

**TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**  
Trinity County Library, Weaverville, CA  
December 13, 2005

**Meeting Summary**

**Members Present:** Present: Mike Long, *Acting TMC Chair USFWS*; Brian Person, *BOR*; Irma Lagomarsino, *NOAA Fisheries*; Bill Brock, *USFS*; Dave Hillemeier, *Yurok Tribe*; Roger Jaegel, *Trinity County*; Neil Manji, *CA Dept. of Fish & Game (State)*

**TMC Members Absent:** Hoopa Valley Tribe

**Others Present:** Doug Schleusner, *TRRP Executive Director*; Arnold Whitridge, *TAMWG Chair*; Gil Saliba, *Redwood Regional Audubon Society and Northcoast Environmental Center Liaison*; Joe Polos, *USFWS*; Russell Smith, *BOR*; Tom Stokely & Joshua Allen, *Trinity Co. Planning NR Div.*; Tim Hayden, *Yurok Tribal Fisheries*; Randi Perris & Jim Spear, *NRCS*; Monty Currier, *CDFG*; Curtis Anderson, *DWR*; Priscilla Henson and Rod Wittler, *TRRP*

**The meeting was called to order at 10:15 am by Acting Chair Mike Long.**

**Regular Business:**

**Introduction:** Validate agenda items; approve  
TMC minutes from Sept. 20-21, 2005

Hillemeier moved to approve minutes of September 20-21, 2005, which was seconded by Brock. Motion approved unanimously.

**Report from TMC Acting Chair Mike Long:**

Motion made by Hillemeier to send a letter to HVT expressing that the TMC appreciates their participation and thanking them for all of their contributions. Seconded by Lagomarsino.

A friendly amendment was made by Schleusner to have all partners sign the letter instead of just the chair of the TMC. Amendment was approved by Lagomarsino.

Approval of the motion was unanimous.

**Action Item:**

**Election of Officers**

Manji motioned to nominate Mike Long as TMC chair. Roger Jaegel seconded the nomination and asked that nominations be closed on the matter and the vote be brought to the floor.

Bill Brock nominated Irma Lagomarsino because she has enthusiasm, has been very participatory, and has contributed a lot in her 2 years involved in the program.

Roger withdrew his motion to close nominations.

Mike Long was unanimously elected TMC chair.

Mike Long motioned to nominate Irma Lagomarsino as vice-chair of the TMC. Jaegel seconded the nomination.

Irma Lagomarsino was unanimously elected as TMC vice-chair.

**Lunch was called at 12pm, the TMC reconvened at 1 pm.**

Following lunch, a draft letter was submitted by the a few members of the TMC to send to the HVT Council asking them to continue their TMC participation. The letter was reviewed and agreed upon.

Hillemeier motioned that the TMC approve the letter to HVT and to just have the Chairman be the signatory. Manji seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

**Information Item:**

**FY2007 Budget Process Update by Irma Lagomarsino**

*Review findings of Nov. 1 subcommittee meeting;*

*Discuss next steps prior to 2006 B-Team meetings*

Jaegel made a motion to approve the recommendations for the 2007 budget process and the section on budgets beyond 2007.

Person made a friendly amendment that the motion be approved as a foundation, subject to revision & modification.

Jaegel accepted the amendment.

Brock seconded the modified motion.

Hillemeier and other TMC members agreed with the proposed changes; agreement in the concept, but it is subject to revision & modification.

The motion was unanimously approved.

**Action Item:**

**FY2006 Budget Update by Doug Schleusner**

*Provisions of final Reclamation appropriations, Review TRRP staff proposal for use of new funds*

Lagomarsino made a motion to approve the TRRP staff recommendations for the additional \$1.2 million and that the TRRP staff continue to improve the process by utilizing the foundations within the 2007 budget Development Process, as approved previously by the TMC.

Brock seconded the motion as amended.

Motion passed unanimously.

Jaegel moved to adjourn the day's TMC meeting. The motion was seconded by Manji, and was passed unanimously.

**The TMC adjourned for the evening at 5:15pm and will meet 12/14/05 at 8:30 instead of 9 am.**

**TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**  
Trinity County Library, Weaverville, CA  
December 14, 2005

**Meeting Summary**

**Members Present:** Present: Mike Long, *Acting TMC Chair USFWS*; Russell Smith (Alternate), *BOR*; Irma Lagomarsino, *NOAA Fisheries*; Bill Brock, *USFS*; Dave Hillemeier, *Yurok Tribe*; Tom Stokely (Alternate), *Trinity County*; Curtis Anderson (Alternate), *DWR (State)*

**Members Absent:** Hoopa Valley Tribe

**Others Present:** Doug Schleusner, *TRRP Executive Director*; Arnold Whitridge, *TAMWG Chair*; Gil Saliba, *Redwood Regional Audubon Society and Northcoast Environmental Center Liaison*; Joe Polos, *USFWS*; Tim Hayden, *Yurok Tribal Fisheries*; Randi Perris, *NRCS*; Priscilla Henson, Joe Riess, Brandt Gutermuth, Nina Hemphill, and Rod Wittler, *TRRP*

**The meeting was called to order at 8:45 am by TMC Chair Mike Long.**

**Action Item:**

**Technical Work Group Proposal by Doug Schleusner**  
*Review/modify/approve latest version of proposal; Includes possible shift of April meeting to March in Bylaws*

Schleusner went over the proposal that he had developed and submitted to the TAMWG, and revised accordingly.

Lagomarsino moved to adopt Schleusner's proposal in concept and specifically move the TMC meeting to March. The motion was seconded by Stokely.

The motion was approved unanimously.

**Calendars:** Confirm next meeting date and location

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for March 29-30 in Weaverville.

**The meeting was adjourned at 1:37 pm.**

**TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**  
Trinity County Library, Weaverville, CA  
December 13, 2005

5

**Minutes**

**Members Present:** Present: Mike Long, *Acting TMC Chair USFWS*; Brian Person, *BOR*; Irma Lagomarsino, *NOAA Fisheries*; Bill Brock, *USFS*; Dave Hillemeier, *Yurok Tribe*; Roger Jaegel, *Trinity County*; Neil Manji, *CA Dept. of Fish & Game (State)*

10

**TMC Members Absent:** Hoopa Valley Tribe

**Others Present:** Doug Schleusner, *TRRP Executive Director*; Arnold Whitridge, *TAMWG Chair*; Gil Saliba, *Redwood Regional Audubon Society and Northcoast Environmental Center Liaison*; Joe Polos, *USFWS*; Russell Smith, *BOR*; Tom Stokely & Joshua Allen, *Trinity Co. Planning NR Div.*; Tim Hayden, *Yurok Tribal Fisheries*; Randi Perris & Jim Spear, *NRCS*; Monty Currier, *CDFG*; Curtis Anderson, *DWR*; Priscilla Henson and Rod Wittler, *TRRP*

15

20

**The meeting was called to order at 10:15 am by Acting Chair Mike Long.**

**Regular Business:**

**Introduction:** Validate agenda items; approve  
TMC minutes from Sept. 20-21, 2005

25

Minor clarifications to the minutes of September 20-21 will be submitted from Mike Long and Dave Hillemeier to Joshua Allen who will incorporate them into the final approved minutes.

[Hillemeier moved to approve minutes of September 20-21, 2005, which was seconded by Brock. Motion approved unanimously.](#)

30

**Open Forum:** Comments from the public

Joshua Allen from Trinity County Planning Department's Natural Resources Division presented the EPA Watershed Nomination Grant Program "Big Check" to the TMC & gave a summary of the grant and projects that will be implemented using funds from the grant. A general discussion followed that covered spending amounts, project objectives, and the watershed component of the ROD being met by this grant. Joshua was congratulated by the TMC for receiving such a prestigious grant award for his first successful grant application and was thanked for coordinating the efforts to apply for the grant with the Yurok Tribe and Trinity County Resource Conservation District. The grant will be used by the County to help supplement the implementation of TRRP's Indian Creek Project in the amount of roughly \$200-210k.

35

40

**Report from TAMWG Chair Arnold Whitridge:**

45

TAMWG met on December 7th, and members were appreciative that a few TMC members and alternatives participated in the meeting. The stakeholders had a number of recommendations and endorsed the budget recommendations, budget & work proposal, & technical work proposal. Stakeholders went further in the proposal process; the group felt that it is important & desirable

to have a strategic plan in place. TAMWG has identified people available to work on the strategic plan, but would like TMC direction.

5 The issue of water year type forecasting was a topic of concern; according to the ROD, the elaborate flow schedule assumes a frequency of certain water year types. A phrase got in there that the water year type would use a 90% exceedence by April 1. According to Spreck Rosekrans, it should be change to a 50% exceedence due to a shift of drier years based on miscasting by the 90% exceedence on April 1. A long term average shows that the flows are being shorted 49,000 AF 42% of the years by using the 90% exceedence. A 50% exceedence  
10 would be much closer to historical flows. The TAMWG voted that they would seek more info on this matter and recommends that TMC look into and take an interest in this issue. There is info available that BOR is looking at dealing with this issue through the OCAP.

15 Jaegel: There was some discussion about travel cost reimbursement. Where is the TAMWG on this topic?

Whitridge: This topic has not been clarified. We need a policy that is clear on this issue in order to do reimbursals. Non-federal members will be reimbursed that were officially appointed by the Secretary of Interior, members and alternates can't both be paid at the same time. It may become  
20 more of an issue if workgroup proposals get implemented and how many can be paid due to the program's ability to pay. It behooves the TRRP to be sure that members and various representative do show up at meetings and not just stay away because of financial issues.

25 Long: Members and alternates can be reimbursed for "official business", but it isn't clear what official business is at this time. Probably for technical work groups; but how many show up to subgroup meetings? How much is appropriate because at some point it could turn out to be a budget concern. There has been some discussion of TAMWG members sending technical representatives to meetings and workshops that report back to TAMWG members; we absolutely cannot pay for those meetings, it's very clear cut. The program can't pay for both members and  
30 alternates to go to the same meeting.

Schleusner: They have allocated three times the amount spent last year for TAMWG travel in anticipation of this issue. It still is not a huge number. It is not a budget issue at this time; it's what is appropriate. What Long alluded to is that the technical representatives can't be  
35 reimbursed and they haven't gone through the appointment process. Currently there are 16 members and 3 designated alternates that have been appointed; if they went through the appointment process, then they could get reimbursement.

40 Whitridge: The issues we are wrangling with aren't budget issues, it's not budget insufficiencies, and it's what the law says about it. The charter now says that the Secretary of Interior must appoint members and alternates, not the Designated Federal Officer. The ROD also assumes TAMWG members are senior policy levels and that there will be technical representatives at various sub meetings. That assumption and federal requirements of FACA don't mesh; it just takes time.  
45

Lagomarsino: This sounds like there is no ambiguity.

Long: One issue may be the sediment transport workshop in Arcata; should TRRP pay, or is it something that only one person goes and represents everyone?

Whitridge: There is some ambiguity.

Jaegel: We need clear policy to clarify it.

5

Long will clarify the issue and write it up for review. Some of the issues will go away if Schleusner's work group proposal is adopted.

10

Hillemeier: Klamath River Task Force Technical Work Group members do get reimbursed for their time and are appointed by their Klamath Task Force members.

Long will double check the policy with Darla Eastman of USFWS in Yreka.

15

Hillemeier brought up the 90% vs. 50% exceedance issue in forecasting annual river fishery flows.

20

Stokely explained that he asked Andreas and the CVP Operations Office (CVOCO) which water year type would be used if it were wet on April 1 with a 50% exceedance, but normal with a 90% exceedance. Nobody had an answer.

Lagomarsino: A presentation at the next TMC meeting may be too late. At that meeting we will need to make a flow decision.

25

Person: There will be a difference in water amounts between the 50% exceedance and 90% exceedance, there is a discrepancy. How did this happen?

30

Stokely gave background on 90/50 issue and its genesis, which has not been reconciled. A 90% exceedance criterion was originally used because the 1993 Biological Opinion for Sacramento River winter run chinook required use of it in forecasting water contract deliveries. However, because water contract amounts can be increased as the season progresses, but the fishery flows are final after May, there is a discrepancy in use of the 90% exceedance criteria. Spreck Rosekrans of Environmental Defense performed an analysis of it, which CVOCO generally agreed with. The 2004 Supplemental EIS was intended to result in a supplemental Record of Decision (ROD) that included use of a 50% exceedance criterion instead of 90%. However, since the SEIS was no longer required by the courts, the supplemental ROD was never completed. The recent Long-Term Biological Opinion for the CVP Operations Criteria and Plan (CVP OCAP) did include use of a 50% exceedance criterion for Trinity fish flows.

35

40

#### **Report from TMC Acting Chair Mike Long:**

Long: I have written a thank you letter to Reclamation to express our appreciation for the end of year allocations. I also would like to thank the TMC members who attended the TAMWG meeting along with Doug and his staff for preparing for this week's TMC meeting.

45

Formal congratulations was given to Manji for his promotion as Fisheries Program Manager overseeing all fisheries north of Chico.

Long was concerned about the absence of the Hoopa Valley Tribe (HVT), and will leave it to other members to open this issue up for discussion.

5 Long: My personal opinion is that the tribe is a crucial component of the TMC and I ask that the TMC encourages them back to the table.

Manji: I've gotten bits & pieces about this issue. Is this a forum we can discuss why HVT is not here?

10 Long: Let me defer to Doug or Brian.

15 Person: We were informed by McBain & Thrush that the HVT would not be here today. I've had a couple of discussions about this issue with a few people. There's no way to sidestep the HVT issue. HVT is concerned about their role in the TMC, the TMC funding recommendation being different than what the tribe would do with it, the debate of science over implementation, and they don't feel that the TMC is a good forum to air their issues. TMC is a very important resource that BOR can better fulfill its trust responsibility to HVT. HVT has a very strong feeling that the TMC is not fulfilling that trust obligation. BOR has a draft MOU to the HVT to better encompass the HVT concerns. The discussion over the 2006 Annual Funding Agreement (AFA) was the straw that broke the tribe's back on this issue. I would ask that we recognize that we are at a critical junction to meet HVT trust responsibilities.

20 Schleusner: I would like it to be clear that the issues there are not solely in funding alone. It has to deal with the decision process within the TMC. One of the items that had arisen is that there is a significantly different interpretation of the AFA funding allocation.

25 Jaegel: What is the role of BOR as far as trust responsibilities to the tribe; could you tell us what that is?

30 Person: What I can't get my arms around is the HVT idea of trust responsibility, being that their expectations are different than other tribes we deal with. Formally it is a government to government interaction. One of those trust responsibilities is to fulfill the program goals and the ROD. The program would not be where it is without the contribution of HVT.

35 Hillemeier: Please remember that when you do the MOU that there are two tribes that BOR has trust responsibilities to.

40 Largimoso: The NMFS fully supports the HVT participation in the TMC. It's difficult at times, but the participation they provide is invaluable.

Schleusner: It is not just them not being here today, but over the past few months the HVT has directed their employees and consultants not to attend any meetings. It's their lack of participation and lack of coordination that hurts the process.

45 Brock: Isn't there some by-law about absences and TMC participation?

Schleusner: Three unexcused absences against any agency, according to the by-laws, will remove the agency's position in the TMC.

Manji: What does that mean?

Schleusner: When they are a no-show and don't send an alternative, it's an unexcused absence.

5 Manji: We need to put our heads together to figure out how to make the process effective if a partner is not attending. There could be a major stalling of the program if the HVT does not participate and the process will not move forward.

10 Jaegel: It seems to me that if we give them the access and encouragement to participate, things can continue, but I'm a little curious why you think the program will be stalled.

15 Manji: My perception is that the Tribal Trust Responsibilities (TTR) and TMC responsibilities are supposed to be in concert. In the view of the HVT, if BOR is not fulfilling TTR, then the process is not working for them, and in the long run it will stall the program.

Hillemeier: I would say that we shouldn't speculate on this matter. What we should do is send a letter as the TMC to state that we appreciate their support and what their contribution has been to the program.

20 Lagomarsino: I would second that if it's a motion.

Motion made by Hillemeier to send a letter to HVT expressing that the TMC appreciates their participation and thanking them for all of their contributions. Seconded by Lagomarsino.

25 A friendly amendment was made by Schleusner to have all partners sign the letter instead of just the chair of the TMC. Amendment was approved by Lagomarsino.

Approval of the motion was unanimous.

30 **Action Item:**

### **Election of Officers**

Long: Only federal officials qualify for chair and vice-chair.

35 Manji: Doug, how it is working to have USFWS as Chair? How does this affect the image of the program not being dominated by BOR? Is it more difficult to perform certain executive tasks, etc.?

40 Schleusner: For context when Mike Ryan and Mary Ellen Mueller were on the TMC there was a different dynamic due to their long-term involvement. It was never viewed it as a BOR program, the process worked well with Mike Ryan, but we also have a great working relationship with Mike Long who has done a great job.

45 Manji motioned to nominated Mike Long as TMC chair. Roger Jaegel seconded the nomination and asked that nominations be closed on the matter and the vote be brought to the floor.

Bill Brock nominated Irma Lagomarsino because she has enthusiasm, has been very participatory, and has contributed a lot in her 2 years involved in the program.

Roger withdrew his motion to close nominations.

5 Irma Lagomarsino said she wouldn't accept the chair nomination and thinks that Mike Long should be the Chairman as he is already doing a great job as acting chair, other than the fact that he isn't a woman. She mentioned that she would be willing to accept the vice-chair position.

Mike Long was unanimously elected TMC chair.

10 Mike Long motioned to nominate Irma Lagomarsino as vice-chair of the TMC. Jaegel seconded the nomination.

Irma Lagomarsino was unanimously elected as TMC vice-chair.

15 **Lunch was called at 12pm, the TMC reconvened at 1 pm.**

Following lunch, a draft letter was submitted by the a few members of the TMC to send to the HVT Council asking them to continue their TMC participation. The letter was reviewed and agreed upon.

20 Hillemeier motioned that the TMC approve the letter to HVT and to just have the Chairman be the signatory. Manji seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

**Information Item:**

25 **FY2007 Budget Process Update by Irma Lagomarsino**  
*Review findings of Nov. 1 subcommittee meeting;*  
*Discuss next steps prior to 2006 B-Team meetings*

30 Lagomarsino went over her written report on the Trinity Budget Process Meeting, as amended at the 12/7/05 TAMWG meeting. There was a general consensus in the spending plan by TAMWG. A handout with a breakdown of the budget process meeting was made available at the meeting.

Long: I appreciate the write-up, process, and potential solutions to the problems.

35 Hillemeier: In regard to Tribal Trust; a right of first refusal for projects should be considered, which should be subject to external review of project design.

Schleusner also mentioned the issue of a needs-driven proposal process.

40 Jaegel: I am unclear about that relationship between Tribal Trust and the TRRP. If there's a definite connection, I'd like to hear it.

Person: HVT has made it clear to me that BOR is the common denominator between TRRP and Tribal Trust. Budget development is a critical time when HVT will look for government to government negotiations.

45 Hillemeier: It should be understood that the Tribes will be involved in some of the projects, and independent scientific review is appropriate, but it is more efficient to identify tribal participation.

Manji: The Tribes might not actually do the work, but the Tribes should be involved.

Russell Smith: DOI makes a final decision based on TRRP, TMC, and Tribal input, but DOI has an obligation to make the best use of funds.

5

Jaegel: It's not the TMC's prerogative to decide who does the work.

Schleusner: It's an unnecessary step in the process to put something out to bid if the Tribe has historically done a good job for a reasonable price; therefore, that project would NOT go out to bid.

10

A general discussion ensued about the need for a Strategic Plan.

Schleusner: FY 2006 set the stage for FY 2007 and beyond budget processes.

15

Jaegel made a motion to approve the recommendations for the 2007 budget process and the section on budgets beyond 2007.

Person made a friendly amendment that the motion be approved as a foundation, subject to revision & modification.

20

Jaegel accepted the amendment.

Brock seconded the modified motion.

25

Hillemeier and other TMC members agreed with the proposed changes; agreement in the concept, but it is subject to revision & modification.

The motion was unanimously approved.

30

**Action Item:**

**FY2006 Budget Update by Doug Schleusner**

*Provisions of final Reclamation appropriations, Review TRRP staff proposal for use of new funds*

35

Schleusner went over the handouts from the PowerPoint presentation and spreadsheet that he gave at the TAMWG meeting. He sent out information on the budget increase and requested guidance; he received about 6 responses, and that plus the recommendation from TRRP's staff is a result of that.

40

\$1 million more was added to the program through appropriations in Reclamation (water and related). There was also \$200,000 more in carryover than previously thought from the USFWS, which equals \$1.2 million in extra funding.

45

The Science Framework may also get a grant from the BOR Science and Technology Program.

There was a question about USEPA and DFG grant award funds that the County has applied for and when they would be available. To date, only the USEPA Watershed Nomination grant has been awarded, which will supplement roughly \$200k for construction of the Indian Creek

Project. The DFG Fisheries Restoration Grant, which was applied for in the amount of \$500,000 for the Indian Creek Project, has yet to be awarded and the County will not know whether the funds will be received until the end of January 2006. It is the County's contention that funds brought to the table for TRRP floodplain restoration projects are meant to be used to supplement implementation of the ROD, and that any extra funds that this funding frees up for the program should be used for implementation of other projects; not science and monitoring. Such switching of funds from implementation to science and monitoring creates a disincentive for the County to seek and apply for extra funding for implementation of the ROD. It was noted that those funds would essentially be available for the FY 2007 budget, not the FY 2006 budget.

Person gave the perspective of the HVT that they asked to provide to the TMC a conference call he had with them. The HVT differs in the interpretation of the conference committee language. BOR thinks it is subject to normal processes. HVT believes it's a specific earmark for the HVT at their discretion.

The second message is that \$2,406,025 million in funding has been requested by the HVT. There is some agreement between TRRP and BOR on this issue.

Schleusner: It's not just the position of the HVT that the \$500k is theirs, but that the entire \$2 million in the CVPIA Restoration Fund is all to meet the HVT's trust obligations.

Person: It's an entitlement according to the HVT, but also the "need" for the BOR to meet Trust obligations.

Schleusner: \$2 million in CVPIA RF is solely for construction, not TMAG, so it could imply that the \$500k is for construction purposes.

Hillemeier: From the Yurok perspective, the Congressional language doesn't recognize the Yurok Tribe's trust responsibility.

Schleusner: Use of the \$500k should be used to get the RIG closer to 50% of the total budget and do floodplain structure modifications, then use any additional funds to implement high priority monitoring/analysis tasks, and if there is any left to hold the program administration constant.

Ed Solbos went through the list of proposed RIG increases: Bridge modifications, invasive plant species studies, the Poker Bar Roads Project, the Indian Creek Project, and the Canyon Creek suite of projects.

A general discussion followed to consider all the different ways to deal with floodplain relocation; acquisition of properties, changing hydraulic elevations in the river, etc. How to decide to achieve 11,000 cfs can be accomplished a lot of different ways. If it can be done while enhancing fish habitat too.

Stokely: There are concerns with getting environmental documents and permits for the Indian Creek Project done in time to award a contract before 9/30/06.

Jaegel asked if large cobble would be obtained from the project.

Solbos: There probably won't be a lot of cobble in this project area.

Stokely noted that the project might consider permitting under the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) to allow commercial sale of the gravels.

5 Solbos: We really need to see the hydraulic analysis in order to see what the benefits are.

Stokely added that the hydraulic analysis is what is holding up the process to determine designs and alternatives.

10 Rod Wittler gave a summary of the revised recommended TMAG budget, with a 1-3 priority. All of Priorities 1 and 2 would be funded under this proposed budget, but not priorities 3.

15 Wittler: Subprogram reviews are an external review of various programs. Empirical habitat assessment is already funded, but not aerial photo work: we need 2006 imagery to determine river contours. Priorities in category 3 are unfunded.

Schleusner said that point of this is prioritization of proposed work. What is the priority of work?

20 Jaegel: What is the value of Coded Wire Tags?

Wittler: Released fish are 25% marked at the hatchery. The tags help identify which brood stock the fish come from.

25 A General discussion on angler harvest followed. HVT definitely wants more for that line item than BOR is willing to fund.

Hillemeier: We need to get the most important data requirements.

30 Whittler: We are looking at benefits of angler harvest versus overall harvest which will help to recommend certain funding levels.

35 Long: Regarding purchasing of CWT machines, can't that be funded through BOR's hatchery funds, or this program's funding? What is the appropriate role of the TMC in the TRRP? There is some confusion between role of hatchery and TRRP.

Manji: CWT's are mostly for chinook. We will look at the need for new machines. The existing machines are ready for refurbishing.

40 Jaegel: How does hatchery marking help us with our ROD goals?

Wittler: Rotary screw traps and marking allow identification of number of hatchery vs. natural fish produced.

45 Hillemeier: Hatchery marking and harvest monitoring help determine natural production of juvenile and hatchery fish, respectively.

In regards to Redd surveys; additional money has been added to make up for the shortfall in funding.

Schleusner: I would like to wrap up this issue. I want a sense of some comfort level with proceeding with this recommendation.

5 Jaegel said he was prepared to make a motion to approve it.

Hillemeier wants to conceptually approve, but there may be modifications as new information comes available.

10 Brock feels comfortable with the proposal.

Manji: I agree with Hillemeier in concept. Without TMC approval today, there is nowhere for BOR to negotiate with HVT on the annual funding agreement. I am feeling comfortable with this action.

15 Lagomarsino: I'm not feeling as comfortable. There wasn't as much time for coordination or a B-Team meeting. Did TAMWG approve this?

Whitridge: They approved what was presented to them. However, TAMWG didn't go through the lines as well as today, but nobody was in the position to certify it was as perfect as it can be.

20 Lagomarsino: I feel more comfortable with the RIG budget than the TMAG budget. Who did they confer with?

Wittler: HVT, Yurok, DFG and USFWS.

25 Schleusner added that this wasn't started with a blank sheet; it was an extension of the budget process initiated in April. In some cases they are reinstating cuts made previously.

30 Manji said that after reviewing the minutes, the TMAG identified that there was already an identified shortfall in money for constant fractional marking and scale/age analysis; and they would have had to cut other projects in TMAG to pay for it.

Lagomarsino hopes she can get to a place where the TMAG has a list of priorities developed by the TMAG working group.

35 Persons: I know I am the new guy, but the budget is being developed without input of one TMC member. If BOR comes back to this group with a new proposal to close gaps, do we (BOR) have to get back to this group?

40 Schleusner: That is his responsibility to find the difference between what BOR agrees to give to HVT. If it's large enough, he would have to go back to the TMC for review and approval. If small enough, he can do it without going to TMC, though if too big, would have to go back to the TMC.

45 Jaegel: I want to be sure that the budget reflects the priorities of the TRRP.

Long isn't comfortable with the proposed changes. He hasn't had enough chance to review it and talk to his staff about it. He is also balancing that with the work load of the TRRP staff.

Hillemeier: What is alternative to approving this today?

Long: We would have to conference call in early January or face to face to resolve this issue.

5 Wittler: A lack of approval holds up my staff's work on developing funding agreements.

Lagomarsino and Long are uncomfortable with the TMAG budget.

10 Lagomarsino made a motion to approve the TRRP staff recommendations for the additional \$1.2 million and that the TRRP staff continue to improve the process by utilizing the foundations within the 2007 budget Development Process, as approved previously by the TMC.

Brock seconded the motion as amended.

15 Schleusner said he appreciates the motion, but that it implies that there wasn't coordination with program partners, but that isn't true, and his staff has made extraordinary efforts to work with program partners. He doesn't mind the notion that they can do better, but takes exception to the notion that coordination didn't occur.

20 Manji: If the TMC had received the information earlier, then possibly others would have had the opportunity to have their technical representatives review it ahead of the TMC meeting. I knew there was coordination, but not all the details. Either a B-Team meeting or an e-mail ahead of time would have been helpful. What the TRRP did with this budget, would it fall under the guidelines of having the Executive Director's authority, as proposed by Schleusner at the  
25 previous TMC meeting?

Schleusner: No, because this is of a large enough magnitude to require TMC review and approval.

30 I would always come back to this group for changes of this magnitude. The appropriations bill was signed on November 19<sup>th</sup>, but I didn't get any info until after Thanksgiving. There wasn't much time for coordination.

Lagomarsino said she disagreed that all program partners weren't coordinated with.

35 Motion passed unanimously.

Jaegel moved to adjourn the day's TMC meeting. The motion was seconded by Manji, and was passed unanimously.

40 **The TMC adjourned for the evening at 5:15pm and will meet 12/14/05 at 8:30 instead of 9 am.**

45

**TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**  
Trinity County Library, Weaverville, CA  
December 14, 2005

5

**Minutes**

**Members Present:** Present: Mike Long, *Acting TMC Chair USFWS*; Russell Smith (Alternate), *BOR*; Irma Lagomarsino, *NOAA Fisheries*; Bill Brock, *USFS*; Dave Hillemeier, *Yurok Tribe*; Tom Stokely (Alternate), *Trinity County*; Curtis Anderson (Alternate), *DWR (State)*

10

**Members Absent:** Hoopa Valley Tribe

**Others Present:** Doug Schleusner, *TRRP Executive Director*; Arnold Whitridge, *TAMWG Chair*; Gil Saliba, *Redwood Regional Audubon Society and Northcoast Environmental Center Liaison*; Joe Polos, *USFWS*; Tim Hayden, *Yurok Tribal Fisheries*; Randi Perris, *NRCS*; Priscilla Henson, Joe Riess, Brandt Gutermuth, Nina Hemphill, and Rod Wittler, *TRRP*

15

**The meeting was called to order at 8:45 am by TMC Chair Mike Long.**

20

**Action Item:**

**Technical Work Group Proposal by Doug Schleusner**  
*Review/modify/approve latest version of proposal; Includes possible shift of April meeting to March in Bylaws*

25

Schleusner went over the proposal that he had developed and submitted to the TAMWG, and revised accordingly.

30 “We have suffered from a lack of formality” It came from the ad hoc group that Curtis Anderson had informally chaired. Work groups; what are they?

Schleusner said he didn’t want to have too many groups and too many meetings.

35 In January, all groups will meet to feed into the flow scheduling team that meets the second week of February.

40 The interdisciplinary meeting is the way to share all the information from all the teams, ask questions, and help each other understand. It will allow technical representatives to better understand and brief TMC and TAMWG principles. Moving the TMC flow meeting to March helps reduce stress and tight schedule for both flows and budget. Should be able to do an either/or based on whatever the water year type is. We could have a conditional decision by late March for flows, which would then allow more focus on budget development.

45 Summer meetings are related to fall flows and fish health.

If adopting the proposal, members need to be aware that the bylaws currently state that the spring meeting is on or about second week of April; an exception can be made without changing the bylaws, or bylaws can be changed. There needs to be a commitment that these dates will work.

Leaders of each work group will make those dates. There is a potential for conflict; an individual might want to go to all 4 groups and may not be able to do so.

5 That leads to the question of membership. The TAMWG appointed representatives to each of these teams at the last meeting had as few as 4 attend to some meetings while and as many as 6 attended others. Should there be a designated point of contact for TMC members for their technical reps? Or should there be designated individuals for each one? It would help TRRP's staff coordinate meetings if there are designees, so there aren't 40 people. However, all meetings would be open to attendance to anyone wishing to attend.

10 The master distribution list needs to be reviewed. Every time there is a meeting, the invitation goes out to all 110 on the list, the problem is estimating many attendees there will be in order to schedule the proper sized room. Distribution of info as early and widely as possible is also desired.

15 In regards to operating guidelines; notification is on the website. TRRP staff will ID meeting objectives and agenda items. Anybody else on the group can take notes, minutes, etc.

20 Anderson: It creates more sharing between partners when everybody pitches in. Everybody recognizes that to be on a core team is more than just showing up at a meeting. Minimizing travel, telecommuting, etc. will make it easier. The problem has been too much informality, this idea is more formal. If it's too formal, we could scale it back later. There are groups that don't fit into this structure. The Strategic Plan is one thing that can help; the TAMWG has established a group of 6 to work on the Strategic Plan. There may be other ad hoc groups; they just need to be widely noticed. The other example is the small subcommittee that's been meeting for the past year with Doug Schleusner on a monthly basis. There wasn't a specific direction to do it, but the participants felt it was the right thing to do. However, in recent months, some have felt the subcommittee meetings were exclusionary. Should we continue to do that? That group came from a recommendation to keep contact between the flow study authors and the Executive Director (ED), Myself, Tim Hayden, Tom Weseloh, Scott McBain, and Robert Franklin have been the participants, and I think it is a good thing.

35 Schleusner: I appreciate the informality of the meetings. I'm not really interested in taking notes and making a big deal out of the meetings.

Schleusner noted that other agencies should use the list, such as USFWS meetings related to rotary trapping and redd counts.

40 Long: Anyone could participate if they wanted to. If Curtis' sub-group is effective, it should continue.

Lagomarsino: Doug, how have those meetings influenced your decisions?

45 Schleusner: I received an awareness of concerns that some program partners might have, which is a type of an early warning system. Also that group is the most consistent and substantive in terms of feedback on various issues I've asked for input, mostly as focused comments from that group.

Anderson: I agree that the group is useful; it develops a level of trust, and helps to exchange each other's perspective.

5 Schleusner: I am concerned that if too many show up at those meetings, the informality will be lost and it won't be as effective.

Long: Doug, you have the option to meet with anybody you need to meet with.

10 Hillemeier: The calendar is a good starting place, but the work groups and subcommittees of the work groups will have to meet to deal with topic specific issues, such as Habitat Assessment, that will necessitate various meetings outside of the schedule. It's good to have transparency.

15 Stokely: I like the change of the TMC flow schedule meeting to March. I don't think we need to worry too much about too many people at the meetings.

Long: It would be a good idea to block out dates to get people there. There should be a Point of Contact from TMC for each group.

20 Lagomarsino: We should set a date to designate a POC for each team from the TMC.

Schleusner: I would like a formal action from the TMC on this issue.

25 Smith: It's a good idea to have more technical meetings, but don't schedule too many meetings because there can be overloads. If there are too many meetings, it could collapse under their own weight. I would start with fewer groups and see how it evolves. The issues change year to year, but we should be ready to change.

Hillemeier suggested that the groups can determine their own agendas and meeting frequencies.

30 Anderson pointed out that TMC needs to make sure that the meetings don't direct staff, but to provide input. Direction would come from the TMC to the ED. He doesn't have a problem with advertising meetings of his sub-sub group.

35 A general discussion followed of how the various sub-groups will operate, agendas, etc. Minutes could be bullets of what transpired.

Lagomarsino moved to adopt Schleusner's proposal in concept and specifically move the TMC meeting to March. The motion was seconded by Stokely.

40 Smith: We don't need to approve every little change and the ED would retain flexibility, hence in concept.

The motion was approved unanimously.

45 Whitridge said that the TAMWG wants the Strategic Plan to be dealt with. The Strategic Plan group from TAMWG will bring back some results in March and ask the TMC to adopt a Strategic Plan at its June meeting. The TAMWG would like participation from the TMC in development of a Strategic Plan.

Schleusner expressed a desire for TMC members to work with the TAMWG group working on the Strategic Plan so that one plan is developed. March 2004 was the last draft of the Strategic Plan. It's a good start.

- 5 **TMC members will tell Schleusner who their Point of Contact is for each work group and comments on the e-mail list by next week.**

The calendar of work group meetings will be on the TRRP website.

- 10 Anderson moved to strive to have a Strategic Plan adopted at the June meeting. Stokely seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

**Information Item:**

- 15 **Science Framework and Monitoring Plan** by Rod Wittler and staff  
*Review time schedule, key content items, next steps*

- 20 Wittler gave a PowerPoint Presentation on the Science Framework and monitoring Plan. A complete draft of the Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Plan will be available for review by various partners on 1/23/06 for a 2-3 week review. On 2/20/06 it will go to SAB; then on March 7 there will be science framework workshop. The final draft is supposed to be done by April 1, 2006.

Hillemeier: April 1st is a good deadline for the budget process.

- 25 A general discussion followed about the time schedule and the need to complete the IMEP.

Wittler will provide a list of names, dates and chapters of the IMEP to the TMC so that scheduling can be kept on track.

30 **Information Item:**

- Habitat Assessment Project by Nina Hemphill**  
*Review objectives, components, rationale, participants*

- 35 Hemphill gave a PowerPoint on the various methods of Habitat Assessment such as 2D modeling, Empirical Habitat Monitoring, and Biomonitoring. Measurements will be by square meters of habitat (M)

- 40 A general discussion followed about the process and benefits of the Habitat Assessment work and each of the different methods of determining habitat. Baseline information, trend analysis, and prediction are all purposes of Habitat Assessment. There has been rigorous discussion over the various methods to be used and there are a variety of opinions on the utility of each method.

- 45 A general discussion by the TMC on the topic of whether the SAB should review this methodology and provide an opinion followed.

Anderson: Yes

Hillemeier: I'm uncomfortable with edge bathymetry.

Smith: The methodology looks fine. No motion as such.

**Information Item:**

**Update on Floodplain Structure Modifications by Ed Solbos and staff**

*Review time schedule and inventory results*

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

40

45

There are 109 properties between Lewiston Dam and Weaver Creek that represent 22 issues for the release of full ROD flows; there are 15 well pumps, 3 decks, one mobile, and a detached garage that needs to be addressed before the 11k cfs + 10yr tributary flow in May can be achieved. DWR is shooting elevations for identification of problems. Some of the projects will be handled by the TRRP office, while others will be through the County. Liquidation of the Tullis Property is being handled by the General Services Administration; there is very little control over that project. Diana Clifton is the new realty person hired at the TRRP office, and will be handling real estate issues fro the program.

We should be able to release 8,500 cfs by this spring or greater; maybe 11k cfs this year, but there are still hindrances. We just received from the Denver office, 10 and 100 year hydrology models from Weaver Cr. to the North Fork. The program can now look at structure issues below Weaver Creek, which will likely only be 11k + 100 year cfs flows.

The program has topographic, LIDAR, and hydrology information. Once the program receives all of the data, they will send letters to landowners to notify if they will be inundated at 11k cfs + 100 year flows, and maybe for 8,500 cfs. This will also allow the County to adopt this information as best available information for floodplain development and permitting.

Schleusner: By having Diana Clifton in office, we can now approve realty actions that we couldn't before.

Update on rehabilitation sites:

- The 4 sites for the Canyon Creek Suite of projects have 50% designs. An award date is scheduled to happen by late summer.
- Indian Creek now has conceptual designs; HEC-RAS for the project still needs to be done. Josh Allen with the County has done a lot with grants to procure extra funding for the project and done other related items related to this project.

There need to be a buy-in to the hatchery gravel injection project. The program is looking to get it done by this fall.

Hocker Flat revegetation work can now be done.

Stokely: The County has received approval from the BOS to use organic herbicide for invasive plant species. AS per floodplain mapping issues, we still will need help. We also have concerns with the design of the Indian Creek Project, such as getting the environmental review and permits moving forward and done, so the contract can be awarded before the end of the fiscal year.

Solbos: We must have it done.

**Information Item:**

## **Update on Klamath Trinity Coordination Efforts Petey Brucker of the Salmon River Restoration Council**

5 Petey Brucker thanked the TMC for the opportunity to speak to them and complimented them for their work. He said the Trinity was wise to focus on the mainstem and he is inspired. How can this information be transferred to the Klamath side? The transparency of this program is really great and allows him to be involved in related issues.

10 Schleusner indicated that there has been past problems with overlap from various Klamath meetings.

Brucker mentioned that the TMC, KFMC and Upper Basin Working group have all identified the need for more coordination. You can't take care of one spot in a watershed without looking at the entire basin. The issue of the fall pulse flow is an example of that kind of coordination. There is also a need to determine a hydrograph for the Klamath River (the big elephant).

Pre and post flow monitoring and K-T hydrographs still need to be examined. Klamath Program is based on consensus, but is plagued by low funding; on top of that the program sunsets in September 2006. An accomplishment report is being done to show results. If they look at fish as a surrogate of their success, then they didn't do well. The Scott and Salmon Rivers returns are some of the worst ever; disease is a big issue, fish numbers are poor, and toxic algae is now a big issue in the river and upstream reservoirs. How does all of this relate to fish health? Perhaps the road map put forth by the TMC can help with scheduling of meetings between Klamath and Trinity regulatory authorities. The issues below Weitchpec are the same for both rivers.

There are many programs on the Klamath side such as the Conservation Improvement Program, Chadwick group, FACA group, KFMC which deals with the entire basin, the Inter-tribal fish and water commission, TMDLs, and the NW Forest Plan. As the KRTF goes away, there will be a huge hole in coordination. They can do whatever they want in the Salmon River, but it won't succeed without changes in the mainstem Klamath with issues such as flows, diseases, etc. The limiting factor is always the mainstem Klamath.

KRTF did sub-basin planning and identified the mainstem as its own sub-basin. The mainstem goes to the Link River.

There are ways to use existing groups to take up the void when the KRTF and KFMC disappear next year. Perhaps a sub-basin group from the Lower Klamath River could fill the void?

40 There appears to be little interest by the existing authorities.

Spring chinook will be a whole basin restoration project. Pacifi-Corp FERC relicensing process, coho BO, and the Hardy Phase 2 are all issues that will have a massive effect

45 The disease problem for fish in the Klamath is such that the Trinity may never be able to achieve the goals and objectives of the TRRP.

PFMC will probably take over for the KFMC. Though the lower basin will need help and funding.

5 The RAC's (federal advisory committees) set up by the Forest Reserve funding legislation are also expected to sunset.

They are also concerned about future funding. The need will be for Trinity experience to be transferred to the entire basin in order to help the Klamath achieve success.

10 He is KRTF Technical Work Group (TWG) Chair; the question is how to better coordinate? He will recommend that the TWG mimic the Trinity's process.

There are environmental organizations that are considering petitioning for listing of chinook. There are a lot of things being discussed in this regard.

15 Long: I'm concerned about fish health in the Lower Klamath affecting Trinity RRP success. It's very sobering.

20 Smith: We should worry the most about diseases in the Lower Klamath. We should help out there. Should we provide funding, and how much is appropriate?

Long: There will be a Fish Health workshop on Klamath January 12 of this year.

25 Hillemeier: The ecosystem is collapsing and the fish are the indicators.

Lagomarsino: What will be the impact of no more Klamath funding? How will it affect funding of harvest management information.

30 Brucker said he might look at projects being funded with Klamath funds that won't be available so that shortfalls can be identified and planned for.

Hillemeier: \$150k/year is going into the Harvest Management Model.

**Regular Business:**

35 **Report from Executive Director Doug Schleusner**

There was no written report. Schleusner reported that the office is now put back together, and includes a larger conference room that can accommodate 20-24 people. He offered it as available for various meetings. There will probably be an open house after the first of the year.

40 The Program's office personnel has gone through some change. Diana Clifton, TRRP's new realty specialist is now in the office. Bob Sullivan took a job with the USFS in Lassen NF. Noelyn Habana has taken a position with CALTRANS. David Guyman from USGS will be the second physical scientist, John Klochak will join the program as the second fishery biologist, and they will both start in February.

Hillemeier complimented Schleusner and his staff for the progress being made.

Schleusner said he would have an accomplishment report completed soon. He wants to be able to report good results and that the funding is being wisely spent.

5 Long thanked the TMC for voting him in as Chairman. TMC & TRRP are the envy of other programs in terms of the funding being received. The hard work has been done such as studies, EIS/EIR, the litigation, etc.

**Open Forum:** Comments from the public

10 There were no public comments at that time.

**Calendars:** Confirm next meeting date and location

15 The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for March 29-30 in Weaverville.

**The meeting was adjourned at 1:37 pm.**