Draft Minutes. Recorded by Charlie Chamberlain

DRAFT MINUTES
TRINITY ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP
June 19-20, 2003
Victorian Inn - Weaverville, CA

Thursday June 19, 2003
Meeting open to the public.

9:15 AM Convene
Members present:

Member	**Representative Seat**
Bernice Sullivan (Alternate for Member Serge Birk)	Central Valley Project Water Association
Jeffery Bryant	American Forest Resource Council
Edgar Duggan	Willow Creek Community Services District
Patrick Frost	Trinity County Resource Conservation District
Dan Haycox	Miners Alliance
Dana Hord	Big Bar Community Development Group
Kevin Lewis	American Whitewater
Byron Leydecker	California Trout, Inc.
Richard Lorenz	Trinity County Resident
Elizabeth Soderstrom	Natural Heritage Institute
David Steinhauser	Six Rivers Outfitter and Guide Association
Arnold Whitridge (Chair)	Safe Alternatives for Forest Environment
James Spear	Natural Resource Conservation District
William Huber	South Fork Trinity River CRM

Designated Federal Representative	
Randy Brown	Assistant Field Supervisor of the Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office, standing in for Mary Ellen Mueller

Douglas Schleusner, Executive Director of the Trinity River Restoration Program also in attendance.

Members not in attendance: Serge Birk - Central Valley Project Water Association (Mr. Birk's alternate, Bernice Sullivan attended in his place), Tim Colvin - Trinity Lake Resort Owners Association, Zeke Grader - Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations (Mr. Grader later joined the meeting at the 11:15 break), Jim Smith - Humboldt County Board of Supervisors, Charles Schultz – Bureau of Land Management (Francis Berg of BLM attended as an unofficial representative for Mr. Shultz), James Feider - City of Redding Electric Utility Department (later joined the meeting following the lunch break).

1. Welcome and introduction

Welcome and Introduction by Chairman Arnold Whitridge
Agenda changes suggested. Cancel Gold Bar presentation (proponent not yet ready for presentation). Move tomorrow's Sediment Strategy session to today. Perhaps insert into Executive Director's Report. **(Attachment 1 - Approved agenda)**

Note: All attachments will be included in the final package of meeting materials as part of the public record, and will be available on the Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office website http//Arcata.fws.gov

Approval of minutes from the April meeting.
****Motion** Byron Leydecker made a motion to approve minutes from the April 03 meeting.**
****Second** Ed Duggan seconded.**
****Motion passed****

2. Public Comment Period

No comments

3. Update on Bridge Replacement Project

Tom Stokely – Trinity County Planning Department. **(Attachment 2 – Letter to TAMWG from Trinity County regarding Bridges Draft EIR/EA)** Notes on Tom's presentation *italicized* below.

Tom briefly described the history of legislation behind Record of Decision. Bridges and other structures have long been identified as an impediment for putting flows down the river.

Persistence by the County finally got funding through CDFG after several rejections from federal and CVP/CVPIA funds. And the Program finally got $1.5 million from CVPIA. These funds have been the only money we ever got from CVPIA and may be the last.

The Bridge document was released May5 for 45 day review. Workshops were held by the County Planning Commission. Close of comments is today at 5:00 PM. Trying to obligate 1.6 million dollars before the end of September this year before it is lost.

This was a joint effort. The County could not have done it without Reclamation's efforts.

The most controversial element of the Bridges Project is the issue of public access at Salt Flat. The proposed action is for a private bridge. All currently private bridges are to remain private under the proposed action. To do otherwise would require condemnation of private property.

Ed Solbos – Trinity River Restoration Program Rehabilitation Implementation Group Leader. Notes on Ed's presentation *italicized* below.

Tom did great job laying it out. The primary focus for the last two weeks has been public involvement. Virtually no comments were received on the bridges except regarding Salt Flat.

The vast majority of commenters support the proposed action, but there are valid dissenting comments.

We don't care what the bridge is (private vs. public) but just need it able to pass the flows. We really don't want to condemn people. We need public support of this program. Approximately 35-40 property owners are affected at Salt Flat. Most would rather have privacy than a new public bridge.

The new proposed bridge is virtually in the same right-of-way as the old bridge. We will address all of the comments we received. Will spend a lot of time and do a good job.

Nancy Tennyson – Lewiston Resident and property owner at Salt Flat. Nancy's comments *italicized* below.

The issue is public vs. private.
It was stated in the April meeting that a goal of the Lewiston Trails Group was a public trail from Lewiston to Rush Creek. As a member of the Trails group, Nancy disagrees. "There are many areas without public trails. We wanted to emphasize trails on public lands where there was limited access."

Trash was a big concern about adding public access. Part of the suggested mitigation is to provide parking area and trash facilities. The existing access to Cemetery Hole in Lewiston is example. The access is a mess with fishing debris, human waste, and trash. Another local resident researched who is responsible to maintain this sate and found it was CDFG. The County was not aware of this agreement. The private individual got the County to put a restroom there and she picks up the trash herself.

Ed or Tom's comment about working with the public to restore the river is a good point. Condemnation of private property sets a very negative precedent for landowners. Rather than building a public bridge, the landowners would prefer to keep the old one.

We have worked closely with the Trinity River Restoration Program to come up with solutions without really giving up the privacy we have enjoyed the last 25 years.

Jerry Hauky – Lewiston Trails Group. Jerry's comments *italicized* below.

I was here two months ago and have attended various forums since then.
Want to point out that the mission statement of the Department of Interior is "…to protect and provide access to our Nation's natural and cultural heritage…"

I have two motions I would like the board to take action on today:

1. *One, the proposed action of alternative one should be modified to provide administrative access for Bureau of Land Management (BLM). As it stands now, BLM cannot cross the bridge. There are 70 acres of BLM property that lie across the bridge. On this land are Indian sacred sites.*
2. *The second thing I will ask for is for public access. Modify the proposed action to include fishing access and a parking area on the Goose Ranch/BLM side of the river with portable-potty and trash can. This would require using Salt Flat Road. There is*

one property owner there to deal with. Include other mitigation measures to address parking in the proposed action. One cannot mitigate the strong feelings of the Salt Flat landowners against fisherman and other river users.

John Ward – Salt Flat resident. John's comments *italicized* below.

In direct response to parking area and public access, there are several things difficult about that option. A neighboring landowner has a water line that runs under the parking area. The parking area is within the frequent floodplain and at flows of 2,500 cfs or more this proposed parking area is underwater. Oil contamination would be a problem. The fishing access area would not access the river directly. It would lead to a side channel constructed by CDFG for salmon. This side channel was once singed to keep public out to prevent disturbing this habitat.

There has been discussion about spending public funds for private bridge. A purpose of the bridge is restoration of the fishery. Another is to give BOR more flexibility to avoid failure of Trinity Dam. Trinity Dam came close to failure in 1977 with high runoff. Those two benefits are ample justification for expending public funds. Adding public access is not necessary. We (Salt Flat Property owners) did not ask for a new bridge. We will benefit but did not ask for it. Easement road landowners do not want public access.

In closing, paraphrasing from a letter from Cal Trout, "While we support public access, we do not support condemnation of private land." Eminent domain would poison the well for the future.

Pat O'Connell (Spelling?)

Sequoia Pacific Industries does not have deeded access. It is negotiated. And in addition to parking problems in the floodplain is a portable-potty in floodplain.

Jim Spear – Does BLM have a MOU to manage property there? Francis Berg – Presently the Nor-Rel-Muk Nation has an agreement that provides the Nation and BLM administrative access from a route upstream. It is a functional access, but tough. That route is unusable for part of the year.

Doug Schleusner - The Nor-Rel-Muk Nation sent a letter of support for the proposed action.

Ed Duggan –I have not heard about access for firefighting purposes. Ed Solbos – all bridges meet CDF specs and emergency personnel access. The new bridges will meet access requirements that the existing bridges don't

Pat Frost – What is the difference between administrative access vs. an easement? Francis Berg - Administrative access is only for official business. It is not open to public. Administrative access can be as customized as needed. BLM does not currently have the access.

Elizabeth Soderstrom – Is there a way to craft a win-win situation? For example – A bridge that is public but access determined by landowner terms. Incentives could be provided for

landowners to provide public access. That kind of situation doesn't close the door forever to public access.

Tom Stokely – My understanding is that this is the only issue the landowners here have ever come to consensus on "No public access". We have to get each and every landowner to sign off. They will vehemently oppose public option.

Arnold Whitridge – There is no such thing as a public road that can have private restrictions on it. Not to say the win-win approach offered by Liz is not possible. The only public entity that could operate this road is the county.

Jeff Bryant – When you look at our charter it does not matter to Trinity River Restoration whether that bridge is public or private. If the bridge can pass the water we need to flow downstream is the issue. Private vs. public shouldn't matter to this group.

Arnold Whitridge – This is beyond perhaps our core mission.

Byron Leydecker – To me there are 3 issues. Our principle function is restoration. In order to accommodate the flows the bridges need to be raised. Number two is public safety. Number three is dam safety. There will have to be changes made to the dam to accommodate higher flows. The bridges are currently in terrible condition. While access issues are significant, they are transcended by safety issues and restoration. Cal Trout supports the project as proposed in the Draft EIR, as do multiple other fishing organizations. (Byron passed out copies of Cal Trout letter of support.) I ask that the motions that Jerry forwarded not be considered and we focus on dam safety and restoration take precedence. **(Attachment 3 - Cal Trout Letter supporting the Bridges Project)**

Richard Lorenz – It is best not to antagonize private landowners. It's important that we take a stand to support the proposed action.

****Motion** Richard Lorenz made a motion to support the proposed action contained within the EA/EIR of the bridges project.**
****Second** Byron Leydecker seconded.**
Discussion – Pat Frost – It's unfortunate when folks cannot collaborate. Jerry came today with compromise solutions differing from his first presentation to this group from our last meeting. We should recognize that laudable effort. The respect for private land demonstrated by the Bureau of Reclamation is also laudable.
****Motion passed**

4. Flows Update

Daryl Peterson – Presentation on Annual flow recommendations.

Thanks to this body for coming together quickly last meeting and providing input that was acted upon by TMC member organizations. It was a very effective example.

We were restricted to the 452 thousand acre feet of the dry year volume. Early assumption was that the schedule had to also follow the dry schedule.

In late April met to look at various options. We stepped back and looked at the Flow Evaluation Study and contemporary hydrologic conditions. Each hydrograph is assembled from segments that have specific objectives and when pieced together require a certain volume for each water-year type. The technical team looked at current conditions, considered the die-off of last year, looked at last year's 6,000 cfs peak, and weighed geomorphic and biological objectives. The team decided to maximize the biological objectives temperature and habitat. Focus was on the 2,000 cfs bench. We worked closely with Central Valley Project Operations and the safety-of-dams flows. We have ongoing monitoring in the spirit of adaptive management including water temps, smolt survival/growth.

Judge Wanger in April 4 ruling also allowed up to 50,000 acre feet release in late summer/fall for fish die-off prevention. The availability of that water is pending some Klamath decisions.

Arnold Whitridge – Do you envision a process to be used in the future? Daryl Peterson – It was obvious there was limited public input this year. As a result, the process will start much sooner to provide opportunity for input. Doug Schleusner – As a follow up we have had questions about the timing of meetings. TMC meetings will probably occur in late March. This group may want to consider addressing the timing of TAMWG meetings in the by-laws. Daryl Peterson – Water year classification occurs April 1. Then there is a two week window for implementation of flows.

Arnold Whitridge – There has been interest in the process for the possible 50,000 acre feet. Is that volume available? Daryl Peterson – FWS and BOR envisioned a process for implementing that, but its availability is dependent on Judge Armstrong's Klamath decision.

Doug Schleusner – Update from the Klamath Basin Task Force meeting yesterday in Eureka. They are even more interested in the Trinity flows than we are about Klamath Flows. The Klamath Water year was revised from "Dry" to "Below Average". Iron Gate flows at the 1st of August will be 1,200 cfs and maintained at least 1,000 through September. Arnold Whitridge – It may be less likely that our 50,000 acre-feet will be implemented.

Ed Duggan – Public safety concerns were expressed in the Willow Creek area this Spring about the extended period of 2,000 cfs Lewiston release combined with high tributary flows further downstream. Tributaries have died down since then and the safety factor has eased. We would like to see the position or ability to adjust flow as conditions warrant and take into consideration the tributary flows. South Fork flows were even higher than those in the mainstem. It created a problem downriver with big flows. The Forest Service and the Water Safety Coalition from the coast posted warnings on the beaches. This creates an economic impact to a small community. Second worry brought to me regarded the potential pulse flows – what is it going to do to the fall run, and what will it do to the river? We have never had pulse flows like that. Consider the impacts.

Dan Haycox – What is the purpose of the pulse flows in the first place – move sediment? Arnold Whitridge – They are to move fish upstream. Daryl Peterson – The intention is to avert another fish die-off. The solution had to be Trinity based. We were trying to capitalize on salmon migration cues to increases in discharge and trying to use as little water as possible. This has not been tested before in the Trinity. We needed a large enough pulse to be obvious to us and the fish. Needed to ensure we don't repeat last year's die-off. We focused on trying to attract Trinity River fish out of the Klamath.

Elizabeth Soderstrom – Water years were bundled in certain way by 5 water year types. Now we are unbundling them. This complicates things. How does that impact our ability to use adaptive management and evaluate the hydrograph? Daryl Peterson – We didn't want to un-bundle them but we are working within current legal constraints. We are trying to match what we can of the current hydrology within our volume limitations.

Tom Stokely – Wanted to point out the White Dear Skin Boat Dance will occur this summer and that there will already be a pulse related to that. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has found a positive effect on lower Klamath River during these flows in the past. Complaints in past years have occurred about stranding of juveniles in the Trinity River associated with this dance flow. I encourage TAMWG to make others aware. The report from Paul Zedonis (FWS) may be available on FWS web site.

Recess 11:15

Reconvene 11:25
Zeke Grader has joined the meeting.

5. Gold Bar Acquisition Proposal (presentation canceled)

Canceled

6. Executive Director's Report and Sediment Strategy presentation

Doug Schleusner – Executive Director Report

No written report yet. Will have that by time of the TMC meeting next week.

- **Science Advisory Board status** - We received approximately 75 nominations. Review process is continuing. Will meet in the near future.
- **Supplemental EIS.** Scoping meetings have been delayed. The Redding meeting will be July 8, the Hoopa meeting will be July 10 at the neighborhood recreation center.
- **Web-site.** Work is proceeding. The sire will hopefully up and available sometime in the month of July. Intention is to have pages for TMC and TAMWG and include associated meeting materials.

Jim Spear – A question about the annual workplan. Is there a long-range plan that ties into this? Doug Schleusner – Yes. That is also in the developmental process. The section of funding/budget will be developed with a three year cycle. We are making do with an annual process in the interim. There have been suggestions in various meetings for changes to that document. Jim Spear – I suggest that the TAMWG engage in that process.

Andreas Krause – Sediment Strategy (Originally scheduled for presentation on day two)
PowerPoint Presentation on Sediment Workshop. **(Attachment 4 - Sediment Workshop Summary PowerPoint)** Notes on Andreas' presentation *italicized* below.

Primary topics of the presentation were:

- Establish Sediment Technical Workgroup
- Watershed restoration
- Potential USGS collaboration
- Course sediment management plan
- GSTARS sediment routing Model

Bernice Sullivan – Is there a relationship of this group (the Sediment Technical Workgroup) to the Science Advisory Board (SAB)? Andreas Krause – The SAB will have the product of this group. The SAB will be larger scale focus and not the detailed technical review for all aspects of the program. Daryl Peterson – The technical working groups are formed issue specific. The SAB will have broader concern.

Elizabeth Soderstrom – Are you developing the conceptual model based on existing conditions and what you think conditions will be? Andreas Krause – Yes. The bathymetry survey is an example. The decision support system will be developed over the next couple of years. Elizabeth Soderstrom – Graphical display of the conceptual models is helpful to groups like this.

Arnold Whitridge – Are there matching funds for some of the involvement such as USGS or the GSTARS model? Daryl Peterson – Some.

Jim Spear – It is helpful to everybody to have the big picture. There will be a greater degree of support when the long-range comprehensive management plan is in place. Encourage full support of that in the budget.

Break for lunch 12:15
Reconvene 12:25

7. Work Plan and Draft Budget for FY2004

Doug Schleusner
PowerPoint presentation **(Attachment 5 - Proposed Program of Work and Draft Budget for FY 2004 PowerPoint).** Notes on Doug's presentation *italicized* below.

- Primary topics of the presentation were:
- Describe budget development process
- Outline priorities from Staff and B-Team
- Summarize Draft FY 2004 Budget
- Highlight major changes from FY 2003
- Identify key unfunded activities

Criteria for Priorities: Biological urgency, critical path, annual flow considerations, program improvement, areas of scientific uncertainty, long-term data sets, secondary benefits, expiration of matching funds, complete ongoing studies first.

Areas of emphasis: Complete SEIS (Critical). Construct all four bridges (Critical). Correct other infrastructure issues (Critical). Develop capacity of TRRP science (Critical). Inventory/evaluation of mercury issues. Construct Hocker Flat. Complete Sediment Management Plan. Address Rush Creek delta situation. Evaluate existing bank rehab monitoring data.

Estimate of available funds: 7 million from BOR, 2.3 million from FWS. 1.2 million from CDFG Coastal Salmon Recovery Program for Poker Bar and Bucktail Bridges.

Summary: Initial FY04 program costs are $800k more than available funds under the best case scenario. Administration costs are $262k higher than FY03. Implementation costs are $610k higher than FY03, Monitoring/Analysis $155k higher than FY03.

Projects not included in draft budget
Bullfrog ecology 50K, bat species composition 75k, aquatic invert study 75k, estuary water quality, green sturgeon habitat use/tracking, ESA coordination.

Ways of dealing with the gap: Increase funds, fund no new projects, delete projects, reduce scopes of work, phase-in projects. We have done a little of all of these.

Possible sources of funding. Existing appropriations. Other Federal agencies. CVPIA restoration fund, state/local agencies, non-federal matching funds.

Next steps. Incorporate TAMWG comments June 23 to TMC. Present draft budget to TMC June 26, Distribute call letter July, due date for proposals, September, FY04 appropriations bill signed, staff and B-Team review, revise/resubmit budget to TMC October, Initiate funding agreements November, execute agreements January 2004.

Byron Leydecker - Understanding that not possible to complete the SEIS by July (the scoping is just occurring), how is this incorporated? Doug Schleusner – A significant amount of work has already occurred. Byron Leydecker – I have heard estimates of two to three years to complete the SEIS for a long time but DOI only asked the judge for 18 months. Arnold Whitridge – If the time takes longer, the 250K to 500K gets us at least to July, then additional funds could be allocated if necessary at that time.

8. Budget Subcommittee Report

Richard Lorenz – Budget subcommittee lead. I believe the budget committee is one of the most important stakeholder functions this group will have. Some real brief comments here: The program is genuinely looking for input and reacting to it in a positive manner. Some concerns are that administration and monitoring costs are around $7 million and allocations for restoration are only around $4 million. Another concern was that we were looking at a 2004 budget, but some of the line items are a multi-year commitment. Another, are we emphasizing the ROD and the 40 plus projects outlined in that Decision and there are no monies in 2004 for tributaries.

Byron Leydecker – Handout regarding Rush Creek Delta Problem. **(Attachment 6 - B. Leydecker summary handout regarding Rush Creek Delta)** Wants to thank Andreas enormously regarding information presented of dredging of Rush Creek Delta. Thinks Rush Creek Delta removal project line item in budget should be eliminated. Solution should rather focus on addressing the real problem upslope in Rush Creek. Delta removal is not contained in the EIS/EIR or ROD. It is yet unknown what the capability of flows will be to move sediment from Rush Creek. Extensive analysis of the project will be required due to coho up and downstream of the project. Money should rather look into comprehensive alternatives and/or Rush Creek restoration. We are moving too fast here. We will be putting a band aid on a problem whose source is nowhere near the mainstem.

Doug Schleusner – There have been changes made in the scope of work for that project. In terms of a process we believe is appropriate to look at the watershed. If you choose to go forward with a motion that is your prerogative, but we have made changes that address some of your concerns already. We don't have an estimate of what funds would be needed for analysis of Rush Creek watershed. There are a number of other restoration activities we are looking at such as the County's Grant program, sediment management plan, development of the integrated study design has components of this as well.

Byron Leydecker – I am interested in there being no contract let until the source of the problem has started to be addressed. Don't design it before you have the other information. Ed Solbos – NEPA/CEQA compliance will drive the timing of contract award. There are some compelling reasons to believe there are significant problems at Rush Creek. The bank on the other side of the delta will be lost next winter if not addressed, resulting in catastrophic channel avulsion. The bar will always continue to grow. Byron Leydecker – The way I read this though, is this is a design to dredge the delta and award the contract. Ed Solbos – It is to dredge-and-fill to redirect the flow of the Trinity to the mouth of Rush. Without ROD flows, this site cannot be maintained. Some design has included a sorting basin to let oversize material settle out.

Jeff Bryant – If the scope of the project is to look at the watershed and determine where to spend the money, then that is one thing. If the scope is to look at the delta and determine where to spend the money, then that is pre-decisional. Doug Schleusner – If the bank opposite the delta is lost then the solution is lost as well.

Arnold Whitridge - A couple of different angles. When something is put in the budget, perception is that it is authorized to be spent. A potential hoop is the necessity of armoring the bank. Are we going to armor banks wherever someone's well is at risk? That is a different program than we signed on for. It also seems to me we have a problem in the watershed. Some of the hydrologists say that even if we immediately made the watershed pristine, we still have a problem of the existing delta. Those need to all be addressed in a way that involves public input.

Ed Solbos – This will be a very controversial project and there will be multiple challenges. On the other side, there are going to be bad things happen if it is not addressed. Take it out or the river will move. Byron Leydecker – I dearly appreciate Ed's commitment to restoration. I just would like to see this "Design and award" thing taken out of there.

Jim Spear – Grass Valley Creek was an example we can learn much from. Construction of Buckhorn Dam was the bottleneck that we had to complete before anything else. It was a hard sell to convince folks that solving problems in the watershed made sense and may be cheaper than dealing with the problem with solutions like Buckhorn Dam or Hamilton Ponds. I want to be aware of these issues earlier in the process so I am not in the reactionary mode. We need to step back like Byron is suggesting. Some of this is just an education process. Maybe some of this just involves getting some of the rest of us up to speed.

Arnold Whitridge – One problem we are having is that for some people, approving the budget means approving every line item. What is the wording for the Rush line item? Would we get a chance to review again before award of contract? Doug Schleusner – Identify funding to do construction and identify funding for compliance. Compliance will involve extensive public involvement. In the summary spreadsheet it is identified as the Rush Creek delta plan. We are hearing the message loud and clear that there is a desire to look at this in an integrated fashion including the watershed. The funding is there and the intent is there. There is $175k for delta planning and $250k for design and construction contract. Ed Solbos – Another way to look at this is there is an incredible amount of ebb and flow in the budget each year. There are multiple examples from last year. We are still trying to get contracts out with FY03 money. There will be lots of opportunities to revisit these as funding pictures and realities change through the year.

Pat Frost – Doug presented broad brush look today and I think that is what he is looking for guidance. The Byron Leydecker proposed action is very specific in terms of guidance. Doug Schleusner – We have purposely not presented much of the detailed line items. It would not be an appropriate use of this body's time to review line by line. That level of review should occur in the budget subcommittee. Actually Byron's statement is very useful. He is suggesting looking at the problem in a broader context rather than as a focused action in the mainstem. Arnold Whitridge – It is our prerogative to provide advice general or specific. Perhaps however it is more appropriate to provide the broader input.

****Motion** Byron Leydecker made a motion that TAMWG recommend to TMC that the FY04 budget funds development of a Rush Creek Watershed and delta improvement plan, and that no contract be let until the analysis completed.**
****Second** Bernice Sullivan seconded.**
Discussion
Jeff B – With this motion on the floor, it looks like we are directing the staff only in one direction. I would rather say go do the analysis and then do what the analysis suggests. There are decision points in the future to provide input/direction.

Arnold Whitridge – Formally speaking, we don't advise staff of the TRRP. We talk to the TMC. We advise the TMC formally.

Bill Huber – My perspective that it is generally accepted that doing work upslope is better than doing work in the river. What do others feel is the right approach? Byron Leydecker – Bill is right. This issue is precedent setting. Jim Spear – At the last meeting a motion was passed to take watershed approach. Arnold Whitridge – To be fair, that was made to address a response to

consider tributaries downstream, but appears applicable here. We need to bear in mind that even if the watershed is restored there may be a problem in the river that needs to be addressed.

*****No objections. Motions passed**

Arnold Whitridge – Other budget discussions? Seems like the most useful to TMC may be general ideas on how to approach the budget. Dana Hord – Perhaps the criteria for priorities presented by Doug.

Elizabeth Soderstrom – I personally would like to see more funding made available and bundled into small packages rather than large line items. Efficiency gains with smaller grants for groups such as private landowners, watershed groups etc. Arnold Whitridge – Are you suggesting we move that way with this FY04 budget? Elizabeth Soderstrom – It could be moved to others to administer like the County Grant program, NRCS. Zeke Grader – Concern with that, question is this is a federal government obligation to fix something it broke and it should address that priority. Congressman Thompson and others have chased the funding for this. Arnold Whitridge – Could it be argued though that the best way may be to contract with smaller entities? Zeke grader – Just don't get a lot of small entities involved just to make everybody feel good without actually accomplishing the big priorities. Don't compromise the federal government's obligation to fix the problem they created. Bernice Sullivan – This monies are to restore the fish.

Byron Leydecker – There are significant funds other than this program funds that come into the basin. Tom Stokely described some of the Five County effort, SB 271, leverage funds from this program to garner more funds from other sources. The Countie's Grant program is not just a watershed program. It is open to public at large for any significant idea that arises. It is there to meet the goals of the program. Wanger blasted the agencies for only focusing on the mainstem thinking that tributary restoration would reduce need for water in the river.

Doug Schleusner – Process point. I agree with Elizabeth's suggestion in concept, but advise if your recommendations are to increase allocations for particular line items, say what we should decrease. Pat Frost – Perhaps the TMC should look at a budget that far exceeds available funding. Anybody interested should be beating the bushes for the monies. I don't see the problem recommending there are needs that should be addressed even if they exceed the funding. Doug Schleusner – That is fine, but we are under increasing pressure to finalize funding agreements.

****Motion** Pat Frost made a motion to recommend to TMC the draft conceptual budget of the PowerPoint presentation, amended regarding the Rush Creek Watershed and Delta Plan, and recommend addition of a Watershed Restoration Goal with a line item of additional $1.5 million (total 2 million) (link to ROD), and that the TAMWG watershed committee develop a strategy for funding of watershed restoration.**
Bill Huber Seconded.
Discussion
Pat Frost – I think that 1.5 million will be put on the ground next summer through other funding sources. Zeke Grader – This tells us to go after the additional money. One way is to advise the TMC to go after the additional money. This leads eventually to congressional pressure for more

funding. Identify that this budget is less than what the ROD proposed. Have a discussion of strategies to bring other potential funding agencies with responsibilities in the basin (USFS, BLM, etc). Jim Spear – This begins to move us further down the road toward the overall strategic work plan. As a group, let's first identify how we get to restoration that meets the goals. Figure out who pays for it next.

Daryl Peterson – The TRRP is more than the 11 people in the Weaverville office. Pat's suggestion opens up the issue to participation of many other organizations and individuals.

*****Motion passed.**

Arnold Whitridge – The possibility exists that we will not get everything. We may at some point have to discuss prioritization, or what to cut if funds are inadequate. With regard to conceptual framework. There is intention to fund SAB. TMC agencies are funded to be part of the program. A scientific staff here is funded with the program. It seems we may have the wherewithal to do this in-house rather than spend 500K

Daryl Peterson – At issue are development of comprehensive science framework. Conceptual models of how we think the system works. A number of them require work along multiple disciplines. Help to understand how management actions affect the system and how you might manage to get the desired response. Predictive capabilities. Help communicate concepts of how we think system works and how/why management actions are taken. Second part of that is study designs. In many cases the study design and data has not been critically reviewed. Conceptual models identify what to monitor and how to feed that information back in. The 100k is for the developmental framework for fy04. Arnold Whitridge – What is stopping you from doing this development or leading the process yourself? Daryl Peterson – I may not have the expertise and I have an over-commitment of time. Pat Frost – So how does the program development and integration relate to things like redd scour modeling and various workshops? Daryl Peterson – Those are proceeding in parallel. But there are different scales with understanding how to apply the data and integration with other models.

Arnold Whitridge – This is analogous to the Rush Creek model where we don't want to commit to the contract before we have the plan. Elizabeth Soderstrom – Eight workshops in the next year seems like an aggressive timeline.

Doug Schleusner – Arnold did raise this question at the last meeting and my staff has re-focused on some things. Admittedly there is some uncertainty in what individual components may cost. The temptation in the program is to focus on projects. The Flow study did not answer ALL of the questions. Fundamental to the program.

Curtis Anderson – As someone that has been involved in the past, there can be conflict of interest. Not all participants may have the necessary skill sets and good to bring in independent expertise.

Zeke – Recommend we discuss the Humboldt County letter and then adjourn and not return tomorrow. Bernice Sullivan – It may be OK to adjourn if we postpone the Humboldt County

letter because public may come tomorrow expecting to discuss it. Zeke Grader – Do it via teleconference. Arnold Whitridge – Federal Register requirements may require 6 weeks to pull this off.

9. Proposed TAMWG Bylaws

By-laws discussion
Zeke Grader moved to approve By-laws with a change that we advise the Secretary through the TMC.
Jeff Bryant seconded.
*****Motion passed. Draft By-laws adopted.**

10. Humboldt County Request

Byron Leydecker – The 1955 contract that Humboldt County has with BOR says they should get 50,000 acre-feet of water annually.

****Motion** Richard Lorenz mad a motion for TAMWG to support Humboldt County's request of Interior for the 50,000 acre feet pursuant to the 1955 act.**
****Second** Ed Duggan Seconded**
****Motion passed**

11. Public Comment Period

Curtis Anderson – I want to reiterate my commendation of TAMWG for moving very quickly on the flow issue at the last meeting.

12. Assignments and Calendars

Next meeting will be a one-day meeting to be held September 4.

All agenda items were accomplished in day one of this meeting. The decision was made not to reconvene for day two.

Adjourned 5:40

Summary of all actions items and motions passed:

Approval of minutes from April meeting
Byron Leydecker made and Ed Duggan seconded a motion to approve the April minutes. Motion passed.

Trinity River Bridges Project
Richard Lorenz made and Byron Leydecker seconded a motion to support the proposed action contained within the EA/EIR of the Bridges Project. Motion passed.

Rush Creek
Byron Leydecker made and Bernice Sullivan seconded a motion that the TAMWG recommend to TMC that the FY04 budget funds development of a Rush Creek Watershed and Delta Improvement Plan, and that no contract be let until the analysis completed. Motion passed.

Program Budget
Pat Frost made and Bill Huber seconded a motion that the TAMWG recommend to TMC the draft conceptual budget of Doug Schleusner's PowerPoint presentation, and amended regarding the Rush Creek Watershed and Delta Plan, and recommend addition of a Watershed Restoration Goal with a line item of additional $1.5 million (total 2 million) (link to ROD), and that the TAMWG watershed committee develop a strategy for funding of watershed restoration. Motion passed.

TAMWG Bylaws
Zeke Grader made and Jeff Bryant seconded a motion to approve the draft By-laws with the change that we advise the Secretary through the TMC. Motion passed.

Humboldt County Letter
Richard Lorenz made and Ed Duggan seconded a motion for the TAMWG to support Humboldt County's request for the 50K acre feet pursuant to the 1955 act. Motion passed.

Attachments:

Note: All attachments will be included in the final package of meeting materials as part of the public record, and will be available on the Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office website http//Arcata.fws.gov

Attachment 1 - Approved agenda

Attachment 2 – Letter to TAMWG from Trinity County regarding Bridges Draft EIR/EA

Attachment 3 - Cal Trout Letter supporting the Bridges Project

Attachment 4 - Sediment Workshop Summary PowerPoint

Attachment 5 - Proposed Program of Work and Draft Budget for FY 2004 PowerPoint

Attachment 6 - B. Leydecker summary handout regarding Rush Creek Delta