**MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 9, 2003 TMC MEETING**
**Location: Victorian Restaurant, Weaverville**

**TMC Members Present**: Chairman Mike Ryan, USBR; Vice-Chair Mary Ellen Mueller, USFWS; Executive Director Doug Schleusner; Sharon Heywood, USFS; Irma Lagomarsino, NOAA Fisheries; Mike Orcutt, Hoopa Valley Tribe; Tim Hayden for Troy Fletcher, Yurok Tribe; Neil Manji, Dept. of Fish and Game for the State of California; Ralph Modine, Trinity County.

**Others Present**: Doug Schleusner, Executive Director; Tom Stokely and Janet Clements, Trinity County Planning Dept./Minute Takers; Jeff Phipps, CVP Power and NCPA; Serge Birk, CVP Water Assn.; Byron Leydecker, sportfishing/California Trout; Joe Polos, USFWS; Arnold Whitridge, TAMWG Chairperson; George Kautsky, Hoopa Valley Tribal Fisheries; Daryl Peterson, Andreas Krause, Lori Kleifgen, Rich Miller, and Brandt Gutermuth, TRRP; Harry Rectenwald, DFG; Glen Yoshioka, citizen; Al Zepp, NCPA; Sherri Miller, USFS/Redwood Sciences Lab; Curtis Anderson, DWR; Ryan Benson, Seth Naman, Aaron Martin and Mike Stutsman, Yurok Tribal Fisheries

Chairman Mike Ryan called the meeting to order at 9:18 am.
Mike Ryan announced that Troy Fletcher has designated Tim Hayden as the Yurok representative for this meeting.

Mike Orcutt asked whether the TMC would be able to meet before the flow schedule is decided on April 1. Doug Schleusner stated that the next meeting will be April 15, 2004, after the flow schedule is completed.

**AGENDA ADOPTION**

Mary Ellen Mueller requested that an agenda item be added for her to relay some concerns from the TAMWG regarding the Bridges Project.

Ralph Modine moved that the agenda be approved as amended. The motion was seconded. Motion carried.

**MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 29, 2003 TMC MEETING**
The TMC members reviewed the minutes from the October meeting. Several edits were made and noted and changed as follows:

On page 2 under "Election of Officers", sixth sentence, add in the words "Bill Brock, speaking for Sharon Heywood…"

On page 4, in the paragraph that starts: "Mary Ellen is concerned…", change the last sentence to read "…he feels that the TRRP staff is working effectively with the TMC technical representatives."

On page 9, paragraph which starts with "CDF&G does not have an Upper…" Change the second sentence to read: "They saw 32,000 chinook this year at Iron Gate…"

On page 9, second to last paragraph, fourth sentence, change "Essex" to "Essa".

On page 10, the first paragraph under "ESA/Coho Coordination Activities: Preliminary Report". Delete the sentence that reads: "The State process in phase two will probably be a spin-off of the federal recovery plan" and replace it with: "Phase 2 of the federal recovery planning process will consider the outcome of the State process."

Ralph Modine moved that the minutes be approved as amended. Mike Orcutt seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously as amended.

**OPEN FORUM**

There were no comments from the public.

**REPORT FROM TMC CHAIR - Mike Ryan, TMC Chairperson**

Mike Ryan reported that work continues on the preparation of the SEIS/EIR. The Administrative Draft is currently being circulated among the co-lead agencies. A public draft will be put out the first week of February for public review and comment. The Administrative Draft is approximately 250-300 pages long. It serves as a stand-alone document with lots of references to the original document. He also reported that the reservoir storage situation is strong for this year. Storage in Trinity Lake is at 1.7 million AF, which is close to the flood control curve of 1.9 million AF. The storage at Shasta is 3.2 million AF, which is even closer to the flood control curve for that reservoir.

Neil Manji asked if there are plans to hold public workshops or meetings when the SEIS/EIR is put out for public review. Mike Ryan stated that there will be at least one workshop in the Trinity River basin and one in the Central Valley.

Mike Orcutt asked what the current schedule is for completing the court required SEIS? Mike Ryan answered that it is on schedule but that the ESA consultation must be completed for the Long-Term Central Valley Project Operations Criteria and Plan (OCAP) before the SEIS/EIR can be finalized. Interior must report to Judge Wanger in January on the status of the schedule. At that time, they will also report on the status of OCAP. Mike Ryan's advice to Interior is that they need to move OCAP along as quickly as they can.

Mike Orcutt asked what Interior's position is regarding what the flow regimes will be for the 2004 water year, if it is per the Court's decision, and whether it includes the 50,000 af for the improvement of adult passage in lower Klamath/Trinity? Mike Ryan does not know but he thinks the ruling from last year still stands and the same flow regime will be implemented, with the possible exception of the 50,000 AF. He believes that there will be a desire to request additional flows in 2004, however, he cannot speak for Interior or the Tribes. Mike Orcutt would like to have a TMC meeting in February or March in order for the TMC to have input into that process. He would also like the numbers on the total amount of water sent down the Trinity last year. Although no exact numbers were available at the meeting, it was agreed that it was at least 480,000 AF.

Ralph Modine asked if there was anything the TMC could do that would have an impact on Judge Wanger and/or Interior in terms of taking a proactive role in the construction of the 2004 release schedule? Mike Ryan stated that the defendants in the SEIS/EIR litigation would likely be trying to influence that process in Judge Wanger's court. He does not think that any TMC action above that would have much influence. However, last year the Secretary gave great consideration to the TMC's recommendations on how to shape the flows. He stated that Reclamation would like to hear advice from the TMC again this year on how the flows will be shaped.

Serge Birk asked if the July 9$^{th}$ date for SEIS/EIR completion was also a date for a ROD? Mike Ryan stated that July 9$^{th}$ is the date Judge Wanger ruled that the SEIS must be completed. Mike does not think that includes the ROD, just the completed Environmental Document. Mike answered that if the NEPA document was completed before OCAP consultation, there is a risk that there will be requirements or conditions under ESA that were not included in the ROD. In that case, the SEIS/EIR ROD would have to be re-evaluated.

Irma Lagomarsino clarified that the OCAP Biological Assessment (BA) includes the Trinity ROD. Judge Wanger ruled that parts of the NOAA Fisheries opinion on the Trinity ROD were wrong. It is still unclear for the Trinity side what form the consultation will take. NOAA must re-evaluate any changes in baseline conditions or the status of the species.

Tom Stokely explained that the Trinity flows incorporated into the future conditions for OCAP are the Trinity ROD flows of December 2000.

**TAMWG REPORT - Arnold Whitridge, TAMWG Chairperson**

The TAMWG met on December 8, 2003. The TAMWG is still grappling with how its committees should interact with the rest of the program. Arnold reported that the Trinity County grant program funded by the Restoration Program has received a proposal for watershed coordination from the Trinity County RCD. The proposal was well received by the TAMWG as well as TRRP staff. The County can only award the grant with TMC approval. TAMWG recommends that the TMC approve that proposal.

A second matter discussed at the TAMWG meeting was the program evaluation. The TAMWG passed a three-part motion. First, the TMC should establish an overall, long-term protocol/process for both technical and programmatic evaluation. Secondly, there is some concern that the TAMWG had not yet been engaged or asked to participate in the evaluation. They asked that they be included. The third part of the motion asked that representatives from the various TAMWG sub-committees be invited to participate.

Arnold reported that the TAMWG spent a lot of time considering the Draft Strategic Plan and a number of informal comments were offered to Doug. As a group they did not make any recommendations about the Strategic Plan.

Mary Ellen Mueller reported that there was a discussion at the TAMWG meeting regarding the status of the bridges, especially Salt Flat. Mary Ellen relayed several TAMWG member's concerns. She expressed that the TAMWG did not want to make a recommendation but some members felt strongly about using eminent domain. Arnold stated that no recommendations were made because the TAMWG members do not have legal expertise to gage these risks, but there is a concern.

Doug reported that the pre-solicitation notice for Salt Flat and Biggers Road Bridges went out on December 2nd. The contract award is expected on February 6th. Salt Flat can be withdrawn from the bid if problems are not worked out. A final offer has been made to the property owners at Salt Flat. If issues are not resolved, the landowners have been advised that the bridge will be taken out of the construction bid and the program may not have funds to construct it at a later date. The letter gave the property owners until January 13th to agree to let the project proceed.

Mike Ryan stated that Trinity County would like $50,000 from the County Grant Program to go to the RCD for watershed coordination. Tom Stokely explained the proposal as a watershed coordination grant, helping to implement the watershed restoration component of the ROD. Tom explained that the funding is from last fiscal year and a new agreement would with Reclamation not have to be completed for the project to proceed.

Ralph noted that the biggest part of the budget funds work on the mainstem, and there has been a lot of discussion on implementing projects in the watersheds. The RCD has a local capacity and has been very successful in securing and implementing watershed efforts. He thinks the overall program would benefit greatly with the approval of this grant.

Ralph Modine moved that the TMC approve the recommendation from the TAMWG with regard to the RCD watershed coordination grant. Sharon Heywood seconded. Mike Orcutt asked for a better understanding of the grant program process. Tom Stokely explained that this was an unsolicited proposal. The County intends to go out with an RFP process soon. He feels this proposal is very important and cannot wait much longer. If this proposal went through the RFP process, it would be at least 6 months from now. He explained that this is FY 2003 money. This is somewhat of a deviation from normal procedure in the past, but the County has had unsolicited proposals before. 2003 and 2004 money will be available for other projects. Doug stated that $500,000 has been identified for spending on watershed restoration. He believes that this proposal would be effective in leveraging further funds for watershed restoration. The motion passed unanimously.

**<u>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT, Doug Schleusner</u>**

Doug reported that since the last meeting TRRP staff has continued to work on the bridges, the scientific framework, and financial assistance agreements. The appropriations bill has been signed. The final numbers have not come down from headquarters but Doug does not foresee many changes. This does allow us to move forward with funding agreements. The request for $2 million from the Restoration Fund was approved. The $1.2 million request from the California Department of Fish and Game's Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund has not yet been confirmed.

Doug reported that there is a vacant fishery biologist position open within TRRP. The program hopes to advertise it soon. Staff is currently working on an accomplishment report with the help of the Trinity County RCD. He announced that the program's Sediment Management Symposium is scheduled for February 8 and 9, 2004. Many renowned speakers and experts in the field will be attending. TAMWG representatives will also be presenting.

Daryl Peterson announced that the first Scientific Framework Workshop will probably be held in June.

Mike Orcutt stated that it is important for people to be aware that although negotiations are still open with Westlands, the technical merits of Westlands' settlement proposal are lacking. Also, in regards to the budget and CVPIA Restoration Funding, it is his understanding that the Regional Directors have the authority to disperse the funding and he is glad they did. He hopes it is included in future funding development. He realizes there is opposition to funding projects in the Trinity, but the Trinity does contribute water and power to help fund the CVPIA Restoration Fund. He would like to know what the Trinity's contribution has been since 1992 when CVPIA was passed. Mike also asked Doug what the general status is of the restoration sites. Doug stated that the reason he did not include that in his report is because it was in the October report and the status has not changed. The design team meetings and the NEPA/CEQA work are continuing. The floodplain mapping and FEMA requirements are new issues. He is not exactly sure what the requirements will be, however Staff is trying to move forward. Staff is working on the

NEPA/CEQA documents for sites downstream of Canyon Creek. Construction funding for those projects will not be in the budget for 2004 but hopefully will be for 2005 and 2006.

Jeff Phipps asked when the Science Advisory Board will be getting started. Doug reported that four members have been appointed. Daryl is currently making arrangements for their first meeting, which will probably not happen until next year. Staff will be looking for a variety of sources to get the Board familiar with local issues as quickly as possible.

Serge Birk commented on page 7 of 24 of the Strategic Plan. He would like to see the program positioned to National Academy of Science sooner than 2008.

Doug gave a Power Point presentation highlighting the major accomplishments of the program this year.

**TMC PROGRAM REVIEW, Ad hoc Committee Report - Curtis Anderson, DWR**
Curtis provided the background of the program evaluation. The charge of the evaluation subcommittee is to compare how things were originally envisioned for the program and the intention of the ROD vs. how things are being implemented and what has been accomplished. The intent of this evaluation is to help guide the program in the right direction. Curtis reported that the subcommittee met on November 13, 2003 in Arcata and on December 1, 2003 at Shasta Dam. The committee has also communicated through numerous emails and phone calls. At the first meeting, members of TRRP Staff met with authors of the AEAM portion of the ROD implementation plan in order to get a historical perspective. The committee discussed timelines, accomplishments, and hurdles with Doug Schleusner, Ed Solbos, and Daryl Peterson of TRRP. The committee also had a brainstorming session identifying both positive and negative issues associated with each entity of the TRRP. TRRP Staff did not participate in this portion of the meeting.

The committee met with Mike Ryan, Mary Ellen Mueller and Doug Schleusner to discuss various issues concerning the evaluation and to identify sensitive issues.

Issues that the committee identified include:
- The intent of the TRRP is not being fully met as envisioned;
- There has been an inadequate transfer of vision from originators to TMC, TMAG, RIG, TAMWG, and SAG. Especially in regards to the TRFER;
- There is a need for the TMC to be very involved in the oversight of the TRRP;
- There was a large amount of scientific research and development work envisioned for the TMAG;
- TRRP is encountering significant hurdles to implementation not initially envisioned;
- The time is appropriate for program review and finding a way to move forward.

Curtis asked the TMC to provide direction to the subcommittee to continue with the evaluation. The subcommittee would like to continue discussion with all components of the TRRP including Weaverville office staff, TAMWG, and TMC partner agencies. Curtis proposed the subcommittee prepare a briefing document in February/March and send the briefing document to the TMC by late March. The committee will formally present the document to the TMC at the April 15, 2004 meeting.

Curtis stated that the committee would like to have TAMWG members involved. Neil Manji suggested that the TAMWG develop the protocol for evaluation for the ad hoc committee to implement. He thinks that the committee has the technical expertise to evaluate program well.

The TAMWG may better serve to develop the protocol for review. This would also keep tech review team more specialized.

Curtis stated that there is a perception that the TMC is evaluating itself. One idea to make sure that is not the case is to involve the SAB. The committee felt that would help to have a more independent review.

Irma has concerns with relying too heavily on the original authors rather than the published documents.

Serge Birk suggested that TAMWG participation could be limited to one or two members from each subcommittee. He stated that the TAMWG would like to have ownership in whatever product comes out of this process. He believes the way to achieve that is to get the TMAWG involved from the beginning.

Neil Manji feels that he was misunderstood; he did not mean to say that the TAMWG should not be represented on the review committee, but that the TAMWG should also develop protocol for review.

Serge Birk stated that he was led to believe that there were limits to the size of the group. TAMWG is doing everything they can to be engaged. They are interested in the process and he believes that they should play a role.

Byron suggested that the four main elements of the program be evaluated individually, not only in the general overall context of the total program.

Mike Orcutt apologized to the committee members for not being as active as he should have been to this point. He is struggling with the term evaluation and what the lifetime of the process will be. Curtis responded that the committee has not gotten to that point yet. Mike asked if the committee anticipated having adequate resources to complete the task. Curtis answered that as far as he knows, those people will be available.

Mike Orcutt stated that one thing he has felt is that the groups should have input into the flow regime. He asked about the role of the TMC in deciding the flow regime and whether the TMC should wait for the outcome of the litigation. Curtis answered that the committee has not gotten to that level of review. They have discussed the possibility of the TMC becoming more involved and whether that was possible. They have not discussed detailed responsibilities of the Council. Mike Orcutt stated that the TMC should act as advisors to the Secretary rather than waiting for the litigation and deferring to the defendants.

Mary Ellen Mueller stated that there will probably be some quick changes made as a result of this process, for example, increasing the role of the TMC, filling positions at TRRP, and changing the requirements of those positions.

Mike Ryan stated that the flow schedule, the most important part of implementation, is involved in litigation. He questions where we are at and where we should be because we are tied to the litigation. Mary Ellen pointed out that there are a lot of things the program can do and has done in preparation of the higher flow releases. Perhaps the program is not as far along as it should be or could be. This review process has caught her attention. She would like the Program to move forward even faster if possible.

Sharon is concerned with the review in terms of whether a group can review itself. She is comfortable with the recommendations Curtis has put before the TMC. She is comfortable that the review can go forward.

Mary Ellen moved to approve Curtis' recommendations. Irma stated that she did not realize how deep the review would get into staffing issues at TRRP. She does not feel it was discussed openly that the committee would be getting so deep into personnel issues. She was a bit surprised by that aspect. Mary Ellen stated that she was also surprised at first but she then realized how important it is to have that review. Irma stated she would rather wait to vote until after lunch.

Mike Ryan asked about the possibility of accelerating the pace of this review because it may be helpful to have it completed before the SEIS/EIR is completed. Curtis responded that the current schedule is already pretty ambitious. There was a general discussion regarding the link between the review process and the SEIS/EIR. It was generally agreed that the SEIS/EIR will not address those issues addressed by the review. The SEIS/EIR is being written to evaluate specific issues identified by Judge Wanger.

Neil stated that the review is really a part of adaptive management in going back to see what might have gone wrong and determining how to fix it.

Tom Stokely stated that the subcommittee's recommendations would be helpful in developing the Strategic Plan, rather than being linked to the SEIS/EIR effort. The review process and the SEIS/EIR should not be held up for one another. Byron Leydecker stated that as far as the SEIS/EIR is concerned, each TAMWG member will probably individually submit comments on the public draft. He agreed that the review process relates more to the Strategic Plan.

**<u>LUNCH</u>**

Mike Ryan stated that the ROD and its implementation plan are the primary source for the direction of the program because they capture the formal agreement between The Hoopa Valley Tribe and the Department of the Interior. The original authors can help with the process but the documents serve as the ultimate guide. People can often get critical and judgmental in evaluating the status of the program, but it is important to have patience. It took decades to get to where we are today and it will take time to change. He feels that the program's limiting factors must be identified. He realizes there are several things to be improved. He is interested in knowing that smaller set of challenges. He also feels that the program needs to establish what is important now. He asked the committee for recommendations that can be implemented this year. He thinks that the TAMWG should be included. If the TAMWG thinks that representatives from each of their committees should serve on the subcommittee, he is fine with that.

Sharon Heywood agreed that in the business of natural resource management, things happen relatively slowly. Mary Ellen stated that of course correction is a good thing, but it does not mean that Doug and his staff have not done an excellent job. Irma stated that she is comfortable with the review; however, she is concerned with the perception that the program is reviewing itself. She suggested that the next evaluation be more independent. Mike Orcutt said one of the challenges is the correction part of the process. It is a needed element, it is not meant to point any fingers, but is a normal, healthy process. One of the challenges is keeping in check with what the long-term evaluation process will be. He is generally supportive. Neil Manji stated that he is also supportive. He agrees with using the documents as guides. The findings of the group to will attest to whether the review is sugar coated. He suggested that the TMC might want to narrow down what they are looking at to the ROD and the implementation plan. Ralph stated that as long as the TAMWG is not disenfranchised, he is supportive.

Doug pointed out that as Mike Ryan spoke, he outlined much of the Strategic Plan. He suggested integrating the two processes. Mary Ellen agreed that she would not want to put together the Strategic Plan without hearing the subcommittee recommendations. There was a general discussion on the integration of the strategic plan and the review. It was generally agreed that parts of the review may feed directly into the Strategic Plan.

The review committee is not to plan out the next 3-5 years for the program that will be parsed out in the Strategic Plan.

Due to meeting schedules, the review committee will present to the TAMWG before presenting to the TMC. The TMC members did not see a problem with that.

**<u>STRATEGIC PLAN WORKING SESSION</u>**

Doug asked the TMC members, what they think of when they hear "Strategic Plan". Each member responded with his or her vision of what a Strategic Plan should look like.
Doug presented a slide show on the Draft Strategic Plan. He highlighted the need for the plan, the elements in the draft, and the process to date. The plan was initiated in March 2003 with a target date for completion in Spring 2004. The Plan's time horizon is 3-5 years. Doug explained that he would like the TMC to review and comment on the mission, goals, and vision statements in the Draft Plan during the working session. He would also like further comment from individual agencies.

<u>Mission Statement</u>
"The mission of the Trinity River Restoration Program is to restore, enhance, and conserve naturally-spawning anadromous fisheries, native plant communities, and associated wildlife resources of the Trinity River basin in sufficient quantity and quality to ensure long-term sustainability".

Mike Ryan stated that Judge Wanger focused on the 1955 and 1984 Acts. He asked if mission statement complements those pieces of legislation? Doug stated that Staff did look at that legislation, but he will re-evaluate it in that context.

Harry Rectenwald suggested that Adaptive Management be incorporated into the Mission because it is the emphasis of the Implementation Plan is adaptive management.

Seth Naman stated that wording that speaks to the watershed level is important. He thinks the statement is written well.

Glen Yoshioka suggested replacing anadromous fisheries with native fisheries. With only anadromous, the native resident component is excluded.

Mike Orcutt suggested that the mission might want to stick with the revised purpose and need statement of the SEIS/EIR in order to comply with Judge Wanger's order. The down side to that would be that it does not include wildlife and plants.

Tom Stokely stated that the key to the mission statement is compliance with the 1955 and 1984 Acts.

Goal 1 of 5:
"Restore natural populations of anadromous fish in the Trinity River basin to levels that existed prior to the construction of Trinity and Lewiston dams, and maintain such levels".
Harry Rectenwald stated that with natural populations of anadromous fish, it is important to realize the relationship between the number of spawners and the number of juveniles produced. By putting adults and juveniles in the goal, it makes it more measurable.

Glen Yoshioka stated that the CVPIA, and the 1955 and 1984 Acts talk about fish and wildlife, particularly in the1984 Act they talk about anadromous fish. There could be one goal that talks about fish and wildlife, another about anadromous fish.

Irma asked how realistic it is to restore natural populations of anadromous fish to levels that existed prior to construction of dams.

Mike Orcutt asked if the reason the flows were not included in the goal is because of litigation. Doug stated that Staff does not know when the flows will be implemented and they did not want to wait that long. This is almost an interim plan. Once the flow issues are resolved, changes in the document can be made as necessary.

Mike Ryan stated that there is existing legislation that talks about what the program is supposed to be accomplishing. It is important not to lose sight of those things, whether they are in legislation or not.

Harry Rectenwald stated that harvest is one of the things that go along with maintaining levels. He suggested that "with harvest" be added at the end.

Goal 2 of 5:
"Restore attributes of a healthy, functional alluvial river system to the Trinity River basin downstream of Lewiston Dam to enhance populations of native fish species".

Doug stated that he has received several comments that this should not be a goal but a tool in achieving the first goal. Neil Manji thinks we should leave it as a goal. Mike Ryan agreed because if Goal #1 is not achieved, the program should still aim towards Goal #2.

Goal 3 of 5:
"Identify opportunities for restoration activities within tributary watersheds that provide direct benefits to mainstem health and function; consider all restoration activities within the context of improved watershed health".

Mike Ryan suggested Staff double check the language in Wanger's ruling to make sure this goal captures what he says.

Mike Orcutt asked if this goal resolves the South Fork Issue. Doug stated that one school of thought is to make watershed restoration a goal and develop objectives under that. Another viewpoint is that we do not specifically need it as a goal, but it should be incorporated into the overall program approach. Doug does not think that the South Fork needs to be specifically mentioned.

Mike Ryan stated that when the program funds activities, the funding authority must authorize the specific activity. He believes that Judge Wanger's orders went further then simply saying, "consider" watershed activities. He suggested that the language could be stronger in the goal. Tom Stokely thinks this particular goal addresses the current ROD language but Judge Wanger said we need to go further than that.

<u>Goal 4 of 5:</u>
"Provide credible and objective scientific knowledge that furthers our understanding of regulated alluvial river systems for effective adaptive management of the Trinity River".
No substantive comments were offered regarding Goal #4.

<u>Goal 5 of 5:</u>
"Restore and enhance diversity of species, structure, and function of riparian and associated upland plant communities within the historic floodplain to increase the quality of wildlife habitats, and enhance native populations of wildlife species".
Tom Stokely noted this goal seems very similar to Goal #1.

Doug reviewed the process for completing the Plan and the vision of what the program will look like in March 2004, 2006 and 2008. He is interested in a general reaction and feedback.
Mike Ryan asked how the vision fits with the performance measure aspect. Doug responded that to get a handle on response we need to better document a baseline.

George Kautsky stated that assigning years to the vision elevates expectations that in 5 years one will see marked changes in the environment. He suggested the Plan be couched in conditions met rather than years. For example, one can expect to see change after x number of large events. Some of the triggers do not depend on years. If there are no flow releases, certain things will not happen in 5 years.

George cautioned that it might be brood years out before we can see a response. It also depends on ocean conditions. He asked if there was a definition of success or the end of the program. The mission statement references long-term sustainability.

**OPEN FORUM**
No comments from the public.

**NEXT MEETING**
The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday April 14, 2004 in Redding.

At 3:12 p.m. Neil Manji moved to adjourn the meeting, Mary Ellen seconded. Meeting adjourned.

**ACTION ITEMS**
Approved the December 9, 2003 TMC meeting agenda. Motion made by Ralph Modine. Motion seconded and unanimously approved.
Approved minutes from the October 29, 2003 meeting as amended. Motion made by Ralph Modine, Seconded by Mike Orcutt. Motion was unanimously approved.

Approved the recommendation from the TAMWG that Trinity County award the Trinity County RCD $50,000 for watershed coordination under the County's Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Grant Program. Motion made by Ralph Modine, seconded by Sharon Heywood. Motion was unanimously approved.

Although no official action was made, the TMC generally supported Curtis Anderson's request for continuation of the program evaluation and the TAMWG's participation in that process.

Adjourned meeting at 3:12 p.m. Motion made by Neil Manji, seconded by Mary Ellen Mueller. Motion was unanimously approved.