

Final Minutes
TRINITY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
Days-Inn Large Conference Room, Arcata, CA
Tuesday and Wednesday, Sept. 15-16, 2009

Tuesday, September 15, 1:35 PM

Attending Members:

Brian Person	Bureau of Reclamation, Chair
John Engbring	Fish and Wildlife Service, Vice-Chair
Gary Stacey	California Department of Fish and Game
Dave Hillemeier	Yurok Tribe
George Kautsky / Bob Franklin ¹	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Irma Lagomarsino	NOAA Fisheries
Bill Brock	Forest Service
Roger Jaegel ²	Trinity County
Arnold Whitridge ³	Trinity Adaptive Management Work Group
Mike Hamman ³	Trinity River Restoration Program, Executive Director

¹ alternates for Mike Orcutt
² attended the second day
^{3 non}-voting members

Others Attending: Randy Brown and Joe Polos, FWS Arcata Field Office; Teresa Connor, CDWR; Gil Saliba, TAMWG; Mike Berry, CDF&G; Don Reck, USBOR; Jennifer Faler, TRRP; Seth Naman, NMFS

Review of motions and action items:

Motions

John Engbring made a motion to accept the minutes as changed.

Irma Lagomarsino seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to formalize the Trinity Temperature subcommittee to address Trinity River temperature issues so these issues may be integrated into various flow management and decisions. Membership would be technical representatives of the TMC and possibly other technical specialists. A contact person would report back to the TMC.

The motion was seconded by Roger Jaegel.

The motion passed with seven aye votes and one nay vote.

Action items:

A committee (Whitridge, Sharon, Person) would meet on the conflict of interest and a one page summary would be drafted for the TMC before their next meeting. Hillemeier and Hoopa Tribe will participate.

Brian Person will place on next TMC agenda the consideration of BLM for TMC membership.

Mike Hamman will search for any clarification in the ROD regarding prohibition of work in tributaries.

Mike Hamman will improve TMC announcements for future meetings.

Dave Hillemeier asked that the TAMWG letter of June 2009 should be addressed point by point.

Mike Hamman would continue to work on the mission statement and draft a one page statement and issues. Specific examples of program at odds with the mission should be identified.

Several decisions were made to facilitate meetings such as numbering the agenda, referencing supporting documents, name tags, and meeting closeouts. Brian Person would handle this.

Regular Business

Introductions

Brian Person, Chair of the Trinity Management Council (TMC) opened the meeting and announced that George Kautsky would be sitting in for Mike Orcutt. Kautsky suggested that the agenda be organized (e.g., numbered items) so that separate documents could be associated with agenda items. The agenda was approved unanimously.

Regarding the June 2009 minutes, Kautsky suggested a clarification to a letter mentioned in the minutes.

John Engbring made a motion to accept the minutes as changed.

Irma Lagomarsino seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously

Comments from the public

No comments were made.

Report from TAMWG Chair

Arnold Whitridge chair of the Trinity Adaptive Management Work Group (TAMWG) started his report by noting that the announcements of the TMC meetings are not generally available and the public has less access to the process. Mike Hamman noted this and said he would resolve it.

Whitridge continued his report of the TAMWG meeting. He noted several highlights as the attendance of TMC members to the last meeting, progress on hatchery management, Mike Hamman presented information on reorganization of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP), and Mark Lancaster made a presentation on watershed restoration that the Five Counties program is undertaking. Whitridge said that TAMWG recommends that TMC budget \$0.5 million per year for watershed restoration. Whitridge commented on the problems of contracting and the need for creating an easy way for funds to be carried over to future years. He also said that watershed restoration should be interpreted broadly and

should include sediment reduction, barrier removal and habitat restoration in the tributaries. Whitridge asked if the TMC agrees with the opinion that the tributaries are indeed important to fish restoration.

Whitridge reported that, overall TAMWG is unsatisfied with TMC progress on effective leadership, functionality, or conflict of interest. Fair or not, stakeholders on TAMWG want more explicit action by the TMC on this issue. TAMWG is considering going to Congress on this issue if no progress is apparent. Progress likely would be perceived as some sort of results and not just formation of a committee.

Dave Hillemeier commented that, during his attendance at the last TAMWG meeting, he noted the conflict of interest as the biggest issue brought up. Hillemeier asked if progress on the Request for Proposal (RFP) might help alleviate the dissatisfaction of the TAMWG. He also said that the TMC should respond point by point to the TAMWG's June letter.

Whitridge also noted that when TAMWG sends advice, sometimes it is followed and sometimes not. But the TAMWG doesn't know why advice is not followed. Whitridge asked "Is the TMC is getting the most out of their advisors?" He specifically noted that the conflict of interest has been brought up to the TMC as early as June of 2007. Whitridge had not heard of any discussion that the TMC may have had. This leads to a perception that the TMC does not listen to the TAMWG. Some formal acknowledgement by the TMC would help.

At this point, the TMC decided to discuss this issue as discussion of TAMWG recommendations had been placed on the TMC meeting agenda. Irma Lagomarsino had agreed to take up the issue of conflict of interest. She provided an update on her progress regarding the conflict of interest issue. Lagomarsino said she has failed to "rally the group" toward resolving the conflict of interest issue, though she did have some substantial discussion with Mike Hamman. One idea being proposed is to develop a five-year outlook that could help to resolve conflicts and Hamman would be speaking on this later during the meeting. Person noted that discussion of the conflict of interest was on the agenda at the TMC's recent retreat. Person acknowledged that Mike Long, the former chair of TMC, did not think it was an issue. Person noted that TAMWG members who read the retreat minutes did not agree that the TMC had given the issue "its due." Lagomarsino recited Mike Long's reasoning, "How can a federal agency have a conflict of interest when Congress gives the funds to the agency to restore the Trinity? It seems natural that some of the funds would come to the agency." Lagomarsino reported that she now thinks she cannot serve as effectively in this role as she originally hoped.

Person offered that, if Arnold and Sharon are still willing to serve on the conflict of interest committee, Person would still pursue the issue. He said he will have an answer before the next meeting of the TAMWG and TMC. John Engbring expressed some confusion and asked that the problem be more clearly stated. Person thought a conflict of interest paper would help to define the issue. Whitridge agreed and thought a paper should be delivered before the next meeting. Dave Hillemeier expressed interest in helping. George Kautsky asked that Mike Orcutt be given an opportunity to participate.

Upon returning to the agenda item TAMWG chair report, Whitridge brought up the issue of whether the restoration program considers watershed restoration important. The ROD mentioned a need for \$2 million of work and listed a variety of funding sources. Responding to Stacey's question, Person said that the ROD did not forbid work in the tributaries, but it focuses on the main stem. Bill Brock

mentioned that the Forest Service has been spending about \$2 million in the South Fork Trinity largely in fish passage and road work. Irma Lagomarsino said her agency has focused on coho and also recognizes tributaries. She did recall some type of prohibition for work in the tributaries. She thought some sort of policy statement might help. Person asked if Mike Hamman might be able to provide some clarity from the ROD. Gary Stacy said it is fairly clear to most people that restoration in tributaries is important. He cautioned that the funding such an effort may turn out to be huge. Irma Lagomarsino thought that such spending may be wise as it could leverage more funding.

George Kautsky noted that TAMWG had made a statement that it hoped that TMC members would be supportive and helpful in the hatchery review. Kautsky pointed out a copy of a letter from the Hoopa Tribe that said they are not in any way reluctant to review hatchery practices. This would be discussed in more detail later in the meeting.

Report from TMC Chair

Brian Person presented an update of TMC activities. He said he is imposing the “business format” and he will avoid participants from “rambling” during TMC meetings. He wanted to express sincere appreciation for the river float and thought it was a fantastic day. All members of the “federal family” have tried to fulfill their government to government responsibilities and are holding meetings and discussions with the tribes. These are very productive and informative. Discussions involve the Hoopa Valley Tribe’s concerns with the Klamath River restoration program. A government-to-government, facilitated retreat is being planned. Person cited as a particular difficulty, the scheduling of both regional directors to meet on the same day. Other discussions and activities of the TMC have focused on organizational refinements and plans to increase integration of the TRRP. A letter has been drafted asking for full ROD funding; federal agencies were obliged to abstain from voting on this. He noted that a letter to the regional directors of the Bureau of Recreation (BOR) and Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) from Congressman Wally Herger to the Secretary of the Interior asked that the TMC accept the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) as a member. Herger specifically noted that the voting rules for membership seem exclusive of new membership. Person suggested this issue be taken up again and passed out copies of the letter. Currently, the bylaws require a unanimous vote to accept a new member.

George Kautsky asked if they could vote on a failed motion. It was thought that it was allowed. Dave Hillemeier noted that the Record of Decision named the eight members. Irma noted that the bylaws allowed for changes. She said she was still in support of BLM. Gary Stacy also stated his support and noted the BLM cooperation and success in restoration in the Trinity basin. Dave Hillemeier wanted to confer with the Yurok Tribe leadership before a vote. He noted the success and good work of the BLM. He wondered if a single representative would serve for all Interior Department agencies. He expressed concerns that another Interior representative could affect Tribal interests. Person noted that addition of the extra representative would change the dynamic of blocking affirmative votes. They agreed to think about it overnight and take it up tomorrow.

Report from Executive Director

Mike Hamman noted that copies of his report is in the members’ information packets and he would not go through it in detail as many of the issues will be discussed in more detail later on the agenda. He stated that a letter was sent by the TMC to the Central Valley Operations Office about temperatures and reservoir management had yet to be responded to but there has been discussions with CVO as to how to

best proceed beyond the ad hoc approach that has occurred during 2009. He noted that the RFP process is ongoing and touches on the conflict of interest issue. He also noted the efforts being spent on an operating agreement between the Program office and our partners, budget, and other issues that promote the goals of the TMC that will be discussed in more detail later on the agenda. He noted progress in several areas: the Master EA/EIR that provides the foundation for progress and alleviates some of the site-specific permitting issues, in-channel work terminates today at the Sawmill site, a budget update, and physical office remodeling to provide more space for cooperative partners to work at the Weaverville office. The IDT workgroup has met and will continue to meet to address planning and design matters for rehab sites. The TRRP annual science symposium is being planned for January 12-14 in Weaverville.

Information/Decision Items:

Review and status of TAMWG Recommendations

This was discussed during Whitridge's TAMWG chair report and the minutes record it above.

Proposal for TMC Workshops

Brian Person attended the June TAMWG where a presentation was given by Clair Stalnaker, saying that such as presentation was very valuable. The idea of a workshop has evolved; it would have the flow study authors speak to the TMC on original intent and new ideas. Information on other programs such as the Grand Canyon or Platte River may be useful. Person thought the cost would be relatively low.

George Kautsky said, while he is not opposed to workshops, he asked how this may "hook up" with ongoing processes. He noted several other synthesis or reviews in the past. Would this help to make the program more functional? Person said this would have nothing to do with Dr. Moore's effort on development of business practices. He thought it would be useful to see if the program has strayed from original concepts and whether straying is acceptable. Dr. Stalnaker would be able to comment on program drift and whether it was a good idea or not. Mike Hamman agreed that a strategic view would be helpful. He recently attended a workshop on adaptive management and learned that many other programs are struggling with the same sorts of issues as the TRRP.

John Engbring thought it may be useful to hear from others that are working on similar projects. There would be some investment of time and it would likely be worth the time. Mike Hamman thought it could actually be two presentations, one from the flow study authors and another from similar programs. One advantage to hear from other programs is that others have started an RFP process. Whitridge noted that Nina Hemphill reported to him that the Nature Conservancy has started a review process of how well adaptive management has worked below dams.

If such a presentation was hoped for by the December meeting, it was agreed that decisions and action needs to start right away.

Program Realignment and Integration Update

Randy Brown reported that a list of certified eligible applicants has been established for the Science Coordinator position. He invited members from the TMC to participate in the interview process. Arnold Whitridge and Mike Hamman had already agreed to participate. The Hoopa Tribe, the Yurok Tribe, and Brian Person indicated interest. John Engbring noted the need for confidentiality in anyone's participation in the process. Brown described the process as reviewing resumes, followed by an online conference call, phone interviews with the best candidates, another discussion to rate the candidates, check of references, and finally face to face interviews. Brown hoped that a group agreement would be reached, however it would be Brown's (FWS) final decision.

The Contracting Officer Representative (COR) position is moving forward. A candidate has been selected and an offer is being developed.

Budget Development Process Update

Mike Hamman gave a PowerPoint presentation on the 2009/ 2010 Budget and on a five-year (2011-2015) budget process. Hamman described the steps of the budget process that have been completed so far. He explained aspects of the five-year budget process with multiple steps of committee reviews and comments. He presented a hypothetical five-year budget broken into program administration, implementation, and modeling and analysis.

There was discussion about whether the five-year budget could resolve conflict of interests where agencies may be put in a position to vote on issues that affect their potential to gain or lose funding based on the vote. George Kautsky gave an example of how the tribe or other agencies may go after a specific project that may support their own staff or program. He thought Mike Hamman's approach may eliminate 75 % of the conflict of interest. Gary Stacy gave an example of how competing for projects via an RFP would be welcome to the Department of Fish and Game as he thought the agency would do well given their expertise. Competition would relieve them of the perception of conflict of interest. Person said competition brings out the best in competitors. Other elements that would be built into the five-year process are periodic independent reviews to help advance techniques and provide capacity building or training of partners.

Joe Polos noted a copy of a memo in the members' information package regarding the Integrated Assessment Plan (IAP). A workshop was held on August 4-5, 2009. The workshop prioritized the issues to be addressed (PITAs) in the IAP. Once the list is finalized, the steering committee will consider the IAP to be complete. It was recommended that annual reports address the key hypotheses, assessments and PITAs.

Adjourned for the day, 5:35 PM

8:05 AM Thursday, June 18

At the start of this day of meeting, Person announced that the Herger letter regarding BLM membership would be discussed right before the break for lunch.

Information/Decision Items (continued from yesterday):**2009 Water Year Update**

Brian Person provided an update on the auxiliary bypass valve, a release structure on Trinity Dam that may allow an option for additional management of water release that may be a way to maintain cool river temperatures. It was designed was for emergency releases and it is located at a lower elevation than the normal release point on Trinity Dam. It would release cooler water (two degrees F). Person made a field visit with project engineers to check the condition of the valve. It was found to be in operable condition and could be used but it should be carefully monitored during use. It was deemed to be a real option and could be used this year to help maintain cool temperatures in the river. Using the by-pass valve will lose some electrical power generation. It is thought that the by-pass valve will not be able to resolve the entire temperature problem as there is a limit to how much cool water they can access.

Mike Hamman gave a PowerPoint presentation entitled “2009 Trinity River Operations and Temperatures.” He outlined some the objectives for temperature management in the Trinity River and how releases from the dams may be used to maintain cool water in the Trinity River. Temperature targets in the Trinity are 60 F summer (before September 15) and 56 F in fall. These targets were based on a literature review performed several years ago. River temperatures exceed the 60 F maximum at Douglas City in July; they reached up to 61.7 F with an average of 60.5 F for the month. Hamman showed a graph of dam releases and actual river temperatures measured in the river. As flows out of Lewiston Dam increase, river temperatures drop as witnessed during the Hoopa Boat Dance release. Summer temperatures out of Lewiston are about 52 F. As Lewiston release temperatures rise about 50 F, and air temperatures exceed 70, and direct solar radiation is high, river temperatures rise above 60 F during the peak of the summer heat at Douglas City in July. Hamman thought this period is when one may want to manage additional flow releases. He proposed they put together a temperature subcommittee of the Flow Schedule workgroup to come up with an operational plan. This committee would then evaluate the draft plan to come up with next year’s flow release. Hamman noted that we don’t exactly know what the biological impacts may be, to exceed temperatures of 60 F for two weeks.

Irma Lagomarsino asked if water transfers “over the hill” to the Sacramento system could also be the cause of the exceedance of the maximum temperature target at Douglas City during July this year. Hamman did not know, but thought the two main factors were air temperatures above 70 F and water temperatures beginning to exceed about 51-52 F coming out of Lewiston Dam.

Robert Franklin explained the complex system and decision making used to manage diversions into the Sacramento Valley. He explained the forecasting and thought the Trinity people should coordinate with the Central Valley people as they begin to make decisions about diversions of water to the Sacramento from Lewiston. He thought the Trinity is not getting its due consideration in these discussions as the Central Valley Operations (CVO) has a very large task in managing their system with many “Masters” to serve. He asked what is BOR required to do if they forecast for diversions that may violate storage requirements. Hamman noted that there will be a re-consultation with NMFS on this issue soon regarding carryover storage.

John Engbring asked what needs to be done to formalize action. He thought a committee should be formed.

Dave Hillemeier made a motion to formalize the Trinity Temperature subcommittee to address Trinity River temperature issues so these issues may be integrated into various flow management and decisions. Membership would be technical representatives of the TMC and possibly other technical specialists. A contact person would report back to the TMC.

The motion was seconded by Roger Jaegel.

The motion passed with seven aye votes and one nay vote.

Robert Franklin, representing the Hoopa Valley Tribe, voted against the motion because the committee as formed is a TMC committee and not a Bureau of Reclamation committee. As such, it may not be able to get the attention of the Central Valley Operations group. It was hoped that the establishment of this committee would move towards Franklin's goal of engaging the CVO in flow decisions.

Franklin provided an update on the Hoopa Valley Tribe Boat Dance where four dugout canoes float down the river abreast in a historic ceremony. They pass through several historic riffles and a minimum release is needed to get the canoes through. The flows at Lewiston were increased from 450 cubic feet per second (cfs) to 2650 cfs for a full day and then ramped down to 450 cfs. This quadrupled flow at Hoopa to get a 2.5 foot gain and the release was perfectly timed.

There were noted biological effects. The Willow Creek weir immediately began catching adult Chinook and steelhead with the release. This tailed off with the cessation of increased release at Lewiston.

Dave Hillemeier reported that there are more fish in the river. The tribe has met its catch limits. But they really won't know the actual numbers until January. Bill Brock noted that temperatures look good lately. George Kautsky also reported good catches by the Hoopa Tribe. The ocean recreational catch was not very good. It was thought the chinook were deeper than normal and the fisherman did not find them until late in the catch window.

Trinity River Hatchery Operations Review

Gary Stacey summarized handouts he passed out yesterday. He noted that the hatchery should be operated in a manner to not adversely impact Trinity River fish. A first meeting has been held by an ad hoc committee to address hatchery effects. Issues they are addressing are impacts to listed coho and effects of hatchery fish on natural fish. The committee decided to separate into two groups--the ad hoc and a technical group. The technical group is planning a second meeting for September 23. They have requested that the Hoopa Tribe to join the group to provide their expertise in this area. Person noted that these issues are being addressed in ongoing G2G meetings. Stacey noted that the Department is committed to making the necessary changes but changes are difficult. Person clarified that coho escapement by hatchery fish are 2.5 times higher than goals and these higher numbers of hatchery fish may be competing with natural coho. Also, any decrease in the releases of hatchery coho will affect tribal harvests of this species.

George Kautsky noted that the Hoopa Tribe has had a long-term interest in hatchery operations and have provided inputs to ensure the restoration program is successful. The Tribe wants the tribal trust issues resolved first. Whitridge noted that a perception by TAMWG stakeholders can arise that the Tribe may be holding up the scientific discussions by asking for tribal trust discussions to be resolved first. Whitridge asked that the Tribe simply consider this.

Seth Naman of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) passed out a copy of a report on a literature review of 145 studies on hatchery production effects on wild salmonids. No specific statements were made on specific effects of the Trinity River Hatchery, but the conclusion was that hatchery fish cannot be assumed to have negligible impacts on wild fish. Whitridge thought that the ad hoc committee would use this review as a “good tool” to derive statements about the Trinity hatchery. It was asked, if negative effects are apparent from the Trinity hatchery, how the TMC might act to change hatchery policy of an agency. Person described a consultation process and, if there is general agreement, change can be achieved. Person thought that hatchery goals can be changed.

Sawmill Restoration Site Construction

Jennifer Faler of the TRRP gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Sawmill restoration site. She listed a variety of features that are being constructed at this restoration area. She compared the Sawmill site to past sites and noted this site is more compact. She described how they decided to “phase” the inputs of gravel to protect downstream structures. She said the floodplain may be shifting as a result of the large amounts of gravel inputs. They reduced the gravel inputs by 5,000 cubic yards in order to reduce the predicted flood levels by one foot. A house is within three feet of the modeled 11,000 cfs release flood height. Faler reported that several complaints were received about water turbidity from the Sawmill in-stream work even though the turbidity requirements were met. The construction crew hit clay layers, a turbidity curtain did not work, and she showed a photo showed of a muddy river. This was despite careful turbidity monitoring showing the project stayed within the turbidity limits of 20 NTUs at 500 feet downstream of the site. Faler also showed photos of the on-site gravel processing plant. They produce “fish rock” that ranges from 3/8 to 5 inch diameter. The rock is cleaned and generally rounded. She showed photos of sequential removal of large bank volumes to create a “forced meander.” She also showed photos of creation of gravel bars and point bars. The project cost \$2 million and was completed in 20 days.

Advancing TMC Goals and Policies

TMC Mission for the TRRP

Mike Hamman started the discussion on the TMC Mission for TRRP by giving a PowerPoint presentation entitled, “Advancing TMC Goals and Policies.” He asked if there really was a stated mission for the TRRP. He noted that the ROD has been “in flux” since the first year, the agencies bring their own missions to “the table,” and these missions are often not “in sync” with each other. He also noted the lack of resolution of the government to government issues and asked if this is an impediment to resolving a program mission.

Responding to questions, Hamman clarified that the ROD itself has not been in flux, but the interpretation of the ROD has been in flux. Roger Jaegel thought the mission and the objectives of the ROD are clear. Jaegel thought that the problem is that no one is in a leadership role in deciding how to accomplish the objectives. Brian Person thought also, that there is general agreement on the ROD. It

may be that certain areas were left “gray by design,” given all the agencies and interest groups involved. The ROD perhaps describes the “what or why” but not the “who or how.” Irma Lagomarsino clarified that Hamman could not locate a mission statement. She noted that goals and objectives do exist concerning hydrology and escapement goals. She agreed that a mission statement could be useful in guiding decisions. Person asked how a mission would differ from a goal. Whitridge noted that a mission or goal statement was approved at a meeting and is on the front page of the IAP document. George Kautsky said the mission should speak toward their purpose and acknowledge the diversity of the participants and their responsibilities. He thought a flow chart may help to relate these terms. The preamble to the US Constitution was brought up as an example of stating a set of goals and a mission. Bill Brock noted that a similar effort took over a year for the TMC to accomplish. John Engbring thought the mission should be succinct and related to fish production. Person thought that the TMC could not wordsmith a mission statement, but that he would be willing to try if the group wanted.

Gary Stacey asked how the TMC would do things differently with an official mission statement. He said they all seem to understand the mission of the TRRP as to establish the anadromous fishery of the Trinity. But he did understand how a formal mission statement might make the TMC more efficient in their management.

Roger Jaegel suggested that Mike Hamman develop a one page statement of what Hamman thought the mission is and what it needs. When asked what he is looking for, Hamman said he wanted to see that the TMC has discussed the mission and that it is or isn’t different from the directives of the ROD. He wanted to know if the mission has evolved and that the partners agree to it. Roger Jaegel stressed that he heard during the float trip that Andreas Krause noted the need for a policy change in order to institute some construction change. Jaegel said he would need to know exactly what policy prevents the program from doing specific things.

Person asked Hamman to develop a one- or two-page statement of the issues of lack of mission or mission drift as a start of this process. Dave Hillemeier asked that Hamman would include specific examples of where decisions or actions are at odds with the missions.

Break for lunch.

Discussion of Congressman Herger’s request to consider TMC membership for BLM

Brian Person opened this item that was tabled from yesterday. He asked if there was more discussion or any response that could be delivered back as a response.

Gary Stacey motioned that the council add BLM to the TMC membership.

John Engbring seconded the motion.

Based on the discussion of the motion, Stacey and Engbring withdrew the motion.

During discussion of the above motion, John Engbring noted that adding too many members can slow progress. But adding one more member can keep the group vital and growing. The fact that the public

does not come to the meetings suggests that interest is lacking. Roger Jaegel added that BLM has a lot of land along the river and they are viewed as very good partners in restoration. BLM has a bias for action and getting things done. Brian Person said he was sensitive to Dave Hillemeier's concerns that another Department of Interior member could create a voting block or imbalance. Person noted that in the past, he and Mike Long of the FWS have voted differently. Hillemeier thanked Person for putting off the vote until today as he had a chance to confer with his tribal council. He said he would not be able to vote in support until the tribe had a chance to discuss in their tribal council meeting. George Kautsky also wanted to wait until he has a chance to confer within his tribal group. He also cited Robert's Rules of Order that allows revisiting a formerly defeated issue if it is brought up by a supporting member. The rules required that the motion be reconsidered the same day or in the same meeting. He further noted that it hasn't been "agendized." Person agreed with this reasoning and asked the motion makers to have the motion be postponed until the next meeting when it will be on the agenda. Jaegel and Engbring agreed to withdraw the motion.

Advancing TMC Goals and Policies (continuation of Item discussion)

Following the consideration of Congressman Herger's letter, Mike Hamman continued his PowerPoint presentation and discussion of the TMC goals and policies.

Program Integration – Partner staff at Program Office

Hamman introduced the concept of Program Integration and reported that the TRRP is working on an integration plan. He suggested creating greater synergy and sharing of resources throughout the Klamath/Trinity basin. He said the future Science Program Coordinator will be a key to integration. Hamman also suggested that program partners provide a staff member at the Weaverville Office.

George Kautsky said that Hoopa Tribe is very guarded about the resources available for restoration of the Trinity. He asked how sharing of resources with the Klamath basin would work. Hamman responded that neither group (Klamath or Trinity) will be interested in providing funds in either direction, but sharing of ideas and strategies would benefit both groups. He further pointed out the lower 40 miles of the Klamath are part of the Trinity in that Trinity fish must swim through this part during anadromous migrations. Dave Hillemeier noted that there could be advantages and that the "devil would be in the details." John Engbring thought sharing of funds is not the idea, but sharing of ideas or consultant tasks.

Procurement Policy – Proposal Process

Hamman noted that a policy for procurement is lacking and that it may be appropriate to review or revise the existing policy for TMC approval. He also said he is developing a draft policy with an RFP process. The policy would include building partner capacity in order to capitalize on Program expertise and would utilize experts to assist with technical development and reviews.

Roger Jaegel suggested that they address the real issue here—that is, of conflict of interest. He said the tribes have been on the river for centuries and they should have the expertise to do much of the work. He asked given this case, how do we document that they have the expertise and that they are doing the work to standards? He said this could be done in the way the work is specified and how it is inspected and not necessarily in discussions of a procurement policy.

Peer and Third Party Reviews for all Assessments

Hamman recommended the use of peer review and third party reviews.

Base Funding Agreements for Partners

Hamman said agreements could be established to eliminate perceived conflict of interest, streamline the procurement process and allow long-term planning.

TRRP Operating Agreement or Plan

Hamman recommended the program dedicate staff toward developing an understanding of how to work together under a mission statement. He suggested dedicating FY 2010 toward resolving long-term management issues. He suggested this start with a senior staff planning meeting in October.

George Kautsky thought that the mission statement exercise may help with the issues listed by Hamman. Hamman agreed that there are a number of issues that are clouding the program.

Person clarified that the program partners should put staff toward contributing. Bill Brock noted that he is the only staff he has. Roger Jaegel said he would be happy to offer Trinity County entire planning staff. George Kautsky, John Engbring, Gary Stacey, and Irma Lagomarsino all agreed to support this process with staff. They expressed that there is some “fuzziness” in the details, but that they expressed that they trusted in the direction that Hamman is proposing to go.

TRRP Annual Report

Mike Hamman mentioned a successful reporting procedure used by the Grand Canyon. They also published a 10-year retrospective that highlights successes and failures. The TRRP has already started work on an annual report and has started planning for a 10-year report for 2012.

John Engbring said he would like to see the draft report. Irma Lagomarsino thought it should not be too long and have nice photos.

TMC Retreat – Follow up meeting and dialogue

Brian Person opened the discussion noting that he refers to the retreat notes regularly. Some of the retreat items are listed in the newly created Action Tracker. Gary Stacy wanted to note that he really enjoyed dinner and the discussion that occurred there.

Person reviewed the Action Tracker and noted which have had action or effort. Irma Lagomarsino referred to her notes from the retreat and brought up the method by which items are brought up for future agenda. Person asked if the current method works by having Mike Hamman review past meeting notes, drawing up a draft agenda, review by Person, and emailing out. The members generally agreed. Kautsky asked if they could receive the materials in the information package possibly ahead of time and with notes indicating to which agenda items the materials are associated. Dave Hillemeier suggested they number the agenda items and then note this on the supporting documents. Lagomarsino noted that they also agreed to have a meeting closeout review. Name tags were suggested to be placed on the table. It was suggested that monthly conference calls be continued.

Open Forum: Comments from the public

Kim Mattson, as a member of the public, offered his opinion that the mission statement of the ROD, to restore fisheries to pre-dam levels, is probably unattainable and this is probably the reason why there is discussion about defining the mission at this time in the program. He further noted that there doesn't appear to be a successful river restoration program in the United States. This generated some comments that progress is being made and that this is the purpose. Person noted that when he came to the program three years ago, he thought the science was "in place" to restore fisheries despite all the constraints. He now acknowledges that this is a formidable task.

Franklin suggested that when actions or assignments are made a specific person be assigned to the task. Mike Hamman agreed to handle this.

Calendars: Confirm next meeting dates and locations

The next meeting is scheduled for December 16-17 in Redding, CA.

Conference calls were scheduled for the third Wednesday of the month from 10 AM to noon.

The workshops for flow study authors, Platt River and Grand Canyon experts workshops would be handled by Mike Hamman.

March meeting would be scheduled during one of the upcoming conference calls.

Adjourn at 3:40 PM