

Final Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
 Trinity County Library
 Weaverville, CA
 Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Wednesday, March 28, 2012; 9:36 AM

Attending Members

Member	Representative Seat
Brian Person	Bureau of Reclamation, Chair
Nancy Finley	Fish and Wildlife Service, Vice-Chair
Dave Hillemeier	Yurok Tribe
Mike Orcutt	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Ann Garrett	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Fisheries
Bill Brock ¹	Forest Service
Curtis Milliron	California Natural Resources Agency
Roger Jaegel ²	Trinity County
Gil Saliba ³	Trinity Adaptive Management Work Group
Robin Schrock ³	Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director

1) Alternate for Sharon Heywood, 2) replaced by Judy Pflueger after item 7, 3) non-voting members.

Others that attended: Joe Polos (Fish and Wildlife Service); D.J. Bandrowski, Rod Wittler, and Nina Hemphill (Trinity River Restoration Program); George Kautsky, Andreas Hilton, James Lee (Hoopa Valley Tribe); Don Reck and John Dotter (Bureau of Reclamation); Tim Hayden (Yurok Tribe); Wade Sinnen (California Department of Fish and Game); Teresa Connor (DWR); Travis Michel, Liam Gogan (Trinity River Guides Association); Seth Naman (NOAA Fisheries); Alex Cousins (Trinity County RCD); Arnold Whitridge, Gene Goodyear, Gail Goodyear (members of the public).

List of Motions that Passed during the Meeting

Bill Brock made a motion to adopt the scope of work for the watershed assessment.

The Program Office will prepare a purchase request for a competitive bid.

The language of the scope of work would keep the original language of aquatic habitat and ecosystem function. The final decision on the award would be conditional pending approval by the TMC.

Ann Garrett seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion that the TMC adopt the flow regimes as recommended by the Flow Workgroup to follow the ROD recommended flows for a Dry year or a Critically Dry year.

Roger Jaegel seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the TMC advise the Secretary of the Interior to see that water be made available from Trinity and or Klamath to avert 2012 fish kill as needed.

The motion was seconded by Dave Hillemeier.

The motion passed unanimously.

Action Items Derived during the Meeting

Brian Person and Robin Schrock will address comments to the incorporations to the Bylaws regarding teleconferences by the next TMC meeting.

Ernie Clarke will prepare a current version of the budget for each TMC meeting.

Regular Business:

1. Introductions

Brian Person opened the Trinity Management Council (TMC) meeting. He invited Mike Orcutt to make a short comment. Orcutt commented that, given the quarterly planning, the TMC did not have sufficient time to deal with “thorny issues.” He said that issues have been raised but there has not been sufficient time set aside and to consider these and that is what a deliberative body needs to do.

Person noted that Robin Schrock was responsible for finalizing the agenda and he reminded the TMC to be timely in getting their responses back to Schrock on the agenda. Orcutt noted that the agenda for this meeting was shortened from two days to one day.

Person brought up the minutes and thought the January and December minutes, for the most part, were comprehensive and most changes were editorial. But since comments by Mike Orcutt on January and Dave Hillemeier for December may be more than editorial, it was decided that the minutes be reviewed one more time. The TMC agreed to provide their comments over the next week and the changes to the minutes will be reviewed at the April conference call.

2. Open Forum

Travis Michel of the Trinity River Guides Association noted that no gravel was being added this year. But for next year, he thought that further study should be undertaken before going back to the standard procedure of adding gravels.

Mike Orcutt inquired about the gravel additions and particularly the evaluation and streamlining of permits. Robin Schrock noted the bathymetry study is ongoing and will contribute to their knowledge of the channel bottom. Orcutt mentioned that he was still uncertain about where that was going and the requirements.

Roger Jaegel hoped that the Program could answer the Guides questions about how gravel affects adult holding and juvenile habitat. Person agreed and noted that the Phase 1 review and bathymetry data should address these issues. He thought they should be able to determine if there is too much focus on spawning and rearing. Dave Hillemeier asked if the bathymetry data will be arriving too late for the Phase 1 review. D.J. Bandrowski said that 1/3 of the data has been delivered by the consultants, and the remainder should be collected this spring.

3. Report from Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group Chair

Gil Saliba, vice-chair of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG) sat in for Elizabeth Hadley the newly elected chair. First off, Saliba offered his thanks for Arnold Whitridge's past service as TAMWG chair. He next reviewed the recent TAMWG meeting. He noted that the TAMWG received lots of comments from the public and most were negative. Saliba said the TAMWG wanted some guidance from TMC so they know how to handle these sorts of public comments. He appreciated that Robin Schrock and Brian Person attended the TAMWG meetings to help with explaining Program information. He said the TAMWG is pleased with the responses they have been receiving from both Schrock and Person. He reported that TAMWG supported the Flow Workgroup's proposal for the flow schedule. They are interested in another joint meeting with the TMC.

Mike Orcutt referred to TAMWG chair, Hadley's letter and noted that it was not clear what the property owner's concerns were. Saliba explained that there is a difference between the Program goals and the perception of the land owners. Saliba thought the public relations people need to help riverside residents understand the risks of living along a river. He said there is going to be erosion and issues with infrastructure. Person thought that perhaps most residents along the river are program neutral, some have had issues, and some have expressed their negative responses. He noted that Mr. Wellock may be one of the most vocal against the program. Person said he is concerned about the substantial gap between what Mr. Wellock expects and what the Program has done. Saliba asked if there may be a document that would help explain to residents their rights and responsibilities. Person thought that there wasn't.

Robin Schrock noted that Mr. Wellock's tort claim is only one of two they have had. She explained how she had spent a considerable amount of time with Mr. Wellock and that they were exploring alternatives to the tort claims. She noted that they have tried to find a solution to Mr. Wellock's situation, but they cannot simply issue a check under the federal law. Person noted that the TAMWG is very useful as the TMC's "eyes and ears" for the program, but it is not the TAMWG's responsibility to handle problems. Mike Orcutt noted they may have had a knee-jerk reaction to contracts recently on a motion they made in January. But the issues of tort claims are complex and the TMC does is not always privy to all the information regarding these issues. Roger Jaegel related that, at the last TAMWG meeting, Rich Lorenz stated his interest in finding out how these sorts of public complaint issues may be properly elevated. Given that these groups have quarterly meetings, there could be an unnecessary delay in responding. Person acknowledged that there has been a lag in the TMC response, but that landowner concerns are normally referred to the Program Office for resolution. He also noted that he has devoted hours of time to this issue and they have not been able to resolve it to Mr. Wellock's satisfaction. It has been Mr. Wellock's determination that there has been a "lack of action." Schrock asked that the TAMWG also follow up with fact checking as they consider various issues with the Program.

Orcutt asked about the discussion on endorsing the water year determination. Saliba said they did not have a lot of discussion on that and they did not discuss alternatives to the ROD flows.

4. Report from Trinity Management Council Chair

Brian Person, chair of the TMC discussed the current conditions for precipitation. He said March is not a miracle yet, but it has been significant. He noted that Shasta Reservoir storage has been increasing.

Person noted several "cleanup" items that he has taken care of recently. One was that the reply to EPIC will be coming from the Bureau of Reclamation and that a letter was sent out recently. A

second item was that the TMC should amend the bylaws about what the purposes of the monthly calls should be. Several new incorporations were developed and these were being offered at this meeting in one of the handouts. The incorporations generated discussion. Mike Orcutt said that the protocol questions are not entirely clear and that he had questions about which was the proper “ruling document.” He noted his desire to get the “lay of the land” regarding the guiding documents. There was discussion about what the conference calls should address. Regarding the new incorporations, Curtis Milliron asked about the voting rules and the number of votes required to pass a motion. There was discussion about possible contradictions in the offered changes. Mike Orcutt clarified that the voting rules for adding new members needed full vote. Roger Jaegel suggested the TMC avoid taking actions that may affect the public during a conference call since the public cannot participate. Dave Hillemeier noted that the value of the conference calls was in dealing with issue of urgency. Person said they will address these concerns at their next meeting.

Action Item: Brian Person and Robin Schrock will address comments to the incorporations to the Bylaws regarding teleconferences by the next TMC meeting.

Person next brought up the process of decisions on fall flows and projections of high ocean abundance and predictions of 350,000 returning Chinook. He noted the concerns for potential problems this fall and that this has prompted a series of discussions and conference calls. He noted the existence of triggering conditions and responses. He said the Regional Director will respond as needed to avoid a fish kill. The only decision will be if the emergency flows would come from the Klamath or the Trinity.

There was an extended discussion on fall flows. Mike Orcutt asked for a document that described the record of discussions regarding the use of water for fall flows and from whose source the water came. He asked if one could link the two flows and what the volume of water was. He did not want to “plow that ground again.” Person acknowledged that they did not have authority to release ROD water for fall flows and “this ground will not be plowed again.” Orcutt urged that groups need to be fully engaged and coordinate with the Klamath Basin.

Roger Jaegel said Trinity County is concerned about Trinity Lake levels as high levels are important as a temperature control tool for the river. Mike Orcutt wanted to emphasize that this predicted run is higher than they have seen. He said he is not clear on coordination and nexus with coordination with NOAA Fisheries and wanted to tease this out. Ann Garrett said NOAA did ask for the Federal agencies to have a coordination process. Roger Jaegel said Trinity County wants to be part of any coordination discussions on flows and fisheries that affect Trinity County. George Kautsky clarified that Tim Hayden chairs the Flow Workgroup and that Nina Hemphill heads up a sub-group called the Fall Flows Sub-Group. The sub-group is just getting started with their meetings. Mike Orcutt asked if the TMC could get support for the concept that the source of the water would satisfy Humboldt County’s contracted water. Person said the decision on Humboldt County’s water has been slow. Mike Orcutt thought a motion may be in order to speed the decision on Humboldt’s contracted water. He thought the fish numbers are not being very well tracked and that it is clear water will be needed.

Person noted that the triggers involve a threshold of 170,000 run size and 2800 cfs flow below Iron Gate. Curtis Milliron added that the last time they had this large of a return was in the 1980’s and at that time the harvest of fish in the ocean was higher. Dave Hillemeier noted that the original thoughts of the triggers did not consider an “off-the-chart” run size and perhaps the 2800 needs to be “bumped up a bit.”

Person closed his report by mentioning the issues of the budget, government-to-government discussions, and mods to the AFA.

Robin Schrock noted that the TRRP website has posted Workgroup meeting summaries and they are working toward putting TAMWG meeting minutes there and possibly the Action Tracker.

5. Report from Executive Director of the Trinity River Restoration Program

Robin Schrock, Executive Director of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) went over her memo of her report that she had passed out to the TMC members. She noted the following points:

- Flow scheduling recommendations were made and that Tim Hayden would be presenting on this.
- Fall flows meetings are taking place and are discussing the need for fall flows.
- Budget for 2012 has been affected by extra costs of the Phase 1 review and redesign of channel projects.
- 2013 budget has been set at \$16.1 million but they still need to be cognizant of budget realities in Congress. She recommended the 2013 budget return to the 2010 allocations (20:30:50).
- Organizational update includes a better website to deliver information. A new riparian ecologist has been hired and the new person is a Hoopa Tribe employee. Mike Orcutt said this is a very good statement about cooperation and the Tribe is very excited about it.
- The 2013 TRRP Science Symposium is scheduled for the week of January 7, 2013.

6. 2012 Budget

Robin Schrock said the outstanding item in the 2012 budget is the watershed assessment. There was an extended discussion about the budget and if there were savings that would cover the watershed assessment. Mike Orcutt and Dave Hillemeier thought a review of the budget would help to better understand the status of the budget and what funds are available. There was discussion about whether savings may be realized or not from the reduce construction and the increased planning that has occurred this year. Schrock said there really have not been savings given the fixed costs to mobilize for the project and likely inflation costs by delaying projects to the next year. Schrock confirmed the 2012 budget is \$15.492 million including the Services contribution this year.

Person reviewed some of the discussions and the solicitors' opinions on the watershed assessment. He reported that the solicitor said there are restrictions on "brick and mortar" work in the watershed (e.g., the South Fork Trinity) but "studies" on the watershed has greater latitude (e.g., to established a biological nexus between tributaries and mainstem). Roger Jaegel thought that when they get a solicitors' opinion they should also give the solicitor their opinion on how this affects their ability to restore fisheries. He is "tired of playing games" with these opinions when they need to focus on how to spend the dollars most effectively. Curtis Milliron said that the solicitor did not give a "yes or no" but it appeared to give the TMC some charge in deciding what to do. They have not been able to overcome the issue of 120 miles of inaccessible habitat given the brick and mortar prohibition.

Person asked Arnold Whitridge for his opinion. Whitridge commented that it not possible for the rest of the group to know what exactly the solicitor was asked except by "you four." He thought it was important to preserve and propagate fisheries and that seems to include work in tributaries.

He would like to hear this addressed “directly” by the solicitor. These “vague discussions” act to derail the budget discussions every year.

Several other TMC members commented on tributary work. Gil Saliba said the SAB may be able to offer an opinion. Wade Sinnen thought that sediment control projects were allowed in the watersheds. Whitridge again stated his opinion that this issue should be clarified. Bill Brock asked if the solicitor would consider work in the tributaries as a way to protect work that has gone on in the mainstem. Ed Duggan noted that since tributaries enter the mainstem, he did not understand why the Program would not allow funds to open up the mouths of tributaries for fish access.

Person noted that, today, Schrock was seeking approval of the scope of work for the watershed assessment and the approval of specific language in the scope. Mike Orcutt noted that this has been a prolonged discussion and that the TMC does not have a budget estimate for the project. He asked for “more specificity” on this. Person said that budget issues could be addressed later after these technical issues were decided. There was a discussion on how to estimate costs. Nancy Finley suggested that costs be worked out once a contractor works out a more defined scope of work. It was pointed out that there was an urgent need for a decision today in order to meet the budget deadline for 2012. Andrea Hilton asked if the bid process could go out to the open bid process and not just an IDIQ. Schrock said it would.

Person pressed the group to craft a motion. Bill Brock started a motion and this started discussion on the wording and adding of amendments. Mike Orcutt proposed a cap on the price of the contract of \$25,000 but then agreed it could be revisited after the project was awarded. There was discussion about the specific words in the scope of work. But the solicitor did not say there were restrictions on the language according to the ROD. Eventually the motion was crafted.

Bill Brock made a motion to adopt the scope of work for the Watershed Assessment. The Program Office will prepare a purchase request for a competitive bid. The language of the scope of work would keep the original language of aquatic habitat and ecosystem function. The final decision on the award would be conditional pending approval by the TMC.

Ann Garrett seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Before breaking for lunch there was further discussion about the usefulness of budgets and allocations for each meeting.

Action Item: Ernie Clarke will prepare a current version of the budget for each TMC meeting.

Lunch

Information/Decision Items:

7. Flow Release Recommendation

Tim Hayden, Flow Workgroup coordinator, and Rod Wittler of the TRRP, gave a PowerPoint presentation on how the flow release scheduling proceeded. Hayden noted that the snow water content for Northern California has been increasing and by this morning it had increased to 65 % of average conditions. Rod Wittler showed that the year is becoming wetter by referencing that

reservoir levels are approaching or exceeding 100 % of their average and that precipitation at the Trinity Hatchery is now 70 % of average.

Roger Jaegel asked about ideas of managing reservoir levels such as a minimum reservoir levels, and whether they could manage releases and hold back releases to reserve for later temperature needs. Wittler said they need to examine a number of factors (more than just the lake levels) in managing for river temperatures and that this is being considered.

Wittler explained some of the forecasting data they use in making their decisions about flow scheduling. The inflow forecasts to Trinity Reservoir as of March 1 predict a Critically Dry year. But he also noted that there have been substantial rains since March 1. They also get the B2 forecasts from the Central Valley Project that predicts storage in the reservoirs by months under a 90 % and 50 % exceedance probability. Both probabilities predict over 1 million acre feet by next September.

Hayden commented on some of the temperature considerations they used in arriving at their recommendations. They explained that the auxiliary outlet works from the Trinity Reservoir is currently out of order but will be repaired by mid-August. They explained that they considered one alternative of an increased peak flow of 6,000 cfs. But this proposal was withdrawn by the Physical Workgroup as it would have interfered with planned measurements. Wittler showed that the predicted temperatures at Douglas City under a worst case scenario for air temperature could exceed the maximum targets for a short period, but a normal year scenario should be good for staying below the maximum threshold.

The three different flows schedules they considered consisted of two ROD recommended flows (one for a Dry year and one for a Critically Dry year) and a third alternative of a slightly enhanced peak flow under a Dry year. The Flow Workgroup recommended that the ROD flows be followed for a Dry or for a Critically Dry year. They are planning public outreach. They will coordinate with the Sacramento River Temperature Task Group.

Mike Orcutt asked about the in-river temperature requirements. Hayden explained these are from the North Coast Regional Water Quality Board (WR 90-5). Wittler said there are some studies beginning regarding temperature management in Lewiston Reservoir. He noted that temperature is a function of reservoir levels, travel through Lewiston, and air temperatures. These studies should help to improved predictions of river temperatures.

Person suggested the group begin to consider some wording for a motion regarding the recommended flow schedule. There was more discussion about options for fall flows and coordination with the Klamath project. Roger Jaegel brought up the issues for management of lake levels, especially if there are multiple dry years.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion that the TMC adopt the flow regimes as recommended by the Flow Workgroup to follow the ROD recommended flows for a Dry year or a Critically Dry year.

Roger Jaegel seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mike Orcutt expressed his appreciation that the Program was following the ROD recommended flows. He also took this moment to introduce James Lee as the new riparian ecologist that will work for the Program out of the Hoopa Tribal Office.

Ernie Clarke also mentioned a group meeting on April 12 for the fall flows sub-group. There was discussion about conversations that are occurring in anticipation of problems this fall given the

large fish returns. Dave Hillemeier said the Yurok Tribe will be conducting real-time monitoring and will be coordinating with Foote. Both Schrock and Person thought the monitoring would be very useful despite that they may not have specific thresholds regarding disease development. Roger Jaegel said that the fishing guides had notions of disease development in 2002. He stressed the need to use all available information. Dave Hillemeier asked if the fall flow subgroup might consider the 2800 cfs flow given they are expecting an “off-the-chart” fish return. Mike Orcutt wants the group to make a recommendation on Humboldt County water and supplemental flows. He also mentioned the need for coordination with the Klamath side. Dave Hillemeier said that the Klamath system is operating under a new Biological Opinion and that there should be higher releases from the reservoirs this fall.

Discussion about a motion regarding fall flows and Humboldt County’s 50,000 acre feet of water. There was discussion about the nature of the agreement with Humboldt County and the permits that the Bureau of Reclamation holds, whether there needs to be a scientific determination for the water. Roger Jaegel wanted to use the language of the 1955 Act and that the water would come from that allocation. Curtis Milliron asked for clarification about how the water was paid for. Person explained that the last release by water from Shasta and did not affect the ROD supply. Eventually they decided to parse the motion into two separate motions.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the TMC advise the Secretary of the Interior to see that water be made available from Trinity and or Klamath to avert 2012 fish kill as needed.

The motion was seconded by Dave Hillemeier.

The motion passed unanimously.

The second motion underwent considerable discussion and word smithing.

Mike Orcutt made a motion that the TMC advise the Secretary to acknowledge the importance of the water volumes consistent with the Act of August 12, 1955 Section 2: “Provided further, that not less than 50,000 acre-feet shall be released annually from the Trinity Reservoir and made available to Humboldt County and downstream water users”, including recognition of the 1959 water contract between Humboldt County, and the Bureau of Reclamation to be administered separately and distinctly from the 2000 Record of Decision flows.

The motion was seconded by Dave Hillemeier.

The motion failed. It received four votes and four abstentions.

Since there were four abstentions, five affirmative votes were required for passage according to the TMC bylaws Section 604.

8. Implementation Update

D.J. Bandrowski gave updates on channel work on Lower Steiner Flat and Upper Junction City. He noted that a number of things were happening simultaneously with permits, contracts, landowners, and other logistics. They are evaluating the Bucktail Bridge value analysis. The infrastructure relocation for wells is underway. So far the wells project is going well. Comments are closed for the Environmental Compliance; they received five letters and they are developing responses and moving toward permitting. There are five projects underway for the watershed implementation program.

9. Phase 1 Review

D.J. Bandrowski said that the contractors are well underway on the review. They are planning to produce an interim report on July 1. They have taken comments received in November and incorporating them into their scope. A short report is due next week.

Ernie Clarke explained that material was passed to the SAB last fall. The SAB suggested the meeting that was held in January. The SAB settled on an 8-member panel that will provide one independent, expert review. The SAB asked that they have more time to deliver their report to the expert panel. It was originally scheduled for May 1 and is now August 1. Adkins was selected as the contracted project manager but the review will be performed by the 8 experts. The TMC will receive a report on July 1. They will have a 2-week period for this internal review. Then the SAB will prepare a next draft as the submission to the expert panel by August 1.

10. Science Update

Ernest Clarke made a PowerPoint presentation on the Science Program of the TRRP. He covered a list of topics on the Science Work Plan development process:

- Work planning concepts and the timeline: there are a set of guiding principles and a timeline. The timeline included steps of submission of plans, reviews, and recommendations.
- Procedures and products: he showed a large table of projects that were ranked. The members were provided with this information in their packages.
- Status and next steps: they are now in the 2013 planning. The submissions are being made into an Access database that creates metadata.
- Future plans: there were difficulties using the Access system and they plan to make it more user-friendly. They may push off until mid-March the submission due dates for the work plans for next year.

Responding to questions, Clarke explained that Technical Workgroups did the project ranking. He also acknowledged that a separate review panel other than the SAB may be useful in the future. He noted that the Access data base will streamline a variety of management tasks related to the Work Plan.

George Kautsky was asked to provide some comments on the problems the Hoopa Tribe encountered with the Access system. Kautsky said they took 6 to 7 weeks to get familiar with the system. He thought some comments and review could be mediated through the IDT. He noted that he had been told that 2012 and 2013 would also be more user-friendly. He thought that transparency and peer review were addressed but he wasn't convinced that this new program was moving toward program synthesis, adaptive management, and annual funding agreements. Ernie Clarke noted that the program could be difficult but that Eric Peterson was available for aid and that he did help to clear up issues.

Regarding the submission of work plans, Person thought that an adjustment to March was satisfactory.

Clarke next explained the general process of review of proposals, programs and projects. He noted that they are embracing a program of review. He listed plans, reports, and other documents that are under current review. He presented the review findings from the adult salmonid monitoring review. This review noted consistent programs, but variable reporting particularly of uncertainty. The review recommended increased integration, interpretation, and analysis. Joe

Polos said that the reviewers noted that the pattern of more effort on data and less on integration is common for programs like this.

Dave Hillemeier commented that they did a good job with the adult review. He thinks the data uncertainties can be readily addressed, but the integration will be a bigger job.

Ernie Clarke closed his presentation by touching on the bullets regarding the Science Update in Robin Schrock's executive director's report.

11. Open Forum

Gail Goodyear, a local landowner, commented on the ideal structure proposed by the adult review as presented by Ernie Clarke in the previous presentation. She asked about the designs and the assumptions of individual projects. She said without descriptions of design or stated assumptions, the TRRP projects appear more like "just data collection." As a landowner that cooperates with the Program she would want to know about the validity of the research and how the data will be used. A lack of a research design is evident in some of the past documents and this will hurt their ability to make credible public presentations.

Ernie Clarke responded by noting that they are embracing scientific review and the use of formally stated hypotheses and statistical designs. Curtis Milliron commented on the DFG efforts to bring science into many of their programs. He cited Wade Sinnen's work on the fish returns. He said outside of TRRP there is a lot of data use and analysis going on. Goodyear related that when she was asked to sign the contract for work on her ownership at Reeding Creek in 2007, she did not receive very good responses to her question about the design. D.J. Bandrowski acknowledged that that project did not have very good design for project effectiveness. This is being addressed as they design new more scientifically robust projects.

Goodyear noted that the need to attend the new public relations meeting is an additional burden and she would like to be able to go to fewer meetings to get information on the program and to be heard. Robin Schrock noted that these public relations meetings were for those that lived further out and those that did not have computer or internet access and that Goodyear did not feel it necessary to attend all these meetings.

George Kautsky noted that a recurring theme at today's meetings is the need to have structured assessments that guide the Program and to ensure they are making the right choices in an adaptive management manner. Ernie Clarke thought that the Program is not that far off as they move toward integration and adaptive management.

12. Calendar

During the wrap up Tim Hayden asked that they try to work together the flow scheduling calendar with the TAMWG and TMC meetings for next year.

Meeting Adjourned; 4:25 PM