

Final Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
Trinity Public Utilities District Conference Room
26 Ponderosa Lane, Weaverville, CA 96093
Wednesday and Thursday, June 16-June 17, 2010

Wednesday, June 16

Start of meeting 9:40 AM

Attending Members:

Brian Person	Bureau of Reclamation, Chair
Nancy Finley	Fish and Wildlife Service, Vice-Chair
Mark Stopher	California Natural Resources Agency
Dave Hillemeier	Yurok Tribe
George Kautsky ¹	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Irma Lagomarsino	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Fisheries
Dero Forslund ²	Trinity County
Bill Brock ³	Forest Service
Arnold Whitridge ⁴	Trinity Adaptive Management Work Group
Jennifer Faler ⁴	Trinity River Restoration Program, Acting Executive Director

1) alternate for Mike Orcutt, 2) alternative for Roger Jaegel who attended on day 2, 3) alternative for Sharon Heywood, 4) non-voting members

Others that attended: Joe Polos, Fish and Wildlife Service, Arcata Field Office; Don Reck Bureau of Reclamation; Larry Hanson and Mike Berry California Department of Fish and Game; Kelli Gant and John Gant Trinity Lake Revitalization Alliance; Ernie Clark and Eric Peterson Trinity River Restoration Program; Teresa Conner Department of Water Resources; Tim Hayden, Yurok Tribe; Robert Franklin, Hoopa Valley Tribe; Gil Saliba, TAMWG and Redwood Audubon Society; Jimmy Smith and Jill Duffy, Humboldt County; Seth Naman, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Fisheries.

Regular Business:

Introductions

Brian Person opened the Trinity Management Council (TMC) meeting and welcomed everyone. Person next noted that a quorum exists. The agenda for the meeting was reviewed and accepted. The minutes from the past March 31- April 1 meeting had not been reviewed by all members and the motion to accept or edit the minutes was delayed until tomorrow.

Open Forum

There were no comments from the public at this time.

Report from Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group Chair

Arnold Whitridge, chair of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group, referred to a letter from the TAMWG to the TMC that constituted their recommendations. Whitridge commented on several key actions, recommendations, or points of the TAMWG:

- 1) The TAMWG approved of the RFP process but had several concerns such as independent review, allowable scope, and budget adjustments of \$100,000 for coded wire tags.
- 2) The TAMWG was discouraged that hatchery discussions have stopped and want to see the process restarted.
- 3) They support the Trinity Lake Revitalization Alliance and their efforts to seek mitigation of the dry boat ramps.
- 4) There were questions about the proposed federal legislation that contained language to pass greater program control of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) to the Hoopa Valley Tribe.
- 5) There were questions about use of extra Trinity water for relief of Klamath water quality.
- 6) TAMWG would like TMC to consider the concept of using the Science Advisory Board (SAB) to perform a 10-year programmatic review of the TRRP.
- 7) They recommend that TAMWG become a voting member, receive written responses from TMC regarding TAMWG recommendations, and have Clair Stalnaker make a presentation to the TMC.

The discussion moved to specific issues the TMC should take up for possible action. Person said he would research whether TMC and program options exist for mitigation for dry boat ramps.

Person next asked George Kautsky if he would see if the Hoopa Valley Tribe would be willing to make a presentation on the Tribe's perspective of taking on greater responsibility of the program at the next TMC meeting in September. Kautsky said he would ask the Tribe regarding a presentation. Kautsky also attempted to offer some background. During his attendance at the last TAMWG meeting, he sensed a lack "understanding of tribal sovereignty" and its importance to the Hoopa Valley Tribe. He cited the findings of the Situation Report that highlighted existing program problems regarding the issues of tribal rights and interests. He cited several questions the Tribe is asking about the structure of the program. His response suggested that these yet unresolved issues are an unsatisfactory condition for the Hoopa Valley Tribe and are the motivation for the Tribe's actions. Because the Hoopa Valley Tribe is recognized as a domestic dependent nation within the United States, resolutions of such issues are normally addressed in what are called "Government-to-Government discussions" between the Federal Government and the Hoopa Valley Tribal Government and involve issues that the TMC is not authorized to address.

Whitridge said the TAMWG recognizes the issues Kautsky mentioned and overall, the TAMWG respects those issues. Whitridge said, "It seems a solution is being proposed, but without specificity or details." It seems appropriate to "publicize their solution." Person had also attended the TAMWG meeting and acknowledged some harsh criticisms of the tribe. Kautsky noted his appreciation of Whitridge's keeping order in the meeting. Kautsky also offered the Tribe's perspective on the hatchery. He stated that the Tribe's interests "were put on hold" after meetings with various agencies regarding the hatchery. The Tribe sees the hatchery as a facility that is managed by the State but also serves a tribal trust function and the Tribe feels they should have equal standing on decisions of the facility. Kautsky explained that the Tribe withdrew from the Ad-hoc review process because they feel the policy issue to bring the Tribe and State together has to be addressed first.

Continuing with TAMWG's messages to the TMC, Whitridge noted the TAMWG wants the TMC to request the Science Advisory Board (SAB) to perform a review and formal assessment of hypotheses of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP). Jennifer Faler said that Mike Hamman started the

process for the SAB to perform a 10-year review. Ernie Clark said he would address some of the issue of review during his presentation on the Science Retreat tomorrow.

Whitridge wanted to reiterate the TAMWG's concerns about the hatchery ownership and management—he noted there has been two years with no response. He rhetorically asked, “What prevents us from figuring out the best way to operate the hatchery regardless of who owns it?” He said that the TAMWG thinks the TMC should continue to move forward in its evaluation even if implementation may be held up. Person noted recent activity in March in that the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) urged the Hoopa Valley Tribe to join the effort. The BOR will bring it up in government-to-government discussions and Person took responsibility for the slow progress. Person suggested to Kautsky, based purely on biological issues, perhaps some steps may be taken. Kautsky suggested that the Tribe has been the “lone voice” asking effects of hatchery on native fish. He said, “We must have the policy horse ahead of management horse. We have said this since 2009.” Dave Hillemeier noted the Yurok has decided to participate and they agree it is important to look for ways to minimize effects on natural fish. The BOR wants the Ad-hoc group to continue, and Person recently learned there is more the Ad-Hoc can do—particularly an analysis of steelhead impacts. There was more discussion about the stalled analysis of hatchery effects from Whitridge, Larry Hanson, and Irma Lagomarsino with general agreement that lack of progress is a problem. Lagomarsino noted that no action is essentially “an action” and that the information seems clear that coho are having an impact to natural coho. She also noted that the hatchery is not on the agenda and this is a problem. Whitridge echoed that the big issue for the TAMWG is the assessment seems to have been stopped. Hanson said the next step was not steelhead but to deal with the recommendations about coho. Person noted that Reclamation is at fault that government-to-government discussions have not taken place.

Report from Trinity Management Council Chair

Brian Person noted the following activities and actions taken by the TMC:

- 1) Organizational refinements and the integration of the two Interior agencies. The RFP process and the formulation of multi-year funding with tribes also help.
- 2) He has sent out a letter on Central Valley Operations. He seeks feedback on the Integrated Assessment Project letter from TMC members.
- 3) They have received the Interior Secretary's negative reply to voting structure and addition of members. A reply letter is owed to Congressman Herger.
- 4) The hatchery issues have been touched on.
- 5) Additional names have been solicited and obtained for hiring a new Executive Director of the TRRP.
- 6) He will work to improve efficiency of following up on issues and information management and communication.

Report from Trinity River Restoration Program Executive Director

Brian Person acknowledged Jennifer Faler for filling in during the absence of an Executive Director.

Faler noted that following in her report:

- 1) Organizational refinements continue via several steps: the integration of Nancy Finley and Ernie Clark; a common vision is being developed; plans for a science retreat; starting multi-year agreements; a botanist/riparian ecologist is being considered and possibly could be filled with a non-BOR person; construction activities have increased and they need a construction manager.
- 2) The budget is incorporating an RFP process and has shown success this year.
- 3) The conflict of interest is being address as laid out by Mike Hamman.
- 4) The annual report is on track and is hoped to be ready by August.

- 5) The flow scheduling and temperature management workgroup is being brought together.
- 6) Implementation update: planning for Phase 2 is starting. Two presentations were made last Monday by stream consultants (and were videotaped)—they recommended using multiple channel designs in lieu of current approach of intensive in-channel work. She noted that the program continued moving toward building larger projects and that at least one partner wants to stop and evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation. Having sites designed and ready to build can capture available money, for this reason she does not recommend stopping. It is not yet clear how to complete Phase 2 regarding cost and timing.

Dave Hillemeier agreed that the future channel rehabilitation design strategy is a big issue and it would need to be “agendized.” Providing more specific, Faler said there are 23 Phase 2 sites, with ten that will be designed by November and six that will be designed next year. Person noted the improvements to the design that have occurred over time and that slowing or stopping may not be wise as funds may be disappearing and it is important to get on the ground work done.

Joe Polos added his opinion that the authors of the ROD did not necessarily want to focus on just removal of berms but intended that the program implement the Flow Study. The language of the ROD is not entirely clear on this.

Person asked that Faler send an email regarding the filling of the Botanist/Riparian Ecologist position.

Action Items Update

Four items from March are completed from March. One from December is not yet completed.

Information/Decision Items:

TMC Bylaws Amendment

Whitridge noted that the TMC bylaws are unclear on what the minimum number of votes is. He wanted to remove the possibility for arguments. It was agreed that no measure should pass without five affirmative votes. Mark Stopher thought it may be appropriate to discuss this following the item of TMC membership as this could change the math.

Break for lunch.

Information/Decision Items:

TMC Membership

Person noted that TMC membership has been discussed several times before. It had been agreed that it would be helpful to hear from Humboldt County and the TAMWG about their respective interests in voting membership.

Jimmie Smith, Supervisor for Humboldt County, noted his past working relationship with the Klamath Task Force and the Trinity Task Force. Jill Duffy also voiced her enthusiasm for Humboldt County to join the TMC. Responding to George Kautsky’s question, she said Humboldt County would be seeking membership as a voting member (similar to Trinity County). Irma Lagomarsino, Mark Stopher, Bill Brock, and Dero Forslund all voiced their support for Humboldt County membership. Dave Hillemeier also stated that Yurok support for membership, but would like to review how this might affect the voting structure.

George Kautsky spoke on behalf of the Hoopa Valley Tribe and their opposition. He started with a review of the Hoopa Valley Tribe's perspective. He noted the Situation Assessment that reviewed the operations of the TRRP. Some of the issues are being addressed but the Tribe expects more change. But they do not think changing the voting the structure is in their benefit. While they respect Humboldt County and their intentions, there are too many other issues pending, and changing the voting structure seems "premature."

Brian Person commented on some of the history of how the super-majority arose as a way to preserve consensus decision-making and that any addition of members should not stop consensus nor should affect the tribal trust responsibility. He suggested that, with a new member, a rule of 8 of 9 votes would constitute a close arithmetic ratio to the current 7 of 8 super-majority.

There was discussion for how a motion might be crafted, given that the voting structure and addition of TAMWG is also pending. Person noted that unanimous vote is required to change membership. Before the vote, George Kautsky asked that the motion be withdrawn so, out of respect to Humboldt County, he would not have to vote against the motion. Mark Stopher opined that having Humboldt County as part of the TMC may be helpful to resolving some of the issues brought up by Kautsky. Jill Duffy added that Humboldt County has been "at the table" regarding restoration and are very interested in offering help regarding restoration, being engaged, and collaborating with the partners. Kelli Gant expressed her support for the motion.

Dero Forslund made a motion to add Humboldt County as a voting member of the TMC and have the super majority change to 8 or 9 and adjust the other ratios accordingly.

Mark Stopher seconded the motion.

The motion failed with seven aye votes and one no vote.

The discussion then moved to the addition of TAMWG as a voting member. There was discussion of whether TAMWG, as a FACA organizing that advises the TMC may be prohibited from being a voting member.

George Kautsky asked how Whitridge thought the TAMWG's effectiveness may be enhanced if they had voting rights. Whitridge said that the stakeholders think the TMC ought to have government participation, but also have other non-government members that are interested in restoration. He also said that it is generally thought that voting rights may confer more influence, but given the voting structure, it may not change very many TMC decisions. It may be more of a symbolic gesture and this could be important to the stakeholders. Person also noted that the TAMWG members are frustrated with progress of the TMC and that voting rights is one way to react to this. Person asked that Nancy Finley speak with Randy Brown regarding the FACA issue and that the issue be taken up tomorrow.

Data Management Presentation

Eric Peterson, Data Manager for the TRRP, gave a short presentation about forming a Data Team that would coordinate communication and data transfer and use. He recounted the problems that currently exist regarding data, its use, and how it is shared. He noted there is confusion about what data a particular office has and whether it is available. Sometimes data is being updated while it may be in use

by others. Nancy Finley echoed Peterson's proposal and cited examples where she has seen loss of data in large programs without a proper data management protocol. Peterson clarified that the individual offices seem to have done a pretty good job of maintaining their data. It is the program-wide data that needs work. Peterson cited an example where partners were reluctant to share data because of past behavior and perceptions of misuse (he recited a case where another worker withheld data claiming the TRRP office was untrustworthy). Roger Jaegel, as a member of the public, stated that if data useful for channel design is being withheld, the program has serious problems. George Kautsky noted the high costs of data currently budgeted and asked if Peterson was looking for more support. Peterson said support would only be the time required for staff to participate.

The TMC supported the concept and also noted the need to deal with issues of trust. Trust issues would not likely be resolved by a data team, but the issues could readily be identified and forwarded by such a team to the policy managers for resolution.

TRRP Vision or Mission Statement Development

Jennifer Faler noted that there is not a general agreement about the mission statement. Bill Brock thought a goal or mission statement was passed in 2008. Dave Hillemeier noted indeed a goal statement for the IAP was passed in June 2008. Person recalled that the Interior Department's official opinion of the statement brought discussions to a halt and it was never voted on, though it was adequate for the purposes of directing the Integrated Assessment Program. Mark Stopher noted his surprise hearing that a mission statement is still missing. There was discussion about which legislation provided the foundation of the program and possible conflicts in the language of each. Person asked that Faler have staff assemble existing statements about missions from the literature and legislation for the TMC to review.

It was discussed that Clair Stalnaker and other Flow Study authors come to speak to a workgroup. This could integrate with the SAB during a possible program review.

The meeting adjourned for the day at 3:40 PM.

Next day, start of meeting Thursday, June 17, 8:05 AM

Two items of business were addressed at the start of the day.

The March 31- April 1 TMC minutes were reviewed and several minor edits were offered.

Mark Stopher made a motion to accept the March 31-April 1 minutes as edited.

Dave Hillemeier seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Nancy Finley reported back following her discussion with Randy Brown on FACA issues and if TAMWG is prohibited from being a voting member of TMC. She said that the TAMWG is not directly prohibited, but FACA issues and restrictions would arise by having TAMWG as a voting member. For example, Brown thought, voting rights would require Washington approval and would throw the TMC into a FACA charter and make things more complex. Given this complication, no motion was pursued.

When asked if this action is satisfactory to the TAMWG, Whitridge responded that, some TAMWG members may be disappointed; he could say at least some progress is being made.

Decision Items:

FY 2011 Proposal Process / Science Work Plan

Joe Polos gave a presentation on recommendations of the Integrated Assessment Plan (IAP) Steering Committee regarding the Request for Proposal (RFP) process and how this affected the budget. Polos showed slides describing the RFP process and the method of scoring the proposals. He noted that the process had to be fast tracked and steps such as external review of proposals had to be omitted this year. As a result, the review was conducted internally and this involved scientists reviewing their own proposals. He also noted that the scoring process was not even among reviewers. This prompted an extended discussion about changes for next year. Dave Hillemeier suggested that certain essential projects be identified and not “competed” and that reviewers not review their own proposals. There was discussion of use of independent panel such as the SAB or a USGS service. Arnold Whitridge said the TAMWG is very interested in having independent review. Mark Stopher asked whether the TMC should solve these details or whether it made more sense to pass these issues back to the IAP Steering Committee for development of options and recommendations. George Kautsky also pointed out that Polo’s presentation had not been finished. Person agreed to halt discussion on changes to the RFP until later and they returned to Polo’s presentation.

Joe Polos continued his presentation and noted that 34 proposals were received—25 for assessment or data collection, 5 to address important identified priorities (PITAs), and 4 for data communication. The proposals requested \$600,000 more than the \$4.9 million that was available. Polos next went over the individual projects and showed where adjustments were made to the budget in order to cut the \$600,000. Projects that were cut included SAB, data management, sediment monitoring. Some projects were increased: IAP, and juvenile fish monitoring. Some projects were found to have some overlap in objectives and could share costs.

FY 2011 Budget

Jennifer Faler went over the budget updates driven mainly by the adjustments of the RFP process. She referred to a handout of the FY2011 budget. The annual budget for FY2011 is \$15.0 million. There were concerns over a \$356,000 deficit in the 2010 budget. Faler noted that these budgets are a “projection” and the actual budget is commonly arrived at with adjustments during the year; the budget will be balanced at the end of the year. A clarification was made that the entire budget is considered to be “reimbursable funds” under Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) except for the \$2.18 million from the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS).

Faler went over various budget changes following the post RFP process and budget adjustments discussed earlier by Joe Polos. One item discussed was savings resulting from substituting a hatchery fish marking technique currently paid to the Hoopa Valley Tribe and whether this savings should be reserved for the Tribe for other TRRP related projects. This would help to alleviate any unemployment of Hoopa Valley Tribe fisheries technicians resulting from cuts to this project. This will be negotiated by TRRP staff.

Person noted that the 30:50:20 budget allocation for RIG:Science:Administration is being followed reasonably well.

George Kautsky noted that the Tribal Harvest survey proposal was prepared by the Hoopa Valley Tribe and they used guidance from the IAP objectives. But the RFP and budget adjustment process reduced funding to a lower level based on historic funding levels. He questioned this. Roger Jaegel used this opportunity to bring up another unfunded item of importance—temperature and flow analyses have been identified as a important need for the program, but nothing has been done. He expressed his reluctance to approve budgets with unresolved issues such as this. Person suggested that they hear from Ernie Clark on the Klamath Fall Flows and see if this may help with Jaegel's questions and issues over temperature management.

Passing a motion on the budget was delayed until hearing about reservoir management for in river temperatures (see next item below). Upon the completion of the discussion of Klamath augmentation flows, the budget was reconsidered.

Upon returning to the budget discussions, Roger Jaegel clarified his objection to the budget as based on the lack of necessary resources to adequately perform temperature and flow studies for the Trinity and Klamath basins. He said his requests that a flow study be performed to address causes and solutions to the 2002 fish kill have not been acted on. This is "the most important issue" for the program and it is difficult for him to support a budget without this in it. He wanted a more comprehensive analyses than that described by Ernie Clark. He thinks there may be more options than releasing an additional 35,000 acre feet of water. Robert Franklin presented a concept to come up with a flow and temperature plan that would be able to address operations, facilities and climate change. He offered some potential ideas a group would consider (pipeline in Lewiston, removal of Lewiston, a modified outlet). The cost of such work was discussed and noted to be potentially prohibitive. Jennifer Faler noted that two functioning temperature models exist and could be used, but currently only one model is in use. George Kautsky asked if the \$20,000 budgeted for temperature modeling can be used to help. Faler said she would obtain an update when Rod Wittler returns from a modeling class he is attending for these purposes.

Mark Stopher made a motion to approve the budget.

Irma Lagomarsino seconded the motion.

The motion passed with seven aye votes and one no vote.

Mark Stopher mentioned that voting on a budget will not solve the temperature and flow issues raised by Jaegel and it is surprising that his issue have not been resolved. George Kautsky said he would not be able to support the approval of the budget as full program funding is not yet met, and the \$6 million for science may be unjustified as the RFP process was not fair, did not resolve conflict of interest, and did not create "transparency." Person said he regrets Kautsky feels that way.

Klamath Fall Flows Update

This item was taken up before the vote on the budget as it was thought this information may be useful to hear before the vote was taken. After this item the TMC returned to the vote on the budget (above item).

Ernie Clark gave a presentation on Klamath Fall Flow Augmentation and his recommendation to reserve 35,000 acre-feet of water. He reviewed that a workgroup was convened to consider the advantages and consequences of releasing fall flows from Trinity Reservoir to help avoid fish kills in the Lower

Klamath similar to that which occurred in 2002. Fall flow augmentations of about 35,000 acre-feet have occurred during 2003 and 2004 but not since. It is recognized that there could be unintended consequences of a release including the promotion of early-run-timing, mixing of spring and fall chinook, increased mortality in warmer water below Iron Gate Dam, or early incubation of turtles. Clark reviewed the concept of using “triggers” to initiate a proactive release (e.g., to avoid conditions leading to a fish kill). Two triggers are a projected run size of over 110,000 fish and a projected flow at Tewer of less than 2500 cubic feet per second (cfs). This year, the triggers are being met: the projected fish returns are 110,700 fish and the projected flow in September is 2360 cfs (though this estimate could be slightly low as a dry year scenario was used to estimate tributary contribution). But given the possible negative effects on fish and turtles, the question remains as to whether an augmented fall flow should be released or not. Limited radio tagging (n=18) suggests that fish did not move as a function of increased flows in 2003 or 2004. Roger Jaegel cautioned for a conservative approach (i.e., to protect against the risk of a fish kill) and favored seeking the water. Person noted that there will be some negative consequences of acquiring the water for the flow. Clark said that a decision was not needed right now as a follow up meeting of the workgroup is scheduled for June 28 (location to be announced). George Kautsky noted that the potential fish kill is a sign of a failing ecosystem processes created by managed flows. He questioned the use of more managed flows to fix problems if the larger problem of over-allocation of basin flow is not addressed. Arnold Whitridge asked whether the Klamath basin should be the one to release the water, but it would be important to know the consequences of using warmer Klamath water instead of cooler Trinity water. Dave Hillemeier thought the flows and run size projections could be reviewed and it could be revisited by a phone conference in July. Maybe only 300 or 500 cfs may be enough.

A motion was made after much discussion about the wording.

Mark Stopher made a motion that, for the 2010 year, the TMC send a letter to Reclamation requesting a set aside 35,000 acre-feet of Trinity water to be used as for a precautionary action if the release triggers are met. Beyond 2010, the Klamath has to be part of the comprehensive solution.

Bill Brock seconded the motion.

The motion failed with 6 aye votes and 2 no votes.

Before the vote, the motion had extensive discussion. Arnold Whitridge argued that the costs of using Trinity River are borne entirely by Trinity stakeholders, sending the “wrong message.” Person said Reclamation will acquire the water and it may have to be purchased. George Kautsky wanted the motion to not necessarily restrict the source of water to the Trinity. Roger Jaegel agreed with Kautsky that the source of the water not be named. Dave Hillemeier noted that his understanding of the motion is that the triggers may still be modified. Jennifer Faler said that the future findings of the flow augmentation workgroup will be circulated to the TAMWG and TMC. Jaegel said for the record, that Trinity County’s failure to support the motion is their objection to the failure of the program to do the full analyses necessarily for flows and temperature for several years.

The FY 2012 Proposal Process

The discussion returned to the item FY 2011 Proposal Process that was discussed earlier and then postponed. The discussion was regarding improvements on the RFP process for the future years. George Kautsky presented his conceptual understanding of the process and showed a stepwise

relationship among the government-to-government discussions, approval of the Integrated Assessment Project, and review by the Science Advisory Board. This would lead to development of the scope for the RFPs by an expert panel and review of proposals by an independent panel. This would avoid internal review and use of the current budget as a way to drive proposal development.

Regarding the scope question, it was deemed that the IAP should be used, despite that the government-to-government discussions have not yet accepted it. Jennifer Faler noted that key monitoring elements are missing in the IAP. Tim Hayden said that some direction from the TMC regarding the continuing role of the IAP Steering Committee would be helpful. There were questions and discussion about several issues such as timing of the RFP process, which parts of the IAP would be addressed by RFPs, the roles of the SAB and their possible conflicts, and who would develop or write the RFPs. With these questions and for lack of time, it was decided that the discussion would be continued in a monthly conference call.

Science Retreat

Ernie Clark announced that he had spoken with Clair Stalnaker last night and that Stalnaker would be able to make a presentation during the September TMC meeting. September 22 was proposed for a one day TMC meeting, and September 23 as a day for Stalnaker and possibly other flow evaluation authors to address the TMC.

Clark next explained the idea of the Science Retreat. The purpose would be to focus on issues of the Situation Report such as developing a joint proposal for program implementation, program organization, and dispute resolution. It was proposed the retreat may occur this fall. He was seeking input on who might be attending and where the meeting might occur.

Regular Business:

Open Forum

There were no comments from the public at this time.

Calendars

Conference calls are scheduled from 10 AM to noon on July 15, August 19, October 21, and November 18. The next meetings are scheduled for September 22 and 23 in Arcata, and December 15 and 16 in Redding.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:55 PM.