

Final Minutes
Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group
Veteran's Memorial Hall 101 Memorial Lane, Weaverville, CA

Wednesday, March 22, 2006

The meeting was open to the public.

1:00 P.M. convene

Members in attendance:

Member:	Representative Seat:
Arnold Whitridge (Chairman)	Safe Alternatives for Forest Environment
Ed Duggan	Willow Creek Community Service District
David Steinhauser	Six Rivers Outfitter and Guide Association
Tom Weseloh	California Trout, Inc
Elizabeth Soderstrom	Natural Heritage Institute
Pat Frost	Trinity County Resource Conservation District
Steve Anderson	Bureau of Land Management
Richard Lorenz	Trinity County Resident
Serge Birk	Central Valley Project Water Association
James Spear	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Byron Leydecker	Friends of the Trinity River
Spreck Rosekrans	Environmental Defense
Joan Hartmann	Local Landowner
Dana Hord	Big Bar Community Development Group

Members that came on day two of the meetings:

James Feider	City of Redding Electric Utility Department
Dan Haycox	Miners Alliance

Designated Federal Officer: Randy Brown, Fish and Wildlife Service, Arcata, CA.

1. Welcome and Introduction and Agenda

Arnold Whitridge opened the meeting. Randy Brown, Deputy Field Supervisor for the Fish and Wildlife Service in Arcata was the newly appointed Designated Federal Officer. The Designated Federal Officer is the government representative at FACA (Federal Advisory Committee Act) meetings and ensures that the various rules for FACA meetings are followed. Brown noted that he has spent a considerable length of time both as a Service employee and as a resident in the Trinity basin. He was looking forward to his new assignment.

Changes to Agenda

There were no changes to the agenda at this time.

2. Changes to December 2005 minutes

Byron Leydecker noted that during the last meeting, he was replaced by his alternate, Joe Neill, after agenda item 7.

Sherry Miller of the US Forest Service Redwood Science Laboratory noted that, in her presentation, the reference to willow flycatchers in agenda item 4 should also include the Trinity River.

Arnold noted that the word “quorum” should be avoided in item 4 and replaced with another word. The Charter rules do not allow changes to quorums.

Tom Weseloh made motion to accept the minutes as edited.

Seconded by Rich Lorenz.

Motion passed unanimously.

3. Comments from the public

Spreck Rosekrans noted that there are two processes underway in Sacramento to evaluate CVPIA (Central Valley Project Improvement Act). The CVPIA is a program created by Congress to provide funding for fish, wildlife, restoration and mitigation on an equal footing as delivery of water. One process, known as PART, is an internal government review. The second process is a review being conducted by the Department of Interior (Fish and Wildlife and Bureau of Reclamation) that is intended to include all interested parties. Rosekrans expressed concerns about the review process and whether it was being adequately run under Interior leadership or at the behest of water and power

Tom Weseloh announced that California Trout has a fish passage video/CD that shows restoration of culverts and fish in streams that is available for public to view. California Trout has will have 1000 copies that will be distributed to the public. He also noted the progress of bill SB 1125 and for which members might want to express their support to their various representatives. The bill ensures that payments from tideland oil development to environmental protection continue.

Chuck Lydy of the Shasta-Trinity Fly Fishers in Redding passed out some photos of the river taken this morning. The photos show high amounts of erosion of banks on private property.

4. Federal Tribal Trust Responsibilities

Frank Perniciaro Native American Affairs Program Manager, Bureau of Reclamation, provided a detailed slide presentation about the legal aspects of the obligations of the federal government to protect tribes. He passed out a handout (Attachment 1).

The origins of the federal trust come from treaties signed between the United States and the various Indian tribes. These treaties are protected by Constitution (Article VI). Nearly 400 treaties were signed and there are 600 total agreements (some tribes are executive order tribes, some are congressional, but some tribes are not federally recognized and some have been “terminated.”)

One of the problems in understanding tribal trust responsibilities is that there is no single law that explains things. The interpretation of the extent of the responsibilities has evolved in various court decisions.

There are these “Four cornerstones of Indian Law:”

Tribes self government

Independence of tribes subject to Congress

Power to regulate tribes is wholly federal.

Federal government has responsibility to protect tribes

All federal agencies have the fiduciary obligations to “reduce waste and protect or develop income” for the tribes, protect the tribes, and consult regarding actions affecting tribes.

Danny Jordan of the Hoopa Tribe noted that there are three documents that give comprehensive explanation of what constitutes federal responsibility. He noted two opinions written by federal solicitors (lawyers) regarding the federal responsibility to the tribes. He passed out copies of two of these documents (see Other Documents listed with attachments). The Hoopa are unsatisfied with how well the federal government has met their tribal responsibility.

Several comments focused on dams, tribal fishing rights, and the federal fiduciary responsibility. Perniciaro noted that the federal trust responsibility extends to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), the agency responsible for dam licensing.

5. Executive Director’s Report

Douglas Schluesner, executive director of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) passed out a handout containing his report (Attachment 2). He next introduced two new hires at the TRRP, Dave Gaeuman, fluvial geomorphologist and John Klochak, fish biologist/restoration ecologist. He noted the updated website and that it was receiving good traffic (2500 hits in February). Schluesner noted that they are on schedule to be ready for 8,500 cfs releases in 2006. Coarse sediment augmentation is scheduled for July. Habitat assessments are being planned. He highlighted successful grants and the large number of recent meetings.

Brian Person Northern California Area Manager for Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) clarified the issue regarding the how water years are forecast. The intention of the TRFES

and TRRP was to implement flows based on historic hydrologic frequencies and that the use of the 90% exceedance forecast methodology in the ROD was a deviation from this methodology. Specifically he described the differences between a 50 % probability of exceedance prediction versus a 90 % probability of exceedance. He reported that Appendix C of the EIS cited the use of a 90 % exceedance; this was being replaced by a 50 % exceedance. The Federal Register would soon note this correction. The importance of this is that using 50 % can result in more water being released downstream in the Trinity River.

The discussion next moved to whether to add a briefing by Ed Solbos on the CVPIA review to the agenda for tomorrow.

Rich Lorenz made a motion to add a briefing on CVPIA to item 11 of the agenda.

Seconded by Byron Leydecker.

The motion passed with 11 voting for the motion, 1 against, and 2 abstaining.

Serge Birk voted against, Steve Anderson and Ed Duggan abstained.

6. Reports from TRRP Work Groups

Work groups were established at the previous TAMWG meeting. These were more technically focused groups that were comprised of the TAMWG members. They were to meet on an occasional basis and report any pertinent information at the regular TAMWG meetings. The reports are as follows:

Budget work group: Had not yet met.

Flow work group: Had two meetings with reported good process and mostly information exchange.

Implementation work group: Jim Feider was not yet at the meeting and would be asked to report tomorrow.

Physical work group: Had a first meeting for visioning and are planning a second meeting in April.

Fish work group: Had a meeting with good progress. Another meeting is planned.

Riparian work group: No meeting yet, but one is scheduled.

Watershed work group: Emails have been sent regarding a meeting scheduled for May 3. They think they may need a broader group.

7. DFO topics – tech reps, travel policy, and Charter renewal.

Randy Brown, the DFO, briefed the TAMWG on a variety of technical issues or questions raised at the previous TAMWG meeting.

The processing of actions for FACA groups takes a very long time. The timeline needed to work on renewal of the TAMWG charter is six months. He handed out a flow chart that showed there are 22 separate steps in Washington DC required in order to complete the appointment of new members to the TAMWG (Attachment 3).

Conference calls are okay for certain types of information exchange, but they need to provide a way to involve the public in the calls. Reimbursement is allowed. Fish and Wildlife or TRRP may be available to set this up and be able to provide outside lines. Web meetings could also be accommodated. The meetings do not need to be advertised in Federal Register if only for information exchange.

Technical representatives can be used by the TAMWG to serve on a technical subcommittee or to attend working group meetings. They can report to TAMWG on workgroup progress. There is not a means to reimburse alternates that attend working group meetings.

There was discussion about how much of the agenda can be changed after it is published in the Federal Register. It seems there is some degree of flexibility.

Adjourn for the day.

Meeting resumed the next day at 8:40 AM (Thursday March 23, 2006)

Arnold Whitridge noted the addition of Ed Solbos briefing to Agenda item 11.

8. Election of TAMWG officers for 2006

Arnold Whitridge noted that TAMWG lacks specific protocols for elections and opened the floor for suggestions on how to proceed.

Tom Weseloh nominated Arnold Whitridge as chair of TAMWG.

The nomination was seconded by Joan Hartmann.

There were no other nominations and this nomination passed unanimously.

Several nominations were floated and discussed for the vice chair. Serge Birk declined to serve another term. Other candidates discussed were Jim Feider, Pat Frost, Ed Duggan and Joan Hartmann. Final nominations were:

Elizabeth Soderstrom nominated Joan Hartmann as vice-chair of TAMWG.

Seconded by Steve Anderson.

Serge Birk nominated Ed Duggan as vice-chair of TAMWG.

A second was not noted, but it was apparent that none was needed.

Joan Hartmann received nine votes; Ed Duggan received seven votes.

Joan Hartmann was elected vice-chair of TAMWG.

9. 2006 Flow Schedule

Rod Wittler and Ed Solbos of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) gave briefings on the flow schedule. The TAMWG was seeking a make a recommendation to the Trinity Management Council (TMC) on the flow releases. Wittler passed out a paper copy of their Power Point presentation (Attachment 4).

Preparations for high flow releases from Lewiston Dam

Ed Solbos described the Poker Bar Roads as tough but satisfactory. The Tullis, yellow house, had been sold (\$5000) and moved off-site. The flood plain modifications at Indian Creek are ongoing. The focus is now to protect private infrastructure so that it can withstand an 8,500 cfs release this year.

A project is in planning to excavate 100,000 yards of bed sediment from the Trinity River starting from the former location of the Tullis house down to the mouth of Weaver Creek. This will allow the river to contain the 11,000 cfs plus the 10-year flood additions (about 13,500 cfs) mostly within the banks of the river and will relieve the need to move houses and retrofit infrastructures that would otherwise be flooded.

Solbos noted that, still, some houses will need to be moved. Costs are expected to be high (\$400,000 for one house).

Flow Schedule Deliberations

Rod Wittler next presented his briefing on the deliberations on the Flow Schedule. While the ROD prescribes the spring flow releases that are to come from Lewiston Dam in volumes and timing, these prescriptions can be modified based on better information and ongoing research. Wittler presented some of the considerations for modifying the ROD prescribed releases.

Wittler noted that last year was classed as a “normal water year;” this year is looking like a “wet year.” A “wet year” allows for more water to be released down river from Lewiston Dam. Given the ROD recommendations along with the floodplain infrastructures considerations, they are planning to release 8,500 cfs peak at the Lewiston Dam for a five-day period in May. Not more than 6,000 cfs can be released before May 16 in order to complete pump house upgrades in the Indian Creek floodplain area.

Wittler thinks there will not be a need to have late-summer, emergency releases. His reasoning is based on expectations of low returns of adults this fall and moderate flows during the summer. Since there is no water being purchased by BOR for emergency releases, any water for a later summer release would need to be reserved or held back from the spring releases. If the year ends up being classed as “an extremely wet year,” there could be additional water for releases.

Wittler presented four options for modifications to the ROD release scenario under a “wet year”: 1) maximum sand transport, 2) modified rampdown for 80 % smolt out-migration, 3) combined sand and modified rampdown, 4) combined-early release (two week early release of option 3).

In an “extremely wet year,” they could not go to 11,000 cfs releases due to the infrastructure at Indian Creek, but they could extend the time of 8,500 cfs release.

Wittler next outlined some of the considerations for each option. A substantial amount of sand has been delivered to the river from high rains this winter. Fine sediments in the river have been identified as one of the major impacts to the main stem. Modeling suggests that there is not a very large difference in fine bed transport among the options. However, the desire is to obtain as much transport fine sediment (<8 mm diameter) but keep larger gravels in the river. Modeling suggests these transport options should move most new fine sediment inputs in some areas of the river, but not at others (e.g., Limekiln Gulch).

Another consideration is the effects of the descending limb of the controlled releases. The ROD prescription contains a 2000 cfs “bench” of moderate releases during the final stages of the release. This was designed to maintain cooler water temperatures during chinook smolt out-migration and to help keep willows from re-colonizing gravel bars. Several lines of data or reasoning were given that de-emphasized the need for the “bench” flows. Data suggests that smolts may be migrating earlier due to the ROD releases and may not need the “bench” flows later in the spring. Models now suggest that the “bench” will cool the river water but not maintain the 17 C “optimum” for smolt migration. A more naturally descending limb (no bench) is thought to send a “better signal” to the smolts. The 2000 cfs bench may also provide the lowest amount of floodplain and off-channel rearing habitat. The 2000 cfs bench may create a partial velocity barrier of upstream passage at Burnt Ranch for adult spring chinook (based on tracked movement of these fish). Options 2 through 4 drop the 2000 cfs bench.

Tom Weseloh expressed concerns about options 2-4 that drop the “bench” and have lower flows after June 25. He thought these could be bad for in-stream rearing fish such as steelhead and coho. He was more in favor of ROD prescription or Option 1 but adding in the provision for low flows for opening of trout season.

Serge Birk asked if ROD flows should really be modified, they have not been rigorously invalidated by any testing, and he favored the ROD option.

Byron Leydecker favored the option 1 (max sand transport) given the high amounts of fine sediment inputs of this winter and since it was still very close to the ROD prescription.

Steve Anderson liked option 1 as it wasn't too far from the ROD and it was thought to encourage the most cottonwood colonization in the floodplain.

Jim Feider did not think the ROD was quite as constraining as some have interpreted it to be. He favored option 3 (max sand and modified rampdown).

Arnold Whitridge tried to restate some of the opinion expressed by technical specialists at previous meetings on this subject. Whitridge thought they stated “the corner of the bench” may not be that useful after all. And that the ROD option may be somewhat “invalidated” or has had some doubt cast on it. He also noted that there was favor expressed for the early release or option 4.

Tom Weseloh disagreed with Whitridge's recollection that there was consensus among experts about the “bench.” He thought there was still mostly speculation and restated Joe Polos' caution that smolts may actually leave later this year due to cool wet conditions (and would therefore need the “bench”).

Ed Duggan noted that high flows could impact recreational trout fishing and affect the revenues, which he estimated to be \$1million in the basin.

A motion was made by Ed Duggan to send a recommend to the Trinity Management Council (TMC) to accept option 3.

Rich Lorenz seconded.

Before a formal vote was taken, the members decided to take a straw poll of several options instead of a sending a recommendation for only one option.

The straw poll results for option 3 (combined max sand and modified ramp) were 5 “yes” and 8 “no” votes.

The straw poll results for option 1 (max sand transport) were 10 “yes” votes and not more than 3 “no” votes.

Based on the straw poll, option 1 for the spring 2006 flow release appeared to be the most favored option. With no objections noted, Whitridge accepted this as the decision of the group.

Next, the members verbalized some recommendations that might accompany the option 1 recommendation.

Jim Spear also wanted the TAMWG to recommend to the TMC the need to keep erosion control going too as this is the cause for sand in the mainstem.

Elizabeth Soderstrom asked that during the discussion of flow options, the specific hypotheses are clearly verbalized and that greater efforts be made to rigorously test these hypotheses with data collected for this purpose.

Rich Lorenz asked that it be noted that 5 members voted for option 3.

Dave Steinhauser suggested that considerations begin to be given to other times when increased flows may benefit the river (i.e., maintaining habitat in a wider summer channel).

Joe Neill commented that opening of fly fishing would be impacted under option 1 and asked if the members wanted to consider keeping the flows low for the opening.

A motion was made by Tom Weseloh to recommend that the TMC keep flows low for the opening of fly fishing.

Seconded by Rich Lorenz.

Motion passed unanimously with one abstaining.

In the event of an extremely wet year, Ed Solbos did not favor sending increased fall flows for fear of sending the mix signals to fall fish.

Elizabeth Soderstrom noted the value of assessing years by “flood flow types” as opposed to “water year types.” She noted that UC Davis is promoting this for the Consumes River.

10. Trinity River fishing regulation

Tom Weseloh passed out copies of two letters (one sent by Cal Trout, Attachment 5a, and one by the TRRP, Attachment 5b) that asked the California Fish and Game Commission to open fly fishing for the “flywater” section just below Lewiston Dam on April 1. This would avoid the conflict with the ROD spring flows and allow a period of sport fishing.

11. Resolution regarding water-year type forecasting and CVPIA program review

Spreck Rosekrans made a motion that the TAMWG praise Interior for its pending decision to correct its methodology for determining Trinity River year-type from one based on a 90 % exceedance forecast--as using a 50 % exceedance forecast is expected to result in a frequency of flows consistent with the Trinity Restoration Plan.

Seconded by Byron Leydecker.

Motion passed with at least one abstaining.

CVPIA program review

Ed Solbos gave a briefing of the ongoing review of Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA)—a restoration program designed for fish and wildlife to complement the water development programs of the Central Valley. He passed out a hard copy of his Power Point presentation (Attachment 6a) and another two-page info sheet on the review was handed out (Attachment 6b).

The review is actually composed of two separate, parallel reviews. One is called the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) and is being conducted pursuant to OMB directives. The other is called the Program Activity Review (PAR) and is being conducted by the Department of Interior (BOR and FWS) in collaboration with stakeholder involvement and participation. The PART process is an internal agency review without participation of the public and addresses explicit requirements of OMB to evaluate all federal programs.

The PAR process was initiated by and a subgroup of the CVPIA Restoration Fund Roundtable (RFRT). The Restoration Fund Roundtable (RFRT) provides a forum for stakeholders and the public to discuss CVPIA program budgeting, planning and implementation. The purpose of the PAR is to see how well the CVPIA 38 programs have performed and to meet goals and objectives of CVPIA. Solbos reported that the Secretary of Interior may decide to reduce the water user’s payment the Restoration Fund Pursuant to CVPIA Section 3407.

Serge Birk provided additional background and history of the CVPIA Restoration Fund Round Table (RFRT). The RFRT was established by a diverse group of stakeholders during the mid 1990’s and provides a forum for the stakeholders, interested parties and the public to discuss CVPIA program planning, budgeting and implementation. Birk reported the original co-chairs of the RFRT were Jason Peltier formally of the Central Valley Project Water Association and David Yardenes of the Environmental Defense Fund.

The next meeting of the RFRT is scheduled for May 18th in Sacramento California. The agenda will include progress made in the PAR process.

Birk noted that the PAR meetings are being run by a professional facilitator that has established ground rules to ensure the process is open and transparent. The next meeting of the PAR group is scheduled for March 28, 2006 in Sacramento. Participation in the PAR group is open to stakeholders and interested parties and notices are sent out by email and press releases.

Spreck Rosekrans expressed his concerns about the review process. When the Environmental Defense first heard about the review, the meetings had been already going for about one month. He feared the purpose of these meetings was to reduce funding for restoration for Trinity and other programs and cited the specific language of the December 6, 2005, CVPWA/NCPA letter to support his point.

Tom Weseloh asked that Whitridge suggest to the TMC that the CVPIA review is monitored and that the TMC promote an open and accurate review be carried out.

Elizabeth Soderstrom noted that since the TRRP doesn't have a strategic plan and this could result in it receiving a "poor" review. Therefore, it is important that this be addressed.

12. Science Framework: TMAG update

Rod Wittler provided an updated schedule for operations for the Technical Modeling and Analysis Group (TMAG). He passed out a new schedule (Attachment 7a). He noted the plans for a program review of the Science Program. He also passed out a draft of the Science Program (Attachment 7b).

Byron Leydecker was replaced by his alternate, Joe Neill for the remainder of the meeting.

13. TRRP strategic plan

Jim Feider gave a briefing on the workgroup phone meeting working on the strategic plan. They identified six keys issue areas (i.e., obstacles): 1) communication to the public, 2) wildlife emphasis, 3) watershed and tributaries emphasis, 4) floodplain modifications to infrastructures, 5) environmental permitting, and 6) scientific framework.

A strategic plan should outline what to do and how to evaluate and where to go next. It may provide a bridge between the flow study and budgeting. They are not sure how to do the strategic plan. They want to see the Science Framework. They thought that the TRRP staff ought to be involved as it makes sense to have them be the authors of a strategic plan that involves them. There was discussion about how the TAMWG could provide inputs about what should be in the strategic plan.

Rich Lorenz asked whether a draft strategic plan was already prepared. Doug Schluesner noted that, indeed, three drafts had been prepared, but some time has passed and that it

could be useful to bring these efforts up to date. He noted the need to define the strategic plan.

Joe Neill noted the need for a strategic plan that is rather simple. He noted that the Science Framework should be considered the tactical plan with details.

Jim Feider indicated that he would arrange another conference call of the work group to consider how the first 3 chapters of the Science Framework might help frame a strategic plan.

14. TRRP Vision Statement

Joan Hartmann gave a briefing on a vision statement and its value for a program. She passed out a framework for public outreach (Attachment 8).

She provided some background on the evolution of public outreach and some of its goals and strategies. The group first addressed agenda item 15 and took a break and several members left at this time. Upon returning, the members tried to verbalize what ideas they had about their own visions for the TRRP and the restoration of the Trinity.

Arnold Whitridge noted that our civilization should be run without “wrecking this place.”

Ed Duggan envisions 112 miles of a healthy stream from the dam to Weitchpec. All the communities are coming back to life and are viable. People are able to enjoy the values and riches of the river. The Trinity is a healthy fishery where families can enjoy themselves. He then recalled how he and his dad would spend time together in the headwaters during trout opening season.

Jim Spear noted that restoration should not be thought only in the context of natural systems but should include people and communities--healthy fisheries and healthy communities

Jim Feider wanted restoration programs that lead to a healthy river and fisheries in a pragmatic way that balances natural resources, financial resources, and human resources. He acknowledged that it is not easy to agree on the same vision in a diverse group such as the TAMWG.

Dave Steinhauser noted that while he did not have a particular vision yet, but that he has started to think and talk about it. He mentioned that he had read we are moving from a manufacturing, to a service, to an experience economy. And that “moments of truth” come from the river. These include catching a fish, the sounds of the water, the feel of the water... He also cited “relationship moments of truths” such as the grandson and grandfather or fishing buddies experience. The are “learning types moments of truth” such as information displays that explain the river. He mentioned emotional type of experiences and experiences of economy.

Elizabeth Soderstrom noted that, in her 10-15 years of work experience in this type of work, the word that comes to her is “connectivity.” This means connecting to the floodplain; upstream to the downstream... She noted that we have gotten past “fish” to a more “ecosystem perspective.” Connectivity of the people of economy and stewardship of the river. This project and river are also being connected to other watershed efforts around the country.

Joe Neill read from some notes he had written down: There is a legal mandate is to restore the level of fisheries to pre-dam levels. What is the return value in real dollars? Placing an actual dollar value is difficult. The Trinity will never be the same since the dam. People need to spend some time on the river and experience the river. It would be an emotional experience. It is a costly project, but the overall returns are priceless.

Rich Lorenz noted that he has lived on the river since pre-dam days and he would like to see it return. He noted, however, that there is more wildlife now. We shouldn't become so socialistic that we forget about the private property rights. He wants the basin citizens to be compensated for giving away their water for cheap electricity. (That is not a fair return.)

Tom Weseloh noted that we have the chance to restore a river and this may be our best chance. Local economies have been devastated. Salmon is a social icon. He encouraged everyone to get out on the river. Restore fish, healthy economies, in a sustainable way, for future generations. This can become an example for others to learn from.

Pat Frost said simply that restoring a river is to restore its way of life.

Spreck Rosekrans noted that the famous river geomorphologist and writer, Luna Leopold passed away last month. Rosekrans cited Leopold as saying that the restoration plan below Lewiston Dam on the Trinity River was the best he had seen. Rosekrans noted that legal and tribal fishing rights are a part of a restoration. We need to include all components including people. People from other parts need to be considered too.

15. Date and agenda topics for next meeting

Date for next meeting is June 14 and 15.

Items to discuss:

Budget

Danny Jordan briefing on Hoopa Tribe concerns,

Tributaries—what is known and what is unknown

Standing items such as items 1-3, 5 and 7.

CVAIP

Executive Directors report and anecdotal report on the 8,500 cfs flow

LIST OF MOTIONS

Tom Weseloh made motion to accept the minutes as edited.

Seconded by Rich Lorenz.

Motion passed unanimously.

Rich Lorenz made a motion to add a briefing on CVPIA this to agenda.

Seconded by Byron Leydecker.

The motion passed with 11 voting for the motion, 1 against, and 2 abstaining.

Tom Weseloh nominated Arnold Whitridge as chair of TAMWG.

The nomination was seconded by Joan Hartmann.

There were no other nominations and this nomination passed unanimously.

Elizabeth Soderstrom nominated Joan Hartmann as vice-chair of TAMWG.

Seconded by Steve Anderson.

Serge Birk nominated Ed Duggan as vice-chair of TAMWG.

A second was not noted, but it was apparent that none was needed.

Joan Hartmann received nine votes; Ed Duggan received seven votes.

Joan Hartmann was elected vice-chair of TAMWG.

Based on the straw poll, option 1 for the spring 2006 flow release appeared to be the most favored option. With no objections noted, Whitridge accepted this as the decision of the group.

A motion was made by Tom Weseloh to recommend that the TMC to keep flows low for the opening of fly fishing.

Seconded by Rich Lorenz.

Motion passed unanimously with one abstaining.

Spreck Rosekrans made a motion that the TAMWG praise Interior for its pending decision to correct its methodology for determining Trinity River year-type from one based on a 90 % exceedance forecast--as using a 50 % exceedance forecast is expected to result in a frequency of flows consistent with the Trinity Restoration Plan.

Seconded by Byron Leydecker.

Motion passed with at least one abstaining.

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Federal Tribal Trust Responsibility, Power Point presentation. By Frank Perniciaro

Attachment 2: TRRP Director's Report for December 2005 to March 2006. By Douglas Schleusner, Executive Director.

Attachment 3: Flow chart for Federal Advisory Committee packages. By Randy Brown.

Attachment 4: WY 2006 Flow Schedule, Power Point presentation printout. By Rod Wittler and Ed Solbos.

Attachment 5: Letter "RE: Proposed Trinity River Fishing Season Date Change." February 17, 2006. California Trout.

Attachment 5a: Letter "Subject: Proposed Trinity River Fishing Season Date Change." February 27, 2006. Trinity River Restoration Program.

Attachment 6: CVPIA program review. Power Point presentation printout. By Ed Solbos.

Attachment 6a: PL 102-575 Title 34—CVPIA Program Activities. Draft 3/01/06.

Attachment 6b: Performance Review: Central Valley Project Improvement Act. March 2006. Bureau of Reclamation.

Attachment 7: Integrated Monitoring & Evaluation Plan. Plan B – Schedule for Completion. February 3, 2006. By Rod Wittler.

Attachment 7a: Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. Jan 23, 2006 – Preliminary Draft. Trinity River Restoration Program. By Rod Wittler.

Attachment 8: Public outreach—theoretical framework. By Joan Hartmann.

Other Documents:

1. Trinity River Flow Evaluation Study. May 22, 1998. Office of the Solicitor, US Department of Interior.
2. Fishing Rights of the Yurok and Hoopa Valley Tribes. October 5, 1993. Office of the Solicitor, US Department of Interior.