FINAL Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

US Forest Service Conference Room, Redding, CA
Wednesday and Thursday, December 16-17, 2009

Wednesday, December 16th, Start of meeting 10:00 AM

Attending Members:

Brian Person	Bureau of Reclamation, Chair
John Engbring	Fish and Wildlife Service, Vice-Chair
Teresa Connor [1]	California Department of Fish and Game
Dave Hillemeier	Yurok Tribe
George Kautsky [2]	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Seth Naman [3]	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Fisheries
Roger Jaegel	Trinity County
Sharon Heywood	Forest Service
Arnold Whitridge [4]	Trinity Adaptive Management Work Group
Mike Hamman [4]	Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director

1) alternate for Gary Stacy, 2) alternate for Mike Orcutt, 3) alternate for Irma Lagomarsino, 4) non-voting members

Others that attended: Joe Polos, Randy Brown, Fish and Wildlife Service, Arcata Field Office; Don Reck, Bureau of Reclamation; Robert Franklin, Hoopa Valley Tribe; Tom Weseloh, California Trout; Bill Brock, Shasta-Trinity National Forest; Mike Berry, California Department of Fish and Game; Cesar Blanco, Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento; Elizabeth Hadley, Jim Feider, Redding Electric Utility.

Regular Business:

Introductions:
Brian Person opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. Person acknowledged the several alternates in attendance today. He apologized that he would need to leave for about an hour and that John Engbring would serve as chairman and Don Reck would sit in as Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) member until he returned.

Approval of September 15-16, 2009 Minutes
Several changes to the minutes were submitted and accepted.

Roger Jaegel made a motion to accept the minutes as edited.

John Engbring seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Open Forum:
There were no comments from the public.

Report from TAMWG Chair

Arnold Whitridge, Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG) Chair, reported on yesterday's TAMWG meeting. He noted that he did not have a prepared letter but would likely still submit one. He went over the items that were discussed during the two-day meeting. Brian Person, as chair of the Trinity Management Council (TMC), had sent TAMWG a long-awaited response letter. Person also discussed elements of the letter at the TAMWG meeting. Whitridge appreciated Person's efforts and his willingness to "stick with it." Whitridge noted the presentation from Jennifer Faler and that there is a sense that the Restoration and Implementation Group (RIG) may also need independent review not just the science side. Bill Brock reported on watershed issues that included roads, the potential for failure, and that there is $72 million of needed work with a good portion of that required in the South Fork watershed. Whitridge cautioned against planning to allocate $0.5 million per year for watershed work in years in which the full program funding level of $2 million for watershed work is requested and received. Rod Wittler presented on ROD flow and temperature management planning and suggested that the April 1 date should be reviewed for water-year forecasting as significant cold water storage was released in 2008. He went on to tell the TAMWG of the focused planning effort underway to further integrate Trinity operational issues into CVO planning processes.

Whitridge further noted TAMWG frustration with the lack of response from the agencies on requests for information like the long overdue letter from CVO. He also noted that the water banking recommendation has been neglected. He said it would be more acceptable to TAMWG to hear a "no" than hear no response. Mike Hamman presented some policies and principles on a 5-year budget planning process on day two of the meeting. A progress report on the Ad hoc hatchery management review was presented by Wade Sinnen that illustrated potential recommendations for changes to Coho practices at the Trinity River Hatchery. There were excellent presentations on tribal fisheries management and the harvest allocation process presented by George Kautsky and Dave Hillemeier. He thought this information would help to quell criticisms of tribes' fish harvesting practices. Whitridge personally enjoyed Troy Fletcher's presentation on the Klamath Dam removal proposed under the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement.

Whitridge further noted that the TAMWG appreciates Mike Hamman's efforts to improve the functionality of the TRRP. Whitridge said, however, that while there is appreciation for the efforts being made on resolution of issues, the TAMWG decided to write individual letters to the Secretary of Interior requesting the addition of new members to the TMC, that voting rules be changed to simple majority, and that the Department give higher priority to resolving issues such as long-standing matters raised through government-to-government discussions and other issues raised by TAMWG. He said that TAMWG asks for responses to their concerns and sometimes there is no response, other times they are told that these questions have been raised in government-to-government negotiations and can't be discussed until resolved in that forum .

John Engbring thanked Whitridge and acknowledged that some progress is being made but in other cases, the rate of progress is not acceptable. Roger Jaegel noted that getting timely responses is also important to Trinity County and would be willing to support the TAMWG in their request to the Secretary. Sharon Heywood asked what the TAMWG views as watershed activities. Whitridge listed sediment reduction, fish passage, water quality, water quantity, and other activities that would help the fish. George Kautsky noted that the lack of watershed funding was raised at the last B Team meeting. Kautsky next commented on the Tribes' fisheries reports made to the TAMWG, and asked about how the TAMWG might help public relations. He observed that those with issues regarding the tribal fishery were not present in the audience and hoped that TAMWG would inform their constituents of the presentation. Kautsky also noted that the Tribes had responded to adverse publicity by writing a "rebuttal" op-ed piece to the editor of the Record Searchlight and that he would provide it to the group.

Report from TMC Chair
No report at this time.

Report from Executive Director
Mike Hamman, Executive Director of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) noted that he is submitting a written report and will touch on some highlights. Organization is one of his top priorities and he is holding monthly meetings with the tribal partners and the Fish and Wildlife Office. He is seeking ways to use the various expertise and skills of each group. There is one position, the Science Program Coordinator soon to be filled, and potentially two new positions in the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) that would be shared with the Weaverville Office. The Arcata FWS has proposed a reorganization plan that has yet to be implemented that includes these concepts. He noted that the lack of expertise they may need to be filled given the development of the Klamath agreements and he specifically noted a need for a biometrician. Both offices are continuing to refine these discussions. He discussed the progress in developing the out-year budget planning, and will present more on this tomorrow. He discussed that the first annual TRRP report is now in the planning stage and writing assignments have been made through section lead authors with a deadline of March 1 for the first draft. His main focus is that the Program be taking steps regarding recommendations to build a comprehensive science agenda, capitalizing on available expertise more efficiently, increasing trust between Program partners, using proposals and independent reviews, and wants to incorporate a modeling approach to analyzing Program progress.

He noted that there are a number of facilitated meetings/retreats planning in early 2010 and is discussing with Whitridge the idea of holding a joint TMC and TAMWG meeting after the next TAMWG meeting and potentially before or right after the next TMC meeting. He also noted channel work at the Sawmill Site is nearly complete and this was one of the largest sites yet, costing $2.5 million.

Dave Hillemeier asked how the new Science Advisory Board members are selected. Hamman said he has the authority to recruit candidates and set the SAB agenda as provided within the ROD Implementation Plan. He focuses on the specific expertise needed, gets staff input, and researches background and experience in restoration/fisheries work . To date, he has selected Dr. John Buffington as a geomorphic and stream restoration specialist and just recently announced that Dr. Chris Jordan of NOAA, a fisheries expert with experience in modeling in the Columbia basin, was added as the fifth SAB member.

Regarding a meeting of TMC and TAMWG, John Engbring at first questioned the efficacy of another meeting. However, the discussion seemed to favor a meeting. Sharon Heywood thought that CDR participation would be helpful. George Kautsky asked if SAB and other groups might be invited. He noted that his interaction with SAB had been limited in recent years. Engbring agreed that there would be some benefits and it sounded doable. Roger Jaegel asked about the purpose of the SAB and noted that he never recalled ever receiving any reports from them. Hamman said they provide the oversight of the science program and provide a guiding force toward adaptive management, but acknowledged their limited interaction in the past and is taking steps to have them fully engaged in 2010 including a programmatic 10-yr review.

Action Items Update

Mike Hamman noted that the Action Tracker has been updated since the last meeting. He has also taken notes on things that were noted as still missing. He intends to have it posted on the TRRP website.

<u>Information/Decision Items:</u>

Review and status of TAMWG Recommendations

BLM Membership (Congressman Herger inquiry)

(Discussion of this topic was delayed until Person's return.) Person returned at 1:45 resuming his role as chair and introduced this topic by noting historic votes on granting the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) membership to the TMC have not passed. Granting membership to BLM has been voted down, based mainly on the concerns that a Department of Interior (DOI) voting block may be created. The item was taken up again at the September meeting given Congressman Herger's letter supporting BLM membership. At the September TMC meeting, it was agreed to table it until this meeting to allow for TMC members to confer with their leadership on the matter.

Francis Berg of the BLM was asked to speak to, or answer questions about, BLM activities and practices in the Trinity basin. He noted that the BLM would like to be a voting member on the TMC. Dave Hillemeier asked if the BLM may be interested in being a non-voting member. Hillemeier also suggested that the BLM would be granted special voting privileges if there were specific issues brought to vote that concerned the BLM, provided one of the other DOI seats were temporarily vacated. Berg said, from their perspective, it would make more sense to be a full voting member, particularly since they are implementing projects on the Trinity River. Hillemeier asked if the BLM interests are not being met with other Department of Interior representation. Berg thought their interested were quite different than the other agencies as the BLM is a land-management agency and do not perform water/ power regulating or species protection. The discussion turned to block voting again. It was noted that the agencies all abstained from voting as a block when asked to vote on requesting increases to the Federal portion of the TRRP budget. Engbring countered that this was necessary as voting to increase the budget could be construed as lobbying, from which Federal agencies are prohibited. The discussion then turned to the value of having the BLM on the TMC. Berg noted that acquisition of land along the Trinity River is the number one national priority of the BLM's acquisitions program and stated that they are a tremendously cooperative agency. Roger Jaegel reiterated the cooperative work and importance of the BLM. George Kautsky said he appreciates BLM's work and assistance in the program. He asked how the BLM maintains a presence today and how membership might enhance this. Berg thought he has good communication with the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP), particularly with Hamman on proposals on BLM property. He talked about land acquisition and their work in Grass Valley and mentioned that their current level of involvement would not change with membership. He said one change might be that Steve Anderson, the BLM supervisor, would be at meetings and this would be a communication link at the executive level. He noted the BLM is not as well-staffed as other agencies and that is what makes them cooperative. He thought membership would help them elevate the status of the Trinity River nationally. John Engbring thought there would be greater potential for things to get done and this would outweigh the negative elements of the voting block. In an attempt to get the tribes to move positively on this issue, Engbring suggested the TMC try it for one or two years to see if this voting block actually arises. Engbring thought the BLM could contribute to the program, particularly in their ability in purchasing property. He noted that the TMC tribal representatives had asked to be able to speak to their leadership before being asked to vote. Engbring asked the tribal representatives what their leaders had said or thought about this. Hillemeier said the Tribe's view is that two DOI members are enough. At this point, Seth Naman announced that he was unaware he would need to vote and would need to abstain unless he could first consult with Irma Lagomarsino, the regular member. The dynamics about the super-majority voting were reviewed to try to see what would happen if another member were added. Hamman read the bylaws and it seemed to state that given a membership of 9, 8 votes would still be required to pass motions. Person acknowledged that perhaps, given the tribes' position on this issue, a vote would be moot. There was discussion whether they should still vote or some other means may be tried. George Kautsky closed down the discussion when he said that there are four federal agencies on the TMC now and that the Hoopa Valley doesn't see the need to shift the balance. He noted the situations where the Hoopa have made recommendations to the budget but the federal agencies abstain and this effectively trumps the Hoopa's position. Person noted that it appeared that a vote would be useless, but it was noted that Herger's letter was asking for action. Therefore Teresa Connor said they should vote.

Teresa Connor made a motion to add the BLM as a member of the TMC.

Roger Jaegel seconded the motion.

The motion failed with five aye votes and two nay votes.

Seth Naman abstained.

There was a request to add the Addition of Humboldt County to the TMC to the next TMC agenda.

Conflict of Interest concerns
Mike Hamman opened the discussion by referring to a copy of a TMC letter mailed to the TAMWG chairman on December 11. The letter was a response to three assertions of the TAMWG: 1) the TMC had not functioned as a "board of directors," 2) the AEAM science program has not adopted a proposal-driven process, and 3) TMC has not focused on implementation of specific areas (watersheds, mainstem, carryover storage, and hatchery). Hamman listed some areas of progress: discussion of conflict of interest, greater focus on policy, greater communication, relationship building, use of the action tracker, hiring of additional staff, inclusion of TAMWG chair as ex-officio TMC member, and recommendations about hatchery practices.

Dave Hillemeier commented on conflict of interest from the tribe's perspective. He noted there is a lack of funding from the Federal government to run Tribal fisheries programs and that a level of base funding is needed to be able to accomplish projects in support of the restoration program. Brian Person commented that base funding is being pursued but he noted that funding would need to be "tasked-based."

Person asked Arnold Whitridge if this progress gives him cautious optimism. Whitridge said "yes" but "the devil is often in the details" and he stressed that the timing of this progress will be important.

Hamman closed with the comments that the relationships between TMC and TAMWG need to be strengthened. He said he appreciated the long-term perspective of members of the TAMWG.

Person acknowledged there are still some missing items not covered by the letter such as IAP and independent review.

There was a question about how large the changes to the hatchery might be. Person and Don Reck acknowledged that there was not clear answer to this, but there were “sideboards in place” that would not allow wholesale changes without proper consultations.

Robert Franklin asked whether or not a temperature management subcommittee is going to be formed. Hamman noted that Central Valley Operations (CVO) needs to be involved and that modeling activities will be a part of the activities. Robert Franklin thought that the initial meetings could start now and would not need to wait for CVO and formal efforts. It was noted that the first conference call would occur the first week of January to initiate formation and scoping. Seth Naman echoed the need to get this process going as soon as possible citing the fact that the reservoir is at a very low level and that temperature issues could be a major problem in the river.

Whitridge commented that whatever the staff can do to help the Trinity in working with the CVO on temperature issues would be good. He also asked what the Trinity could do to operate “at the top” that would help to focus attention on the effects on Trinity fish and keep water from being exported for Sacramento temperature management.

Discuss the need for holding a TMC/TAMWG meeting
Brian Person opened this topic by acknowledging that the TMC has not had a good track record of responding to TAMWG recommendations and requests. John Engbring provided a short review for Person and reported that the previous discussion had demonstrated general agreement that a meeting would be helpful next spring. Whitridge suggested a meeting in conjunction with the Science Symposium. Person agreed a joint meeting would be a great idea.

At this point, the discussion returned to the delayed item, “Review and status of TAMWG Recommendations,” before continuing on.

Program Realignment and Integration Update
Science Program Coordinator Position
Randy Brown, FWS, provided an update on the progress toward hiring a Science Coordinator for the TRRP. The top candidate has been selected and needs to be approved by the FWS Human Resources Department in Region before an offer can be made. It is anticipated this should occur within a week or so.

Mike Hamman noted that another new hire in Weaverville, Tracy Tenholder, is working out well as the COR .

DOI Agencies discussions
There was no discussion on this item other than what was previously presented in the Executive Director’s report.

TRRP Annual Report
Mike Hamman said there is a process underway to draft an annual report. The focus of the report is on the ROD management actions and all Program science activities. In responding to questions, he explained that the scope of the report may be about 30 pages with references to sources of information.

This will be the first annual report but it will cover some activities since the start of the program so it may be a larger effort than what would be in future reports. The report will be used to speak to Program activities and the audience would fit the need to report to Congress, and agencies, but it will also serve to inform the public and document the activities of all program participants.

Watershed Program within TRRP

Mike Hamman reviewed a document provided that he was asked by the TMC to prepare that addresses program authority allowing work in the watershed (i.e., beyond the main stem channel). He noted areas within the foundation documents that mentioned watershed work. He thought it was clear, from an authority perspective, that the program can address all the tributaries from Lewiston Dam down to the estuary. Work can address both sediment control and habitat for fish. It gets interesting when it discusses funding sources. The Solicitor determined that certain Bureau of Reclamation funding (A30 funds) can only be used for mainstem ROD functions, but CVPIA restoration funds have a broader authority and could be used in the watershed. Limits on Fish and Wildlife appropriations are not known, but these funds may be useable for watershed activities as well.

Roger Jaegel thought it is the job of the TMC to restore fisheries, and if the tributaries are important to the success of fisheries, then he did not see why work was not occurring in the tributaries. There was discussion about the rationale and Solicitors' roles in limiting A30 funds to just the mainstem of the Trinity.

2009 Water Year Update/2010 Planning

Trinity Operations and Temperatures

Mike Hamman reviewed some history by noting that the water temperature in the Trinity River exceeded the criteria for a few weeks in during the peak of the summer. Water was pulsed out of Trinity Reservoir using the auxiliary valve in late September and this did reduce temperatures downstream. Hamman went over a table showing how releases of water from Trinity Dam to diversions and the Trinity River have exceeded inflows for the past 3 years and this has now resulted in low reservoir levels of 990,000 acre-feet as of December. Cold water storage may be impacted by low runoff in 2010 and diminish their ability to manage for temperature. The Program Office is leading an effort to develop a temperature management plan with the assistance of the CVO staff and a sub-committee of Program scientists.

Robert Franklin, Hoopa Tribe Hydrologist, noted that the motion made in September to formalize a Trinity temperature subcommittee has not yet happened. Mike Hamman noted this and will facilitate getting the subcommittee involved in the process.

On the carryover storage topic, Whitridge commented that the Metropolitan Water District was allowed to hold over water in the Shasta and he asked how they did it. Person said that there is currently a difference of opinion as to whether this water is actually available for carryover.

TR Hatchery Operations Review

Joe Polos, FWS fish biologist, gave a PowerPoint presentation on hatchery operations. He reported that a technical action group (TAG) was formed to review hatchery operations with respect to coho hatchery releases and the effects on natural fish in the river. There is a very large hatchery component in the coho population. The proportion of natural influence (PNI), a measure of the natural component in the genetic pool, was estimated to be 0.05 for the Trinity River. This is very low and can be compared to a desired of about 0.67. Historically, there have been several thousand coho returning to the hatchery. However, to obtain the eggs needed to meet the mitigation goals for lost of habitat above the dam, they estimated that they would need only 400 females returning to the hatchery. They recommended that the hatchery reduce coho production to 200,000 smolts, introduce one-on-one mating to increase genetic diversity, limit harvests, continue developing TRRP habitat, and monitor results. The next steps would be to take up steelhead and chinook. However, several policy questions about tribal concerns and Endangered Species Act concerns of culling threatened species need to be addressed. The urgency of action in order to affect releases to be made this year was brought up. It was noted that the TAMWG supports the recommendations and recommends that the TMC does also. Whitridge asked if the tribe would be willing to test this as an experiment and see what the monitoring result show. The discussion ended with the tribal representatives agreeing to talk to their leaders and the BOR were to discuss issues with the State. The urgency to make a decision to cull eggs before they hatch was made, but this deadline was noted to be “ambitious.”

The meeting adjourned for the day at 5:45 pm and the TMC departed for the dinner set at 7 pm.

Thursday, Dec. 17, 8:30 AM

The meeting was called to order by John Engbring as Brian Person was absent for the day for medical reasons.

Information/Decision Items:
2011-2015 Budget Plan
Mike Hamman first commented on the 2010 budget, reviewed the process that went into the 5-year budget plan, listed the principles of the process, and covered some line items and policies.

Hamman reported that he had originally thought their 2010 budget had a projected deficit of $231,000. However, the BOR budget office told him they had found extra money—enough to cover the deficit and to supply funding for extra studies requested by the tribes. He noted that there would also be funds to cover anticipated facilitation costs during 2010.

A discussion regarding funding authorities ensued about whether Program funding was primarily reimbursable (paid by water users) or taxpayer funded. Arnold Whitridge asked George Kautsky about his views on this. He asked for clarification if it were true that the tribes want the water users to pay 100% of the costs associated with the TRRP i.e., that it is “reimbursable” and that a portion of this funding be a reserved as “base funding” for tribes that would not need to be argued over each year. Kautsky said that the Hoopa Valley Tribe believes that all activities associated with TRRP are legally reimbursable to the tax payer. Understanding that funds initially are appropriated by Congress while repayment by rate payers may lag a year or two behind and that rate payer contributions go back to the US Treasury. Citing the Expenditures, Credits and Offsets (ECO) table, provided on the USBOR web site for CVP financials, it would appear that since 1992 through 2008, at least half of the costs of the Trinity program have remained with the taxpayer with ratepayers covering only $44.25Million. For accounting purposes, Kautsky requested that future budget tabulations by the ED provide attributes as to reimbursable/non-reimbursable costs categories. Cesar Blanco, FWS, tried to clarify that under CVPIA authorities some funds are reimbursable, others are partially reimbursable, whereas still others are not reimbursable; he thought A30 is totally reimbursable.

Hamman next gave a PowerPoint presentation on the goals and principles of the 5-year budget plan. He cited several useful goals that a 5-year budget would achieve—these basically would contribute to the stable continuance of the program by assuring channel completion, advancing monitoring, building partner capacity, and facilitating reviews and publications. He cited several principles such as the need to develop out-year costs estimates, build in the needed peer-review and IRPs, project channel costs, project monitoring costs, and allocate funding based on IAP priorities.

Kautsky noted that the Hoopa Tribe has encouraged Hamman to extend the timeline for channel construction out until 2018, estimates for completion by 2015 are based on the time and cost invested in completion of phase 1 sites, including those with significant flaws. Whitridge noted that he hoped the TMC would weigh in on the principle of achieving full program funding. He gave as an example the TMC using watershed funding for something else. This should be clear in any requests made.

Hamman showed what a 5-year budget would look like and went over line items in the 5-year budget. This generated a long discussion and questions—mostly on the 2011 year budget. Some lines were questioned as to the cost (stream gaging, or coded wire tags for hatchery fish), others to the need (e.g., those listed as “expert consultation”). Specifically TAMWG Chair, Whitridge suggested that hatchery mitigation (A40) should pay part or all of the $360,000 per year for coded wire tagging of juveniles released from the hatchery. Don Reck noted that if this funding was shifted to A40, it would need to come from other sources within Reclamation and he recognized the value for the restoration program if this occurred. Joe Polos noted that the program does pay for data analysis of hatchery stock monitoring already. Whitridge’s opinion was that the application of the tags is an operations and maintenance issue for the hatchery, not the Program.

Budget Development Policies

Mike Hamman next showed a couple of PowerPoint slides that listed the policy statements regarding the 5-year budget process. The main points were 1) to balance program priorities to assure completion of the construction by 2015 assuming full Program funding, 2) determine core on-going monitoring projects, 3) determine base funding for partners, and 4) adoption of a proposal and independent review driven science program.

Engbring prompted the group to be able to decide if these goals are acceptable and whether the TMC would be able to support them with some sort of motion. There was some discussion about program goals and several rounds of word-smithing. Robert Franklin asked if there are any plans to revisit sites to assess how well the construction is working to meet goals. Dave Hillemeier asked that a condition be added about the need to increase the timeline if costs increase and that construction of sites be performed at the appropriate scale. John Engbring noted that the base funding would be focused on tribes and not other agencies. Arnold Whitridge clarified that it was hoped that base funding would help to reduce conflict of interest by removing the fear of loss of funding by tribes when discussing whether or not to fund a specific line items that supports a tribal project and employees. There was a long discussion on point 2. George Kautsky pointed out that he cannot support the concept behind policy point 2 in that it presumes and (condones) that a fully funded program will not occur and that redefining budget policy based on supposition of inadequate funding would be inappropriate in a setting where the cost for service (diversion) should equal the full cost of Trinity restoration. Whitridge suggested, as a fix, to add a statement that full program funding is needed and that the water users “should pay their share.” He suggested there be another “Plan B” that deals with prioritization if funding falls short. Bill Brock suggested point 2 should be part of point 1. It was also pointed out to drop the word “policy” from the title. Seth Naman suggested that point 4 should include a requirement that written summaries be produced as deliverables.

Following the lunch break and before continuing with the previous discussion, Joe Polos, chair of the IAP team, gave an update on using the IAP to assist the budget process.

Mike Hamman continued his presentation by listing a set of budget statements: 1) the interdisciplinary team would recommend science priorities, 2) metrics developed for best use of resources, 3) SAB conducts reviews, 4) B Team makes budget recommendations, and 5) Executive Director allowed limited re-programming. There was discussion about the meanings and wordings of these statements.

George Kautsky commented that some elements are missing and he disfavored the use of an incomplete IAP to advise the budget process; the result would be an incomplete implementation of the ROD. John Engbring noted that the IAP is being negotiated and noted issues exist over lamprey and numeric goals. Joe Polos noted that the IAP has the perception of being stalled by government-to-government meetings but certain elements of the IAP can be used.

The TMC approved that Joe Polos and Mike Hamman continue forward with their processes as outlined in today's discussion. John Engbring asked if the TMC also needs to draft a letter to the regional directors to get the IAP process going again. It was noted that the hatchery and CVO issues could also be brought up. Mike Hamman agreed to draft the letter. Don Reck suggested that the letter should focus only on the main issue of IAP matters. A draft letter would be circulated.

Advancing TMC Goals and Policies

Mike Hamman introduced this topic by reciting some of the language of the 2004 TRRP Subcommittee Report and the CDR Situation Assessment. The reports listed problems of an incomplete or differing vision between Program participants that seem to be a route cause of misalignment in performance of the mission. Both reports recommend developing a common vision between all TMC members increase effective communications and trust, and improvement in addressing management objectives.

Hamman suggested a series of meetings, retreats, and workshops to help improve communications and trust levels and to help develop a sense of group direction and vision. There was discussion on how to organize a joint TMC and TAMWG meeting. The TMC supports the approach and urged that these meetings be scheduled soon.

The IAP was discussed again and Roger Jaegel noted that he is unclear about what process the TMC still needs to take on obtaining closure to the IAP. The importance of the letter that will be sent was emphasized—that the regional directors need to get resolution on the government-to-government negotiations.

Open Forum: Comments from the public - There were no comments at this time.

Calendars:

The next TMC meeting is scheduled for March 31 and April 1. The location will be at Hoopa. A combined meeting with the TAMWG may be a part of this meeting.

Conference calls were scheduled for 10 AM to Noon for the following dates:

January 21
February 11
March 18.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:35 PM.