

Trinity Management Council (TMC) Meeting 1/9/03

Location: Cattleman's Restaurant, Redding, CA

TMC members present: Mike Ryan, Chair, Bureau of Reclamation; Mary Ellen Mueller, Vice Chair, USFWS; Irma Lagomarsino, NOAA Fisheries; Sharon Heywood, US Forest Service; Mike Orcutt, Hoopa Valley Tribe; Dave Hillemeier (alternate), Yurok Tribe; Tim Ramirez, California Resources Agency; Ralph Modine, Trinity County

Others present: Doug Schleusner, Executive Director; Ed Solbos, Noelyn Habana, Andreas Krause, and Daryl Peterson, Trinity River Restoration Program Office; Bill Brock, USFS; Russell Smith, BOR/Shasta Dam; Curtis Anderson, DWR; Charlie Chamberlain and George Guillen, USFWS; Neil Manji, Harry Rectenwald, and Steve Turek, DFG; Tim Hayden, Yurok Tribal Fisheries; Allison O'Brien, DOI/OEPC/Portland; Jeff Phipps, CVP Power Customers; Kate Grossman, Americorps Watershed Stewards; Jim Monroe, DOI/MP Solicitor's Office;

New TAMWG members present: Serge Birk, CVP Water Assn.; Arnold Whitridge; Pat Frost, TCRCD; Jim Spear, NRCS; Ed Duggan, Willow Creek CSD/Fishing Guide; Jim Feider, City of Redding Electric Utility; Tim Colvin, Vacations Forever/Trinity Lake; Dave Steinhauser, Trinity River Rafting; Richard Lorenz, river resident

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m.

Ralph Modine asked that the TMC write a letter to DOI in support of appealing Judge Wanger's decision. The item was added to the agenda.

Doug Schleusner had two changes/clarifications to the 9/25/02 meeting minutes. The changes were noted and incorporated. Dave Hillemeier had several minor edits to last meeting's minutes, mostly clerical in nature. They are as follows:

- Paragraph 8 under heading "Letter to DOI", change to:
"Doug Schleusner expressed concern with the length of time it would take to get the federal, state, and tribal biologist recommendations. "
- Paragraph 2 under "Letter to DOI", delete KMC in second sentence and replace with "the Klamath Basin Fisheries Task Force"
- Paragraph 1 under "Budget", 7th line, change "\$240,000 from the CVPIA restoration fund" to "\$2.4 million from the CVPIA restoration fund".
- Paragraph 1 under "Report on May 2002 6,000 cfs Releases" delete "a report by Curtis Anderson, Department of Water Resources, was also made available." Add: "The following reports were also made available:

"Trinity River Flows and Their Influence on Water Temperatures of the Trinity River, a preliminary investigation—WY 2002" by Paul Zedonis, USFWS;

Trinity High Water Staking—May 2002, DWR;

Summary of Rotary Screw Trap Data During Spring 2002 Flow Releases of 6,000 cfs from Lewiston Dam, USFWS;

Maintenance and Effectiveness of the Hamilton Ponds – UPDATE; TRRP.

- Paragraph 5 under “Fisheries Update”, first sentence, “Clove Flat” was changed to “Clover Flat”.
- Paragraph 2 under “Lower Klamath River Fish Kill”, first sentence, add USFWS, Yurok, Hoopa, and Karuk Tribes have been doing in response to the fish kill after “Neil Manji gave a report on what CDF&G”

Sharon Heywood motioned that the minutes be approved as amended. Mary Ellen Mueller seconded the motion and the motion carried.

The TMC members present introduced themselves. Tim Ramirez and Mike Orcutt were not yet present. Doug Schleusner called on the TAMWG members present to introduce themselves. Please see attached sheet for list of TAMWG members. The first meeting of the TAMWG is scheduled for February 20th and 21st in Weaverville. The meeting is open to the public and everyone is welcome to attend. Mike Ryan welcomed the new TAMWG members and thanked them for their patience and their efforts.

Open Forum:

There were no public comments.

Mike Ryan noted that a public comment period would also be added to the agenda for the end of the meeting.

Fisheries Update

Neil Manji, California Department of Fish and Game (CDF&G), gave an update on CDF&G’s fisheries program. See attached handouts.

Neil presented the preliminary estimates for fall chinook returning to the Trinity and Klamath Rivers. He reported that the estimates and analysis for this year’s run is not yet finished. Fish were still running through December and even into January and there is a lot involved in estimating numbers. He reported that the CDF&G mega-table will be out in approximately three weeks. Additional analysis is needed as some information holes still exist. The current estimate is 146,413 fish. This number does not include some tributary counts that will add another six to ten thousand extra fish. Neil’s best guess for final count is 160,000 fish.

Neil reported that George Guillen, CDF&G, the Tribes, and others are currently trying to analyze numbers from the fish kill in terms of cohort /class and age group. The Trinity fall chinook are just about all in for this year and the current count is approximately 22,000, which is about 35% of last year’s 63,000. The Department is looking into whether the fish kill hit the Trinity harder than the Klamath. Neil handed out the last page of mega-table for comparison to 2001.

In estimating numbers from the fish kill, much of the data was taken from hatchery tags, fish tagged from the Trinity River hatchery and Iron Gate Dam. From the tags we can estimate what proportion came from the Trinity Side, what proportion are hatchery fish, etc. They can also determine the jack and grill component and the age structure.

This year is the first year that fall chinook will be less than spring chinook. Fall chinook numbers usually double those of spring chinook. Neil estimated that about 38,000 spring returned this year as compared to 22,000 fall chinook.

Neil does not expect numbers to change by more than a couple of thousand of fish, however, numbers are kept preliminary until next year's numbers come out. Fall chinook are usually the biggest part of the department's analysis and they do see the entire run of fall and spring Chinook. CDF&G's Annual Report includes numbers and estimates for fall-run chinook, spring-run chinook, steelhead, and Coho. Neil stated that he would be able to give a full report on that at a later date. The CDF&G Annual Report takes approximately one year to complete, however, preliminary numbers are available. Neil reported that the majority of estimates have good confidence intervals and he believes that they are pretty tight numbers.

Egg take goal was met on Klamath side. On the Trinity side, the 6 million egg take goal was not met. 4.7 million eggs were taken. However, Neil believes that due to hatchery renovations, the department will still be able to produce 3 million fish from the 4.7 million eggs. Unfortunately, due to the fish kill, the genetic diversity of the eggs taken is not as stratified as it normally would be. The number of eggs taken is not proportionately representative of the peak, as most of those fish did not make it up the river.

Status of Ongoing Litigation and the SEIS/EIR

Jim Monroe, representing USFWS and BOR, presented a history of the ongoing Trinity litigation as well as an update on the status of the SEIS/EIR.

DOI has not yet made the final decision on appeal, but discussion is underway. Jim expects the DOI to appeal or at least to explain to the Court why 120 days is not an adequate time period for the completion of the SEIS/EIR. December 9, 2002 is the starting point for the 120 days the lead agencies have to complete an SEIS/EIR. The clock for appeal is 60 days and it started on January 3, 2003. In order to appeal, DOI must appeal to the Department of Justice. The Solicitor General then makes the final decision.

Mike Ryan stated that work has begun on the SEIS and that effort continues. The challenge is what will be in the Supplement. Pending appeal, it is uncertain whether it will contain everything in the judge's order. Without that knowledge it is difficult to say how long it will take. Mike thinks it looks like an order of magnitude of over a year. The four co-leads are continuing to work on the preparation of the SEIS/EIR. Even after a decision to appeal is made, the outcome of appeal is still unknown. Mike does not believe that the Supplement will be completed before next water year due to NEPA and CEQA time guidelines. He reported that the technical folks continue to do all they can on the document.

Jim Monroe reported that the Purpose and Need Statement does need to be changed but it has not been decided what it will be changed to.

Sharon Heywood asked whether there is any history of a case where the Purpose and Need Statement has been ruled to narrow. She noted that agencies are usually granted that discretion.

Jim Monroe agreed that the courts usually defer the discretion to appropriately determine scope to the administrative agency. He feels that this aspect of the decision needs to be appealed.

Tom Stokely explained that the Judge did direct the agencies to develop and analyze an Integrated Management Alternative. The Judge chastised the federal agencies because the BO's came out at same time as the EIS/EIR and the prudent and reasonable measures were therefore not incorporated into final EIS/EIR.

Jim Monroe responded that one of the areas DOI is looking to appeal on is the Judge's statement that the reasonable and prudent measures in the BO were reasonable and prudent alternatives not measures. Judge Wanger found that the reasonable and prudent measures were major modifications and that they should have been included in the EIS/EIR. However, Jim reported that disclosing the effects of BOs is not

usually called for in the EIS process. Under that scenario, lead agencies would be caught in an eternal endangered species consultation.

Director's Report

Doug Schleusner reported on the activities of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP). He prepared a five page summary of the quarterly report. The summary was handed out and it will be distributed over the list serve.

During the past quarter, the Trinity River Restoration Program staff has focused on five major areas: 1) orientation of new employees, 2) development of the FY 2003 call letter and evaluation of proposals, 3) preparation for the first meeting of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG), 4) planning and design for the Salt Flat and Treadwell bridges, and 5) establishing a framework for the monitoring program.

Ten new employees have been added to the TRRP staff. A lot of time has been spent getting the staff up to speed, taking field trips, meeting with residents and different agencies.

The 2003 call letter went out in October and all responses were received by November 29, 2002. The month of December was spent reviewing proposals and putting together the TAMWG.

Ed Solbos has been the lead on planning and design for Salt Flat and Treadwell bridges. Daryl Peterson has been putting together the monitoring and analysis aspect of program, contacting fisheries biologists, agencies, and tribes to put that together. Two positions are pending at the TRRP office. It is expected that an offer will be made for the GIS position later this month (January). TRRP is currently reviewing applications. They are also hoping to advertise a Grants and Special Agreements position in February.

Doug's handout lists all 19 members of the TAMWG and who they represent. The first TAMWG meeting is expected to be largely organizational, laying out operating procedures and sub-committees. An in-depth briefing on the restoration program will be presented. USFWS is the lead agency in terms of managing and supporting the advisory committee but the field office in Weaverville will be helping.

The TRRP is looking at a pilot site for a channel rehabilitation project at Hocker Flat, which is the site located furthest downstream on the river. The office has also been talking to Sacramento about the issue of mercury in mine tailings. Mary Ellen and Doug will be making a presentation in Seattle at an adaptive management workshop.

A summary of the high flow report was put together by Andreas Krause. The report was synthesized from work of four different agencies. Copies of those reports are available via Andreas Krause or Daryl Peterson at the TRRP office. Tim Ramirez asked about the possibility of publishing that document. Andreas commented that it is based on preliminary findings and would need more revision before publication. Tim feels that publishing the paper in an independent journal would help to bring a different perspective and a different sort of peer review. He suggested TRRP think about going in that direction. Daryl Peterson agreed that it would be a good idea and would like to follow up on it. He feels it would help to strengthen the integrated approach the program tries to promote and that it would also help to strengthen the technical base. The general feeling of the TMC was that publication would be a good idea.

Mike Orcutt asked about impediments to implementation of the 47 project sites and the bridges project. Doug replied that it was recognized the program would have a "transition" year to get staff together and focus on environmental planning. North State Resources (NSR) is under contract for the environmental review of the bridges project as well as for the channel rehab projects. The office is looking at 25 channel rehab sites and is focusing on a few pilot sites and all that goes into them. Doug reported that the most

likely things to be implemented on the ground this year are the first two bridges, the Hocker Flat pilot site, and the gravel introduction site. The impediments to implementation were that the office was not fully staffed and that they are trying to have more interaction with fisheries biologists, and others in order to find out what the needs of the program are, how to get the “biggest bang for the buck”. TRRP is trying to involve all the agencies. There was a letter of protest filed with the RWQCB on the cableway gravel introduction project and they are trying to resolve that in order to implement that project this year. Mike Orcutt suggested that whatever influence the Resources Agency has with the State Water Quality Control Board would be useful in getting things cleared up in terms of permitting.

Regarding mercury and mine tailings, Doug reported that over the last 2-3 months there have been questions raised and TRRP is becoming more aware of the problem. It is too soon to say the extent of problem, but they are talking with the different agencies. Serge Birk commented that this issue was not addressed in the EIS/EIR and it probably should be in the SEIS/EIR.

BREAK

Bridges

Ed Solbos gave a PowerPoint presentation on the status of the Trinity River Restoration Bridges Project. Ed is the Implementation Branch Chief for the TRRP.

Ed began by describing the relationship of the peak flows under the ROD and the need for bridge replacement. Currently, the Safety of Dam (SOD) criteria for Lewiston Dam is a 6,000 cfs release due to bridges and other structures located downstream. However, under the ROD, maximum releases will be increased to 11,000 cfs. The basis for the bridges project is mandated by the ROD in order to accommodate the higher flows. The four bridges to be replaced are located downstream of Lewiston Dam at Salt Flat, Bucktail, Treadwell and Poker Bar.

Substrate sampling, load testing, stress strain gages, and a hydrology study have been completed. Ed explained the rationale behind design of the bridges and the process of determining the flows they must pass. Different alternatives were developed to address the releases prescribed in the ROD. These alternatives included maintaining the current bridges, retrofitting the current bridges, eliminating the bridges and developing alternative routes, constructing a new bridge upstream, constructing a new bridge downstream, and constructing a new bridge in the same spot the old one was (this alternative is not as feasible). Ed explained the public and landowner involvement process. The NEPA and CEQA documents are being developed as are all other necessary permits. The total cost for two bridges (Treadwell and Salt Flat) is estimated at \$2,531,000.

Tom Stokely explained Trinity County’s funding sources for the bridges from the California Department of Fish and Game’s Coastal Salmon Recovery Program. Ed reported that \$300,000 was budgeted for NEPA and CEQA for all four bridges. The draft environmental documents should be completed in March and all other permits should be completed by May. The construction contract will be awarded in June and the new bridge open to traffic in February, 2004.

Gravel Management Plan:

Andreas Krause gave a power point presentation on the long-term gravel management plan. The goals of the plan are to increase and maintain coarse sediment storage, to mobilize scour and redeposit, to route coarse sediment downstream, and to improve salmonid habitat. The plan strategy was put together by McBain and Trush. Andreas went over short term and long term augmentation, the need for coarse sediment augmentation, short tem and long term injection, delta management, size and composition, injection sites, placement methods, and monitoring procedures.

The plan written by McBain and Trush is a draft. TRRP will finalize it and integrate it into their other plans and monitoring strategies. Envisioned additions include greater detail regarding particle size distribution and logistics, sediment transport model and sediment budget, linkage between data collection, evaluation, and adaptive management.

Draft will be available for peer review in February.

Serge Birk stated that the TRRP needs to take a look at what happened in the past and reconcile concerns. Andreas agreed but stated it is necessary to take into consideration that how the gravel reacted before will be different than how it will react with a different flow schedule. He feels there are limitations to learning from what has been done in the past. Doug pointed out that the plan is not intended to appease critics and that the concerns have been discussed.

Serge responded that the more that is explained, the less we have to have the same debates. More disclosure is necessary. The stakeholders are here to partner with the program.

Daryl commented that one reason they took this on was to set things right, to get involved with stakeholders concerns and work with them. The plan will be available to the public. Andreas said he would take names of anyone interested and he will send it out when it is available. Serge suggested that the TRRP take a more proactive stance and issue it to as many people as are on the list. He suggested holding a workshop to present it and help to finalize it. Doug confirmed that there is money in the budget for such a workshop.

Mike Orcutt expressed his concern that the program will not go ahead and implement the non-flow related aspects of the ROD because we do not know the flows. He does not want the program to head into “paralysis by analysis”. Ed explained that EIS stated two places where gravel needed to be injected despite flows, the cableway and hatchery sites. The other sites seem to be driven by higher flows. They involve larger amounts of gravel and without flows it does not make sense to implement them because the gravel will not go anywhere. He agreed that he does not want the rest of program to remain idle.

Serge Birk explained Byron Leydecker’s concern that when rock was moved in the past, it filled in good holding pools. Serge thinks that would be a good document. He has not heard anyone respond to Byron’s concerns and whether or not they are legitimate.

Doug stated that monitoring has taken place in that area and the general consensus among biologists, hydrologists, etc. was that the gravel went exactly where they thought it would and is doing what it should. Doug agrees that a more comprehensive look at the effects is a good idea. Doug wants everyone’s voice heard.

Science Advisory Board

Daryl Peterson gave a power point presentation on the Science Advisory Board (SAB). Daryl is the monitoring and analysis branch chief for the TRRP. The science board will be an independent review panel that interacts directly with the TMC and the AEAM team. The role of the Board is to conduct and maintain an overall review of the science aspects of the Trinity River Program, to ensure the use of good science on the river. They will make recommendations to the TMC on how well the adaptive management team is working. The Board will consist of five scientists (experts). The Board members will be chosen by Doug based on recommendations from the Technical Modeling and Assessment group. Nominations from the TMC and TAMWG on those to be invited to apply are welcome and must be received by January 31, 2003. The appointments are four-year non-renewable appointments. The Technical Modeling and Assessment Team will review the applications submitted and will make recommendations to the TMC and the TRRP executive director. Final list will be presented to the TMC. Over one hundred names have already been submitted.

Daryl would like to focus on the invited application in order to recruit top members of the field. Potential board members will be recruited from both agencies and academics. Members should have a knowledge of western river systems and northern California.

Dave Hillemeier suggested that the position be published in periodicals and journals. There was discussion on not just conducting an invited application process. Daryl agreed to put out the job description in a broader manner.

The SAB Work plan includes the development of a comprehensive monitoring plan that will close the adaptive management loop (put monitoring back into implementation). Recommendations will be provided to Doug by April and the final list will be presented to the TMC in May. The Final Comprehensive Monitoring Plan is set for completion August 31, 2003. Travel expenses for the board members are reimbursable. It has not yet been decided whether or not Board members will be reimbursed for time, however, it is worded that way in the implementation plan. Tim Ramirez suggested it would be a good idea to reward the Board members because the program does expect them to put in a lot of time and effort. This would also help to get top notch people. Daryl is going to have a facilitator help with the process of developing the plan.

LUNCH

After lunch, Ralph Modine explained Trinity County's position on appealing Judge Wanger's decision. The Trinity County Board of Supervisors has authorized a letter to Gale Norton urging her to appeal.

Ralph made motion that the TMC send a similar letter to the secretary.

Mike Ryan explained that BOR has not made final decision on whether to appeal all, part, or none of the decision. He feels that he would need to abstain because the agency has no position at this time. Mary Ellen Mueller, as a representative of the USFWS, and Irma Lagomarsino, NOAA Fisheries, stated that they would also have to abstain. With the Federal agencies abstaining the vote would not pass.

Dave Hillemeier said he would support the motion on behalf of the Yurok Tribe. Mike Orcutt supports the intent of the motion, however he recognized that it would not pass.

Tom Stokely suggested that the TMC amend the operating procedure and then take a vote. Mike Ryan is concerned that is not a good way to build credibility and to set precedents for future issues. Doug feels that Tom's suggestion would be more appropriate in a broader context and this issue will be on an agenda for a future TMC meeting.

Ralph withdrew the motion. He hopes that internally, Mary Ellen, Irma, and Mike would urge the appeal. He feels that the decision is an affront to 20 years of work on the restoration of the river as well as to the new field office. It is very important to Ralph and Trinity County that the TMC make every effort to have Wanger's ruling overturned.

Tim Ramirez stated that it has been discussed at the Resources Agency and that it will be addressed with several other issues affecting the state of California simultaneously. The State is not yet a participant and Tim does not know what the response will be but it will be in support of the ROD, and the work that has already been done.

Mike Ryan suggested that if an individual or entity would like to send a letter to DOI regarding appeal, it should be sent by early next week in order to get in on the process in time. Jim Monroe explained that a letter would be most effective within 21 days after the Judge's decision. If the letter is sent to DOI within

that time, it would be taken into consideration in their recommendation to the Department of Justice and the Solicitor General.

USFWS Fisheries update

Mary Ellen Mueller gave a power point presentation on the new Strategic Vision of the USFWS Fisheries program. The USFWS began preparation for developing a Regional Step-down plan by identifying key partners and contacts and coordinating partner input.

The new administration is supportive of the fisheries component of USFWS. Mary Ellen explained the background of the new focus and the new presidential management agenda. Mary Ellen has a copy of the Strategic Vision and will get them to those that contact her by email.

The Strategic Vision aims to strike a balance between recreational uses and conservation activities. Key points include partnerships and accountability, a reconnection with traditional constituents, aquatic species conservation and management, public use, cooperation with Native Americans, leadership in science and technology, and aquatic habitat conservation and management. Natural fish production is addressed in the Strategic Vision. It is not specifically called out as not to alienate recreation groups. There will be a National Fisheries Project Leaders meeting the week of January 20th in Washington D.C. More information is available on the USFWS website.

Funding Watershed Restoration Activities in the Tributaries

Tom Stokely handed out the latest draft of issue paper on the causal linkages of tributaries and watershed restoration to the Trinity River Division. Please see attached issue paper.

Tom did not want to ask the TMC to take a vote on this issue. He suggested that the TAMWG take up the issue of using TRRP funds to work in tributaries and watersheds.

Tom gave a background on the Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Restoration Grant Program administered by Trinity County with funding from the restoration program. He explained that when it came time for the TMC to consider the grant program recommendations, the BOR stated that it would be inconsistent with the Solicitor's Opinion of 1998 to allow work within watersheds and tributaries downstream of the North Fork, specifically the South Fork. Tom explained that Trinity County does not disagree with the Solicitor's Opinion, just BOR's interpretation of it. He also pointed out that the program is paying for some watershed and tributary project upstream of the North Fork.

Based on Reclamation's interpretation the watershed restoration component of the ROD cannot be funded by the BOR funds. Tom feels this creates confusion and does not make sense because work in the tributaries is essential to meeting restoration goals. Tom mentioned some of the work being done by the Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program and the tangible results being seen in the tributaries. Money from the restoration program could help to leverage funds from other agencies to implement watershed and tributary work.

Tom asked that TAMWG consider this and that the TMC remain flexible and open to funding projects. Tom left the issue open for discussion. If the TAMWG is interested, he offered to give a presentation in more detail on the issue paper. He would also like to present some of Trinity County's work through the Five Counties program.

Mike Ryan replied that BOR recognizes the importance of watershed restoration; however, the program has to be careful to spend BOR money on legal projects in accordance with the Solicitor's opinion. This also has implications for the credibility of the program. Mike feels it is important to clarify this point. He sent Tom's issue paper to Washington D.C. explaining that TMC was working on it and would like some

clarification. He is hopeful that we can come up with a screening process to assign the correct funds to the correct projects. Tom feels we need to resolve this before next county RFP goes out.

Irma Lagomarsino noted that one thing she did not see in the issue paper was affect of the TRD on the nutrient balance of the South Fork. Because the TRD has affected populations returning to the South Fork, there are less spawners dying resulting in less carcasses. The depletion of carcasses would affect the nutrient balance in the South Fork River.

Mike Ryan suggested that we get the issue paper into final form so that he can go ahead and try to sort out a decision. Dave Hillemeier noted that part of the ROD is to implement watershed restoration even in the lower river and that the program needs to move in that direction. Mike Ryan would like the TMC to come up with criteria in implementing the program that gives us a screening of projects, if the interpretation of the Solicitor's opinion is not changed.

Tom will get a copy of the final draft to Mike Ryan.

Jim Spear shed some light on the history of the Trinity River Task Force and its watershed restoration program. He is concerned with the "mainstem" approach the program seems to be taking. For example, Jim reported that there is currently a proposal to dredge the delta at Rush Creek, and there is even discussion on continually dredging that area. The program does not seem to be concerned that the delta was caused by problems in the upper watershed. No one is looking at the watershed approach in Rush Creek. The program is taking a "mainstem" approach and has drifted from the watershed focus. This is not cost effective. Other partners will not be a party if there is no attention paid to a watershed approach.

Jeff Phipps stated that there will be resistance to watershed work from many of the stakeholders. The more funds that are pulled away from CVPIA for Trinity, the higher the resistance will be. CVPIA funds are considered to be fully reimbursable through power and water users.

Mary Ellen is the designated federal official for TAMWG and will work with Doug. Ralph Modine wants the TAMWG to recognize the importance of this issue to Trinity County.

Fiscal Year Budget Update

Doug Schleusner gave a power point presentation summarizing the FY 2003 Budget. On September 25, 2002, the TMC approved a budget of \$12.1 million. A call letter was distributed on October 21, 2002 and \$11 million worth of proposals were received by November 29, 2002. With the TMC's approval, Doug hopes to initiate funding agreements by January 13, 2003. The objective for this year is to get funding agreements to the proponents by March or April.

The appropriated funds from BOR and USFWS are expected to be similar to FY 2002, but that the amounts could be less in the final appropriation bills. The federal agencies are operating under the Continuing Resolution (CR) through January 11, 2003. Another CR is expected through at least January 30, 2003. The \$2.4 million dollar request from the CVPIA Restoration Fund is unlikely to be granted and Judge Wanger's decision may have funding implications for the SEIS/EIR. Those costs are unknown at this time.

The current estimate of available funding amounts to \$10,231,000. In order to meet the reduced budget, the program of work has been modified to focus on two bridges (Salt Flat and Treadwell), rather than four. This will allow for flows of up to 8,500 cfs and will not require the use of CVPIA funds. In addition, the \$100,000 requested by Trinity County for the CEQA appendix to the SEIS/EIR was shifted to SEIS Amendments, a broader category. Six funding agreements/contracts were also recommended for deferred funding for a savings of \$800,000. These projects include Channel Rehab Pilot Construction, \$400,000; Long Term Gravel Introductions, \$200,000; Green Sturgeon Habitat Use, \$50,000; Egg

Viability/Thermal History, \$90,000; Spring-Run Scale Analysis, \$26,400; Grass Valley Creek Restoration Assessment \$20,000. The program looked at ongoing tasks vs. new ones, whether or not the timing was urgent, and how the project contributed to the core of the program in coming up with recommendations for deferred funding.

The summary of recommended initial funding agreements totals \$9,557,000.

Doug asked the TMC for the approval to move forward with the budget as proposed.

Several TMC members expressed their concern with the Green Sturgeon Project being deferred for funding. The project is time critical and that little research is currently available on the Green sturgeon. Doug stated that one reason for the recommendation of deferred funding on that project is that he believed it would be funded through Native American Affairs.

George Guillen provided some insight into the network involved with the Green Sturgeon Project and explained that part of that network was based on funding through TRRP. The project is a part of a cost share program, and loss of funding through the TRRP may put the other funding sources at risk.

Daryl Peterson agreed to work with those concerned about the Green Sturgeon Project to try to find a different program for deference.

Doug explained that the \$100,000 moved from Trinity County's CEQA request will go into a different category so that it may be used for either NEPA or CEQA, whichever is needed.

Tom Stokely stated that if Trinity County is unable to meet CEQA obligations due to lack of funding, the County will not certify the SEIS/EIR. A disconnect in NEPA and CEQA could result in having to do split environmental documents.

Doug responded that his intent was to better describe the SEIS/EIR contract modifications.

Serge Birk asked whether there was a better way to package the budget in terms of where the money is being spent and on what types of activities. Doug responded that the program is divided into three categories: Program Administration, Rehab and Implementation, and Monitoring and Analysis.

Mary Ellen and Mike Ryan agree that the budget is a reasonable one. Mike Ryan feels that the program needs to go ahead with the information currently available. Adjustments may need to be made later.

Mike Orcutt would like to call out the \$930,000 set aside in the budget for the bridges separately from the funds that we have direct control over.

Mike Ryan proposed a motion that the TMC re-evaluate the situation of the parties involved (relative to the green sturgeon project) to try to find a better solution. Mary Ellen made a motion that the TMC accept a recommendation with the understanding of working on the green sturgeon situation. Tim Ramirez seconded the motion.

Motion passed 8:0:0.

Open Forum

Harry Rectenwald announced that there are copies of the CDF&G Report on the Klamath fish kill on the back table. It is also available on the CDF&G website, www.dfg.gov

Tim Ramirez asked about the TMC's involvement with the TAMWG and their upcoming meeting.

Mike Ryan responded that he will be going to the meeting. TMC members will not be required to be there but he thinks it is a good idea, especially for the first meeting.

Next meeting

Mike Orcutt would like to coordinate with the meeting schedules of other entities as to avoid conflict where possible.

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday April 29th in Weaverville.

It was decided that the Klamath Task Force will be approached for a joint meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.