

Final Minutes
Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group

Victorian Inn, 1709 Main Street, Weaverville, CA

March 18 and 19, 2009

Wednesday March 18, 2009

Start of meeting: 1:00 PM

Attending members:

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

¹ Attended the second day.

Members that did not attend:

Member:	Representative Seat:
Ann Hayden*	Environmental Defense

* New members

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

1. Welcome and Introductions

As this was the first meeting since the renewal of the charter of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG), Randy Brown, Designated Federal Officer, opened

the meeting. Brown welcomed everyone and asked the new and returning members to the Trinity River Adaptive Management Group to introduce themselves.

2. **Federal Advisory Committee Act and the DFO**

Randy Brown gave a review of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). He noted that the TAMWG is a "FACA committee" and works under the rules of FACA. FACA committees must be "chartered" and the charter must be renewed every two years. This meeting is the first meeting following the recharter of TAMWG. Other comments by Brown were that the committee memberships are to be "fairly balanced;" the meetings are open to the public; minutes shall be kept. The committee shall be terminated as soon as stated objectives have been completed.

3. **Election of Officers and Review of TAMWG Bylaws**

Randy Brown asked for the election of officers.

Byron Leydecker nominated Arnold Whitridge as chairperson.

The nomination was seconded by Dana Hord.

All members approved by voice vote.

Tom Weseloh nominated Tim Viel as Vice Chairperson.

The nomination was seconded by Pat Frost.

All members approved by voice vote.

Arnold Whitridge sought clarification that the TAMWG would use the old bylaws until the new bylaws were approved. One issue was the number of votes required for passing motions. It was clarified that majority vote would be used.

4. **Adopt Agenda and Approval of Minutes from August 2008**

Arnold Whitridge took over as the elected TAMWG Chair. There were no objections to using the agenda as proposed. Whitridge offered a clarification edit to the August 2008 minutes regarding titles of Fish and Wildlife and Bureau of Reclamation personnel.

Several of new members abstained from voting on minutes from a meeting they did not attend.

5. **Trinity River Restoration Program Update**

Mike Hamman introduced himself as new Executive Director of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP). He was raised in New Mexico and was trained as a civil engineer with interest in rivers and resource management. He provided some updates on his

work with the both tribal groups and the Bureau of Reclamation in New Mexico relating to water use and sensitive fish species. He noted both the problems and the challenges associated with his new position.

He commented on the re-organization of the TRRP and said that he hoped it would help to make the organization more efficient. He apologized that Brian Person could not come to this meeting. He said that there would be no separation of the program and no separation of budgets. He passed out a flow chart showing an organization chart of the TRRP (Attachment 1).

He noted the need to elevate the issue of tribal trust responsibilities to the Department of Interior level. He also noted that the Science Program Coordinator is yet to be filled, but he considered this a very pivotal position for the TRRP.

Byron Leydecker noted for the benefited of new members, that idea of separation of the program and the budget was initiated by Mike Long of the Fish and Wildlife (FWS) Arcata Office. He also commented these and other changes to the program that were not originally in the Record of Decision (ROD) that established the TRRP and are therefore a breach of the ROD. He made these notes by way of noting the difficulties that Hamman faces. Leydecker also noted that Hamman is doing a good job and that he hopes the TAMWG gives him full support.

Gil Saliba commented that, given the organization chart, there still is a "division of labor" between the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) and Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). Hamman responded that any "division" would depend on whether or not the Science Program Coordinator will align himself with goals of the program or a particular agency.

Emelia Berol asked about the dollars that may have been withheld from the TRRP by the FWS Arcata office. Tom Weseloh noted that the issue of funding might be made clearer during the budget discussions tomorrow. Hamman noted the disagreements over the Integrated Habitat Assessment prompted some of the decisions to spend the funds through the FWS office instead of passing them onto the TRRP. Whitridge also noted that the Trinity Management Council (TMC) had failed to pass a budget since they had to have a super majority to approve budgets. Whitridge said the FWS might have thought, without a budget, they would spend money through their office.

Pat Frost asked whether the Bureau of Land Management might be brought back into the program, given they are a large landowner in the basin.

Tom Weseloh asked that some information about the budget and flow scheduling be passed on to members today, since some proposals requiring decisions may be presented to the TAMWG tomorrow.

Whitridge noted that the meeting is ahead of schedule. He asked Hamman that some more background on the TRRP program (program priorities and organization) scheduled for tomorrow be presented today for the benefit of the new members.

Overview of the Trinity River Restoration Program

Mike Hamman gave a Powerpoint presentation on the history and progress of the TRRP. The presentation will be made available at <http://www.fws.gov/arcata>. The problem of the

Trinity River is that the reduced flows and cessation of flood flows from the construction of the diversion dams created a reduced channel and loss of floodplain function in the forty miles downstream of Lewiston Dam. The goal of the restoration program is to restore fisheries to pre-dam levels. The signing of the Record of Decision in 2000 set up the TRRP with restoration projects starting in 2004. The restoration will not be completed in 2012 as originally planned. The delay is due to both reduced funding and increases in design complexity. It is now anticipated final work will be completed in 2016.

Hamman described the organizational structure showing administration by the Department of Interior via the Trinity Management Council (TMC). The TAMWG advises the TMC. A science advisory group provides independent input.

Key concepts of the ROD include managed, high-flow releases, removal of both the berm and stream-side vegetation, introduction of gravel, and control of fine sediment from tributaries and watershed rehabilitation. The idea is that restored fluvial processes should provide three- to four-times more rearing habitat for juvenile fish and this should increase juvenile production two-fold.

Hamman showed examples of restored sites. Annual funding is approximately \$10 million per year, but the project should actually be funded at several more million per year.

6. Open forum; public comment

Karen Ducanwood, a Lewiston resident, reported that, near Deadwood Creek, an RV park has taken apart a mobile home that contains asbestos and toxic minerals and has attempted to bury it next to the river. She said the Department of Fish and Game is aware of this issue. She asked that the TRRP take another look at a grant the perpetrator has applied for regarding the relocation of a well.

Mike Hamman said he was aware of this problem. He said that the RV park owner had allowed the TRRP to dig a sediment pit on the RV park owner's land in order to contain sediment during the TRRP site restoration there. Hamman further reported that this landowner would not allow the TRRP contractors to fill-in the pit and, apparently, the landowner is now using it as a dumpsite. The TRRP has sent a letter stating that the RV park owner will have to fill in the pit before he can receive well relocation grant money from the TRRP.

Ed Duggan advised Ducanwood to contact California Department of Fish and Game.

The meeting was adjourned for the day.

Thursday, March 19, 8:30 AM

7. Executive Director's Report - Program Priorities, Organization, and Budget

Executive Director's Report

Mike Hamman presented his Executive Director's report (Attachment 2) and explained his views on the program and his plans for the future. In his remarks, he mentioned his

enthusiasm for the job, his interest in re-establishing good relationships, and that he brings an "unbiased approach." He noted the need to improve communications and to stay on schedule while undergoing reorganization. The program has never published an annual report. He expected to be able to hire a Contracting Officer's Technical Representative in order to free up time for in-house scientists. He noted the need for more funding in order to finish by 2014. He noted the need to integrate efforts with other land-management agencies to leverage funding for the entire watershed.

Sandy Denn asked whether stimulus funding or other non-traditional sources of funding are being investigated. Hamman replied that stimulus funding is being requested via the Mid-Pacific Region budget request.

Byron Leydecker commented that a request for proposal (RFP) process was planned and it would be very specific, but that this has been delayed. He suggested this be addressed. Rich Lorenz agreed that stimulus money would be best spent by an RFP specific process, as otherwise it can be easily wasted.

Whitridge asked if progress is being made toward an RFP process on the science program side. Hamman said they will be looking for the assessments that "lend themselves" to the program priorities and see if they can be accomplished through RFPs. He said they just need to "try a few" to get folks used to the process.

Jeffrey Sutton asked how the process of program work has been carried on without an RFP process. Byron Leydecker said agencies that had historical precedence typically got the work and these projects have been inefficient financially.

Whitridge noted that it is a problem where agencies that spend the funds are the same ones that decide on the budget. He thought an RFP process and a transparent budget process would help.

Tim Viel asked if there would be RFPs by next year. Hamman thought it will be hard to get it started by next year, as more thought is needed about how RFP tasks will fit into the overall strategies.

Tom Weseloh noted that the ROD calls for an RFP process. Plans for RFPs have been continually delayed and postponed. He also noted that an RFP process would help to resolve the current conflict of interest over the budget.

Budget

Hamman next moved his presentation to the budget and passed out a detailed hardcopy of the budget (Attachment 3). Hamman noted that this year's available funding is lower than that of previous years. The budget shows one column labeled "available funding" that represents what the program is planning to do given the current federal budget. A second column labeled "recommended funding" indicates what funding is needed to complete directives of the ROD for that year. Most discussion focused on "available funding." This coming year (FY2010) \$11.1 million is actually available in the federal budget versus \$11.5 million proposed in available funding. Last year, \$12.1 million was originally proposed with \$12.6 million actually received with end of year additions.

Byron Leydecker stated that the budget detail for the FWS Arcata office of \$750,000 (\$750K) is not provided and that such a presentation is "unsatisfactory." Joe Polos said that some of the FWS funds pay his (i.e., Polos') and other's salaries. Polos said that he had requested Mike Long to provide this detail, but Long has been out of the office for the past two weeks attending other meetings. Rich Lorenz echoed Leydecker's comments and noted that Hamman will not likely have supervisory influence over how this money will be spent. Hamman asked for patience and said he will be having more meetings with the FWS office.

Jennifer Faler explained some of the channel rehabilitation budget allocations. Total available funding is \$3.9 million; recommended funding is \$7.0 million. The available funding includes \$739K for staff, \$200K for bridges and structures, \$1.4 million for channel rehabilitation, \$300K for tributaries, and \$525K for sediment management. She mentioned the need for additional permitting expenditures such as \$170,000 for CEQA mitigation. This is to demonstrate no net loss of bird use of riparian vegetation during the vegetation removal portion of the restoration. She noted that the TMC recommended funding lists \$4.0 million for restoration construction projects, but under the draft proposal, just over \$1 million is available. There was discussion about whether stimulus funding might make up this difference.

Hamman described budgeting for the modeling and analysis portion of the program. Total for available funding is \$4.5 million; recommended funding is \$6.1 million. The available funding includes \$854K for staff, \$125K for Science Framework efforts, \$582K for physical studies (gravel, sediment, temperature), and \$3.2 million for biological assessments (riparian and fish).

Tom Weseloh made some comments on the budgets based on the budget workgroup committee meeting he participated in earlier this week. He noted a shortfall in channel rehabilitation (RIG) funding that now is hoped to be filled by stimulus funding, gaps in the FWS details, discrepancy in funding for TMC versus TAMWG support, and in Science advisory efforts. He noted a shortfall in watershed funding. He said it is not clear how the \$750K earmarked for the integrated will be spent. He said additional funds from NOAA may be available for fish health studies. He said it is important to know "when we will know about stimulus funding and how we will adapt the budget." He wanted to know why more watershed projects couldn't be funded under stimulus funds. When asked, Jennifer Faler said no watershed projects were submitted for stimulus funding. She stated the TRRP personnel had thought that only \$250K is needed for watershed work since much of the watershed work is carried on through other agencies. Tom Weseloh disagreed, citing potential work that he learned about during a recent field trip.

Overall, Weseloh recommended TAMWG adopt the budget, but with several recommended changes such as FWS details, movement of budget items, increases in some areas, and resolution of stimulus funding. He said he was not comfortable spending most of the funding on "non-implementation."

Rich Lorenz said he would abstain or vote no for this budget because of the shortfall in implementation and increases in analysis.

Gil Saliba said that he agrees with Lorenz and, in past, there have been motions stating the concerns of disproportionate funding for rehabilitation. He also said that the administration costs need to be brought down.

Tom Weseloh made a motion that the TAMWG advise TMC to adopt the budget with the following caveats:

- 1. FWS clarifies field office costs of \$750K.**
- 2. Shift costs for chinook coded and decoding wire tagging from A30 to A40.**
- 3. Increase funding to a minimum of \$25K in Review Panels to meet RFP needs.**
- 4. Revisit budget if stimulus funding is not secured.**
- 5. In order to balance the budget, scale back geomorphic and riparian monitoring.**

The motion was seconded by Jeffrey Sutton.

The motion passed with twelve affirmative votes.

The following abstained: Rich Lorenz, Gil Saliba, and Sandy Denn.

Gil Saliba made a motion that the TAMWG voice concern to the TMC with the disproportionate low amount of spending for implementation versus analysis and that the TAMWG ask that the budget be moved as quickly as possible to the 20:30:50 split for administration, analysis, implementation.

The motion was seconded by Rich Lorenz.

Motion passed unanimously.

8. Flow Scheduling, Minimum Pool

Andreas Kraus started a Powerpoint presentation on flow release recommendations and he passed out a hardcopy handout (Attachment 4). Kraus stated the March 2009 forecast for a 50 % exceedance probability of flow is predicted to be 866 thousand acre feet (TAF) and this translates into a "dry" year. Tim Hayden, Yurok Tribe fish biologist, explained the proposed flow schedule for this year under a dry-year scenario. The maximum release would be 4,500 cubic feet per second (cfs), peaking in early May and decreasing to 450 cfs by early July. The flow workgroup recommended a modification to the ROD schedule that included more short-term "benches" of stable flow distributed throughout the flow decline.

Kraus next explained that the benches would help in the monitoring process. He noted that a TAMWG member attending the workgroup meeting suggested a slight modification be considered. The modification was to take volume of flow off the duration of the peak flow and use them at the end of the period to maintain 600 cfs flows into September to help maintain cooler water temperatures.

Joe Polos presented model runs from the SNTEMP model that predicts weekly average temperatures in the Trinity River. Important assumptions were 10 C water discharged from

Lewiston Dam and "Normal" or "Extremely Warm" weather conditions. Normal weather model outputs predict a river water temperature at Weitchpec that increases from 12 C in April to 23 C by early July. These temperatures were thought to be in or near the ideal range for salmonid juveniles. An extremely warm condition predicted increased water temperature of 1 to 3 C over the normal scenario and this exceeded the ideal range for salmonid juveniles. The bench releases appeared to show very slight decreases in temperatures when compared to the ROD flows. The TAMWG modification—which later was indicated to be mis-titled and should have been titled Hydrograph Alternative 1 was not modeled.

Rod Wittler showed data on Trinity Reservoir levels and diversions. He noted that diversions to the Central Valley have declined from 90 % of total outflow in 1960's to nearly 50 % in the last four years. Wittler cited the ROD as directing the BOR to protect water quality standards in the Sacramento River and allowed modification of export schedules to accomplish this.

Byron Leydecker, citing other documents, concluded that the BOR was obligated to manage Trinity diversions in a manner to maintain listed in-river temperatures in the Trinity River. There was a debate about whether the Bureau is managing the water appropriately. Issues were contradicting directives about water quality and over-allocation of water to the Central Valley.

Wittler said they have examined Trinity Dam outlets and potential alternatives exist that could help to keep water cooler in the Trinity River downstream of Lewiston Dam. Wittler explained that there are two outlets from the Trinity Reservoir, with an "auxiliary bypass outlet" located at 50-feet deeper and accessing cooler water from the reservoir. He described how temperatures are modeled for the Trinity River with data passing between the Central Valley Operations and the TRRP. He showed that Trinity water is typically cooler than that released from Lewiston Reservoir, but this difference diminishes over the summer season. The assumption of 10 C (equivalent to 50 F) release water by the SNTMP model eventually becomes invalid by July. Release water is predicted to increase to as high as 58 F by late October. But, if the auxiliary bypass is used, cooler water release from Lewiston can be maintained into the fall. The problem is the auxiliary bypass does not generate electricity. Also, if the auxiliary bypass releases were stopped in October, release temperatures were modeled to spike from 52 F to 60 F. Temperatures of 60 F are thought to impair spawning temperatures in the river.

Andreas Kraus summarized that the TAMWG should consider a recommendation about which release schedule that should be implemented. He noted that the operation of reservoirs and the releases are a separate issue.

David Steinhauser asked if he could explain the modified release that had a shorter duration of the peak and 600 cfs low flows. He noted the higher flows in the summer may help control willow production and may improve temperature conditions. He suggested they consider this scenario in the temperature models. Wittler said it is easy to perform such a run of the model. Whitridge stated his support for this additional model run. Elizabeth Hadley asked that the model results be presented before recommending the scenario. Tom Weseloh said time was limited for making recommendations. Rod Wittler said results could be available by one week. Mike Berry of the California Department of Fish and Game said a shorter peak might not give sufficient time for gravel injections.

Tom Weseloh made a motion that the TAMWG recommend to TMC to adopt Alternative 1 hydrograph contingent on conditions staying as a dry-year; also, TAMWG recommends that alternative modeling be performed on flow alternative proposed by David Steinhauser.

The motion was seconded by Dave Steinhauser.

Motion passed with 13 votes.

Jeffrey Sutton and Byron Leydecker abstained.

After the lunch break, the TAMWG assessed the limited time available and they made a decision to drop agenda items 11 and 13 and shorten times for the remaining items while focusing mainly on information. Byron Leydecker asked that the TAMWG address item 15 earlier, as he had to leave before 4 PM.

Byron Leydecker made a motion that the TAMWG chairman write to the TMC requesting it to write to the Bureau of Reclamation asking that it adjust operations so as to maintain a minimum carryover-pool-reservoir level in Trinity Lake to avoid any violation, in the event the Trinity Basin experiences consecutive dry and/or critically dry water-type years, of the State Water Resources Control Board's Water Right Order WR 90-5 requiring specified water temperatures be maintained in the Trinity River, recognizing that the State Water Resources Control Board both issued and controls the Bureau's Water Permits to take water from the Trinity Basin.

The motion was seconded by David Steinhauser.

The motion passed unanimously with twelve votes.

Jeffrey Sutton abstained. Elizabeth Hadley and Sandy Denn were not present during the vote.

9. Gravel Augmentation Update

Dave Gaeuman presented an update on purpose and progress of gravel additions to the river. TRRP has injected 21 thousand tons of gravel last year. He said, based on their estimates, they will have made up the post-dam gravel deficits by next year. He said that, right now, most of it is sitting at Lewiston and it will take some time to move down river. A report is available at http://www.trrp.net/implementation/sediment_management.htm. Gaeuman thought that fish are using the gravel at the hatchery area. Tom Weseloh asked whether there are still worries about elevating the bed with these high gravel injections. Gaeuman thought no, but that much of the gravel has yet to be incorporated into the down river reaches.

Several TAMWG members lamented that more projects should be performed, but that the process of permitting and planning needs streamlining so as to not slow things down.

10. Integrated Assessment Plan Update

Joe Polos presented a Powerpoint presentation on the Integrated Assessment Plan (IAP) and passed out a hardcopy of the presentation (Attachment 5). A final draft of Part I of the assessment was completed by the end of 2008. The TMC decided to not complete Part II as planned but to use an RFP process. To date, several difficult issues have been addressed and a road map has been recommended. The IAP was reviewed by the Science Advisory Board (SAB). He presented a flow chart for the RFP process and a decision tree for prioritizing assessments. He said the IAP is in a holding pattern currently awaiting feedback about "cross-domain priorities."

11. Coho Survival Report

This item had to be cancelled due to lack of time, but Jennifer Faler passed out a copy of a memo and a hardcopy of a Powerpoint presentation that had been prepared for this topic (Attachment 6).

12. Restoration Project Update

Jennifer Faler gave a Powerpoint presentation and passed out a hardcopy (Attachment 7) of her presentation on channel restoration projects. Faler showed several photos of the restoration sites performed last year and she reported that some salmon fry and steelhead adults have been photographed using sites. She noted that permits and regulators require them to replace one willow cutting for each willows taken out. They replace one willow for two removed willows under the assumption that the willows will replace themselves and no net loss of willow will be sustained. This year, they are planning gravel injections. Also, planned is the Sawmill site, a very large channel restoration project. In the last four years, they have completed 16 of 47 sites at an average cost of \$350K each. The next eight sites will cost \$1 million each. After that, will be the Phase II sites. At current funding, they can complete 1-2 sites per year and that could require another 15 years to complete. Therefore, they need to seek additional funding or start to plan for "smaller sites" in order to finish by 2014.

Rich Lorenz asked about comparisons of actual costs versus real costs. He noted that the actual costs sum to \$5.7 million for the channel projects to date, whereas the budgeted amounts for these projects sum to \$16 million. He also stated that 15 years for completion is "not acceptable." He wants to take action to increase the speed or cancel the program.

Responding to questions, Faler noted that they have had poor survival of planted willow cuttings, particularly at Hocker Flat. They now realize the importance of having saturated soil near the bottom of the cuttings.

13. Rotary Screw Trap Phase I and II update

This item had to be cancelled due to lack of time.

14. Klamath/Trinity Fish Population Run Size

Joe Polos gave a Powerpoint presentation on fish population trends and passed out a hardcopy (Attachment 8). The goal is to have 62,000 natural spawning fall chinook in the Trinity River. The goal has not been reached, as the average has been 24,000 and last year was 11,000. The preseason forecast for 2008 fall chinook returns to the Klamath basin was 115,000; the actual return was 70,000. Forecasts for 2009 are 81,600 natural spawners and 48,800 hatchery fish (assuming no harvesting).

15. Other Reports and Updates

Byron Leydecker gave an update on the hatchery operations. The ratio of escapement of hatchery steelhead to wild steelhead is currently inverted with more hatchery fish returning to the river than wild fish. He recapped that the TAMWG asked the TMC to address hatchery management issues so as to bring the ratios in line with the directives of the ROD. The California Department of Fish and Game is willing to cooperate, but no response has been received by the Bureau of Reclamation about the issue.

Byron Leydecker made a motion to ask the TMC to address the 2008 inquiry to Bureau of Reclamation to aggressively pursue a response regarding hatchery fish escapement and compliance with program requirements.

The motion was seconded by Dana Hord.

The motion passed unanimously.

16. TAMWG operational matters, Tentative date and agenda topics for next meeting

Next meeting will be June 10 and 11. There was interest in a field trip. There was discussion about assignments of TAMWG members to committee groups. Assignments were tentatively listed as follows:

Physical: no assignment

Watershed: Viel, Frost

Budget: Weseloh, Leydecker

Flow: Weseloh, Duggan, Sutton

Fish and riparian: Duggan, McCarthy, Saliba

IDT: Weseloh

IAP: Weseloh

TMC: Whitridge, Viel

Meeting was adjourned.

LIST OF MOTIONS

Byron Leydecker nominated Arnold Whitridge to serve as Chairperson for this two-year charter period.

The nomination was seconded by Dana Hord.

All members approved by voice vote.

Tom Weseloh nominated Tim Viel as Vice Chairperson.

The nomination was seconded by Pat Frost.

All members approved by voice vote

Ed Duggan made a motion to accept the minutes as amended.

Byron Leydecker seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Tom Weseloh made a motion that the TAMWG advise TMC to adopt the budget with the following caveats:

- 6. FWS clarifies field office costs of \$750K.**
- 7. Shift costs for chinook coded and decoding wire tagging from A30 to A40.**
- 8. Increase funding to a minimum of \$25K in review panels to meet RFP needs.**
- 9. Revisit budget if stimulus funding not secured.**
- 10. In order to budget balance, scale back geomorphic and riparian monitoring.**

The motion was seconded by Jeffrey Sutton.

The motion passed with twelve affirmative votes.

The following abstained: Rich Lorenz.

Gil Saliba made a motion that the TAMWG voice concern to the TMC with the disproportionate low amount of spending for implementation versus analysis and that the TAMWG ask that the budget be moved as quickly as possible to the 20:30:50 split for administration, analysis, implementation.

The motion was seconded by Rich Lorenz.

Motion passed unanimously.

Tom Weseloh made a motion that the TAMWG recommend to TMC to adopt Alternative 1 hydrograph contingent on conditions staying as a dry-year; also, TAMWG recommends that alternative modeling be performed on flow alternative proposed by David Steinhauser.

The motion was seconded by Dave Steinhauser.

Motion passed with 13 votes.

Jeffrey Sutton and Byron Leydecker abstained.

Byron Leydecker made a motion that the TAMWG chairman write to the TMC requesting it to write to the Bureau of Reclamation asking that it adjust operations so as to maintain a minimum carryover-pool-reservoir level in Trinity Lake to avoid any violation, in the event the Trinity Basin experiences consecutive dry and/or critically dry water-type years, of the State Water Resources Control Board's Water Right Order WR 90-5 requiring specified water temperatures be maintained in the Trinity River, recognizing that the State Water Resources Control Board both issued and controls the Bureau's Water Permits to take water from the Trinity Basin.

The motion was seconded by David Steinhauser.

The motion passed unanimously with twelve votes.

Jeffrey Sutton abstained. Elizabeth Hadley and Sandy Denn were not present during the vote.

Byron Leydecker made a motion to ask the TMC to address the 2008 inquiry to Bureau of Reclamation to aggressively pursue a response regarding hatchery fish escapement and compliance with program requirements.

The motion was seconded by Dana Hord.

The motion passed unanimously.

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1: Organizational Chart, Trinity River Restoration Program, January 2009.
Handed out by Mike Hamman.
- Attachment 2: Executive Director's Report to the Trinity Management Working Group,
March 19, 2009. Handed out by Mike Hamman.
- Attachment 3: FY2010 TRRP Proposed Work Plan (budget). Handed out by Mike
Hamman.
- Attachment 4: 2009 Trinity River Flow Release Recommendations, TAMWG Meeting
March 19, 2009. Handed out by Andreas Kraus.
- Attachment 5: Trinity River Restoration Program Integrated Assessment Plan, 3/18/2009.
Handed out by Joe Polos.
- Attachment 6: Channel Rehabilitation Future. Handed out by Jennifer Faler.
- Attachment 7: Juvenile Salmonid Outmigrant Monitoring Evaluation and Powerpoint slides.
Handed out by Jennifer Faler.
- Attachment 8: Klamath/Trinity Fall Chinook Salmon 2008 Run Size and 2009 Forecast.
Handed out by Joe Polos.

Other Documents

1. History and progress of the TRRP. Powerpoint presentation by Mike Hamman.
2. Letter to TMC from TAMWG Chairman March 30, 2009.
3. Trinity River Restoration Program Integrated Assessment Presentation V2. March
2009. Powerpoint presentation by Joe Polos.
4. Klamath/Trinity Fall Chinook Salmon 2008 Run Size and 2009 Forecast V2. March
2009. Powerpoint presentation by Joe Polos.