do something between 10-year and 100-year projections.

### Remarks by Panelists

Dwight Russell: (Requested clarification on flows.) This looks like a management solution—you can modify flows at the dam and then reduce flows during the next few years it takes to do floodplain fixes.

Response: This deviates from the ROD.

Mike Orcutt: (Also asked for clarification on flows and readiness for an 11,000 cfs event.) I agree that we need to explore the supplemental funding to address the costs of floodplain structures mods.

Roger Jaegel: (Requested clarification on 10-year vs. 100-year trib flows.) What does the ROD require?

Response: we need at least 11,000 cfs releases to scour 2-year old vegetation, assumes some level of tributary accretion.

Ryan Broddrick: I need more information on this “bottleneck.” I need to know about the risks, constraints, and the time schedule.

### Constructing Channel Rehabilitation Sites for Rearing Habitat

Ed Solbos of the TRRP presented an overview of the channel rehabilitation work:

- 44 channel rehab sites plus three side channel sites are planned; general locations were identified in the ROD and some specific locations are already selected.
- Issues include access to private parcels for surveys. Contacting landowners is difficult and time-consuming. Planning and design is the most time consuming element of the project.
- A major problem is that recent and future levels of funding are below what the ROD envisioned. In order to stay on schedule, construction costs of \$2.1 million must be deferred from fiscal year 2006 to 2007. This shift will eventually catch up with us (2008).

Tom Stokely (Trinity County):

- Because the maps for 100-year floodplain are not updated and appear to underestimate the full extent of the 100-year floodplain, building still occurs in upper area of the “true” floodplain.

**Remarks by Trinity Management Council**

Mike Long (acting chair of TMC):

- Channel rehabilitation is important but can we reduce the costs? Should we reduce the levels of design? Can the NEPA/CEQA costs be reduced and still meet legal requirements?

**Remarks by Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group**

Serge Birk (California Valley Project Water Association):

- What future litigation is anticipated? What are the risks?

Response: There are 500 landowners with a variety of interests. The potential exists for litigation.

**Remarks by the Panelists**

Steve Thompson: What is the appropriate fish versus wildlife emphasis?

Response: There is not as large a focus on wildlife. Some wildlife work is required by CEQA/NEPA compliance and permits, and some is part of the restoration effort. Wildlife is recognized in the ROD but there is disagreement about the appropriate balance between wildlife and fish needs.

Roger Jaegel: As 500 people will be affected; I would feel more comfortable knowing how much flow is really needed to accomplish needs of program.

Response: Per the Flow Study and ROD, up to 11,000 cfs based on best available information.

Mike Orcutt: As a Trinity Management Council member, I am concerned about the deficit spending (construction bubble).

Serge Birk (Central Valley Project Water Association): Wildlife issues should be considered, as this is an ecosystems restoration program. Flow schedule discussions do consider other non-fish organisms. We should consider the wildlife issues in the near term.

**Panel 3: Improving Klamath-Trinity Coordination**

There was no staff presentation on this issue; the forum went directly to remarks.

**Remarks by Panelists**

Troy Fletcher: There have been some attempts at coordination for years. But there hasn't been a real recognition of the relationship or coordination. Fisheries, agriculture, tribes were not able to come together and agree on a plan; the agencies could not move forward. Politics and disagreement keep coordination and progress from occurring. Several questions are important: the role of the estuary, the role of diseases, wintertime releases in Klamath are held back to fill lake—this water is not available to flush sediments from the river bottom. The Yurok look at the return spawners as the measurement of success. Restoration goals are in common with the Klamath. Recognition of linkage is important.

The technical and scientific issues are also important regarding the relationship. The process needs to be transparent for peer review. This transparency is not apparent in the Klamath and this affects credibility. Farmers should be able to take a look at technical issues. The issue of jurisdiction is not an excuse to avoid the Klamath. These need to be addressed.

The beginning of the dialog is good. But we may also need legislation to provide direction. We need to take advantage of opportunities now. We need to build trust. The Yurok will not go with the CIP program of the Bureau of Reclamation because of lack of trust. Can the BOR open up the hydrology assessment to peer review and make it transparent? Future flow schedules will be based on this yet unreleased report.

Ryan Brodrick: The State's perspective agrees with Fletcher's comments regarding the need for coordination. The Shasta and Scott basins want self-determination and an incidental take permit. We're committed to building coordination. We need to "evolve" a strategy to do this. How to do this is a challenge.

Dwight Russell: Specific accomplishments in the Scott and Shasta include screen diversions to avoid take of coho by irrigators, moving stranded fish, ground water investigations to increase flows to the Klamath. The Internet will help to make things more transparent. I wish to go on record that we are trying to work together to avoid fish kills and to avoid water shut offs—we want a vibrant ecosystem.

Mike Orcutt: The Hoopa have always thought of the Trinity-Klamath as one basin. Some momentum has starting with the end of the 1986 legislation. We need some clear signals from the Administration—without it, most effort seems to be going with the CIP. I don't know the solution...but it seems to need to come from the basin and the folks of the basin. A long-range vision needs to include the entire basin.

Bernie Weingardt: I commit to collaborative process, but the details are "overwhelming."

Steve Thompson: I appreciate the efforts of everyone. I want to apologize for the lack of progress on the appointments to the TAMWG. I will bring this up during my upcoming meetings in Washington. I will see if I can't help to walk the papers through. I appreciate the Trinity Management Council and the design of the program.

Bluntly speaking, our infrastructure and our ability to move water is the most important—especially now that we have the extra water. What about real-time monitoring? Snorkelers and trap operators need to be in contact with decision makers. Maybe this will come later. But, I get calls from congressional folks that demand an answer in 15 minutes. We also need to gain the trust of the local people. There seems to be good coordination among the groups. We need a better cross-cut budget that shows that Trinity County is putting in more money. There are going to be changes on the Klamath and Trinity and funding is becoming more competitive. We are required to demonstrate need via basic ways—fish returns and smolt production. Congressional staffers can't deal with detail. I agree with Troy on coordination; we're struggling with limited staff and resources and we need to leverage. The FERC relicensing spotlight is going to swing. Finally this is not a research project but data needs to support the policy. For example you need to be able to explain cutting of trees on the bank.

Kirk Rodgers: Trinity-Klamath coordination is important. How to do this? This is challenge. I will address these in the synthesis session coming up.

Arnold Whitridge (chair of TAMWG): There is a logical “disconnect” here. The TMC has recommended coordination every year. But the TMC needs to be more of an advocate. The TMC is silent on Klamath issues that kill fish and “discombobulate” our programs; they’re silent on water releases and budget issues. The TMC has refused to write letters for solutions to the Klamath. The TAMWG thinks the TMC should ask for a Klamath solution for Klamath problems. TMC is “absent” but needs to be “present.” They need to say something about the chronic ongoing, predictable threats to the TRRP. TMC can’t seem to say the ongoing problem in the Klamath is killing Trinity fish. Agencies seem to push individually but the TMC does not.

Bernie Weingardt: I want to avoid “finger pointing.” It seems that Ryan Broddrick has suggested we make a forum to make the Trinity more effective.

Serge Birk (Central Valley Project Water Association): I think linking the two rivers is important but the challenges are large. It nice to be able to celebrate (good job, Ed Solbos, on the bridges). I understand Troy’s comments on trust and perception of transparency. We have a chance for success and can make history. We don’t want the stakeholders to feel marginalized. We have very few places to have open discussion. So far, we have had a lot of unanimous decisions in the TAMWG. Things have gotten better and it is still open.

Christine Karas (Bureau of Reclamation): This program has developed with lightning speed and was built on previous efforts. One concern is the “prescriptive” nature of the program. There needs to be more “process” to determine flows. For example, we need a robust fish-monitoring program to figure out releases.

### **Summary and Synthesis by Panelists**

Douglas Schleusner posed a few questions to prompt the Panelists to synthesize their guidance and advice comments. Schleusner asked: Are we Trinity-centric? What is a proper rate of implementation and what is a good balance for the program? What new things are occurring at your level to help the TRRP program? Is a supplemental appropriation realistic? What are the minimum levels of science? How to deal with FEMA floodplain mapping? With the “sunset” of Klamath Task Force, how should we carry on?

Kirk Rodgers: Thanks for the well-prepared program. I was behind the curve on some details and this meeting helped catch me up. The TMC, TAMWG and TRRP are doing very good job. We need to have clear recommendations that are consistent with the ROD. I will try to sustain the \$7 million per year that Reclamation is putting in, but we are in a budget-cutting climate.

Let’s get the TAMWG appointments finalized. I don’t know the correct balance between science and implementation but will continue to follow the discussion. Additional funding for the TRRP is needed. The CIP criticism gives me concern—I don’t know exactly how to resolve this but it will be attended to. Packaging of a solution under the auspices of the FERC relicensing cannot be avoided—PacifiCorp will have a say. Can we use the relicensing opportunities to solve the basin issues? Funding will drive the rate of implementation. We should look for ways to augment.

Troy Fletcher: Thanks for the program and the meeting. There needs to be a technical meeting to get the coordination going. We should agree on getting the technical discussion going. Budget is always difficult and needs our attention. I am concerned that implementation gets done. Again strive toward trust and responsibility.

Rod McInnis: We need to communicate the successes beyond this crowd. Congress and members of public need basic answers. The interim milestone may be useful way. The accomplishments report may be one way to show the milestones.

Ryan Broddrick: This meeting is pretty unique in that this panel has spent this much time together. We realize this program needs support and it shows that we can make progress through the reams of paper and litigation. California is currently performing an audit to refocus the Cal-Fed program. Trinity fisheries restoration program is an example of a success I may use as an example for Cal-Fed. Funding is on the decline. We also need to consider the contributing tributaries. We need to work with the river. CEQA needs to be addressed. There may be another billion-dollar water resource bond that could provide funds.

Dwight Russell: We never have all information. But one needs to be willing to take calculated risks and be ready to make the small course corrections based on public comments. Long-range coordination on Klamath—Oregon is currently going through water rights determination. Water quality is being studied to stop future harm to Trinity fish. Finally make the effort to produce midterm milestones to get the message out.

Mike Orcutt: Thanks for the meeting. There has been no discussion about a future follow up—what about future meetings at least annually? Today we saw accomplishments, but we have mostly scratched the surface. I suggest we perform greater implementation in the river. Data collection is important. Funding is a real challenge. Can we find other sources? Supplemental funding?

Bernie Weingardt: I am a new member, but I picked up an “internal spirit.” There is no need to jam things down people throats. The collaborative process seems to work. How else can the Forest Service help? What about fuels money, the Northwest Forest Plan, PNW research lab. We have FERC relicensing expertise in our Sacramento offices. We need to redeem our “government to government” relations.

Steve Thompson: Coordination is an issue—I’ve been looking at this for a time. We are moving John Engbring of the Klamath Task Force into a new area. How do we combine forces for leverage? Federal government employees can’t lobby; we’re having trouble getting supplemental funding for hurricane repairs to offices. Continued funding depends on ability to communicate success.