

**Final Minutes**  
**Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group**  
**Victorian Inn, 1709 Main Street, Weaverville, CA**

**September 12 and 13, 2006**

**The meeting was open to the public.**

**1:15 P.M. convene September 12**

Attending members:

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

Members that did not attend:

Member:	Representative Seat:
James Spear	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Elizabeth Soderstrom	Natural Heritage Institute
Dan Haycox	Miners Alliance

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

## **1. Introduction, Agenda, Approval of Minutes**

Arnold Whitridge, chairman of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG), opened the meeting.

### **Changes to Agenda**

No changes were made at this time.

### **Changes to June 2006 minutes**

Two edits were made to the June 2006 minutes.

**Jim Feider made motion to accept the minutes as edited.**

**The motion was seconded by Richard Lorenz.**

**Motion passed without dissent.**

## **2. Open forum; public comment**

No comments were made at this time.

## **3. TRRP fiscal year 2007 budget & program of work**

The total amount of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) annual budget for fiscal year 2007 (FY2007) was not yet known. The uncertainty was due to the federal budget process. In the federal budget process, the president of the United States proposes a national budget that includes Department of Interior and the TRRP. The president's budget has typically allocated about two-thirds of the projected total needs of the TRRP program because the federal government is running deficits, and cannot fully fund all the discretionary programs. Congress then reviews and finalizes the president's budget and, in past years, has added additional funds to the TRRP, but never to the full projected needs of the TRRP. At issue is how the TRRP program should be structured and budgeted under the various and uncertain funding levels. The president's budget for FY2007 allocated \$9.2 million for the TRRP. It was expected that between \$1 million and \$2 million would be added during the this year's Congressional review. The full ROD requirements were thought to be about \$14 million for FY2007.

Douglas Schleusner, executive director of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) presented details of the TRRP proposed budget for FY2007 and was seeking guidance from the TAMWG. He passed out a several packets of information including: a memo describing the newest revisions to the TRRP budget (Attachment 1); a Questions and Answers sheet about the budget from the recent B-Team meeting (Attachment 2); the proposed TRRP budget for FY2007 (Attachment 3); and the TRRP FY2007 Project Descriptions (Attachment 3a).

Schleusner noted that an extra appropriation of up to \$2 million might be received from Congress, but this was not yet certain. He noted therefore, that the revised budget shows

the president's budget, an addition of \$1 million, an addition of \$2 million, and the full program projected budget. Among other things, he clarified how the Fish and Wildlife funds are calculated and pointed out that the use of the term "carry over" is not appropriate. Finally he stressed the need for an approved budget in March of the prior year of the fiscal year so public bids can be processed in time.

Schluesner next commented on progress of Brown's Mountain Road and the culvert repair. Final repairs will not be completed before the 2007 peak spring releases and temporary fixes will be instituted. Ed Solbos of the TRRP commented further on the details of the repairs. Tom Stokely of Trinity County Planning Department commented on the County's costs of repairs (estimated at about \$60,000 for temporary fixes) and noted that the funding is still uncertain and a cause of concern.

Schluesner went over several items on the question and answers regarding the budget raised during the B-Team meeting of August 17, 2006 (Attachment 2). He also noted that the gray boxes in the Proposed Planning Budget 2007 show the changes to the budget.

Tom Stokely noted that the full program component column of the TRRP budget FY2007 is not accurate regarding the Trinity County participation. He stated that the County is being funded at about half their needs. He further noted a decrease in incoming grant funds and, therefore, a projected shortfall of funds exists for the County's participation in the Trinity Management Council (TMC) program.

Ed Solbos next highlighted and described details of various budget items in the Rehabilitation and Implementation Group (RIG) or "implementation" program of the TRRP. Tom Stokely noted that a program exists to help with mitigation of sewer and well problems that result as a function of the restoration peak flows (Attachment 4). Letters and application forms (Attachment 4a and 4b) were sent out to 400 landowners along the river. There is a limit of aid of \$10,000 for water systems and \$5,000 for sewer systems per applicant. Stokely commented that the \$215,000 currently budgeted may not be enough money in the Floodplain Structures Relocation portion of the budget to address all the aid, if a large number of applications are received. Ed Solbos thought there may be enough funding and that the TRRP would take funding from another restoration project, if needed.

Solbos commented that they did not get all the gravel introduced at the Lewiston Dam site, though they did introduce 2500 tons this year. One of the problems is the requirement for "in basin" gravel and there is only one gravel supplier. They are working on resolving this issue. Indian Creek project will occur this next summer and will be a source of gravel.

Tom Weseloh wished to clarify that, in general, that the TAMWG has communicated their view that certain higher priority issues such as Floodplain structures are being addressed in the budget, and there is not a need to go into detail on budget allocations on smaller issues. He wanted TAMWG and TMC to allow greater discretion of TRRP staff to move funds from low priority projects to high priority projects as appropriate.

Serge Birk expressed appreciation for the large amount of work TRRP staff spends on incrementing the budget as the funding is constantly changing. He also noted the usefulness of prioritizing. He asked that budgets be developed more along the lines of actual budgets (i.e., available funds) instead of scenarios.

Byron Leydecker also commented on the need to keep a more strategic view on the budget and not to get too involved with details of how and why funding is changing. More of the details can be left to TRRP staff. Jim Feider also agreed that the TAMWG should not focus on the details of the budget but on the budget itself.

Ed Solbos restated the three highest priorities for the implementation program of the TRRP: floodplain, gravel, and channel rehabilitation. The channel rehabilitation has the largest uncertainty of costs and is likely the source of funds for shortfalls in other items. Watershed issues are no longer in the implementation program of the TRRP. It was recently transferred to the Technical Modeling and Analysis Group (TMAG) or “science program” as they have more expertise in this issue.

Tom Stokely noted that Trinity County spends money in the next fiscal year--that is, they carry over funds from one year to the next. Reclamation doesn't want to provide funds to the County when money is still left over from a prior year. This results in the County being funded every other year. Stokely said that this system doesn't work for the County and that the County has not been able to get a multi-year agreement for spending.

Rod Wittler next addressed the TMAG program of work. He noted that the Watershed Planning and Implementation is being handled by the TMAG. He thought the “terrain database” is going to be operative this year. It will be used to prioritize projects designed to reduce fine sediment inputs to the river. He commented on several areas of the budget: sediment monitoring is prepaid; funding for juvenile emigration estimates has been reduced and there has been some disagreement over this.

**Rich Lorenz made a motion to compliment the TRRP staff for their efforts at cost comparison that may result in cost savings for the program.**

**The motion was seconded by Jim Feider.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

A river property owner from the Indian Creek area, Sid Mickelson, spoke to the TAMWG about some of the problems with the river flooding and sediment from Indian Creek. In essence, he wanted to express that the \$1.4 million for the Indian Creek project should be protected and not cut from the budget.

Serge Birk noted that no funding is allocated for an assessment of the effectiveness of the falls flows project. He suggested this should be addressed, and noted that assessments are important. He also noted that, if there is an effort being made in within other budget items, it should be made clear. Question 21 of the Budget Questions and Answers (Attachment 2) identifies the lack of a comprehensive assessment of continued fall flows.

Douglas Schleusner, for the record, expressed his support for Trinity County as “an important and valued partner” and that the issue of their funding is important. He said the TRRP is doing its best to “work the bugs out.”

Arnold Whitridge asked for thoughts about TAMWG recommendations regarding the budget.

Jim Feider asked about funding distributions among the three main program areas of the TRRP--RIG:TMAG:administration. Douglas Schluesner responded that the 30:50:20 allocation of funding that was a original goal was not explicitly met but they considered their overall strategy and used a “balanced approach” to meet their goals. Schluesner also described how they look at projects that come in at higher costs. They consider how can the project be modified or whether there are offsetting projects from which funds can be obtained.

The discussion next moved to whether accepting the lower three budget options (i.e., below full program funding) may “water down” a previous TAMWG recommendation that the TRRP be funding at the full amount. Opposing views expressed that this budget is a “reality” and nothing is really lost by accepting this. There still was a consensus of the TAMWG that full funding is important for the TRRP. There was discussion about the value of describing precisely what is lost without full funding. Schluesner stated that the TRRP can survive on the \$9.2 million or the \$10.2 million this coming year, but the urgency or problem is that the TRRP will be inheriting the “bow wake” of obligated or postponed costs in future years. He noted that if only \$9.2 million were received in FY2008, the science program will really begin to hurt as it is proposed to increase during the upcoming years.

The TAMWG decided to adjourn for the day and take up the issue of motions on the budget next morning.

**Adjourn for the day.**

**September 13, 2006**

**Convene 8:40 A.M.**

Tom Weseloh summarized the main points that the TAMWG wished to convey in a motion regarding the budget. These points included the continued advocacy for full program funding, support for the reduced budgets based on staff projections of actual funding, and recommendations that the staff have some leeway in adjusting budgets based on agreed on priorities.

Serge Birk asked that the specific risks to the progress of the program be articulated under various funding scenarios. The idea of the "bow wake" of continued under-funding needs to be brought to light.

Jim Feider expressed concerned about the rate of implementation of projects in the river, but stated that he still supports the budget as presented.

Byron Leydecker stated his support given the realities of the current budget.

**Tom Weseloh made a motion that TAMWG continues to advocate for full program funding to avoid substantial delays and increased costs in achieving the goals of the Program.**

**The motion was seconded by Steve Anderson.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Tom Weseloh made a motion that, given potential funding constraints, TAMWG recommends approval of the budget scenarios and recommendations developed by TRRP staff.**

**The motion was seconded by Bryon Leydecker.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Tom Weseloh made a motion that, regarding the budget process, TAMWG recommends that TRRP staff:**

**-develop a short explanatory list of the most and least urgent projects that would guide their final budget implementation;**

**-be allowed reasonable latitude to adjust final budget implementation as actual costs are finalized; and**

**-continued to provide TAMWG and TMC with explanations of variances on TMC approved budget items.**

**The motion was seconded by Jim Feider.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Jim Feider made a motion that TAMWG recommends the following budget guidance priorities, if budget is less than full program (not necessarily in order):**

**-floodplain modification**

**-completion and implementation of the Integrated Assessment Program**

**-channel rehabilitation and implementation**

**-gravel augmentation**

**The motion was seconded by Rich Lorenz.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Byron Leydecker made a motion that TAMWG recommends the budget adequately fund environmental compliance and permitting as required to implement the program. These funds should be placed in the budget under environmental compliance and permits and not under Trinity Management Council participation or program administration.**

**The motion was seconded by Rich Lorenz.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

Given the time spent on the above motions, the TAMWG decided to address Item 7 of the agenda next and then to return to the normal order of agenda items.

#### **4. Integrated Assessment Plan**

Rod Wittler of the TRRP presented an update of the Integrated Assessment Plan (IAP) (Attachment 5). An IAP Goals and Objectives Document has been prepared that describes the IAP and its purpose. He also brought attention to a specific goal of the IAP as outlined in a Memo to the TMC (Attachment 6). He handed out an agenda for the next meeting to be held on September 25-29 (Attachment 7).

The language of the goal in Attachment 6 was discussed in detail. There was discussion about the source of the language of the goal, the exact wording from the prior legislation and the words "dependent tribal, commercial, and sport fisheries..." In order to help to gain passage of a motion, the word "and" was added after "dependent tribal" and a comma was deleted following "commercial."

**Dana Hord made a motion to accept the goal slightly modified as that written in Attachment 6: The goal of the TRRP is to restore and sustain natural production of anadromous fish populations downstream of Lewiston Dam to pre-dam levels, to facilitate dependent tribal, and commercial and sport fisheries' full participation in the benefits of restoration via enhanced harvest opportunities. The TRRP *strategy* for accomplishing this goal restores and**

**perpetually maintains fish and wildlife resources (including threatened and endangered species) by restoring the processes that produce a healthy alluvial river ecosystem. The above restoration *strategy* will be achieved by implementing management actions in a science-based adaptive management program.**

**The motion was seconded by Jim Feider.**

**The motion passed with nine "yes" votes and two "no" votes.**

#### **5. Klamath River conditions; Klamath-Trinity management coordination**

Nina Hemphill of the TRRP gave a brief summary of Klamath River conditions. She described some of the monitoring of fish and gave the opinion that the river conditions seem as "good as they possibly could be for fish."

She commented on juvenile fish out-migrants and said that there is substantial mortality of Klamath juveniles to the myxosporean (protozoan-like) parasite *Ceratomyxa shasta*. Trinity juveniles do not appear to be infected when in the Trinity River but it is not known whether they become infected once entering the Klamath River. Trinity fish are infected with the myxosporean parasite *Parvicapsula*. There is a fish health workshop planned. It is difficult to tell the difference between Trinity and Klamath fish. They are seeking additional funding to be able to help monitor this.

**Tom Weseloh made a motion to add juvenile fish health to list of budget guidance priorities to be used by the TRRP.**

**The motion was seconded by Ed Duggan.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

#### **6. CVPIA Program Review**

Water and Power community (Serge Birk and Jim Feider) had to leave the meeting for another meeting and were not present for the following discussion and did not participate in the motion that was passed.

Tom Stokely of Trinity County Planning made a brief summary of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) review process. The CVPIA was 1992 legislation that modified the Central Valley Project water project and specifically directed that funding be paid by CVP contractors for environmental restoration projects. The CVPIA program assessment review was triggered by a report by the CVP water and power customers. Pursuant to CVPIA Section 3407, if certain activities, including Trinity, are considered "complete" the Central Valley water users' contribution to the CVPIA Restoration Fund can to be reduced by half. The customers are thus applying pressuring to achieve the reduced contribution. The environmental groups have also gotten involved in the review and are taking a close look at the completion criteria. The issue is what are

the completion criteria that demonstrate that restoration is complete in the Trinity River and justifies reduced funding. If restoration on the Trinity is considered complete, funding for the TRRP will probably be lost from CVPIA. Another issue is whether the normal appropriations for Trinity River projects are classed as "reimbursable funds." Classing the appropriations, which have been considered "non-reimbursable" could remove opposition by the water users to use of CVPIA Restoration Funds (which are paid for by the customers), but then there may be opposition to using reimbursable appropriated funds for Trinity River restoration. The Trinity River contributes to the CVPIA RF about \$5 million based on a formula of contributed water and power, but the Trinity River is "zeroed out" in terms of funding back to the river for FY 2007. Stokely referenced a document from the review process and that comments are being taken until September 29.

A copy of a letter was passed out. The letter was from the Bureau of Reclamation and the Fish and Wildlife Service to the Trinity Management Council (TMC) stating that funding is not going to be received from the CVPIA this year due to competing needs (Attachment 8).

**Tom Weseloh made a motion that TAMWG recommends the TMC write a letter to Bureau of Reclamation and Fish and Wildlife to thank them for consideration for continued funding and recommend that the TRRP program remain eligible for CVPIA restoration funding until goals of Public Law 98-541 have been met as required by CVPIA.**

**The motion was seconded by Ed Duggan.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

#### **7. Restoration experience on lower Clear Creek**

Francis Berg of the BLM office in Redding provided a short presentation on the restoration success in Clear Creek. The program goal was to increase fall chinook salmon production. The lower portion of Clear Creek flows from Whiskeytown Lake dam to the Sacramento River in Redding. The project increased flows, re-injected gravel (losses occurred from the dam), removed a small agricultural dam (fish barrier), and performed channel restoration. Other impacts included gravel mining and sections of the creek were heavily braided.

The project appears to be phenomenally successful. The pre-project fall chinook adult returns were 1560; the post-project returns are estimated at 15,000 to 20,000 for this fall. In addition, there are spring chinook and steelhead entering the system. The first sighting of the rare/threatened Western yellow-billed cuckoo in Shasta County was made at Clear Creek.

Berg admitted the exact factor for these success stories is not known. He cited a variety of hypotheses or explanations put forward by the participants: circumstance (i.e., right time, right place), public ownership of the lands, and the collaborative nature of the restoration team. He noted that increased flows, removal of the fish barrier, and

restoration of the braided channel were thought to be important. He specifically stressed the concept of collaboration of their management team. They only held one vote and its result was 17 to 1. The BLM specifically contributed via acquisition of private lands. They purchased 3,000 acres at a cost of \$7.5 million. Public ownership simplified management decisions.

There was some discussion by TAMWG members about land acquisition. Joan Hartmann asked that the TAMWG consider discussing land ownership and acquisitions within the Trinity River at a future meeting.

#### **8. Reports from TRRP work groups**

Tom Weseloh reported that progress is being made on two workgroups—the TMC budget subcommittee and the TMC IAP subcommittee.

Pat Frost noted a planned watershed group meeting scheduled for October 11, 2006. One issue they are dealing with is a site that threatens to deliver 8,000-cubic yards of fine sediment to the river system.

#### **9. Executive Director's report**

Doug Schleusner passed out a handout that provided update on activities of the TRRP (Attachment 9). He commented on challenges of the gravel augmentation, the work towards completion of the IAP, and the need for public education, among other issues. He noted a schedule of events in his handout. The Hocker Flat is now completed and they signed the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the Canyon Creek project.

#### **10. TAMWG Charter Renewal**

Randy Brown explained differences between the proposed and the current version of the charter of TAMWG. The changes were mostly minor and covered issues such as where working group reports should be sent, a change to website address, and clarification on conflict of interest for members. In conclusion, Brown reported that things are moving as they should in Washington DC (where the charter ultimately must be approved). He clarified guidance on reimbursement for airfare and that TAMWG members need to have the Fish and Wildlife purchase tickets at their lower fare rates. He asked that the member note the changes to the website.

#### **11. Open forum; public comment**

No comments.

#### **12. Tentative date and agenda topics for next meeting**

Next meeting is tentatively scheduled December 6 and 7 preferably at the library or else at the Victorian Inn.

Topics for discussion included flows, land acquisition, juvenile fish health, budget process, IAP approval, watersheds, and other non-TRRP restoration activities ongoing in the Trinity basin.

## **LIST OF MOTIONS**

**Jim Feider made motion to accept the minutes as edited.**

**The motion was seconded by Richard Lorenz.**

**Motion passed without dissent.**

**Rich Lorenz made a motion to compliment the TRRP staff for their efforts at cost comparison that may result in cost savings for the program.**

**The motion was seconded by Jim Feider.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Tom Weseloh made a motion that TAMWG continues to advocate for full program funding to avoid substantial delays and increased costs in achieving the goals of the Program.**

**The motion was seconded by Steve Anderson.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Tom Weseloh made a motion that, given potential funding constraints, TAMWG recommends approval of the budget scenarios and recommendations developed by TRRP staff.**

**The motion was seconded by Bryon Leydecker.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Tom Weseloh made a motion that, regarding the budget process, TAMWG recommends that TRRP staff:**

**-develop a short explanatory list of the most and least urgent projects that would guide their final budget implementation;**

**-be allowed reasonable latitude to adjust final budget implementation as actual costs are finalized; and**

**-continued to provide TAMWG and TMC with explanations of variances on TMC approved budget items.**

**The motion was seconded by Jim Feider.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Jim Feider made a motion that TAMWG recommends the following budget guidance priorities, if budget is less than full program (not necessarily in order):**

**-floodplain modification**

**-completion and implementation of the Integrated Assessment Program**

**-channel rehabilitation and implementation**

**-gravel augmentation**

**The motion was seconded by Rich Lorenz.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Byron Leydecker made a motion that TAMWG recommends the budget adequately fund environmental compliance and permitting as required to implement the program. These funds should be placed in the budget under environmental compliance and permits and not under Trinity Management Council participation or program administration.**

**The motion was seconded by Rich Lorenz.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Dana Hord made a motion to accept the goal slightly modified as that written in Attachment 6: The goal of the TRRP is to restore and sustain natural production of anadromous fish populations downstream of Lewiston Dam to pre-dam levels, to facilitate dependent tribal, and commercial and sport fisheries' full participation in the benefits of restoration via enhanced harvest opportunities. The TRRP *strategy* for accomplishing this goal restores and perpetually maintains fish and wildlife resources (including threatened and endangered species) by restoring the processes that produce a healthy alluvial river ecosystem. The above restoration *strategy* will be achieved by implementing management actions in a science-based adaptive management program.**

**Tom Weseloh made a motion to add juvenile fish health to list of budget guidance priorities to be used by the TRRP.**

**The motion was seconded by Ed Duggan.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Tom Weseloh made a motion that TAMWG recommends the TMC to write a letter to Bureau of Reclamation and Fish and Wildlife to thank them for**

**consideration for continued funding and recommend that the TRRP program remain eligible for CVPIA restoration funding until goals of Public Law 98-541 have been met as required by CVPIA.**

**The motion was seconded by Ed Duggan.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**LIST OF ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1: Memo "Subject: Revised FY 2007 Budget Proposal to be presented September 12 and 20, 2006." Trinity River Restoration Program, September 7, 2006.

Attachment 2: Draft FY2007 Budget—Q&As: Developed from B-Team Meeting Notes (August 17, 2006) September 7, 2006.

Attachment 3: Proposed Planning Budget – FY2007 and Estimated FY2008.

Attachment 3a: Trinity River Restoration Program FY 2007 Project Description.

Attachment 4: Trinity River Potable Water and Sewage Disposal System Assistance Program.

Attachment 4a: Copy of letter sent out to landowners, "Subject: Implementation of Dam Releases to the Trinity River for Fishery Restoration."

Attachment 4b: Application for Trinity River Potable Water and Sewage Disposal System Assistance Program.

Attachment 5: Integrated Assessment Plan: update TAMWG and TMC, Fall 2006. TRRP.

Attachment 6: Memo "Re: Goal of the Trinity River Restoration Program." September 6, 2006. To the TMC; from IAP Steering Committee.

Attachment 7: Meeting 1 to Develop Draft 0.7 of the Integrated Assessment Plan (IAP) for the Trinity River Restoration Program. Draft Objectives and Agenda.

Attachment 8: Letter to TMC from Bureau of Reclamation and Fish and Wildlife Service "Subject: Trinity River Restoration Program Funding Support." August 29, 2006.

Attachment 8a: Letter to Kirk Rodgers and Steve Thompson from Mike Long of TMC, July 27, 2006.

Attachment 9: Memo "Subject: Director's Report, April 1, 2006--September 20, 2006." To TMC and TAMWG from Douglas Schluesner, TRRP. September 12, 2006.