

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

**Thursday, December 6 and Friday, December 7, 2007**

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

**Start of meeting: 12:10 PM.**

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
Byron Leydecker	Friends of Trinity River
Tom Weseloh	California Trout, Inc
Dana Hord	Big Bar Community Development Group
David Steinhauser	Six Rivers Outfitter and Guide Association
James Spear	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Dan Haycox <sup>1</sup>	Miners Alliance
Francis Berg <sup>2</sup>	Bureau of Land Management
James Feider <sup>3</sup>	City of Redding Electric Utility Department

<sup>1</sup> Attended first day only.

<sup>2</sup> Arrived during discussion of Item 4.

<sup>3</sup> Attended second day only.

Members that did not attend:

Member:	Representative Seat:
Spreck Rosekrans	Environmental Defense
Pat Frost	Trinity County Resource Conservation District

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

1. **Adopt agenda and approval of minutes**

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

**Changes to September minutes**

Two changes were suggested to the September minutes by Byron Leydecker and Tom Weseloh.

**Ed Duggan made a motion to accept the September 2007 minutes with changes.**

**Byron Leydecker seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

2. **Open forum; public comment**

No comments were made.

3. **Designated Federal Officer topics**

Randy Brown, designated Federal Officer, addressed the issue of TAMWG membership, noting that Joan Hartmann was leaving and Elizabeth Soderstrom was also presumed to be leaving. There was discussion about how to handle alternates and the value of having alternates that can attend meetings with the same privileges as regular members.

Serge Birk announced that this was his last meeting and noted that his constituency will likely want to choose an alternate. Birk suggested, since there did not seem to be a process for assigning replacements, that the Chairman write a letter to ask about how to replace members that leave during the periods between charter renewal.

Tom Weseloh noted that official members are reimbursed, can vote, and can more readily participate, whereas substitutes that "sit-in to listen" do not have these privileges. Brown opined that there is not an easy way to add an alternate quickly. He noted that the paperwork goes back to Washington and this is why it seems to take so long. He said he could provide the flowchart that shows the numerous steps of the approval process. He asked that all TAMWG members inform him that they are all still interested in staying on as he was planning to start the process for member renewal in January. He said they will be advertising locally in the media about the opportunity for new membership by any potential stakeholders.

It was noted that Birk had served since the beginning of TAMWG and several members expressed their appreciation for Birk's work and wished him luck with his new ventures in fish aquaculture.

**Tom Weseloh made a motion that the TAMWAG and the Trinity Management Council write a letter to Serge Birk's organization (Central**

Valley Project Water Association) thanking them for Birk's work with the TAMWG.

Dana Hord seconded.

The motion passed unanimously.

**4. Moving to a Request For Proposals-based 2010 budget**

Douglas Schluesner, executive director of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP), presented his budget update for FY2008-FY2010 (Attachment 1). He noted that a continuing resolution in Washington DC is likely to be in place through much of next year. The TRRP will operate on a Interim Spending Plan that allows no new starts and expenditures to remain at the same level as last year. Available funds were still projected at \$10.2 million; funding levels in FY2009 and FY2010 were expected to be similar to FY2007 (\$9-10 million).

Schluesner noted that the floodplain structure modifications now allow full implementation of peak ROD releases. The channel rehabilitation is 33 % complete. The Trinity River has seen below average runs for Chinook, positive responses for coho, and record numbers of steelhead.

In the future, the TRRP plans to complete the Integrated Assessment Plan by next September and the completion of eight more channel rehabilitation projects. He expressed worry about the possibility of a coming drought and budget uncertainties.

He noted two specific recommendations the TAMWG made to the Trinity Management Council (TMC). These recommendations were regarding the adoption of a budget at the March meeting (and not defer to a later date) and that the TMC should pursue full ROD funding for FY2008 and FY2009.

Schluesner next described his proposal for a simplified budget process for 2009. He noted the problems of the FY2008 budget approval—despite many meetings and reviews, key differences were not resolved and controversial issues had to be elevated to the Department of Interior for final decisions. Schluesner presented a flow chart for a developing a simplified FY2009 approval process. He suggested they use the FY2008 budget as a “starting point” and the TRRP staff would identify needed changes. The staff would develop recommendations for the December/January meetings for review. Modifications would be made for approval by March meetings.

Schluesner next presented a plan for a competitive RFP process by FY2010. The goal is to implement cost-effective proposals that meet program objectives. There was discussion of why some projects should be reserved for Tribes to perform. Schluesner noted that there are prior agreements between the Department of Interior and the Tribes.

Birk asked how individual contractors or universities may fairly compete with agencies that have historically been part of the process. Schluesner added that they are really

committed to going to a competitive process. Francis Berg noted that a competitive process worked well for Clear Creek for the BLM.

There were several questions about how the award process can effectively deal with cost effectiveness, especially if there is only a single bid from a chosen supplier. Will the bids be negotiable? Schleusner said they will have a set of clear objectives that will guide them and that they develop government estimates for projects. But, he admitted that the awarders wouldn't really know if the bids are the best price unless the bids are "openly competed."

There was discussion about how the TAMWG should proceed about providing input into the TRRP budget process. One question discussed was whether to hold a February meeting in order to provide input to the budget development. Several expressed a need for the TAMWG to stay engaged in the budget process. Dan Haycox made a proposal to hold a single-item meeting in February to discuss the budget. It was decided that this would work for most members. If the meeting was to address only the budget, a teleconference meeting might be used.

**Tom Weseloh made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC to adopt the RFP process as presented by Douglas Schleusner.**

**Rich Lorenz seconded.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

##### **5. Integrated Assessment Plan—progress; remaining issues**

Rod Wittler of the TRRP and Tim Hayden of the Yurok Tribe made a joint presentation on the progress of Integrated Assessment Plan (IAP). Hayden noted that two workshops are planned to discuss the nuts and bolts of the assessment. He also went over a schedule and the objectives of the process. Wittler referred to a handout (Attachment 2) regarding the TMC answers to issues and questions regarding the IAP.

There was discussion about the goals statement of the IAP and whether there should be numeric goals. It was also pointed out that the answers provided by the TMC as listed on Attachment 2 were not really "answers." Wittler noted that the TMC did provide guidance that the mission of the TRRP should be the ROD and that other outstanding issues are being resolved. They are trying to get this done by September 2008. The IAP is essential as it will define objectives for the RFP process.

There was discussion about how far the TRRP may or should go in making recommendations about both hatchery and harvest programs. There were comments about the need to address these impacts for the total fishery. Douglas Schluessner commented that that the language of the ROD limited the TRRP to only management of flow and manipulations of channel.

Arnold Whitridge acknowledged the IAP steering committee's work. Hayden acknowledged the help they have received from Tom Weseloh.

## **6. Gravel Augmentation planning**

Dave Gaeuman of the TRRP gave an update on the gravel augmentation work. He presented answers to five questions posed in a note sent to him by Byron Leydecker (Attachment 3). In answering one question about how to estimate needed gravel volumes, Gaeuman said he used bedload transport equations from the literature. These equation use size of the gravel and river transport in an equilibrium transport equation. He noted that the gravel currently in the Trinity River is excessively coarse (median of 90 mm diameter). He attempted to calculate how much gravel of smaller sizes might be added to the bed to effectively reduce the in-river median diameter to about 65 mm and still stay in the river. In answering another question about how to find out what amounts of gravel might be contributed by tributaries, he said he took some best guesses and arrived at rough estimates. He noted that the Flow Study had very few measurements by which to make its particular conclusions of bedload transport.

Leydecker asked whether the gravel projects have received independent review. Rod Wittler admitted that the past projects probably haven't had the sort of formal review Leydecker is referring to, but all future projects will be receiving review from experts.

Ed Solbos of the TRRP presented an update on a "gravel demand" for the Dark Gulch and Lewiston sites. They did not get all the gravel they wanted from the Indian Creek site—6,500 tons was placed up at the dam and 3,500 tons was trucked to the Sawmill site in stockpiles and are ready for high flow injections this spring. 12,000 tons are stockpiled for the Dark Gulch and Lewiston project. The Dark Gulch and Lewiston projects have a demand for 25,000 tons. They are considering purchasing 8,000 tons at about \$250,000. Additions of gravel should be three times higher than last year and should reach the 10,000 to 15,000 tons per year goal.

## **7. Flow Schedule considerations for 2008**

Rod Wittler of the TRRP gave an update on the flow schedule and passed out an "outline of thoughts" (Attachment 4). He noted upcoming meetings planned for this spring. He asked the TAMWG members to look over his handout and begin considering if any changes to the ROD flows are needed.

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

Doug Schlessner, executive director of the TRRP, gave a brief verbal report, noting that he would have a written report in a week or two as the computer servers at the TRRP are "down." He noted several TRRP accomplishments: 1) hiring a new employee, a civil engineer to help with the RIG staff on the Lewiston and Dark Gulch projects; 2) the Science Advisory Board contracts were in place; 3) the website had been updated with Indian Creek project; 4) he recently gave a presentation to the Water Quality Control Board.

Schlessner noted work in progress: 1) the TRRP may receive exemptions for restoration projects such as turbidity standards (now at 20 % above background); 2) they are

planning to refurbish the hatchery kiosk by April at a low cost; 3) the EIR for the upcoming projects are out for review.

Schluesner also noted other ongoing projects. He specifically noted that they do not think they can "obligate" the remaining eight projects with the FY2008 budget. The master EIR will include these eight sites and these sites will be done in 2009. The review of the rotary screw traps is ongoing and a report will be out in January. The statement of work for habitat assessment is ready to go out. He noted that an upcoming Solicitor's review will help to focus objective of the program.

Whitridge asked if the Science Advisory Board may review not only the IAP but also the entire program. Schleusner noted that the IAP probably has to be reviewed first. Whitridge asked about the public concerns raised about the Indian Creek project and increased turbidity and whether there is any way to do more public outreach. Schleusner commented on some ideas to get the word out to guides and agreed about the need to get more information out.

**The meeting adjourned for the day.**

**Friday 8:40 AM the meeting was reconvened.**

#### **9. Rehabilitation project design- progress and current issues**

John Klochak and Joe Reiss gave an update on the progress of the channel project designs for Indian Creek, Lewiston-Dark Gulch, Remaining 8 Sites, and Phase 2.

Reiss first discussed Indian Creek, which was completed in October. He noted that they are very happy with the result. They delivered 6,500 tons of gravel to Lewiston, 15,500 tons stockpiles for future use—most is at the Indian Creek site. Revegetation at Indian Creek is postponed until a flood works the area this winter.

Reiss provided an update on the Lewiston-Dark Gulch project, which was started in May 2007. They are currently in the EIR process and designs; construction is planned for mid July; the project will finish by end of December 2008. He noted they are planning an Interdisciplinary Team meeting December 20, 2008 to discuss design issues. Reiss noted that there are no major controversies. But, in responding to questions, Reiss said there are some groups that feel the TRRP is not taking full advantage of the Dark Gulch site. He noted that the staff feels the project is appropriate at this time. Reiss said that the gravel additions are one of the biggest issues—they are considering how much to add and what sizes.

John Klochak presented a schedule for the "Remaining 8 Sites." The conceptual designs are completed and they are entering EIR process. Construction is planned to start July 2009 and to be completed by December 2010.

Klochak went over some of the details and issues with the Remaining 8:

1. There is uncertainty as to “how big to design”—i.e., should they add more side channels and sculpting of floodplain at specific sites at higher costs? There are only a few sites that present this opportunity—Lowden Ranch, Sawmill, Trinity House Gulch are three.
2. They now estimate that the banks are 20 % “bermed” and 40 % “in bedrock.” Compared to the original Flow Study, these current estimates are lower for bermed and higher for bedrock. They are considering the implications of these revised estimates.
3. Gravel augmentation and best alternatives—how much to add and what sizes.

Phase 2 will start this summer. The concept is to package multiple EIRs and permits together into a single package. Responding to question about whether a particularly sticky project could hold up all the projects, the staff thought this approach has several benefits that outweigh these disadvantages.

#### **10. Numeric fish harvest goals for TRRP**

Tom Stokely introduced the concept of harvest goals and whether or not the TRRP should adopt such goals. Stokely explained that there are escapement goals of restoring natural populations below the dam, but these are different than harvest goals particularly since it is difficult to count or estimate escapement. He noted that the funds from the Central Valley project may be reduced once the restoration goals of the TRRP are met. He asked how do we assess restoration without numeric goals?

Danny Jordan of the Hoopa Valley Tribe next presented some background of the issue of how to define restoration and the case for numeric harvest goals (Attachments 5 and 5a). He reviewed some of the laws that established the ROD. He also expressed the Tribe’s concern of possibly “losing the brood stock” of native fish. He expressed his opinion that the progress of restoration is proceeding too slowly and that goals would help to better assess progress.

Jordan noted that while trust responsibility is an element of Public Law 102-575, it is not well defined. He walked the TAMWG through the reasoning among the laws. He described a general disagreement among Central Valley Project water and power interests, the Federal agencies, and the Hoopa Tribe about the meaning of “trust responsibility.” He specifically noted that the Friant Water District and other parties contend that the trust responsibility does not require meeting fish restoration goals and maintenance of the Trinity River fishery. He made his case that the existing law documents that the trust responsibility does require production of fish within specific timeframe. This is the rationale for establishing numeric goals.

He said that the Integrated Assessment Plan should deal with numeric goals and with hatchery effects. If it doesn’t, the tribes believe the TRRP would be at odds with what Congress dictated.

Whitridge asked about whether the TRRP is expected to be “in charge” of ocean conditions and harvests levels. He asked Jordan that, although it makes sense to have goals, how would we “look at” these issues. Jordan said one should look at the Leishy opinion, as this “wraps it up” and requires fisheries to be restored. Whitridge thought this may require a whole change in regulation. Jordan did not think so and noted that Mike Long sits on the councils that decide on fishing limits. He said there is a “budget need” today that seems to want to downsize Trinity restoration for Central Valley.

Tom Weseloh commented that he agreed with much of what Jordan presented and thought Jordan’s proposals were a good idea. But, Weseloh said he would like to hear more discussion. For example, Weseloh noted he was in favor of changes being made to the hatchery but understood that the TRRP cannot directly control the hatchery. He asked “where the harvest goals go” and how they would be developed. Stokely reiterated that all they should focus on today is to decide whether or not the TAMWG wants to recommend that the TMC should adopt numeric goals.

Responding to a question about his opinion on the issue, Rod Wittler noted his need “to be faithful to the requirements of the ROD” and that smolt production was a major goal of the program.

Leydecker asked about the difference between goals of “quantified habitat” or “harvest numbers.” Weseloh asked whether habitat is separable from fish numbers or not—is the program responsible for just restoring habitat or do they need to consider harvest?

Tim Hayden agreed with Jordan that there is a legal requirement to acknowledge goals. Hayden said the Yurok Tribe is more inclined to adopt “qualitative goals” at this time, but the Tribe is willing and interested in further discussion of numeric goals.

Francis Berg, referring to the Clear Creek project in the Central Valley, said that a goal of doubling or tripling escapement had been made there (or it was “somewhat of a goal”). Even though they surpassed this goal and have seen a five-fold increase, they have not stopped restoration work.

Brian Person of the Bureau of Reclamation responded to a couple of items that were mentioned. He said that Reclamation’s position is not just about section “B23” of one of the laws and they are not going to stop restoration efforts. He noted that they are seeking the BOR’s solicitor’s office to get guidance on a goal statement about numeric harvest and hatchery effects. However, he questioned the role of goals in defining future directions for restoration. He posed the following future scenario: What happens if upon completing construction of restoration sites and smolt production goals are met, but no fish return from the ocean? If we had harvest goals and did not meet them, due to conditions outside of the basin, what would we do? He asked that any goals be meaningful in directing action that the TRRP could take.

Whitridge noted that harvest regulation has effected future returns. The value of a goal allows it to be officially noted that desired harvest is not being met. Whitridge opined that Congress asked that not only escapement, but that fisheries also would also benefit.

Schleusner commented that much of what has been said has merit. He said that it is important to note who has responsibility. The ROD only gives responsibility for the TRRP to restore habitat. Harvest goals are affected by many factors outside the program's responsibility. He did not think that ROD allows for controls of harvest or hatchery management actions. The habitat and flows "lead toward" other goals such as increased harvest.

It was asked if establishment of goals by the TMC would affect the TRRP ability to carry out their mission. Schleusner did not think the TMC has the authority to establish goals. But, he did not think that establishment of goals would materially affect their ability to work.

Leydecker commented that he would like to be better informed on this issue and would like to see the Solicitor's opinion. When he asked how long for the Solicitor's opinion, it was said it is not known and will certainly be more than two months from now. Leydecker noted that he differs from Schleusner's interpretation of the ROD.

Jim Feider agreed with Leydecker that more information would be useful on this issue. He noted that he did not know how discussion of this item would appear in the minutes and specifically he wanted to comment on the information in the handouts passed out by Jordan. First, contrary to what Jordan implied in one of his handouts, Friant Water District does not typically speak for all the power contractors. He further wanted to note that, with respect to the CPAR process, the power contractors are trying to get better definition of the checklist of the 33 items in 3406. They are not trying indicate that restoration in the Trinity is complete, but that they believe the trigger point is the ROD decision that allows "that box to be checked" while implementation goes forward. So, they are not any way trying to truncate or cutoff what is going on in the restoration program. Feider further said that the power contractors do not have a position on numeric goals at this time.

It was decided that no decision would be made by the TAMWG at this time.

## **11. TRRP Roles and Responsibilities**

Mike Long, Chairman of the TMC, provided background and history of discussion of TRRP roles and responsibilities. He noted that differing views had arisen over this topic. A facilitated process to find the underlying cause of this issue is being planned. They hope to have a facilitator chosen and on board by January. Interviews with various TMC members are planned and a final report is hoped for by March. He stated that he hoped this would not be a financial impact on the TRRP and the process will be a consensus.

Whitridge asked whether a facilitated discussion will occur among the various differing members. Long said that the facilitator will be attempting to get to the underlying issues, though he could not state the exact process. The anticipated cost is \$31,500.

Brian Person said they would try to provide funds so the TRRP would not suffer any loss of restoration effort. He related the success of mediation in a prior job he had in

Colorado. One of the issues that the process may address is trust responsibility; another is inherent conflict of interest.

Tom Weseloh commented that, according to minutes of TMC, some items of roles and responsibilities had been decided (e.g., TRRP staffing). He noted that these have not been followed up and hoped this issue would be addressed in the process.

## **12. TAMWG communications with TMC**

Whitridge commented that the TMC has agreed to respond to TAMWG recommendations though response is still slow. The issue of the "paper process" in appointing replacement TAMWG members was brought up and there hasn't been much progress on this. Could the TMC or Mike Long provide impetus for faster action on this?

Long noted his letter that made responses to some recommendations made by the TAMWG (see letter attached as other documents). Long said that he could not speak officially for the TMC, since the TMC was still planning a meeting in January and would address these issues.

Tom Weseloh asked if some of the TAMWG recommendations are on the TMC agenda. Long said he could look at these issues and should be able to add them. It was clarified that the TAMWG was not looking for response from Long now, but that they want the TMC to discuss these issues.

Tom Weseloh raised another issue of who pays for marking hatchery fish and asked if this also was on the TMC agenda, and if not, if the Reclamation Office has heard about this issue. Brian Person of the Bureau of Reclamation acknowledged this issue.

Whitridge reported that the BLM wanted to be a member of the TMC. Rationale given was that BLM supports ecosystem restoration and they have authority as one of the major land managers in the basin.

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

The next meeting was tentatively set for a single day meeting on January 22. This would give an opportunity to provide input to the TMC on the budget process.

A March meeting was tentatively scheduled for two day meeting on the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup>.

**Meeting was adjourned.**

## **LIST OF MOTIONS**

**Ed Duggan made a motion to accept the September 2007 minutes with changes.**

**Byron Leydecker seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Tom Weseloh made a motion that the TAMWAG and the Trinity Management Council write a letter to Serge Birk's organization (Central Valley Project Water Association) thanking them for Birk's work with the TAMWG.**

**Dana Hord seconded.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Tom Weseloh made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC to adopt the RFP process as presented by Douglas Schleusner.**

**Rich Lorenz seconded.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

## LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Budget Update FY2008-FY2010. Copy of visual presentation made at TAMWG meeting December 6, 2007. Douglas Schluesner.

Attachment 2: TMC actions on outstanding IAP Policy Issues (Sept 2007). Handed out by Rod Wittler.

Attachment 3: Gravel Introductions into the Trinity River. Five questions posed by Byron Leydecker 12-1-07. Handed out by Dave Gaeuman.

Attachment 4: 2008 Flow Scheduling. Initial Brainstorming & Collection of Thoughts. 6 Dec 07. Handed out by Rod Wittler.

Attachment 5: Overview of rationale for defining trust responsibility as requiring adopting of numeric goals for fish restoration. Handed out by Danny Jordan.

Attachment 5a: Copies of portions of three Public Laws: 102-575 Central Valley Project Improvement Act, 98-541, and 104-143. Handed out by Danny Jordan.

### **Other Documents that were made available during the meeting:**

Memo from Mike Long to Arnold Whitridge Subject Response to Trinity Adaptive Management Council Working Group (TAMWG) letter of June 19, 2007. Memo dated September 19, 2007.

Letter from TAMWG Chair, Arnold Whitridge to TMC Chair, Mike Long regarding three recommendations from the TAMWG September 2007 meeting. Letter dated September 24, 2007.

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

**Tuesday January 22, 2008**

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

**Start of meeting: 10:10 AM.**

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
Byron Leydecker	Friends of Trinity River
Tom Weseloh	California Trout, Inc
James Feider	City of Redding Electric Utility Department
James Spear	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Spreck Rosekrans <sup>1</sup>	Environmental Defense
Gary Diridoni <sup>2</sup>	Bureau of Land Management
David Steinhauser <sup>3</sup>	Six Rivers Outfitter and Guide Association
Pat Frost <sup>4</sup>	Trinity County Resource Conservation District

<sup>1</sup> Attended via audio conferencing and signed off during discussion of Item 6.

<sup>2</sup> Replacement for Francis Berg.

<sup>3</sup> Arrived during discussion of item 3.

<sup>4</sup> Left meeting after discussion of item 5.

Members that did not attend:

Member:	Representative Seat:
Dana Hord	Big Bar Community Development Group
Dan Haycox <sup>1</sup>	Miners Alliance

<sup>1</sup> Stopped by before the meeting started to report that he a medical appointment to attend.

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

1. **Adopt agenda and approval of minutes**

Arnold Whitridge, chairman of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG), called the meeting to order, noting that Spreck Rosekrans was attending by audio conferencing. It was noted that the agenda appeared to be in order.

**Changes to December minutes.**

Jim Feider requested to add a clarification to his comments recorded on page 9. Ed Duggan made a edit on page 2.

**Jim Feider made a motion to accept the minutes with suggested changes.**

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

**The motion passed unanimously.**

2. **Open forum, public comment**

No public comment was made at this time.

3. **Designated Federal Officer topics**

Randy Brown reported on the progress of TAMWG membership and assignments. He was looking at March 15 as the deadline for receiving nominations for TAMWG membership. They were going to advertise to potential interest groups that may want to have a representative serve on the TAMWG. He referred to a draft of the news release and the request for nominations (Attachment 1). He noted that current members that want to be continue to serve on the TAMWG do not have to resubmit the personal information if it has not changed.

Brown reported that the charter renewal process was moving "according to script."

4. **Election of TAMWG Chair and Vice-chair for 2008**

There was minimal discussion on the topic of Chairman and Vice-Chairman and nominations were made immediately.

**Byron Leydecker nominated Arnold Whitridge to continue as Chairman.**

**Richard Lorenz seconded.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Jim Spear nominated Pat Frost for Vice Chairman.**

**Tom Weseloh seconded.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**5. FY 2008 Budget update and allocation of additional \$3 million**

Doug Schleusner, Executive Director of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) provided an update on the FY 2008 budget and a proposal on how to allocate an additional \$3 million dollars that has been made available to the TRRP. He passed out a handout that noted the steps required to obligate the funds and what the TRRP recommends how the additional funds may be allocated (Attachment 2). The TRRP proposed to allocate \$750,000 to channel projects (RIG), \$500,00 to planning (TMAG), \$500,000 to additional watershed restoration to be determined by the Trinity River Watershed Council, and \$1,250,000 to fund the "Remaining 8" and reduce the "bow wave" (accumulated impending costs due to under funding of the TRRP in prior years).

There were questions and requests about some details of spending proposal. Ed Solbos and Rod Wittler of the TRRP provided additional information on how the additional funds will help their programs. Tom Stokely, of Trinity County Planning Department, noted a meeting scheduled for tomorrow to devise further recommendations directly to reduce fine sediment reduction. Douglas Schluesner said that they expect there may be options for carry-over spending.

Mike Long, Chairman of the Trinity Management Council (TMC), noted that there were "no major concerns," but that the TMC had not discussed the proposal.

Jim Feider asked if the Bureau has made a determination if this \$3 million was reimbursable or not. Schleusner noted he thought it would be reimbursable.

Gary Diridoni of BLM noted that BLM needs to still sign off on some aspects of the projects. Diridoni noted that, as the fisheries and wildlife specialist at the BLM, he is assigned to a variety of tasks and is behind schedule on the Trinity River. Responding to a question, he estimated that additional staff support could cost an additional \$100,000 per year. There was discussion of the appropriateness of using the additional \$3 million for helping with additional staffing. Schleusner noted that whether or not funds should be spent for agency staffing is being discussed at a "management level" within the Department of Interior.

**Tom Weseloh made a motion that the TAMWG Chairman draft a letter to the TMC stressing TAMWG support for the TRRP spending proposal for the \$3 million. The Chairman would communicate that TMC modifications should be consistent with the restoration fund guidelines and that the TAMWG supports the funding for 1) on the ground activities of the RIG, 2) reduction of the "bow wave," and 3) watershed restoration activities. Weseloh also commended the TRRP staff for their work on the proposal.**

**Ed Duggan seconded.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Pat Frost abstained as the Trinity County Resource Conservation District may be receiving funding from the proposal.**

**Tom Weseloh made a motion to prepare a letter of appreciation and commendation for the work of Ed Solbos as he is planning to retire on May 3, 2008.**

**Seconded by Rich Lorenz.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**6. FY 2009 Budget proposal**

Doug Schleusner passed out two handouts. The first was a copy of his memo describing FY 2009 budget proposals and how to review the budget process (Attachment 3). The second was the proposed budget (Attachment 3a). He called attention to page 2 of the memo that asked for comments on the draft budget be sent back to him by February 8<sup>th</sup>. He noted that a revised budget be available for the TAMWG and TMC by the end of February.

Schleusner also presented on his Executive Director's report at this time and passed out a handout summarizing TRRP activities since September (Attachment 4).

Tom Weseloh asked if Schleusner anticipates a revised memo following the upcoming TMC meeting and discussion of the proposed FY 2009 budget. He noted that if there were changes, he would like to review them before going on record for support of the proposed FY 2009 budget.

Jim Spear expressed concern that the \$3 million "windfall" shores up watershed restoration to \$500,000 in 2008 but the FY 2009 budget allows this to drop to \$100,00.

Jim Feider agreed that the watershed restoration dropping down to \$100,000 by FY 2009 is a little bit low, but on the other hand, it is deemed to be reimbursable and he would try to find a way to support it. He expressed concern that when he looks at the FY2009 budget compared to the full-program level of funding for watersheds (\$1.8 million), that money may be found and that would be the "outer limit of the exposure" from a reimbursability standpoint. As a result, he feels he needs a better understanding of the watershed programmatic perspective, how the money is being leveraged, and the prognosis for the multi-year budget in order to discuss this. He clarified a question from Leydecker that, dollars that show up on the TRRP budget are considered reimbursable, whereas spending in other agency budgets are not. Schleusner agreed with Feider on this definition of reimbursability. Schleusner noted that if activities get "too far into the watershed" and do not directly benefit the mainstem, spending may not be considered reimbursable—but he was not able to address this directly.

Tom Weseloh opined that sediment that enters flowing tributaries will eventually reach the mainstem. Feider commented that sediment that enters due to poor landuse practices should not have to be paid for by the Power Contractors of the CVP. He further noted

that sediment which enters due to natural causes, and is within the dollar amounts under discussion here, the Power Contractors would not raise a fuss over it. Leydecker commented on the potential of increased sediment from logging in the watershed. Schleusner noted that the Watershed Council would be one way to deal with this. Whitridge lamented that while the ROD stated \$2 million should be spent on watershed issues, it did not give direction about reimbursability. He hoped that Feider may be able to help lead future discussions so that watershed work could continue. Feider suggested that an agenda item be created for next meeting about spending on watershed issues and budgets.

The discussion next turned to how the TAMWG might comment on the budget process and what sort of recommendation should be made. There was general consensus that \$100,000 was low for watershed work. Schleusner asked that, if the \$100,000 were to be increased, they also suggest from where the additional funds should come.

**Jim Spear made a motion that the TAMWG recommend that the proposed FY2009 budget as proposed by TRRP is reasonable and appropriate with the exception of the concerns about lack of funding for watershed restoration. Increased funding in FY2009 should be sought for watershed restoration commensurate with the levels proposed for the FY2008 budget.**

**Seconded by Ed Duggan.**

**Passed unanimously.**

**7. TAMWG recommendations to TMC**

This item was addressed in the motions that were made during Items 5 and 6.

**8. Executive Director's report Doug Schleusner**

Discussed with Item 6.

**9. Date and agenda topics for next meeting**

The next meeting was tentatively set for March 10 and 11. Topics suggested for items included 1) interactions between hatchery and wild fish, 2) carryover of storage water, 3) flow scheduling, and 4) clarification of funding of a reported \$56 million being via a settlement for Klamath River restoration and how much might be allocated to the Trinity.

**Meeting was adjourned.**

## **LIST OF MOTIONS**

**Jim Feider made a motion to accept the minutes with suggested changes.**

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

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Byron Leydecker nominated Arnold Whitridge to continue as Chairman.**

**Richard Lorenz seconded.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Jim Spear nominated Pat Frost for Vice Chairman.**

**Tom Weseloh seconded.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Tom Weseloh made a motion that the TAMWG Chairman draft a letter to the TMC stressing TAMWG support for the TRRP spending proposal for the \$3 million. The Chairman would communicate that TMC modifications should be consistent with the restoration fund guidelines and that the TAMWG supports the funding for 1) on the ground activities of the RIG, 2) reduction of the "bow wave," and 3) watershed restoration activities. Weseloh also commended the TRRP staff for their work on the proposal.**

**Ed Duggan seconded.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Pat Frost abstained as the Trinity County Resource Conservation District may be receiving funding from the proposal.**

**Tom Weseloh made a motion to prepare a letter of appreciation and commendation for the work of Ed Solbos as he is planning to retire on May 3, 2008.**

**Seconded by Rich Lorenz.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Jim Spear made a motion that the TAMWG recommend that the proposed FY2009 budget as proposed by TRRP is reasonable and appropriate with the exception of the concerns about lack of funding for watershed restoration. Increased funding in FY2009 should be sought for watershed restoration commensurate with the levels proposed for the FY2008 budget.**

**Seconded by Ed Duggan.**

**Passed unanimously.**

## **LIST OF ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1: News Release from the US Fish and Wildlife for Nominations Requested for the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (Draft). January 30, 2008. Passed out by Randy Brown.

Attachment 2: Revised TRRP Staff Proposal for Additional Trinity River Funding made available in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2008. 1/17/08. Passed out by Douglas Schluesner.

Attachment 3: Memo of January 3, 2008 on subject "FY2009 Draft Proposal and Review Guidelines." To Trinity Management Council (TMC) and Trinity Adaptive Management Group (TAMWG) from Douglas Schleusner, Executive Director of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP).

Attachment 3a: TRRP Proposed Planning Budget FY2009.

Attachment 4: Memo of January 8, 2008 on subject "Director's Report; September 27, 2007—January 4, 2008. To TMC and TAMWG from Douglas Schleusner, Executive Director, TRRP.