



## Trinity River Restoration Program

P.O. Box 1300, 1313 South Main Street, Weaverville, California 96093  
Telephone: 530-623-1800, Fax: 530-623-5944

---DRAFT---

Members of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group  
c/o Chairman Arnold Whitridge  
P.O. Box 128  
Douglas City, CA 96024-0128

Subject: Response to the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG)  
Concerns Submitted to the Trinity Management Council (TMC)

Dear Chairman Whitridge:

During the last 5 years, the TAMWG has passed a superfluity of motions and generated several letters recommending that the TMC take action on an array of matters, ranging from functional, budget, and other business matters to specific measures regarding Trinity River Restoration Program (Program) priorities.

I pledged during our conversation at your September 2010 meeting that the TMC would respond in writing as to the disposition of each of the significant recommendations that may be viewed as incompletely resolved. The TMC greatly appreciates the many contributions the TAMWG has made to the Program in the form of guidance and recommendations and also appreciates this opportunity to respond. It is our goal that this exchange of information will facilitate the improved discourse between the entities in the interest of furthering Program goals and objectives.

This response will provide a synopsis of significant recommendations, some of which the TMC has addressed, and in some cases more than once. In the interest of clarity, the recommendations are presented by category, so some TAMWG letters are cited several times if recommendations in multiple categories were included in the letter.

### **TMC Functional and Organizational Relevance**

1. *In many examples of written correspondence the TAMWG has submitted to the TMC in recent years, the TAMWG has been critical of the TMC's organization, functional capability, responsiveness, and relevance.*

The TMC addressed this matter, focusing on recent efforts toward organizational and functional improvement, in a December 11, 2009, letter to the TAMWG Chair.

Trinity Management Council

Brian Person, Chair, Bureau of Reclamation - John Engring, Vice Chair, US Fish and Wildlife Service  
Irma Lagomarsino, National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration-Fisheries - Sharon Heywood, USDA Forest Service  
Mike Orcutt, Hoopa Valley Tribe - Dave Hillemeier, Yurok Tribe - Gary Stacey, California Department of Fish and Game -  
Roger Jaegel, Trinity County - Mike Hamman, Executive Director (ex officio)

## **Budget-Related Recommendations**

### *2. Funding Proportions*

- A) September 19, 2005, letter recommending that the TMC approve the budget adjustments presented by TAMWG on September 13, 2005, including target allocations of a 50:30:20 [implementation:science:administration] funding apportionment, progress toward a program-driven budget, and urging an interactive and informative approach by Trinity River Restoration Program (Program) staff*
- B) March 30, 2009, letter recommending a funding apportionment of 50:30:20 as soon as possible*
- C) March 29, 2010, letter recommending that funding apportionment be brought into a ratio of 50:30:20*

This recommendation was addressed in a letter to the TAMWG Chair dated December 11, 2009. The TMC has referenced the 50:30:20 funding apportionment while developing budgets for the last several fiscal years, though some members have not expressed full support. The past several budget formulations have been relatively close to this ratio (the average for fiscal years 2006-2011 is 45:36:19). In the budgets developed by Program staff at the \$16.4 million funding level, the average ratio for fiscal years 2012-2014 is 48:34:18. Allowing for variances caused by normal shifts in program priorities, changing contract costs, and other unforeseen changes, this recommendation has been essentially followed in years since it was issued.

- 3. June 17, 2005, letter recommending adoption of the budget presented on June 13, 2005, during the June 22, 2005, TMC meeting*

The TMC did approve a budget on the third vote (following two amendments) during the June 22-23 meeting.

- 4. June 17, 2005, letter recommending that the TMC seek funding for "full program" needs in future years*

Though it is not stated in the Record of Decision (ROD), it has been generally considered within the Program that the "full funding" level is \$16.4 million. The Department of the Interior agencies have consistently listed the Program as among their highest priorities while developing their respective budgets, even during this very challenging national budget climate. In fiscal year 2010, inclusive of American Reinvestment and Recovery Act funding, the total Program budget was approximately \$16.63 million, actually exceeding the "full funding" level. Though the fiscal year 2011 budget is embargoed, it appears there may be a slight reduction from the 2010 level, but Reclamation has requested another increase for fiscal year 2012.

- 5. June 17, 2005, letter recommending that the TMC seek a one-time appropriation of \$5 million to meet floodplain mitigation costs*

This request was forwarded to the Interior agencies, but no additional funds were made available.

6. *September 24, 2007, letter recommending that Implementation activities be given priority for new or redirected funding in 2008*

This recommendation was discussed at the September 26-27, 2007, TMC meeting. The recommendation was adopted, as supplemental funding from the Central Valley Project Improvement Act Restoration Fund was expended on Implementation projects. Furthermore, Restoration Funds have been used exclusively for channel rehabilitation, infrastructure relocation, watershed, and gravel augmentation since Program inception.

7. *January 23, 2008, letter endorsing the Program staff recommendation for allocation of the additional \$3 million in Restoration Funds*

The TMC replied in a memorandum dated March 7, 2008. The additional funds promised in 2008 from the Restoration Fund were actually received in allotments of \$1.25 million, \$1.0 million, and \$0.75 million in 2008, 2009, and 2010, respectively. As mentioned above, Restoration Funds have been used exclusively for Implementation activities.

8. *January 23, 2008, letter expressing support for funding Implementation projects and watershed restoration*

This recommendation was adopted. Timely completion of channel rehabilitation and effective implementation of watershed and gravel augmentation is a priority for Program staff. Please consider this as our response that the recommendation has been implemented.

9. *Competitive (Request for Proposal) Driven Budget Development*

- A) *January 23, 2008, letter recommending a Request for Proposal (RFP)-based budget approach for fiscal year 2010*
- B) *June 15, 2010, letter recommending that the TMC improve the proposal process for fiscal year 2012 by requiring and providing for independently reviewed RFP's*
- C) *June 15, 2010, letter recommending that the TMC resolve the "allowable proposal scope" issue and that the fiscal year 2012 process be in place by October 2010*
- D) *June 15, 2010, letter recommending that the Science Advisory Board review the fiscal year 2012 budget development process prior to October 2010 to evaluate the soundness, adequacy, and consistency of the process and compliance with the ROD*

The TMC responded to all items listed in the June 15 letter in a reply dated September 2, 2005.

The Program began implementing an RFP-based approach in developing the fiscal year 2011 budget in response to direction from the TMC. This TMC directive resulted in an open and more competitive process for 2011 than in past iterations, and we were pleased to note that competitive proposals were received for some on-going science and monitoring projects. While some refinements to the process are required, most partners were encouraged by the outcome. Please consider this as our response that the recommendation has been implemented.

### **Financial Conflict of Interest Recommendations-**

10. *June 19, 2007, letter recommending the adoption of measures to limit TMC members in financial decision-making to avoid conflicts of interest*
11. *March 18, 2008, letter urging TMC members to refrain from participating in decisions that affect their agency's financial interest*
12. *June 16, 2008, letter recommending that the TMC adopt measures to limit conflicts of interest, including recusal of representatives from votes that affect the financial interests of their respective agency*
13. *September 14, 2009, letter recommending that the TMC address member conflict of interest and requesting a presentation by the TMC conflict of interest subgroup*

The TMC addressed these concerns in memoranda to the TAMWG Chair dated September 19, 2007, and March 7, 2008. This recommendation was also addressed in a letter to the TAMWG Chair dated December 11, 2009. You and other TAMWG members have been part of many discussions regarding the conflict of interest concern, which was a focal point of the situation assessment, and later the TMC retreats facilitated by CDR Associates. The TMC, whose members agree only to an extent that conflict of interest is a concern, has considered each specific TAMWG recommendation on this topic, but has not sustained any motion other than to appoint a subgroup to define the extent of the concern. The TMC has, however, supported specific actions that it believes will at least partially negate the influences we believe to be at the heart of your concern. For example, the planning and implementation of the September 2010 Scientists' Retreat activities has abandoned the previous politically driven, voting based budget development process in favor of a needs driven, open and more competitive process for 2012. At the core of the competitive process is the incorporation of a consensus based recommendation approach to defining Program needs. When consensus is not reached, issues are elevated and resolved at higher levels within the Program or by outside experts. The 2012 process is underway and is already proving to be an improvement over past practices.

### **TMC Function and Composition**

14. *Voting Protocol*
  - A) *June 19, 2007, letter recommending that the TMC adopt a simple-majority voting requirement for TMC decision-making*
  - B) *June 16, 2008, letter recommending that the TMC adopt a simple-majority voting requirement*
  - C) *June 16, 2009, letter recommending moving to a simple-majority voting requirement*

*Note: The TAMWG sent a letter to Secretary Ken Salazar on January 11, 2010, explaining that the TMC has been unable to provide effective Program leadership and is dysfunctional. They asked the*

*Secretary's intervention to amend the bylaws to provide for a simple majority in voting.  
Commissioner Mike Connor responded to the letter on March 26, 2010.*

The TMC addressed this recommendation in a memo to the TAMWG Chair dated March 7, 2008. This recommendation was also addressed in a letter to the TAMWG Chair dated December 11, 2009. This topic has been discussed in many instances, culminating in action during the June 16, 2008, TMC meeting, where a motion was made and seconded to change the voting protocol such that a simple majority, rather than a super majority, is required to pass a motion. Prophetically, the motion garnered a 4-4 vote and did not pass. In another instance, the TMC spent time considering moving to a simple majority on a trial basis, but the suggestion gained little support.

#### *15. TMC Composition*

*A) September 24, 2007, letter recommending that that TAMWG Chair or his designees be added as a non-voting TMC member in all TMC functions*

The TMC responded to this recommendation in a March 7, 2008, memorandum. At the January 9, 2008, TMC meeting, a motion to include the TAMWG Chair passed unanimously; you have been serving very capably in that role ever since, and we have greatly appreciated your many contributions.

*B) June 16, 2008, letter recommending that BLM, Humboldt County, and TAMWG be added as TMC members*

*C) June 16, 2009, letter recommending that TMC membership be expanded*

*D) September 24, 2009, letter supporting the addition of BLM, Humboldt County, NRCS, and the TAMWG itself as voting members*

*Note: Congressman Wally Herger wrote to Secretary Ken Salazar on July 16, 2009, asking his assistance to include BLM as a TAMWG member. Assistant Secretary for Water and Science Ann Castle responded to the Congressman on November 4, 2009. Congressman Herger wrote to the Secretary again on April 27, 2010, asking his intervention to include BLM as a member of the TMC.*

*Note: The TAMWG sent a letter to Secretary Ken Salazar on January 11, 2010, asking that he add three members to the TMC, representing the Bureau of Land Management, Humboldt County, and the TAMWG. Commissioner Mike Connor responded to the letter on March 26, 2010.*

This recommendation was addressed in a letter to the TAMWG Chair dated December 11, 2009. The matter of adding BLM as a TMC member has been formally considered by the TMC on at least three occasions, and in each instance the motion failed to obtain the unanimous vote required by the TMC bylaws for amending membership.

Adding Humboldt County as a TMC member was also discussed during several meetings and was the subject of a formal motion during the June 2010 meeting following a presentation by Humboldt County representatives. The motion failed, though seven of the eight TMC members voted in favor.

## Hatchery Management

16. *March 18, 2008, letter recommending that the TMC communicate with the Secretary of California's Resources Agency to direct the Trinity River Hatchery to take actions toward achievement of established adult steelhead escapement*
17. *June 16, 2008, letter recommending that the TMC make it a priority to ensure that hatchery management practices do not obstruct Program goal accomplishment*
18. *March 30, 2009, letter recommending that the TMC aggressively pursue a response to the hatchery management inquiry it sent to Reclamation in June 2008*
19. *June 16, 2009, letter recommending that the TMC support the "Collaborative Framework and Decision-making Process" outlined to the TAMWG; the letter also recommended that the TMC commission a review of the scientific literature on the effects of hatchery practices on wild fish, with a synopsis of the relevant findings of each paper*
20. *March 29, 2010, letter recommending that the TMC actively pursue a response to its June 2008 letter to the Interior regarding hatchery management*
21. *June 15, 2010, letter renewing the TAMWG's inquiry about hatchery management authority*
22. *June 15, 2010, letter encouraging the ad hoc and technical advisory groups to resume their work*

These recommendations were generally addressed in a letter to the TAMWG Chair dated December 11, 2009. TMC members and partner agencies have engaged in many forums to discuss aspects of hatchery management in recent years. In 2008, the Hoopa Valley Tribe initiated an effort to develop a Memorandum of Understanding among the Tribe and Interior agencies as a framework for addressing hatchery issues. When that effort stalled, the California Department of Fish and Game coordinated what was then termed an "ad hoc group" approach involving hatchery interests to identify issues and make recommendations. During the group's series of meetings, several recommendations were listed. Reclamation and the US Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) subsequently discussed those recommendations with the Hoopa Valley Tribe during government to government meetings.

The TMC issued a letter to Reclamation in June 2008 seeking information regarding the statutory authority under which Reclamation contracted with the state of California for hatchery operations and inquiring about the actions necessary to alter hatchery management goals and practices. Reclamation's Northern California Area Office and the Office of the Solicitor collaborated on a draft response, which has yet to be issued.

Reclamation Regional Director Don Glaser and then California Department of Fish and Game Director Don Koch, along with members of their respective staff, met on June 3, 2009, to discuss hatchery management practices and objectives. It was agreed at the meeting that the agencies would collaborate with partners in assessing hatchery management objectives, as well as identifying and implementing areas for improvement, particularly those aimed at reducing the adverse impacts caused by hatchery fish. Mr. Koch recommended that the ad hoc group continue as the appropriate forum.

At the June 2009 TMC meeting, Mr. Seth Naman of the National Atmospheric and Oceanic Administration National Marine Fisheries agency volunteered to update the information compiled during his earlier literature search; it has not yet been completed.

On May 3, 2010, the Service announced that it will begin conducting comprehensive reviews of all salmon and steelhead hatcheries in California, and shortly following announced that the Trinity River Hatchery will be among the first to occur. In September 2010, the Service began assembling the review advisory team, and we anticipate that the review effort will commence in the ensuing weeks. I am confident that this focused effort will yield meaningful results that will be helpful in improving hatchery operations, furthering the work that has already occurred in the ad hoc group.

### **System Operations and Temperature Management**

23. *March 18, 2008, letter recommending that the TMC explore options for carrying over ROD water from year to year*
24. *June 16, 2008, letter recommending that the TMC increase its attention to the river temperature effects of reservoir storage levels and recommending that an allowance be made to carry over a portion of the ROD water*
25. *March 29, 2010, letter recommending that the TMC explore options for carrying over ROD water from one year to the next*
26. *March 30, 2009, letter recommending that the TMC write Reclamation to request modified operations to maintain a minimum carryover pool in Trinity Reservoir to aid temperature management and avoid violation of Water Order 90-05*
27. *March 29, 2010, letter recommending that the TMC request a minimum pool of 1 million acre-feet to be maintained in Trinity Reservoir through 2010 to avoid temperature problems in the Trinity River – noting dissent by two members*

Recommendations regarding temperature management were addressed in a letter to the TAMWG Chair dated December 11, 2009. The TMC briefly addressed the ROD carryover request in a memorandum to the TAMWG Chair dated March 7, 2008. In response to the TAMWG recommendation, TMC has discussed the potential benefits of having greater flexibility in managing ROD flows, including the carryover provision. Reclamation sought input from the Office of the Solicitor regarding carryover, and was informed that it is not authorized. The Solicitor cited that the Trinity River Mainstem Fisheries Restoration EIS states on pg. 12, “Based on subsequent monitoring and studies guided by the Trinity Management Council, the schedule for releasing water on a daily basis, according to that year’s hydrology, may be adjusted but the annual flow volumes established in Table 1 may not be changed.”

The TMC has discussed temperature management issues at virtually every meeting in recent years, and has advocated additional operational measures to help assure compliance. The TMC supported—and Reclamation implemented—use of the Trinity Dam auxiliary outlet works to access a colder water lens within Trinity Reservoir, which reduced river temperatures by just over 2 degrees Fahrenheit during a critical period in 2009.

In compliance with the TAMWG recommendation and a corresponding TMC motion, I wrote a letter to Reclamation's Central Valley Operations (CVO) Office in June, 2008, to inquire about Trinity River Division operations that impact—and, conversely, are impacted by—temperature management within the river. I have recently reviewed a draft reply from CVO, and at the time of this writing they indicate will be issued in the ensuing weeks.

28. *Lower Klamath River Flow Augmentation*

- A) *March 29, 2010, letter recommending that no portion of the ROD volume be used for late summer releases for the Lower Klamath River*
- B) *June 15, 2010, letter recommending that no portion of the ROD allocation be used for late summer releases above base flows*
- C) *June 15, 2010, letter recommending that Klamath-side causes should be treated with Klamath-side solutions*
- D) *June 15, 2010, letter recommending that augmentation proposals using non-ROD Trinity water should include analysis of impacts on cold water availability, reservoir refill potential, increased interbreeding of spring run and fall run fish, and possible high-flow construction of redds that are promptly dewatered when flows are reduced*
- E) *Proposals to make extra releases using non-ROD Trinity water should disclose the associated costs (including the value of hydropower foregone and impacts to recreation from lowered reservoir levels that are born by Trinity-side stakeholders and not shared by Klamath-side beneficiaries)*

During TMC meetings subsequent to receipt of your letter, the TMC established a multi-agency Lower Klamath Flows Workgroup, which issued a comprehensive report of findings and recommendations dated August 30, 2010. Many of the points raised in your June 15 letter are addressed in the report. You are aware from your participation in TMC discussions that there is general support among TMC members that no portion of the ROD flows be used for Lower Klamath River flow augmentation. But it has also been pointed out that the 2002 fish kill affected fish of Trinity River origin, so there is at least a presumed nexus.

The other recommendations you list in your letter will be addressed during the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance process, which will be required prior to making such a release.

**Watersheds**

- 29. *March 18, 2008, letter recommending that the TMC urge the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and the California Resources Agency, to elevate the importance of watersheds in the agency decision making and appropriations requests.*
- 30. *September 14, 2009, letter recommending that a minimum of \$500,000 per year be budgeted by the Program for watershed work, that it be made easier to carry over allocations so that contracting delays are avoided, and that a representative of the Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program make a presentation about opportunities to combine Program and non-Program resources.*

31. *March 29, 2010, letter recommending that the fiscal year 2011 approved budget provide at least \$500,000 for watershed work, and that this and future budgets include a note that the "full Program cost" of watershed work is \$2 million per year*

During its September 2009 meeting, Acting Executive Director Jennifer Faler reported to the TAMWG that the Program remains committed to watershed restoration, and has included a minimum of \$500,000 per year in each fiscal year in the 5-year budget plan. This recommendation was also addressed in a letter to the TAMWG Chair dated December 11, 2009. In a recent Watershed Work Group meeting, the participants were encouraged to begin planning for a higher quantity or larger scale watershed projects because higher funding levels are anticipated starting in fiscal year 2015. In several TMC meetings, we have discussed maintaining a mainstem restoration focus until the channel rehabilitation projects are initially completed in 2014-2015, then shifting an even greater emphasis to watershed work.

### **Trinity Lake Revitalization Alliance Topics**

32. *June 15, 2010, letter describing the concerns raised by the Trinity Lake Revitalization Alliance and listing several provisions of the Environmental Impact Statement for Restoration of the Trinity River Mainstem, including:*
- A) *All affected boat ramps should be extended a sufficient distance to accommodate the new water elevations*
  - B) *Marina owners should be compensated for costs associated with moving their facilities or constructing new facilities as a result of the new water elevations*
  - C) *Campground facilities should be modified or funding provided to accommodate the new water elevations*

*The letter then recommended that the TMC determine whether the Program has an obligation or opportunity to implement or help implement these mitigation measures.*

Reclamation reported during the September 2010 TMC meeting, and during informal prior discussions, that the Office of the Solicitor had been consulted, and verbally reported that the Program does not have the authority, or NEPA compliance, to expend Program funds on ramp modifications. However, both Interior agencies indicated they would assist the U.S. Forest Service in their ramp extension efforts, which were discussed at length during the March 2010 TAMWG meeting.

### **Integrated Habitat Assessment Plan (IAP)**

33. *January 23, 2008, letter recommending adoption of the IAP*
34. *March 29, 2010, letter generally approving the IAP, but recommending that it be further developed to improve attention given to steelhead, coho, and bird habitat*

The specific recommendations were forwarded to the IAP Steering Committee for their consideration. I have spoken with Regional Directors Ren Loehefener and Don Glaser of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Bureau of Reclamation, respectively, regarding adoption of the IAP, which is predicated on addressing

concerns expressed by the Hoopa Valley Tribe. The IAP has been identified by Mr. Glaser as among six key items he wishes to address with the Tribe, and while the matter has been discussed at several government-to-government meetings, it has not yet been resolved.

### **Recommendations on Miscellaneous Topics**

35. *September 19, 2005, letter commending Program staff for taking advantage of surplus funding made available at the close of the fiscal year and recommending that the TMC thank Reclamation for making this funding available.*

The TMC appreciates that the TAMWG expressed this recognition, which was forwarded to Program staff and Reclamation officials.

36. *September 19, 2005, letter recommending that the TMC support efforts to obtain Program funding from outside sources, refrain from discouraging grant seekers, refrain from shifting funds to unidentified purposes late in the budget process, and restore \$285,000 to the Indian Creek project budget.*

The TMC has long supported funding for the Program from non-Federal sources, in fact it was envisioned while establishing Program funding objectives that non-Federal partners would provide funding for watershed restoration and other activities. We know of no instances where the TMC, as a body or by its individual members, discouraged partners from seeking grant funding.

As has been described by the Program's Executive Directors, Program staff execute each fiscal year budget in accordance with funding levels approved by the Secretary, with recommendations from the TMC (in the years such a recommendation is made). It is necessary to some degree to adjust funding levels within the Program in virtually all fiscal years, as contract bids and other costs vary from budgetary estimates. The TMC discussed this variability at length during the retreats and established budget variance parameters to be followed by the Executive Director.

37. *June 1, 2006 letter recommending that the TMC recommend to Reclamation and the Interior that all Central Valley Project long-term water contract renewals include language which prohibits interference with any and all efforts to implement the ROD*

The TMC forwarded this recommendation to the Regional Director's Office and contracting staff within the Reclamation's Mid-Pacific Region.

38. *June 19, 2007, letter requesting direction from the Interior about the appropriate roles and responsibilities of member entities and the Program Office*

The TMC addressed this recommendation in a memo to the TAMWG Chair dated March 7, 2008. In addition, the Interior Agencies, the TMC, and partners have engaged in many discussions regarding the identification of roles and responsibilities at a variety of levels. Significant progress has been made in this area. The Interior agencies have implemented definitive measures to assure their respective staff and functions are fully integrated. Program Office staff have also developed a matrix of skills, major duties, and work group involvement for staff from each partner entity. This information has been compiled in a

document titled *Draft Trinity River Restoration Program Roles and Responsibilities of Partner Agencies and Governments (Program Partners)* prepared by Acting Executive Jennifer Faler on December 13, 2010.

*39. TAMWG Membership Appointments and Charter*

- A) June 17, 2005, letter recommending that the Secretary expedite appointment of new TAMWG members*
- B) September 24, 2007, letter recommending that the TMC work to expedite the process for appointment and reappointment of TAMWG members and alternates*

The TMC responded to this latter recommendation in a memorandum dated March 7, 2008. In addition, the TMC expressed its concern with the TAMWG appointment delays immediately after learning of them, and urged the Service to take immediate action to resolve the delays. The Arcata Field Office has worked directly with the Secretary's Office during membership approval efforts, both with the past and present administrations, to facilitate approval.

*40. June 1, 2009, letter recommending that the TMC schedule a presentation by Dr. Clair Stalnaker to review the history and status of the use of adaptive management in the Program*

Many TMC members had made a similar suggestion even before receiving your letter, and we began seeking an arrangement for Dr. Stalnaker to appear at a subsequent TMC meeting. Accordingly, Dr. Stalnaker made a presentation at both the Scientists' Retreat and TMC Workshop in September 2010. His presentations were well received by those in attendance as measured by the discussions that occurred as a result of the information presented.

*41. June 1, 2009, letter seeking a written response from the TMC to TAMWG and SAB recommendations*

The TMC recognizes that many of the formal recommendations issued by the TAMWG in recent years have not yielded a timely response, and we regret that to any extent this inaction has resulted in malcontent among TAMWG members. Virtually every topic presented by the TAMWG has been discussed by the TMC, often on multiple occasions. You have my commitment as TMC Chair that we will be more strident in our efforts to provide timely written responses as well.

In closing, I will reiterate that the TMC regards the TAMWG's role in the Program as vital and appreciates not only the guidance provided by the TAMWG, but your leadership as well.

Sincerely,

Brian Person  
TMC Chairman

cc: TMC Members  
Jennifer Faler

