

Final Minutes
Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group
Trinity County Library, County Supervisors Room, Weaverville, CA

June 10 and 11, 2009

Wednesday June 10, 2009

Start of meeting: 1:00 PM

Attending members:

Member:	Representative Seat:
Arnold Whitridge	Trinity County Resident
Ed Duggan	Willow Creek Community Services District
Byron Leydecker	Friends of the Trinity River
Tom Weseloh ¹	California Trout, Inc.
Tim Viel	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Pat Frost ²	Trinity County Resource Conservation District
Richard Lorenz	Trinity County Resident
Joe McCarthy	Commercial Fishing Guide
Elizabeth Hadley ¹	City of Redding Electric Utility Department
Sandy Denn	Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District
Emelia Berol	Northcoast Environmental Center
Gil Saliba	Redwood Regional Audubon Society
David Steinhauser	Trinity River Rafting, Inc.

¹ Did not attend on day 2.

² Had his alternate sit in for him following discussion of Item 3 on day 1; attended on day 2.

Members that did not attend:

Member:	Representative Seat:
Ann Hayden	Environmental Defense
Dana Hord	Big Bar Community Development Group
Jeffrey Sutton	Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority

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

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Approval of March Minutes

Arnold Whitridge opened the meeting. He opened a short discussion of adjustments to the order of agenda items for today as several members would be leaving after the first day of meetings.

Whitridge next asked for a review of the March meeting minutes.

Ed Duggan made a motion to accept the March minutes.

Sandy Denn seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Open Forum and Public Comment

No public comment at this time.

3. TRRP Organization and Decision-making—Original Concept, Present Status, Possible Improvements

Byron Leydecker introduced Dr. Clair Stalnaker. Stalnaker was one of the original “architects” of the vision and concepts that lead to the Record of Decision (ROD) and the establishment of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP). Stalnaker was asked to speak to the Trinity River Adaptive Management Group (TAMWG) and to describe the original concepts of the TRRP. Stalnaker also was to provide his comments on the program current conditions and to provide guidance about re-orientation and/or adjustments to the program.

Stalnaker gave a Powerpoint presentation and passed out a hardcopy (Attachment 1). He opened his presentation with an review of the original problems with the Trinity River caused by the diversions of flow. He listed some of the early independent studies and noted that these studies were brought together as the Trinity River Flow Evaluation Study (TRFES). These studies identified poor rearing habitat for chinook and the lack of a dynamic, alluvial channel. The TRFES identified a need of increasing rearing habitat by 3-to-4 fold in order to create a 2-fold increase in smolt production. Also, it concluded that reshaping the channel would be required. It was thought that reshaping the channel would lead to increased rearing habitat, and that the 3-to-4 fold increase in habitat could be achieved in a smaller channel. Increased survival would occur with enhanced habitat and enhanced temperature conditions.

These concepts lead to a brand new management system that embraced adaptive management that utilized goals and indicators for assessment and design. New elements also included a scientific basis with peer review and regular assessment of the program. The ROD set the policy for rehabilitation, introduced volumes of release by five “water years” (hydrologic types), and established the TRRP. It was intended that the TRRP be financially independent and free of local politics and have independent peer review that would demonstrate scientific validity and the ROD.

Stalnaker reviewed the details of the TRRP and its reliance on an Adaptive Environmental Assessment and Management (AEAM) process where hypotheses of the ROD would be tested. He noted this was different than basic monitoring, but also, it was not a research

program. There was a desire to create a new program as there were perceptions that the Bureau of Reclamation was mostly an "engineering program," whereas the Fish and Wildlife scientists were overly occupied by endangered species efforts. The Trinity Management Council (TMC) was established to provide oversight. The AEAM process was set up as a Technical Management Analysis Group (TMAG) composed mostly of specialists and a Rehabilitation Implementation Group (RIG) composed mainly of engineers. Also established were the TAMWG to provide stakeholder advice, an independent review process, and a Science Advisory Board (SAB) of science guidance.

Stalnaker presented some of his thoughts after ten years into the program. He noted that there has been a drift towards the old "Task Force" way of doing business. He noted that the successful completion of the bridges and of 14 river restoration sites. He noted that the AEAM scientists are not being utilized as "scientists," by the TMC, nor is the Science Advisory Board being utilized adequately. The program needs to "respond to SAB guidance." There has been a continued delay in completing the Integrated Assessment Plan where it was intended that it would be completed in a year or two and used to measure restoration progress on an annual basis.

He noted that it is not clear how much of the river is "bermed" and whether engineering and re-sculpting sites are better than simply "opening up" the berms. This should be tested. He lauded the report, "Status Report: Vitzhum Gulch December 2008," that asked questions about how the river could be used to accomplish objectives of opening up the berm as opposed to using mechanized means.

Brian Person noted that, while listening to Stalnaker's presentation, he could see that there have been many areas where the program appears to have drifted from its original intent. Person asked about the Science Advisory Board and whether it is being used properly for technical review. Stalnaker conceded that it is not.

Tom Weseloh asked if the SAB was under utilized because of a lack of a Request for Proposal (RFP) process. Stalnaker noted the need for a set of questions to spin off the RFP process. He stated that an RFP process worked well within agencies for the Grand Canyon program.

Weseloh noted the original intent was that the TRRP science staff would set up assessment and monitoring, but currently, the Working Groups have issues about who is going to do the monitoring. Stalnaker noted the need to have a level of trust. Presentations to the TMC should be thought out to help them make decisions instead of raising points of contention.

Stalnaker continued to emphasize the need to return more to a science-based approach. He noted the need to continue the thought process and questioning that should occur when developing ways to test hypotheses.

Byron Leydecker next gave a presentation of his views on the TAMWG and his evaluation of the TRRP. He noted "drift in the program" in several ways. One is that the originally intended "direct line" from the Secretary of the Interior to the TMC was "cut" by the insertion of regional bureau heads from the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) and Fish and Wildlife (FWS) into the organization structure. He noted a failure to use independent review panel and the Science Advisory Board. He says the original ROD organization is now a "Breached Organization." The FWS has changed the structure and inserted control over the Science Coordinator of the TRRP. He noted that the TMC is dysfunctional for several

reasons including inadequate knowledge of the program. This inadequate knowledge is due to many of the members having turned over, and the new members are not familiar with nor understand the program. He noted lack of preparation by members for meetings. He cited members "complaining" they do not have the time to prepare for meetings. He also cited resistance to a strong central program office—e.g., the FWS and Hoopa Tribes want to "go on doing what they have always been doing." Additionally, to make a decision, the TMC requires a supermajority (seven of its eight members). The FWS and Hoopa Tribe have on occasion joined to stop decisions. He also said blatant financial conflict among the TMC members exist and members refuse to recuse themselves from votes. There is more discussion over spending of money than science or policy questions and there has been a failure to communicate with program partners. He noted that any responses to the TAMWG by the TMC are in general, non-substantive—they agree to take up issues, but action is lacking.

Leydecker cited a series of failures: failure to define roles and responsibilities, failure to complete an Integrated Assessment Plan, failure to employ Independent Review Panels prior to initiating action, failure to implement RFP process, failure to act or respond to TAMWG or the Sub-committee report recommendations and failure to use Independent Review Panels and the Science Advisory Board as intended.

As far as impacts to the program, Leydecker listed just three of a sheaf of concerns: failure to address carryover storage in Trinity Reservoir as a way to manage water temperatures in the Trinity River, failure to address rehabilitation of tributaries and watersheds, and failure to address the conflict between hatchery and wild fish.

Leydecker asked, rhetorically, "What can we do now to assure that the Trinity River becomes a national model of a restored river basin ecosystem below a federal dam?"

Brian Person, Northern California Area BOR manager and chair of the TMC, next presented his ideas for organizational refinements to the program (i.e., changes not large enough to be called reorganization) and would be within the guidance of the ROD. Before Person's comments, Byron Leydecker noted that Person has put in "countless hours" but that the problem is not resolvable at the regional level.

Person first announced that the new regional directors of the BOR and FWS collectively stated that there would not be "any division of labor" as proposed earlier. The science coordinator of the TRRP will be an FWS employee and, due to regulations, cannot be supervised by the BOR. Person made several more statements about the TMC and his perceptions about the role of the TMC as follows. Person is now the chair of the TMC and there is an effort to regain TMC relevance. He said there is an ongoing discussion about roles and responsibilities and the TMC in their recent retreat acknowledged the existence of the conflict of interest issue and a committee was appointed. Person noted the RFP process creates concerns for agencies to meet their employment goals. Relationship building is being tried. The new regional BOR director, Don Glaser, is going to take more responsibilities of the government-to-government process and is also supporting more funding for the TRRP program. Person cited the continuing need for TAMWG support even though the TMC has not responded well to all TAMWG initiatives. He said the Integrated Assessment is hung up on hatchery and numeric harvest goals.

Person cited, as reason for hope, the two new additions to the TRRP—Jennifer Faler and Mike Hamman. The Science Coordinator, had their position been filled, should have been

able to avoid the divisiveness surrounding completion of the Integrated Habitat Assessment Plan.

Arnold Whitridge asked if the design of the program is the reason for the conflict of interest. Rich Lorenz disputed this by citing that, normally, anyone with an interest recuses themselves from budget decisions. It was pointed out that the TMC had labeled the conflict of interest as mostly a "perceived issue" and that this was "the nature of the beast."

Tom Weseloh opined that the written "vision" that came out of the TMC retreat is "their vision" and not the "vision of the program," there was no attempt to repair the relationship with TAMWG, and there is no effort to make a statement on conflict of interest. Weseloh stated he has no confidence in the TMC seriously taking TAMWG recommendations.

Byron Leydecker listed things that could be done: 1) the TAMWG could all resign, 2) they could schedule an upper level meeting, 3) the TMC could be replaced by TAMWG, 4) all TAMWG members could come to a TMC meeting to demand a resolution, or 5) they could create a media event to embarrass TMC and Department of Interior.

Rich Lorenz noted that there is a new TRRP manager and he should have a bit of time. He also asked Clair Stalnaker to comment. The supermajority requirement for decisions is not a requirement of the ROD but comes from the TMC bylaws.

Stalnaker opined that the TMC will not change as it is "in their interest to act as they do." He wondered whether the TMC could be composed of particular agency employees that do not have a vested interest in maintaining funds to pay staff positions. He said the original intent of the ROD was that funding would be passed through to the TRRP program with no overhead taken off by agencies and now that it is covering agency staff salaries, the agencies think of the funds as their own money and this will be difficult to change. The TMC will not and cannot change this.

Mike Hamman, newly hired director of the TRRP next provided his viewpoints on the situation of the TRRP. He noted "a plan is needed to take the program to the next step." He said this plan is being formed and he has been meeting with a variety of program partners. He said that the divisiveness is on both sides of the program and this has led to diminished trust levels. The situation has evolved so that funds go to programs for every partner. He sees that progress is possible and he thinks everyone wants success. He wants to start preparation of an annual report that states where they are and where they need to go.

Arnold Whitridge asked if there were suggestions or topics that the TAMWG should bring up to the TMC. The following are some of comments. Emelia Berol suggested that TAMWG members attend TMC meetings and address the TMC during public comment. Byron Leydecker thought, instead of all the TAMWG resigning, the TAMWG could issue a vote of no confidence. Arnold Whitridge opined that someone high up in the Department of Interior will have to dictate changes. After lengthy discussion, a motion was made by Rich Lorenz and modified by Elizabeth Hadley and Tom Weseloh.

Rich Lorenz made a motion that the TAMWG write a letter to the TMC that communicates a series of recommendations as follows. The TAMWG will give the new TMC chairman, Brian Person and program manager, Mike Hamman, to the end of the year to see what change they can accomplish. If no progress is apparent, the TAMWG members will elevate the issue within the Department of

Interior. The letter will contain language to encourage the TMC to work with Person and Hanuman to accomplish change. Additional contents of the letter will state that the TAMWG currently lacks confidence in the TMC. A specific set of recommendations will include: 1) Dr. Stalnaker to provide his presentation to the TMC; 2) the TMC needs to reach consensus on 2004 TMC Subcommittee report; 3) follow CDR recommendations on page 29, that the TMC needs to consider TAMWG recommendations more seriously and consider enlarging TMC membership and add TAMWG members; 4) revisit previous TAMWG recommendations and provide a response on TMC voting procedure, the conflict of interest, and written responses.

The motion was seconded by Elizabeth Hadley.

The motion passed unanimously.

4. Hatchery Goals, Practices, and Effects on Wild Fish

Larry Hanson, California Department of Fish and Game, gave a Powerpoint presentation on the Trinity River fish hatchery program and his proposal of how to start evaluating and implementing changes to the hatchery program (Attachment 2). The current hatchery program on the Trinity River attempts to maximize hatchery production while minimizing adverse effects on wild fish. The hatchery produces about 5 million young salmonids per year that are released to the Trinity River. He also reiterated the goals of restoration are to achieve certain numeric goals of wild escapement. He listed several important issues which he labeled as "unknowns:" the genetic information about hatchery and wild stocks, the carrying capacity of fish in the mainstem, the straying of hatchery fish, the predation on wild fish by hatchery fish, and the effects of hatchery operations on wild fish.

Hanson listed how hatchery practices could be modified—via the numbers of releases, the timing of releases, or the sizes of fish released. He also cited other non-hatchery practices that could be tried to reduce hatchery fish pressure on wild fish such as in-stream flow management or the use of weirs that could possibly restrict hatchery strays.

He next presented a "Collaborative Framework and Decision-making Process" that may involve an ad-hoc hatchery evaluation team to make recommendations. The recommendations would go through a review process where the best recommendations would be implemented. He noted it would be important to decide who was in charge of this process.

He showed a table of fish returns to the hatchery over the past 30 years. The hatchery achieved its annual goals for numbers of adults returning as follows: 71 % for coho, 37 % for fall chinook, 56 % for spring chinook and 9 % for steelhead.

Responding to questions, Hanson said there is an endeavor to modify hatchery operations but there are unresolved legal issues that are being "worked on."

Ed Duggan asked about uncertainties about in-stream capacities of tributaries to produce wild fish. Hanson acknowledged that it is difficult to get data on tributary use by fish.

Tom Weseloh pointed out that the Hanson's table, showing that in only 9 % of years do steelhead returns to the hatchery exceed the 10,000-fish goal, is not an accurate

representation of numbers of hatchery steelhead impacts to the Trinity River. He noted that in 2007, over 46,000 hatchery steelhead passed the Willow Creek weir downstream of the hatchery. Hanson acknowledged this and showed another table that showed the percentage of all steelhead in the Trinity River has switched from mostly wild to mostly hatchery during the time 1978 to 2007. This table also showed that all steelhead returns, including wild, have shown an increasing trend of recovery since the low numbers of the mid-1990's.

Weseloh asked if action must wait for all the "unknowns" to be resolved. Hanson said if an agreement could be reached about authority issues, "incremental changes" could be started. He cited a public trust responsibility regarding producing hatchery fish. Responding to questions, Hanson said that it is documented that some fish stocks, and for certain steelhead, were introduced from out of basin sources.

Gil Saliba asked if there are other studies that could guide changes in hatchery practices. Others noted that Washington State had done a comprehensive review.

Brian Person thought that, from his viewpoint, discussions have not yet identified a single change in hatchery operations that is universally accepted to improve wild fish. Also, the language of the hatchery contract can allow incremental changes. As a comment to Person's observation, it was noted that there are fairly specific changes that have been suggested for hatchery practices, but they may not be "universally" accepted.

Arnold Whitridge asked if Hanson's process is going forward. Hanson said he is going to propose this decision-making process to the TMC and he reiterated that incremental changes can now be made.

The President of the Trinity River guides was in the audience and he commented that the guides and their clientele have a large desire to preserve the wild steelhead and fully support any action to that end. But at the same time don't want to reduce fishing opportunities. He supports an ad-hoc group looking into the hatchery issues.

Tom Weseloh made a motion that the TAMWG advise the TMC to start Hanson's "Collaborative Decision-making process" (as described in his hatchery presentation) with a goal of getting recommendations to implement by the upcoming brood year. It was recognized that the authority issue would need to be resolved.

The motion was seconded by Byron Leydecker.

The motion passed unanimously.

Tom Weseloh made a motion that the TAMWG advise the TMC to initiate a review of the existing literature on hatchery practices on wild fish forthwith.

The motion was seconded by Emelia Berol.

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned for the day.

Thursday, June 11, 8:30 AM

5. Reservoir Management and Temperature Issues

Mike Hamman discussed reservoir issues and passed out a set of handouts (Attachments 3a-3d). His first graph showed cumulative rainfall in Weaverville was about 25 inches of precipitation, thus far, for the water year beginning in October 2008. He also presented a graph of predicted Trinity Lake surface water elevations for the next year and these indicated lower levels for this year (as low as 2,238 feet—140 feet below the spillway—by November of 2009).

Hamman next reported on ongoing discussions about reservoir management and diversions to the Sacramento River. He explained discussions to use an “auxiliary valve” on the dams to mitigate water temperatures.

He showed graphs of river water temperature over time. These were model output for the Trinity River and showed the effects of operating the auxiliary valve during the summer. Lower water temperatures would be achieved while the valve was operating, but an undesired temperature spike from 50 to 52 F would occur at the Lewiston Dam once releases were switched back to the penstocks. This spike would occur in the fall during the critical start of spawning.

6. Designated Federal Officer Topics

Randy Brown made several comments. First, he recognized Pat Frost and the Trinity County RCD as a recipient for a “Partners in Conservation Award.” Brown next noted that two former TAMWG members that had re-applied for membership were rejected this time. Brown is looking into the reasons for this with the hope of having them finally accepted. He also commented on his temporary appointment as head of the FWS Arcata office and that he has had good relations with the TRRP office in his meetings so far. There was discussion about the charter rules regarding to whom the TAMWG reports, and whether TAMWG, as a body, is allowed to write to the Secretary of Interior.

7. Channel Rehabilitation Program Update

Jennifer Faler, TRRP engineer, next presented a Powerpoint as an update on the TRRP Rehabilitation and Implementation. She reviewed the ROD stated mission is to restore the river fisheries and how the Implementation components fit in. She noted good progress in implementation and that the river is physically changing. She noted the poor response of the adaptive management or science program and lack of action on the watershed or tributaries. She noted that \$4.5 million of stimulus money that will go to channel rehabilitation. She showed maps where this money could be spent. She noted that two consultants (Phillip Williams and Cramer) are seeking another \$1.5 million from National Marine Fisheries Service stimulus funds for a project to create a side channel specifically for coho in the Lowden Ranch reach. She noted some political issues from other partners (e.g., turf protection) that she is managing.

Responding to questions she said, instead of notching banks, introduction of woody debris seems to create better fish habitat. Ed Duggan initiated a discussion about the dangers of

added wood can create for boaters. She invited anyone to come to working groups and will send TAMWG members email notifications about working group meetings.

8. Progress Towards an RFP-based Science Program

Mike Hamman gave a Powerpoint presentation on proposed RFP (request for proposals) process. He noted that the intended RFP program has failed to develop as originally envisioned by the ROD. The agencies and tribes have grown to depend on annual funding to run assessments for the TRRP and they fear that an RFP process will divert this funding to outside groups. This issue has caused rifts within the program. But now it is recognized by many that the RFP process must be initiated. He noted two studies that have resulted from RFPs—a sediment transport study and an out-migrant review. Hamman presented his proposal for a general RFP process. He identified two concepts of the process—first to see what tasks would be readily outsourced and second to develop a method for evaluation of proposals. Two elements to satisfy partners are 1) allow the Tribal Partners “first option” to propose/respond to RFPs based on DOI tribal trust relationship; and 2) allow Program Partners to team with each other or outside expertise in preparing proposals. He listed how the B Team, IAP, and SAB might be used in the RFP process. He asked for guidance to fine-tune this concept as he prepares it for presentation to the TMC.

Leydecker, Berol and Saliba all commented positively and expressed appreciation to Hamman for this progress he has initiated.

Saliba commented on the need to break the habit of expected funding. Hamman noted that the good signs are that the tribes have agreed to independent review of their screw trap program. He also noted that there is a trust level that must be maintained and the tribe needs to know the RFP program won't be an attempt to “pull the rug out” from under their current level of employment in its Fisheries Department. He also noted that it is important to stress that any changes be designed for the “good of the program.”

Hamman expressed the value of having Dr. Stalnaker speak and that it help to “crystallize” some ideas.

9. Sediment Monitoring Activities

Dave Gaeuman gave a Powerpoint presentation and an update on sediment monitoring. He noted that the ROD directs gravel to be added back to the river and actual amounts will be determined by both modeling and monitoring. An average of ten thousand tons of gravel are added per year with 100,000 tons since 1970's. Four sites are used to monitor gravel in the river (Lewiston, Grass Valley, Limekiln, Douglas City). He showed there is evidence of gravel moving into the Grass Valley site. Responding to questions, he could not say whether fish are spawning at these sites, but noted the gravel is more intended to stop overall winnowing of gravel out of the system. The gravel transport appears to be working in that coarse gravel appears to be accumulating and sand appears to be exiting. He showed graphs that indicated that model results for sediment transport may not be representative of the river. And this demonstrates that in-river monitoring is also needed.

Jennifer Faler noted that the gravel-monitoring program is an example of a successful element of the TRRP program that this project has used an RFP and it is delivering data.

10. Integrated Information Management System (IIMS)

Eric Peterson, a new TRRP staff member, gave a Powerpoint presentation (Attachment 4) on the Integrated Information Management System (IIMS). Peterson likened IIMS as a toolbox. He showed how data can be viewed out of context and lose their value. Peterson showed some basic concepts of data management and described as an example, a time-series analyst that could be done with IIMS such as how flows or temperatures in the Trinity could be examined over time. The analysis can be done by the public using a website display. He showed how different datasets can be simultaneously displayed. This is still a work in progress and will develop more of its web-based display, will include more biological data, and will create uplinks to other databases.

The TAMWG members expressed appreciation for this approach. To get to the IIMS, one needs to look for the "data portal" link on the TRRP website. Peterson acknowledged that getting data from all the partners will be a challenge. He thought "they were turning a corner" regarding getting more cooperation from partners to contribute data.

11. Executive Director's Report, Budget Update

Mike Hamman presented his progress report and an update of the budget (Attachments 5a-5c). He expressed optimism that new changes are occurring and will be evident within the next six months. He cited the fact that adequate resources are available—both human and economic capital—and the fact that everyone is "tired of the past poor relations and conditions" that have contributed to the slow progress of certain Program elements.

Hamman commented on a series of things he is focusing on: 1) the importance of the science coordinator that is to be hired, 2) dedicating the TRRP to "the program and not to a specific agency," 3) recognizing the needs of the program partners, 4) completing an expansion of the office to create a more collaborative atmosphere, and 5) better use of annual reports.

The approved budget is \$10.3 million for this fiscal year. There still was some discussion about the specificity of details of funding for the FWS field office in Arcata.

Rich Lorenz suggested the TAMWG letter to the TMC should express support for Mike Hamman's initiatives to develop a TRRP operational plan.

12. Tentative Date and Agenda Topics for Next Meeting

No specific agenda topics came up. There was some discussion about the letter and whether to include complaints or make a more constructive message that includes support for Mike Hamman. It was suggested that the letter focus on shifts toward science-based decisions for the budget and initiation of an RFP process. This, together with support for Hamman, might be the best approach.

The next meeting was tentatively set for September 10-11, 2009.

The meeting was adjourned.

LIST OF MOTIONS

Ed Duggan made a motion to accept the March minutes.

Sandy Denn seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Rich Lorenz made a motion that the TAMWG write a letter to the TMC that communicates a series of recommendations as follows. The TAMWG will give the new TMC chairman, Brian Person and program manager, Mike Hamman, to the end of the year to see what change they can accomplish. If no progress is apparent, the TAMWG members will elevate the issue within the Department of Interior. The letter will contain language to encourage the TMC to work with Person and Hamman to accomplish change. Additional contents of the letter will state that the TAMWG currently lacks confidence in the TMC. A specific set of recommendations will include: 1) Dr. Stalnaker to provide his presentation to the TMC; 2) the TMC needs to reach consensus on the 2004 TMC Subcommittee report; 3) follow CDR recommendations on page 29, that the TMC needs to consider TAMWG recommendations more seriously and consider enlarging TMC membership and add TAMWG members; 4) revisit previous TAMWG recommendations and provide a response on TMC voting procedure, the conflict of interest, and written responses.

The motion was seconded by Elizabeth Hadley.

The motion passed unanimously.

Tom Weseloh made a motion that the TAMWG advise the TMC to start Hanson's "Collaborative Decision-making process" (as described in his hatchery presentation) with a goal of getting recommendations to implement by the upcoming brood year. It was recognized that the authority issue would need to be resolved.

The motion was seconded by Byron Leydecker.

The motion passed unanimously.

Tom Weseloh made a motion that the TAMWG advise the TMC to initiate a review of the existing literature on hatchery practices on wild fish forthwith.

The motion was seconded by Emelia Berol.

The motion passed unanimously.