

Final Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
Humboldt Bay Aquatic Center
921 Waterfront Drive, Eureka, California 95501
Wednesday and Thursday, September 22 - 23, 2010

Wednesday, September 22
Start of meeting 9:40 AM

Attending Members:

Brian Person	Bureau of Reclamation, Chair
Nancy Finley	Fish and Wildlife Service, Vice-Chair
Neil Manji	California Natural Resources Agency
Dave Hillemeier	Yurok Tribe
Mike Orcutt	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Irma Lagomarsino	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Fisheries
Roger Jaegel	Trinity County
Bill Brock ¹	Forest Service
Arnold Whitridge ²	Trinity Adaptive Management Work Group
Jennifer Faler ²	Trinity River Restoration Program, Acting Executive Director

1) alternate for Sharon Heywood, 2) non-voting members

Others that attended: Clair Stalnaker, USGS retired; Chad Smith, Headwaters Corporation; Scott McBain and John Bair, McBain and Trush; Joe Polos, Fish and Wildlife Service, Arcata Field Office; Don Reck Bureau of Reclamation; Larry Hanson California Department of Fish and Game; Kelli Gant and Mike McHugh, Trinity Lake Revitalization Alliance; Ernie Clarke, Eric Peterson, and Andreas Krause, Trinity River Restoration Program; Teresa Conner Department of Water Resources; Tim Hayden, Yurok Tribe; Robert Franklin, George Kautsky, and Andrea Davis Hoopa Valley Tribe; Tom Weseloh and Gil Saliba, TAMWG; Suzanne Brentwood, Trinity County; CJ Ralph Redwood Sciences Laboratory.

Regular Business:

Introductions

Brian Person, chair, opened the Trinity Management Council (TMC) meeting. Person welcomed Neil Manji as a new, returning member representing the State of California. The current members and members of the audience introduced themselves.

The agenda for the meeting was reviewed and accepted. The minutes from the past June meeting were reviewed and an edited was offered by Dave Hillemeier.

Bill Brock made a motion to accept the minutes as edited.

Irma Lagomarsino seconded.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mike Orcutt, Roger Jaegel, and Neil Manji abstained as they had not been present at the June meeting.

Open Forum

There were no comments from the public at this time.

Report from Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group Chair

Tom Weseloh acted as chair of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG) for the past meeting and therefore presented the report. Weseloh highlighted the following from his submitted letter:

1. The TAMWG is awaiting approval of its charter and the new members. He asked for the support of the TMC to expedite these approval steps by writing a letter to the Secretary of the Interior.
2. The TAMWG would like the TMC to indicate in the minutes which TMC members voted against motions.
3. The TAMWG appreciated the presentation and the progress on the fall pulse flows.
4. Next meeting TAMWG was set to precede the next TMC meeting. Weseloh asked to be notified if the TMC changes their date. He invited TMC members attend the TAMWG meetings.
5. Weseloh reiterated TAMWG's desire to receive written responses to their requests to the TMC. He asked that TAMWG be sent notices of TMC meetings and copies of communications.
6. The TAMWG is discouraged about hatchery management progress. They want an answer regarding who has authority of the hatchery. They are hoping for a response from Central Valley Operations office of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Following Weseloh's presentation, there was an extended discussion on several topics that Weseloh brought up. Mike Orcutt suggested that the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) and National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) make presentations to the TMC on fall flows and the Klamath Biological Opinion. Irma Lagomarsino said NOAA would be glad to give a presentation on the Biological Opinion. Mike Orcutt opined that the authority to run the hatchery should be clear and he suggested that Bob Clark of Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) make a presentation. Brian Person noted that the answer to "who runs the hatchery" may be more complicated. Roger Jaegel said he "doesn't understand" how a simple response to their request for information to the CVO could take months even years. Person said he has followed this up and that Peggy Manza of the BOR is "working on the reply." Dave Hillemeier stated that he clearly understands that the TAMWG is frustrated with the TMC. Weseloh noted the TAMWG complaints are symptoms of a bigger problem. He opined the TAMWG considers themselves the "representatives of the public" and they do not get the impression that the TMC views them that way. Weseloh said, "I would rather hear a response of 'No' than no response."

Dave Hillemeier suggested that the TMC have a joint meeting with the TAMWG. Mike Orcutt did not think it was appropriate to take this up as a TMC motion, given all the items on the agenda. He also worried that a facilitated meeting with the TAMWG is not where the "focus should be." Orcutt noted that the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Mike Connor, met with the TAMWG and he is currently working on a "fix to the program." Hillemeier gave his impression that the Commissioner thought "the solution lays with the TMC for a fix." Orcutt responded that he thought the TMC is "incapable of fixing the problem." Irma Lagomarsino thought it was important that the TAMWG thinks they are being "heard" and she voiced her support for a joint meeting. She asked why the TMC cannot write these letters. Roger Jaegel said many responses may be "We're working on it." He noted that more information could be provided, such as what is being done and when an answer may be

forthcoming. Dave Hillemeier suggested that TMC receive the TAMWG minutes prior to the TMC meetings. Dave Hillemeier made a recommendation to revisit this issue of TMC response to TAMWG later during this meeting.

Report from Trinity Management Council Chair

Brian Person, chair of the Trinity Management Council (TMC), described meetings between the Commissioner of the BOR and various groups involved with the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP). According to Person, the Commissioner offered that the program suffers a “perception challenge.” In Washington, there is great competition for funding. The Commissioner suggested that greater collaboration is needed among the members, and there needs to be incremental demonstrations of progress. If the TMC wants Congress support, don’t pretend something is working that is not, but don’t show nothing is working either. The Commissioner had no indications that any sweeping changes are coming. However, the funding looks good for the near future.

Mike Orcutt noted that all funding is not being received (i.e. \$16.4\$ M as identified in HR2733), and the Hoopa Valley Tribe wants the water users to pay their share as required in the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) legislation and the water users should not be oppose funding to restore the Trinity River. Roger Jaegel asked if there would be the 50,000 acre-feet for Humboldt County. Person replied that the 1955 Act contains language of 50,000 acre-feet for Humboldt County and other downstream users. He said the Commissioner promised to have a finalized position by Interior on it in two months. Jaegel suggested that “all the players get together” to discuss the ramifications.

Person next described the Science Retreat and expressed his appreciation to those that facilitated the event. He noted that not all objectives were met and the agenda was allowed to drift but for good reasons. Chris Moore, the meeting facilitator, explained what he saw as the problems. In particular, Moore noted that parts of the program have an “adversarial nature” and this slows progress. Person agreed and said that scientific opinions vary and the “challenge threshold” is very low. He asked that all participants think about ways to respond to resolve these issues. Mike Orcutt offered his view that guidance and policy needs to be provided by the federal government. He offered that a major hindrance is that Tribes have a legal property right to 50 % of the harvestable surplus of fish that return to the river. The Tribes need to be active as co-managers and the government needs to say what their trust responsibilities are.

Person noted he was preparing a comprehensive response in a letter to the TAMWG addressing their concerns. Finally he noted that the interviews for the TRRP Executive Director are slated for October 1.

Report from Trinity River Restoration Program Executive Director

Jennifer Faler referred to her written report that had been provided to the TMC members. She noted that several items would be covered in greater detail during the TMC meeting. She covered the following topics:

1. The 2009 Annual Report had temporarily stalled but now should be finalized by October.
2. Work on the formal Program operating agreement is awaiting the next Executive Director to take on.
3. Work in channel is ongoing and new designs for 2011 are being finalized. However, they instituted a value evaluation review by outside consultants which introduced new concepts such as introducing greater amounts of multiple or anabranching channels. Consideration of this has delayed final design.
4. A recommendation for fall flows has been developed.

5. A temperature work group has been formed and is working on temperature study of the reservoirs.

Action Items Update

Faler reviewed the Action Tracker and provided details on what had been completed and status of ongoing tasks. She noted two actions. First the request for a presentation by the Hoopa Valley Tribe on their proposal to take over the program was “complete.” No presentation was scheduled. Instead she noted that the Hoopa Valley Tribe said the TAMWG can review the public record of their testimony. Arnold Whitridge said this does not answer their question—the TAMWG wants to know what the proposed “demonstrated project” would look like. Mike Orcutt said that he did not say the tribes are proposing to “take over” the entire program as there are parts that are reserved for the federal government.

Faler noted that development of a mission statement is ongoing. Brian Person asked Faler to agendaize for the next meeting what has been documented so far regarding the vision statement. Nancy Findley commented that the federal legal councils had advised them that, “If the TMC cannot visualize a mission statement, how can they finalize their restoration program?” Mike Hamman, former Executive Director, had started this issue by asking about vision and goals. Findley characterized the problem as consisting of two different camps or views within the TRRP—the physical view is to simply restore the physical channel, whereas the biological view is that the physical is means to restore the biological aspects of the river. Orcutt recommended that technical support be offered to Trinity County to help with temperature discussions.

Break for lunch.

Re-adjourn 1:40 PM.

Trinity River Hatchery

Person asked the group where they wished to proceed on the issue of Trinity River Hatchery. Mike Orcutt again restated his view that the TMC does not have to have the hatchery as a permanent agenda item and it should be discussed only when new information becomes available. Orcutt also reiterated his suggestion to have Bob Clark, USFWS, to speak to the TMC about the California hatchery review process currently underway. Person countered that there is interest in the hatchery and, unless there was a motion, they should leave the hatchery as a continuing agenda item. Roger Jaegel also thought an ongoing hatchery agenda item would be good and suggested that a brief summary could be prepared by the Executive Director as part of the regular report. Neil Manji noted the existence of an ongoing hatchery review being conducted that will be looking at ways to balance hatchery production with natural production on a river by river basis.

Information/Decision Items:**2010 Flow Schedule**

Andreas Krause of the Trinity River Restoration Program gave a PowerPoint presentation based on a proposal prepared by John Bair of McBain and Trush. The proposal is to reduce the rate of the ramp-down (flow decrease) as part of the scheduled flow pattern. The current ramp-down is a decrease in release from Lewiston Reservoir from 450 cfs to 300 cfs in a single day in October. The proposal is to slow the rate of ramp-down from 1-day to 4-days for this year and evaluate. This should help to prevent desiccation of riparian plants growing near the edge of the river.

There were questions of how starting the ramp-down a day or two earlier may affect river temperatures. George Kautsky asked what monitoring would be in place if this modification were adopted. Krause thought that existing riparian monitoring will capture the process and should be able to test this as a hypothesis. Responding to a question by Bill Brock, Krause said they do not expect an adverse effect on frogs. Jaegel thought it would be useful to follow the proposal as a hypothesis that could show a result. Kautsky cautioned about the effects of rain during this time period. It was also noted that the reservoir will have some difficulty in metering the flows to such as small change. Robert Franklin commented that this adaptation should have minimal effects and that such changes likely better reflect the real conditions in the river.

Neal Manji made a motion to adopt the recommended ramp-down rate with the caveat Andreas Krause checks with Paul Zedonis that there will be minimal impacts to temperature that will result in fish mortality.

George Kautsky seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

TAMWG Letter to Secretary

Arnold Whitridge, TAMWG chair, reviewed that, in June 2009, TAMWG considered writing directly to the Secretary of the Interior voicing their frustration over the TMC having a conflict of interest and it was non-functional. Since there was a newly hired Executive Director, TAMWG waited until December. However, at that time, they still felt little progress had been made and decided to write the letter. TAMWG did not actually “write” the letter, but all members signed it as individual citizens. TAMWG feels it would be good to have a larger range of interests (members) on the TMC to help reduce its “struggle,” and that it would be good to have members that are not “financially conflicted.” TAMWG does not want to mess with TMC membership or bylaws but wants to make the TMC more effective and functional.

Brian Person referred to a letter from the Commissioner of the BOR that suggested group meetings and resolution at the local level. Dave Hillemeier asked about letters sent to Congressman Miller. Whitridge said no group letter was sent, but some may have asked him to get involved. Person added that Miller sent a letter to BOR (which BOR responded) and the Hoopa Valley Tribe also sent a letter to Congressman Miller. Dave Hillemeier stated that a resolution of the TAMWG issues is important as the TAMWG is important component of the TRRP. Roger Jaegel opined that Humboldt County deserves a place on the TMC since the Trinity flows through Humboldt County. George Kautsky (sitting in for Mike Orcutt) acknowledged that the Hoopa Valley Tribe has often been on the “negative end of the votes.” He is hopeful that progress is being made on outside issues such as the government to government relations. He suggested that the voting structure would not need to be changed if these other changes keep occurring.

Dave Hillemeier recommended that the Department of Interior, as they go through the memorandum of understanding, approach the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and tell them that they are valued as a cooperator and perhaps they (BLM) could cooperate via the existing Department of Interior agencies.

TMC Bylaws Amendment

Arnold Whitridge reviewed that one time the TMC had four abstentions on a vote and there was confusion as to how to proceed. Whitridge reviewed the bylaws and noted a contradiction. He pointed out that the bylaws required 6 votes, but the bylaws were silent on abstentions when there were less than 8 votes. He offered a fix to resolve this. Bill Brock noted no holes in Whitridge's suggested changes and that it seemed neutral to the voting structure.

George Kautsky said he was inclined to oppose the motion based on the notion that if it isn't broken, don't fix it. He asked if there were any instances that the voting structure was unable to pass a motion. Whitridge said no. Bill Brock did note the contradiction in two sections of the bylaws (603 and 604).

Roger Jaegel made a motion to approve the changes proposed by Whitridge.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed: 7 in favor and one opposed. The Hoopa Valley Tribe opposed.

Scientist's Retreat Summary

Ernie Clarke reviewed the Science Retreat and passed out a handbook from the meeting. He first noted the success of the retreat. He also noted the usefulness of facilitator Chris Moore's constructive criticisms and that these will be summarized next month. He noted Moore's observations of the program—taking on too much, getting distracted, unwillingness to listen to opposing views, and a misunderstanding of consensus. He noted they hit only half the items on the agenda and did not complete all those items they took on. Tim Hayden of the Yurok Tribe Fisheries commented that the retreat was “very good,” if only in that it identified a list of 20 important issues for the science program.

Clarke went over several topics that were addressed at the Science Retreat:

1. The memorandum of understanding (MOU).
2. The roles and responsibilities—Clarke showed a table listing various technical specialists among the program partners and their contributions to the program. He asked that the program partners fill in the table listing their own specialists.
3. Decision-making—Clarke showed a flow chart describing decision-making within the program. This is being edited and modified.
4. A new way to organize and integrate the various program elements and subcommittees that was created by the scientists.
5. An example of a work group charter describing the purpose, membership, officers etc. Arnold Whitridge asked if TAMWG members can attend a workgroup. Faler noted that attendance is open but decision-making may be limited to official members.

The next steps are to decide who the workgroup members may be. Then they can get to work on their charters and eventually their work plans. Clarke showed a draft description of membership requirements for workgroups.

2012 Budget Process

This was combined into the previous item and required no additional discussion at this time.

Adjourn for the day, 4:00 PM.

Next day, start of meeting Thursday, September, 7:30 AM**Special Event:****TMC Workshop****Trinity River Restoration Program, Concepts/Vision.**

Clair Stalnaker, USGS Senior Scientist, Retired gave a PowerPoint presentation on the overall concept and rationale of the TRRP as viewed during its inception. Before the TRRP, a set of “foundation studies” conducted over a 15-year period had focused mainly on the channel. An integrated committee produced the Trinity River Flow Evaluation Study which was based on “objective science.” Studies were peer reviewed and published; this took until 1997. Two major conclusions were that flow alone could not restore the river and that juvenile habitat was limiting. Restoration needed mechanical action, infusion of gravel, and enhanced temperatures. Novel concepts were the introduction of five different flow types that required “forecasting.” Two major hypotheses were that a 3-4 fold increase in habitat will create a doubling of juveniles and that this increase in juveniles will lead to an increase in adults. It was a “coup” to get the five water years with guaranteed volumes. The Record of Decision set up a new organizational structure base on use of science. The program was designed to be science-driven whereas previous work had used science only as a monitoring tool (e.g., after the fact). This program was not to be a research program but an adaptive environmental assessment and management (AEAM) program. He noted they had originally anticipated that the rehabilitation and implementation group (RIG) would be temporary with a life of 6 to 10 years, that the TAMWG might review outside proposals, and that the science advisory board would provide outside input and review.

In his opinion, the program has been “regressing and pushing back toward the old Task-Force-way of doing business.” The debate continues over role of mechanical channel versus more limited, targeted actions to drive natural geomorphic processes. Rehabilitation should bring about changes in management that allow the physical and biological processes to achieve natural processes. He thought water banking should be considered to help to ensure water flows. AEAM is flexible and it is learning by doing.

Discussion

Mike Orcutt mentioned three observations: 1) that there has been only one “extremely wet” water year so far and, as a result, he questioned whether there is enough time to assess the program, 2) that water banking may be difficult, and 3) whether the system is alluvial or bedrock driven is very important and he was fearful that this debate could be used by some to “change the program.” Stalnaker noted that indeed, not all the river is alluvial, and the alluvial areas need to be clearly identified.

Roger Jaegel noted three years of drought has caused problems and water banking could be helpful. Stalnaker agreed and noted that some modeling is currently being performed to address this. He noted that opening up the water banking issue is “political” and public outreach would be needed.

Dave Hillemeier asked about physical versus biological results and what may be good near-term metrics may show success. Stalnaker said he understands that temperature is having a good effect on juvenile health and growth and this should be publicized. He said to tell them that habitat may be only half way there yet, but progress is also being made. The total run of outmigrants may not be showing increases just yet and this is normal.

Irma Lagomarsino asked about water banking and how it may be done. Stalnaker said water banking from one year to the next may be most important for temperature control in a succeeding year, especially if it turns out to be a drought.

He said that the Central Valley Operations does not always communicate very well with the Trinity River Restoration Program. Stalnaker answered that modeling could be helpful and this would need to be done in-house.

Bill Brock ask about what he meant by the “drift back to the Task Force.” Stalnaker said he was noting that the funding is going to the program partners where the program was designed for greater participation by outside scientists.

Trinity River Flow Evaluation Study: Background, Strategy, and Recommendations

Joe Polos of the Fish and Wildlife Service started a PowerPoint presentation as part of a team with Robert Franklin, Hoopa Valley Tribal Fisheries Department. Scott McBain, McBain and Trush.

Polos summarized the problem of the Trinity River was fish declines following dam construction and resultant habitat declines. He cited five foundation legislations that defined the goals of the TRRP. He summarized the foundation documents of the TRRP as the Flow Evaluation, the EIR/EIS that evaluated 6 alternatives, and finally the Record of Decision (ROD) which was the based on the flow evaluation and the EIS.

Robert Franklin next presented background on the six independent studies that had been conducted on the river and that it as recognized that they were not very well integrated. He described that integration was adopted and the studies were peer reviewed, integrated, and recommendations were made. They were able to get concurrence on the resultant Flow Evaluation Study. The science in this effort was challenged but it was successfully defended.

Joe Polos described how the information was integrated into a restoration strategy. This is described in Chapter 7 of the Flow Evaluation. Two attributes were identified: 1) the need for mechanical work, and 2) that the river would be scaled down. Recommendation included increased flow, mechanical work, sediment management, and the adoption of an AEAM approach. The Flow Evaluation authors were pressed to justify all aspects of the hydrographs and were not allowed to have a 50,000 acre-feet slush fund unless it could be justified with hard science. He noted they asked for artificially high flows in summer (450 cfs) in order to provide cool temperatures for spring chinook. He showed the temperature criteria for fish. He showed how the hydrograph was developed to contain special features: 1) a peak flow with two benches designed to scour the bed, 2) a 2,000 cfs bench to provide for outmigrants, 3) a 450 cfs baseflow to provide summer temperatures, 4) a 300 cfs winter baseflow to provide microhabitat. The hydrograph contains a descending limb and is based on natural snowmelt records. He noted the hydrograph is a means to restore habitat and can be changed.

Scott McBain next addressed a question in his presentation regarding winter floods. He noted that the Flow authors were strongly encouraged to use water efficiently and this lead them to think about using tributary accretion. He showed some of the original thinking and learning process that went into their work: 1) one site (Bucktail) had showed an interesting response from a safety of dam release that lead to cobble bar development, 2) sites were showing vegetation encroachment, 3) that habitat complexity is formed from alternate bars, and 4) that the sediment infusion was designed as short term fix. He listed some other ideas that are listed in Appendix O of the Flow Evaluation Study. He showed, by now, thinking had evolved about how to create habitat complexity: increase in creation of side channels, large

woody debris, looking for alternative scour mechanisms. There is a question of whether the scale of sites has evolved and changes in ideas of floodplain construction and revegetation.

TRRP Implementation Summary (2003-2010)

Jennifer Faler, TRRP, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the physical work in the channel. She reviewed important documents that describe foundations of the program and a newer document describing their visions and concepts: the Trinity River Mainstem Habitat study of 2000. She noted that the ROD describes channel work in only three sentences: 1) to be guided by the TMC, 2) to remove riparian berms, and 3) to do the needed CEQA/NEPA. She reported that there have been little to no difference in vision or changes in program in the variable annual flow, or in the infrastructure improvements (though they spent \$10 million instead of \$6 million). However, channel rehabilitation has evolved based on best available science. But these changes have not been well documented. Sediment management is “on track,” watershed efforts are “consistent” with the foundation documents. Adaptive management is not driving the program to the extent it could. She noted that it was anticipated that the water would be able to do more of the work and now it is thought that mechanical changes are more important. She showed, using a table of planned versus actual activities, 1) that more emphasis is being placed on mechanical versus natural flow, 2) there has been a shift from berm removal to terrace lowering, 3) they have increased the introduction of woody debris, 4) they have designed more than three side channels, 5) the size of sites are similar or slightly smaller, 6) the construction duration is similar, and 7) costs are higher. The original plan was to construct about half the 40 sites, then break to assess, and then finish the remaining sites. She noted that the program is fully staffed and there has been no discussion to stop. This point may be an item for discussion. Another point for discussion is whether the evolution in techniques has been appropriate.

Where Art Thou, Adaptive Management? – Making “Learning by Doing” Meaningful

Chad Smith is a consultant working on the Platte River in Nebraska for the Headwaters Corporation. He works as a staff in the executive director’s office to coordinate science. Smith presented a PowerPoint on his views and experience with adaptive management. He pointed out that adaptive management is a “management model not a science model”—this needs a readjustment of thinking. Decisions need science input, but there are also politics and money issues. He noted three foundation books that describe adaptive management: Holling’s book and Wolter’s book are both difficult to read, but he recommended one by Kai Lee 1994—Compass and Gyroscope. He describes adaptive management as “ecosystemic” versus jurisdictional, tolerant of small-scale failure to test hypothesis, biological time scales, action with no fixed end-point. Learning is the goal. Success depends on taking a systems approach, shared decision-making, and a need to synthesize. There is only one successful river restoration program he is aware of—the Kissimmie River in Florida. They focused on ecological integrity. He reviewed other programs that have not yet shown success: Everglades, Missouri River, and Glen Canyon Dam. One problem he cited was that groups haven’t translated science into management.

He described elements of the Platt River program: 1) focused only on a 90-mile section, 2) governance committee and an independent staff that are not employees of agencies, 3) they buy land, 4) they have a “tug between water and bulldozers,” 5) they have management objectives, 6) they focus on the “why” of information—that is, is it important and what can be learned?, 7) they originally had 47 hypotheses to test, but this was found to be impossible and they narrowed this down, and 8) their science advisory board is critically important, but peer review isn’t needed for everything.

His recommendations for the TRRP:

1. Good to have integrated assessment plan but try to simplify, don’t get too complex as it breeds inaction.

2. Focus on work that will aid decisions over interesting research.
3. Full disclosure—write down the decision you need to make. It may help to identify what science is needed to help with the decision.
4. Mock report—helps to get started to identify the information needed.
5. People matter—involve everyone, need generalists to help synthesize.

Discussion

Mike Orcutt asked about the instance of failure of the Florida Everglades to exclude the bass fishing stakeholder group. Smith noted the importance of having all stakeholders at the table and thought the TMC should involve the TAMWG in decision-making.

Roger Jaegel asked how to explain adaptive management to the public. Smith says it is important to admit that it is a learning process and no one agency or person knows all the answers.

Arnold Whitridge asked how to deal with decision makers who will be financially affected by the decisions of the program. Smith admitted this can be a problem. He added that Congress is beginning to ask hard questions of how money is being used and such conflicts may cause funding to be lost.

Mike Orcutt clarified that the funds come through FWS and BOR and goes through a budget process. He personally has struggled with the issues of the TAMWG as the funds go through agencies and do not really create a “financial gain or profit.” Whitridge clarified that, in the budget process, the decisions do affect the decision-maker and this constitutes a conflict of interest. Smith admitted he doesn’t have a good answer for this. He admitted some of their funds also go to people sitting at the table and this may not be entirely avoided. He noted the need to build trust.

Scott McBain asked about Headwater’s role. Smith said they are not the decision-makers; they do the governance committee’s bidding. They are paid through the executive director’s office.

Brian Person noted that the TMC are not the real scientists and may not, for example, understand the screw trap data. He asked how a synthesizer’s role may help the TMC. Smith said if you don’t know about a screw trap, why are you doing it? He clarified that one does not need to be an expert on rotary screw traps but needs to understand the basics. To help this, there needs to be sufficient communication between the science and the governance committee. He also noted that adaptive management is not equal to sediment management, flow management, as one of the PowerPoints had shown. Smith advised that adaptive management should be viewed as a way to evaluate sediment and flow data.

Evaluation of Trinity River Adaptive Management

Andreas Krause, TRRP, gave his PowerPoint. He noted that, “We are falling down in the assessment and evaluation,” and that their information is “elusive.” He proposed an AEAM litmus test: prediction, experimentation, documentation, communication, leading to a management response. He gave examples of use of an adaptive management approach and discussed how they fare when rated against the adaptive management litmus test. The proposal to modify the fall ramp-down passes the test moderately well. But other management actions such as the introduction of large woody debris or smolt outmigration did not pass the test as well for lack of prediction and experimentation (woody debris) or failure to documentation of their findings (smolts). He thought that the fry rearing habitat limitation study fails somewhat in the testing and documentation. He concluded that the program needs to refocus on doing assessment for adaptive management. He suggested steps for the TMC to cooperate by providing some guidance and accountability.

Panel Discussion

All presenters addressed questions as a panel. Before questions, Clair Stalnaker showed the goals of the program and the implementation objectives, and the scientific assumptions. He listed annual measures salmonid production, health, and that this needs a baseline from which to measure results. He noted a need for synthesis to occur now.

Mike Orcutt asked why we need to monitoring wildlife. What are the objectives? Stalnaker commented that the legislation stated that fish restoration should not negatively impact wildlife but there was no language to restore wildlife. Faler noted the needs of the state permits that have wildlife maintenance requirements.

Roger Jaegel asked about how to establish priorities. He noted that, in some cases, the TMC is asked to referee among scientific ideas. Faler noted the changes in the workgroup organization that just came out of the Science Retreat. These should provide needs and priorities that should drive the program.

Dave Hillemeier rhetorically asked whether the TMC “closes the loop.” He asked if the “why” is being addressed. Hillemeier thought the TMC does need to have some level of understanding in order to provide the needed guidance and also suggested an evaluation of past projects. Smith said if a project cannot be justified, maybe it shouldn’t be done. Ernie Clarke noted that Chris Moore noted the ambitiousness of the group, and Clarke also wondered if, perhaps, it would be better to do less?

Neal Manji commented that some the main issues of the program do not appear to have, given his five-year hiatus (e.g., the screw trap is still an issue). He asked Stalnaker to grade the program. Stalnaker said, “Incomplete.” He noted the need to focus on the assessment part. Manji said he was surprised that Smith had commented that, in some TRRP programs, “the policy is behind the science.” Manji asked, “Is science ahead of policy in the TRRP?” Smith thought, “Yes.” He said he is surprised that some projects are put on the ground (e.g., that science should be following or paralleling the policy). Manji noted the problem with showing increased fish due to its difficulty of monitoring.

Irma Lagomarsino asked about the next phase of the channel implementation. Should we take a year off to assess or continue to plow ahead? Robert Franklin commented that several pieces of information has just arrived or is arriving and that there could be a risk of not taking advantage of that information. Smith noted they have a beautiful learning opportunity and he recommended to take time to do a synthesis, but do not expect science to deliver a definitive answer. A weighted-base of evidence could be developed, however. Polos commented on new information that is currently coming together, but there could be administrative concerns with taking a break. Polos asked, “Could there be a shuffling to learn from this information?” Stalnaker talked about the value of synthesis and that someone needs to be identified to do this. Faler brought up Smith comments about how the science program needs to be in step with the policy and guide implementation. She noted that she had asked the TAMWG and TMC about the rate of progress of the implementation and their answer was that she was “on the right track.” She is now asking them to rethink this question. Roger Jaegel noted that the public wants to see progress. Brian Person noted the changes that have evolved in thinking with the channel projects. Scott McBain commented on the value of science to help resolve questions. Person commented we have done 24 sites and have 22 left. Let’s consider those sites with flexibility, as there will be no perfect site, wouldn’t it be better to get those sites in the river a year to three years earlier? Andreas Krause said this is an important question. One idea is to do a lot of change (i.e., most of the channel work) and then look for a fish response—this is a debatable idea. Robert Franklin noted that Persons idea of not waiting is valid, if we did have 80 % certainty. In some cases we may not have this much certainty. It was apparent that this question would not be answered at this time.

Mike Orcutt noted that the program has been under-funded in the past. Our challenge is to put all the pieces together. He suggested they look at the foundation documents. He noted the failure of the watershed restoration group to identify \$2 million for watershed work. The synthesis needs to be distilled down so the policy people can understand it.

Roger Jaegel he asked the scientists to present information that address the policy questions. Scott McBain thought it is important that scientists should be able to present the trade offs with alternative actions. Smith noted they are trying to come up with simple briefing papers in the Platt River program.

Dave Hillemeier asked if we need another extremely wet year before we do an assessment. Andreas Krause recommended they do a synthesis report with a set of focused questions. He noted there would be some things that couldn't be answered, but some things could and others should be attempted. Franklin said we shouldn't wait forever for 100 years of flows. He noted that numeric simulation modeling is under utilized. Several others noted other ways to infer the effects of higher flows and this could be useful in a synthesis effort.

George Kautsky asked how to detect whether adult returns are restored? Stalnaker noted that the habitat would increase juveniles. The effects of habitat on smolts and the effects of smolts on adults can be simulated with models. Whitridge asked if this means adults would return. Stalnaker conceded that ocean conditions could prevent adult returns. However, it could be modeled to tell you to how much habitat you would need to produce 60,000 adults. Manji cautioned that models can be wrong. Stalnaker pointed out that models allow gaming and this aids learning about the system.

1:00 – 1:30 Lunch

Information Item/Decision Items:

Data Management Team Update

Eric Peterson reviewed that he requested a data team be established in June and that he had been asked to return to make another presentation at this meeting about the plan and his progress to date. He reported good progress in that he has assembled a team that has met. He identified a major hurdle is fear of data sharing. He invited and encouraged participation in his team. He handed out three papers: a one page briefing, minutes from their July data team meeting, and a draft outline of a data management plan.

There was discussion about the use of data and it was noted that it is a requirements for federally funded programs to make data available. Responding to questions, Peterson said he invited a wide group to participate and this that includes Trinity County RCD. GIS would likely be a component. It would use the current IIMS system under development. He did not have cost estimates at this time, but he did not see that the team would have a cost. The storage hardware would cost \$40,000 in FY2010 and \$80,000 in FY2011.

Channel Rehabilitation Update

Jennifer Faler presented a PowerPoint on the Phase 1 sites, lessons learned, and recommendations for Phase 2. She showed slides of pre- and post-construction of sites. She next showed slides of FY2010 construction that will complete Phase 1. She listed the lessons learned: 1) use more large woody debris, 2) create more side channels/edge habitat, 3) use of design scientists on the construction team, 4) do better documentation of design project, 5) use appropriate channel scaling, and 6) the benefits of coarse sediment.

Areas that still remain as problems: 1) lack of synergy in channel rehabilitation workgroup, 2) unknown cost-benefit of lowering terraces and forced meanders, and 3) uncertainty about the desired future condition of riparian vegetation.

She showed projected costs for Phase 2.

Responding to questions, Faler noted the decision to hire a consultant team to do the riparian revegetation. Brian Person asked how the TMC can help to do adaptive management. Faler noted that unless they have an alternative hypothesis, it is not necessarily. There was discussion about the time needed for workgroups to provide input. There was funding in the budget to go back and do maintenance on sites. The TAMWG wants to revisit the design ideology but did not want the channel work to stop. There was some discussion on tributary work and restriction of funding. Whitridge commented on the existence of a white paper written by Tom Stokely on the “nexus for cause” for nearly every square feet of the watershed. Faler was encouraged to take a look at it.

Mike Orcutt made a motion to recommend the development of the Phase 2 plan with collaborative analysis (Synthesis Report) and recommendations to be presented at a future TMC meeting for concurrence/action.

Roger Jaegel seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mike Orcutt commented on the collaborative nature of this motion. He strongly urged that the office to provide the needed support.

Unfinished Business

Brian Person brought up the unfinished business of the TMC holding a joint meeting with the TAMWG. Bill Brock stated his support. Roger Jaegel asked the TAMWG to review the issues. Arnold Whitridge reviewed that the TAMWG listed some of their requests that haven't been discussed. For example the need to bank flows. He said that the TMC only talking to the TAMWG may be viewed as a way to delay taking action. Mike Orcutt thought that the TMC should respond to the degree they can but it is premature to plan a joint meeting. He thought talking may be of limited use if there are no answers to give. Person said that general ideas could be discussed. Whitridge thought there would be some benefit just to talk even though there were not yet answers. Dave Hillemeier and Irma Lagomarsino both voiced their support for a joint meeting. Mike Orcutt asked that an agenda be known before he would be comfortable in attending. Person said a list of items to discuss could be assembled before a meeting.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to write a letter to ask TAMWG to meet with TMC to discuss several items including concerns with TMC and progress and other issues to be determined.

Irma Lagomarsino seconded the motion.

The motion passed with seven ayes and the Hoopa Valley Tribe abstaining.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion for the TMC to write a letter to the Secretary of the Interior to expedite the approval of the charter and new members for the TAMWG.

Irma Lagomarsino seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Brian Person noted that he is drafting a letter of response to the TAMWG. There may be some items that need further discussion, but others could be addressed.

Regular Business:

Open Forum

Kelli Gant said she thought there was a big public perception problem for the TRRP. She noted some vandalizing of signs. Many of the public see “changes” since 2005 that they do not approve of. The project needs to make a major effort in public relations. She thought that half of the people that live on the Trinity Reservoir agree with the program. The other half of the people are resigned to the project, but some want to fight it. Those that want to fight will write their Congressman and could begin to hurt funding.

Irma Lagomarsino thanked Gant for being a good ambassador. Faler responded that NOAA had donated their budget share to help fund a part time, local person to help with public relations. Mike Orcutt noted that the public doesn’t come to meetings, never-the-less he is supportive for public relationships. Person thought this would be a good topic for the joint meeting with TAMWG.

Calendars

The next meeting is scheduled at the Forest Service Supervisor’s Office in Redding, Dec 15-16 with a 10 AM start on the 15 and 8 AM start on the 16. March 23 and 24 is scheduled for Weitchpec with a 10 AM start on the 23rd and 8 AM start on the 24th.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:55 PM.