

Discussion of Watershed Work in the TMC Minutes, 2001-Present

Prepared by Jeffrey Hayes September 2012

2001

July & August

“Report from the Ad Hoc Trinity River Watershed Working Group on FY 2002 Budget- Restoration of the Trinity River basin is larger in scope than just the items in the ROD, including tributary restoration, etc. By looking at other funding sources, a cross cutting budget could be developed. Stokely indicated that an advisory committee he sits on to advise the Department of Fish and Game on how to spend millions in restoration funds is interested in what the TMC or other groups think are high priority projects for the state to fund. For instance, the priorities of the TMC for watersheds and tributaries could then be funded through the state.”

“To develop the budget, we need: 3. Ranking of watershed projects.”

September

“Prioritization Criteria were given from overheads by Scott McBain, which are the basis for development of the draft budget. Some watershed work, but conduct evaluation in parallel.”

“Byron Leydecker brought up the concept that the SEIS may reopen the entire ROD, and that money from mainstem construction projects could be redirected to watersheds, the ROD may be different, and may take longer than anticipated to have the supplement completed.”

2002

March

“Tom Stokely reported on the status of funds from the Trinity County Resources Advisory Committee through recent federal legislation regarding Forest Reserve Funds. There will be \$600,000 available for watershed related activities...”

September

“Byron asked that the TMC consider watershed rehabilitation and tributary restoration throughout the entire basin, including in the South Fork and New River watersheds. He also asked that the TMC take a look at the budget and programs for next year for things that will achieve things here and now. The program needs to take every possible action to restore fisheries throughout the entire basin. Without more water, if the program continues to focus only on the mainstem, it will lose the vital support of fisheries organizations like CalTrout.”

“Tom Stokely reported on the status of the Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Restoration Grant Program funded through the TRRP and administered by Trinity County (see attached handout). Tom explained the ranking procedure, presented the final prioritization, and made recommendations to the TMC to approve the recommendation of the technical review committee as follows:”

Project	Applicant	Ranking
1. Deadwood Road Sediment Reduction Project	Trinity County	2.5
2. Lower South Fork Road Sediment Reduction Project	Trinity County- withdrawn	2.5
3. Oregon Gulch Migration Barrier Removal	Trinity County	2.29
4. Grass Valley Creek Watershed Revegetation	Trinity County RCD	2.25
5. South Fork CRMP Coordination	William Huber and Associates	2.25
6. Lewiston Turnpike Sediment Reduction Project	Trinity County	2.14
7. Healthy Watersheds and Salmon Habitat Education	Trinity County RCD	2.13
8. Gravel Quality Monitoring in the Mainstem Trinity River	Graham Matthews and Associates	2.13
9. Trend Monitoring of Pool Depth and Volume in the Mainstem Trinity River	Graham Matthews and Associates	2.00
6. Schneider Stream Corridor Improvement Project	Trinity County	2.00
7. Post Oregon Fire Water Quality Monitoring Project	Trinity County RCD	1.88

7. Private Landowner Assistance Project	Trinity County RCD	1.88
---	--------------------	------

“The TMC should:

1. Allow the \$20,000 from Lower South Fork Road to go to Oregon Gulch Barrier Removal
2. Allow USFWS funds to be used for the grant program in FY 2003 and in the South Fork Trinity
3. Subject to approval of appropriations and appropriate funding mechanisms, allow approval of all projects 1 through 8, and \$10,000 for South Fork CRMP coordination.
4. Direct that a new RFP be sent out in the mid-2003 to solicit projects for FY 2004 funding. It will take several months to undergo a review process and receive approval from the TMC for subsequent projects.
5. Because BOR funds cannot be spent in the South Fork, FWS money will be used (if available) to fund \$10,000 of the South Fork CRMP, which ranked high among the project proposals.

Ralph motioned to approve Tom’s recommendations. Mary Ellen seconded the motion.

Motion passed 7:1; Mike Orcutt voted no based on the issue of the BOR not funding projects in the South Fork. He feels that diverting the funds just delays the problem that needs to be resolved.”

“Tom handed out a draft white paper explaining the causal linkage between the Trinity River and the South Fork. This issue will be further discussed at the next TMC meeting. Tom requested that comments be sent to him before that time. He feels this is a major policy issue that needs to be resolved by the TMC.”

“I [Byron Lydecker] keep hearing from the Bureau and others in the Restoration Program that "we need some restoration projects on the ground." So I ask you to consider another issue. I ask you to look at the larger picture – to look outside of mainstem tunnel vision and to look at the entire Trinity Basin. Look at rehabilitation of all watersheds, look at rehabilitation of all tributaries and the numerous other worthwhile productive projects “on the ground” that could and should be pursued. The South Fork, the New River and many other tributaries where truly wild stocks of salmon and steelhead exist and are at risk have been impacted severely by construction and operation of the Trinity River Division. These cry out for and demand your attention. Decreased ability to transport sediment in the mainstem, poor water quality in the lower Klamath by Reclamation's damming of both the Trinity and Klamath Rivers, hatchery

dilution of native strains, increased harvest pressure on weak stocks, and tributary contributions to Trinity River fishery restoration goals are just a few of the linkages between the Trinity River Division and the South Fork and other tributaries. The Bureau's failure to recognize or acknowledge these linkages indicates a program doomed to failure. Doomed neither to develop nor attract public support. But if you choose to do so, the TMC can step up to the plate. We ask the Trinity Management Council to take a closer look at your budget and policies for the next fiscal year – a process about to begin. How much money are you approving for projects that achieve positive restoration goals here and now. And more important, how will you meet any restoration goals with no more water assured, no South Fork, other tributary and watershed funding, when even the ROD is purported to meet only two-thirds of the Restoration Program's goals? Clearly, the answer lies in the South Fork, other tributaries, watersheds and numerous other positive projects. If this program is to restore fish runs – even partially - it will need to take every possible action including those out of the mainstem productive ones. If you fail to fund genuine, real "restoration projects," and you want only to continue focusing on mainstem symptoms, without more water, this program cannot be supported by CalTrout and by essentially all other sport and commercial fishing organizations in California."

2003

January

"Tom Stokely handed out the latest draft of issue paper on the causal linkages of tributaries and watershed restoration to the Trinity River Division. Please see attached issue paper."

"Tom did not want to ask the TMC to take a vote on this issue. He suggested that the TAMWG take up the issue of using TRRP funds to work in tributaries and watersheds."

"Tom gave a background on the Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Restoration Grant Program administered by Trinity County with funding from the restoration program. He explained that when it came time for the TMC to consider the grant program recommendations, the BOR stated that it would be inconsistent with the Solicitor's Opinion of 1998 to allow work within watersheds and tributaries downstream of the North Fork, specifically the South Fork. Tom explained that Trinity County does not disagree with the Solicitor's Opinion, just BOR's interpretation of it. He also pointed out that the program is paying for some watershed and tributary project upstream of the North Fork."

"Based on Reclamation's interpretation the watershed restoration component of the ROD cannot be funded by the BOR funds. Tom feels this creates confusion and does not make sense because work in the tributaries is essential to meeting restoration goals. Tom mentioned some of the work being done by the Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program and the tangible

results being seen in the tributaries. Money from the restoration program could help to leverage funds from other agencies to implement watershed and tributary work.”

“Tom asked that TAMWG consider this and that the TMC remain flexible and open to funding projects. Tom left the issue open for discussion. If the TAMWG is interested, he offered to give a presentation in more detail on the issue paper. He would also like to present some of Trinity County’s work through the Five Counties program.”

“Mike Ryan replied that BOR recognizes the importance of watershed restoration; however, the program has to be careful to spend BOR money on legal projects in accordance with the Solicitor’s opinion. This also has implications for the credibility of the program. Mike feels it is important to clarify this point. He sent Tom’s issue paper to Washington D.C. explaining that TMC was working on it and would like some clarification. He is hopeful that we can come up with a screening process to assign the correct funds to the correct projects. Tom feels we need to resolve this before next county RFP goes out.”

“Mike Ryan suggested that we get the issue paper into final form so that he can go ahead and try to sort out a decision. Dave Hillemeier noted that part of the ROD is to implement watershed restoration even in the lower river and that the program needs to move in that direction. Mike Ryan would like the TMC to come up with criteria in implementing the program that gives us a screening of projects, if the interpretation of the Solicitor’s opinion is not changed.”

“Jim Spear shed some light on the history of the Trinity River Task Force and its watershed restoration program. He is concerned with the “mainstem” approach the program seems to be taking. For example, Jim reported that there is currently a proposal to dredge the delta at Rush Creek, and there is even discussion on continually dredging that area. The program does not seem to be concerned that the delta was caused by problems in the upper watershed. No one is looking at the watershed approach in Rush Creek. The program is taking a “mainstem” approach and has drifted from the watershed focus. This is not cost effective. Other partners will not be a party if there is no attention paid to a watershed approach. “

“Jeff Phipps stated that there will be resistance to watershed work from many of the stakeholders. The more funds that are pulled away from CVPIA for Trinity, the higher the resistance will be. CVPIA funds are considered to be fully reimbursable through power and water users.”

April

“The TAMWG did agree to recommend that monitoring and restoration projects should be eligible in all tributary watersheds of the Trinity River as follows:

TAMWG believes that a watershed approach should be taken to restore and manage the Trinity River. The TMC should determine that it is appropriate and proper for the Trinity River Restoration Program, through whatever funds are available, to fund appropriate monitoring and restoration work on the Trinity River and all tributary watersheds to contribute to the goals of Public Law 98-541. “

“CVP water and power users have concerns about reimbursability issues and who pays for that kind of work. [Arnold] Whitridge stressed the support for a watershed approach. TAMWG doesn’t recommend specific projects, just the concept. Projects must stand on their own merits.”

“Whitridge suggested that the TMC make a finding that watersheds and tributaries should be eligible for funding including those downstream of the North Fork.”

June

“[George] Kautsky commented that the concept of crosscut budgeting was originally introduced 4-5 years ago. There’s now a point of departure as it relates to watershed funding where the costs would be shared among many agencies. His concern is that unless all those entities are sitting at this table, there’s an “indefinite trail of responsibilities.” Kautsky said there needs to be a way to deal with funding gaps. He suggested a 3-year budget to get a better way to plan for future funding.”

“Dave Hillemeier suggested that efforts should continue to obtain CVPIA Restoration Funds. Mike Ryan said there was a big effort to make a determination to obtain permission to use those funds. He agreed that this program should keep trying to obtain some of that money. Trinity is an authorized use of those funds.”

“Hillemeier said he’d like to see an earmark in the CVPIA RF for the Trinity River Restoration Program.”

“Richard Lorenz said the TAMWG unanimously supported the budget presentation, with 2 exceptions as follows:

1. The Rush Cr. Studies and analyses should be done prior to letting out a contract on the Rush Cr. Delta rehabilitation. The TAMWG would like to cure the problem, including the cause of the problem in the watershed.
2. Regarding the \$1.5 million for watershed restoration- the TAMWG watershed subcommittee will be working to assist in finding the \$1.5 million.”

“Pat Frost elaborated on the watershed issues for TAMWG... There should be a link between the ROD (which includes working in the watersheds at \$1.5 million/year) and the tributary watersheds.”

“Arnold Whitridge said that the TAMWG previously identified a potential scope of work- all Trinity tributary watersheds, including the South Fork.”

“Mike Ryan asked if the TAMWG is asking \$1/2 million for these watersheds from the TRRP budget and more from other funding sources? Pat Frost responded that other funding sources might be other TMC entities like USFS. The USFS provides funds for the Trinity County Resource Advisory Committee which has committed to using about half its \$1.2 million/year for watershed restoration.”

“Hillemeier asked if the TAMWG agrees with the funding for NEPA review and analysis of the Rush Cr. Delta? Lorenz and Frost said the desire is not to let a contract to implement the Delta project until there has been a look upstream to be sure that the design is the best alternative to implement to solve the problem.”

“Hillemeier asked if one year was enough to complete a WA and get the work designed and a contract let out? Whitridge said the TAMWG wasn't totally clear on that, but there's a strong sentiment on TAMWG asking why we are curing the symptom when we don't know the cause, why deal with the delta mechanically and assume that the ROD flows won't deal with the problem?”

“Neil Manji said there is a line item for the Rush Cr. Watershed Assessment (WA)- is that adequate for this fiscal year to get us on the right track. The state has concerns such as what type of WA is appropriate for that area? There are a lot of questions about the area and project. There's a lot to be done in 2004. Neil would like to know how much has really been developed and discussed with all entities present. Maybe we should get together and back off a bit.”

“Spear said there is too much focus on the mainstem and not enough looking up to tributaries and watershed problems. He can't say what the WA would find. The TAMWG believes it's not prudent to move ahead with a solution until we determine the problem. It still begs the question as to whether we can reduce the amount of sediment coming from the watershed? Is it management related? We have tools to reduce management related sediment going into the mainstem. Do you really know what's going on w/o knowing the big picture?”

“Jim Fitzgerald commented that Watershed Analysis/Assessment is to identify the limiting factors for the aquatic ecosystem. Are spawning gravels limited below Rush Creek? He doesn't know if Rush Cr. is putting out too much or not enough gravel. Does Rush Creek have enough

pools, etc.? USFS knows where sediment sources are and aren't, and what can be done about it, but doesn't know the total linkages."

"Daryl Peterson said that over half of the material coming out of Rush Creek is oversized and higher flows can't move it. It's not a biological urgency or ability to do projects urgency."

"Jim Fitzgerald said that watershed restoration and sediment source reduction can be accomplished, but the effect can't be seen in less than 10 years. Watershed restoration is a long-term solution to too much sediment."

"[Ralph] Modine said that the locals need to feel more involved in this. The Planning Commission is having a hard time dealing with a lot of big environmental documents. Modine said that watershed efforts can contribute to the mainstem efforts. If there are county road issues, we can fix them, but if we press too hard, we could make the public feel left out and feel steamrolled."

October

"Tom asked what the role of watersheds and tributaries is in this [strategic] plan. Daryl [Peterson] stated that will come from the management options that the TMC will consider. Watershed restoration is part of the ROD. What that means has to come from the TMC and policy makers."

"Tom Stokely gave a brief explanation of the EPA Watershed Initiative Program. He asked that one of the Tribes or the State nominate the Trinity River as one of the 20 watersheds nationally to be selected in order to open the possibility of further funding."

"Ralph [Modine] stated that this seems like a good opportunity to address the watershed component of the Restoration Program."

"Doug [Schleusner] agrees with the TAMWG proposal that money should be set aside for watershed restoration."

December

"Arnold [Whitridge] reported that the Trinity County grant program funded by the Restoration Program has received a proposal for watershed coordination from the Trinity County RCD. The proposal was well received by the TAMWG as well as TRRP staff. The County can only award the grant with TMC approval. TAMWG recommends that the TMC approve that proposal."

"Mike Ryan stated that Trinity County would like \$50,000 from the County Grant Program to go to the RCD for watershed coordination. Tom Stokely explained the proposal as a watershed coordination grant, helping to implement the watershed restoration component of the ROD.

Tom explained that the funding is from last fiscal year and a new agreement would with Reclamation not have to be completed for the project to proceed.”

“Ralph [Modine] noted that the biggest part of the budget funds work on the mainstem, and there has been a lot of discussion on implementing projects in the watersheds. The RCD has a local capacity and has been very successful in securing and implementing watershed efforts. He thinks the overall program would benefit greatly with the approval of this grant.”

“Ralph Modine moved that the TMC approve the recommendation from the TAMWG with regard to the RCD watershed coordination grant. Sharon Heywood seconded. Mike Orcutt asked for a better understanding of the grant program process. Tom Stokely explained that this was an unsolicited proposal. The County intends to go out with an RFP process soon. He feels this proposal is very important and cannot wait much longer. If this proposal went through the RFP process, it would be at least 6 months from now. He explained that this is FY 2003 money. This is somewhat of a deviation from normal procedure in the past, but the County has had unsolicited proposals before. 2003 and 2004 money will be available for other projects. Doug stated that \$500,000 has been identified for spending on watershed restoration. He believes that this proposal would be effective in leveraging further funds for watershed restoration. The motion [for \$50,000] passed unanimously.”

“Strategic Plan Working Session Goal 3 of 5:

Identify opportunities for restoration activities within tributary watersheds that provide direct benefits to mainstem health and function; consider all restoration activities within the context of improved watershed health.”

“Mike Ryan suggested Staff double check the language in Wanger’s ruling to make sure this goal captures what he says.”

“Mike Orcutt asked if this goal resolves the South Fork Issue. Doug [Schleusner] stated that one school of thought is to make watershed restoration a goal and develop objectives under that. Another viewpoint is that we do not specifically need it as a goal, but it should be incorporated into the overall program approach. Doug does not think that the South Fork needs to be specifically mentioned.”

“Mike Ryan stated that when the program funds activities, the funding authority must authorize the specific activity. He believes that Judge Wanger’s orders went further than simply saying, “consider” watershed activities. He suggested that the language could be stronger in the goal. Tom Stokely thinks this particular goal addresses the current ROD language but Judge Wanger said we need to go further than that.”

2004

April 14th

“[Doug Schleusner]: The Program has made progress in watershed coordination. Andreas has been working with various agencies on that issue.”

June 28th

“He [Tom Weseloh] said the importance of tributary restoration couldn’t be overemphasized. It’s clear that the TRRP is not going to meet Endangered Species Act (ESA) needs with mainstem activities alone. The TRRP must therefore restore tributary habitat in order to restore coho.”

“Item #8 in the TMC Subcommittee report: Complete a watershed rehabilitation strategic plan in cooperation with land owners and managers that targets remediation of the sediment sources in a time and cost efficient means.”

“[Doug] Schleusner recognizes that the watershed plan is part of the ROD. Given the staffing situation, there is no way the TRRP can play the role in watersheds that it plays in mainstem activities. TCRC is working with others to help get this program going. They met again last Thursday, in which they developed a thoughtful way to approach sediment problems and sediment source analysis. Based on subwatershed analysis, they want the coarse sediment component to go up and the fine sediment component to go down.”

“It was noted that there is seed money in the draft budget for out years to correct problems in watersheds and implement the plan.”

“Orcutt wondered how it relates to other sub-basins such as the South Fork. Is the SF outside of this concept? Schleusner stated that it may fall within the “large circle,” so to speak.”

“Schleusner also stated that Rush Cr. is the first order of business. He doesn’t know where the South Fork would fall.”

“Weseloh said that watersheds would be third behind the science framework and staffing needs. It is a high priority, the TRRP could get pennies on the dollar for a small investment; if the plan and matching funds have high priority of getting funds from DFG on this.”

“Schleusner said that Sierra Pacific Industries was at the watershed meeting last week. If we can get them to be involved, it will be a plus. Brandt added that SPI said they don’t want anybody on their property.”

June 29th

“There was a discussion of the watershed coordinator and its relationship to the Trinity Co. Grant Program.”

August 20th

“Ralph [Modine] added concerns about lack of funding for watershed programs.”

“MEM [Mary Ellen Mueller] said it was clear that they don’t have the money to fund it all. She may not have stated it exactly in the memo. [Mike] Orcutt asked about funding through the CVPIA Restoration Fund? MEM said she’s just talking about money from the Arcata office of USFWS. Troy Fletcher said this amplifies the point that there should be money coming from the Klamath side- has anybody contacted the Klamath BOR about funding because this water release the result of their operations? Mike Ryan said he hasn’t directly contacted them, but he thinks some mainstem monitoring is being funded through them.”

September 29th

“[TAMWG chair Arnold Whitridge] recommended a budget which would restore 4 lines from B-Team proposal; 2 are watershed coordinator and reforestation in GVC. The TAMWG continues to be interested in watershed work and riparian fauna. A comprehensive restoration solution is necessary which includes watersheds. If you don’t understand the riparian processes and watersheds, you can’t understand the entire system; and may be “bitten on the back” by future listed species which inhabit and riparian zone. As a member of the DFG subcommittee, he [Tom Stokely] feels that the DFG funds should go to watersheds and tributaries as opposed to mainstem projects (except bridges); because BOR is less likely to fund watershed and tributary work, but will fund mainstem work. That being said, the minimal funding available for watershed and tributaries through the TRRP budget is being used to leverage other funding sources such as the state funding. [Tom] Weseloh agreed with Stokely and noted that whatever funding is made available through the TRRP budget will be matched with other outside funding sources such as the DFG grants program.”

September 30th

“[Doug Schleusner] TAMWG recommendations did include GVC trees funding for \$40k and TCRCO Watershed Coordinator for \$25k. Watershed Costs are based on the 2003 recommendation from TAMWG for \$500,000 in watershed restoration to bring in another \$1.5 million. Still using that approach here. A comprehensive approach to watershed restoration is needed for the USGS Sediment source analysis at Rush Creek.” [Mike] Orcutt: Are there any matching funds tied to this that are related to the Interior Solicitor’s opinion that funds cannot be spent in the South Fork? Is locale out of policy direction or necessity? Andreas (Krause): Target area for next 3-5 years is the watershed in the upper 40 miles. After 5 years, we might

be able to expand outside of that. The South Fork may or may not be part of that. It can't come out of BOR's funding. [Mike] Ryan: Source of funding should have appropriate authority to do so. [Tom] Stokely: Did USGS get \$52,600 this year? Answer: Yes, just 2 weeks ago. Stokely added that the \$200,000 for the watershed grants program this fiscal year was never approved by Reclamation and it shouldn't show up in the budget as having been provided. [Doug] Schleusner said other recommendations include GVC planting; it's the 10th year of the 10-year plan; there is \$40,000 for that in the Trinity County Grant program."

December 10th

"[Doug Schleusner, Harry Rectenwald, and Neil Manji]: Focus on implementation on the ground.

- County/RCD: Tributaries- emphasize coho
- Find matching: Hamilton pond, dredging, rehab site revegetation."

2005

January 31st

"[Ed Solbos] Watershed source analysis, Rush Cr. Source analysis plan, \$150k, also grant program coordinator were cut to 25%. The County grants program is recommended to be cut from \$223,000 to \$100,000. Non-tributary items doesn't impact us significantly in 05, but 2006 is becoming very problematic in the future. [Tom] Stokely- There is a disproportionate cut in watershed program- 60-% cut, and it didn't get \$200k for grant program last year. There is so little \$ now, that he wants to change the funding from a grant program to a targeted program. Ed [Solbos] suggested that they could get \$50,000 from the Canyon Cr. Rehab projects for watersheds. If extra \$ became available, they could put it into Poker Bar Roads."

"Stokely said that the watershed program is supposed to be \$1.8 million/year, this almost completely eliminates it. Working in the main stem is dealing with symptoms of sedimentation from tributaries, not long-term solutions. There is over \$1 million for fish monitoring, but very little for watershed/fine sediment reduction. He said taking \$50,000 from the Canyon Cr. Complex and putting into watersheds would be a step in the right direction."

"Neil Manji made a motion to adopt the TRRP proposed budget to reflect \$15,000 more for TAMWG to \$74,500, to move \$50,000 from Canyon Cr. to watersheds as seed dollars to get matching funds and to not vote on the TMAG budget until technical individuals can get together to re-evaluate the budget. Irma seconded the motion. The motion passed."

February 15th

“He [Tom Stokely] said there is twice as much money being spent on studying dirt as actually implementing the watershed component of the ROD to reduce fine sediment input.”

September 21st-22nd

“[Tom] Stokely: We would also like to see funding go to watershed restoration and the Indian Creek Watershed which are not shown in long-term need for RIG funding. More funds are going into sediment studies than into watershed restoration itself. It is unacceptable to have more funding on studies than implementation for watersheds. The County cannot support this budget which is heavy on studies, but I will abstain from the vote to not stand in the way if the rest of the TMC will support it.”

“He [Stokely] will check with watershed folks regarding “full program” costs for watersheds, which he doesn’t believe is reflected in this budget.”

“Stokely amended his motion to take \$300k from Lewiston Hatchery project if it does not happen and place \$250k of the funds for the Canyon Cr. and/or Indian Cr. mainstem projects and \$50k to watersheds. Gardner accepted the amendment to the motion.”

“Stokely: The watershed portion of the program is grossly under-funded; it’s supposed to be \$1-2 million/year. I along with others who have been involved in watersheds for many years feel like the hiring of Mary Ann Madej was an effort to put off the watershed restoration program to a study program, which was affirmed by her statement at the TAMWG meeting that basic watershed activities still need to be further evaluated as to whether or not they work. Several of us watershed advocates are now discussing forming our own Trinity River watershed group outside of the TRRP because there really is no leadership here that we had hoped for. We do intend to put together a realistic “full program” budget for FY 2007 and beyond. It’s really discouraging that there is more money being spent to study dirt than to prevent it from going into the river. There is a huge amount of local expertise in the watershed and tributary restoration area which isn’t being fully utilized and the program is losing credibility in some circles because of the lack of a priority for the watershed program. The total exclusion of the South Fork Trinity River from funding through the program is based on a subjective interpretation of the 1998 Solicitor’s Opinion that Trinity County doesn’t agree with, and this further undermines the credibility of the TRRP by basically excluding a third of the basin. That being said, we are using the funds we are getting to leverage other funds. The Indian Cr. and Weaver Cr. watershed restoration projects are being leveraged by the \$150k in 2005 thru the DFG Fisheries Restoration Grant Program. We could use more. Our fear is that we will run out of funds for watersheds before the work is completed. This program can provide matching funds to obtain supplemental funding and we are working on that.”

“[Neil] Manji: Watershed proposals for Grass Valley Creek and other areas may not have been highly competitive. You should use this group to find out what are the best projects to submit for funding to DFG.”

December 13-15th

“Joshua Allen from Trinity County Planning Department’s Natural Resources Division presented the EPA Watershed Nomination Grant Program “Big Check” to the TMC & gave a summary of the grant and projects that will be implemented using funds from the grant. A general discussion followed that covered spending amounts, project objectives, and the watershed component of the ROD being met by this grant. Joshua was congratulated by the TMC for receiving such a prestigious grant award for his first successful grant application and was thanked for coordinating the efforts to apply for the grant with the Yurok Tribe and Trinity County Resource Conservation District. The grant will be used by the County to help supplement the implementation of TRRP’s Indian Creek Project in the amount of roughly \$200-210k.”

“[Petey] Brucker mentioned that the TMC, KFMC and Upper Basin Working group have all identified the need for more coordination. You can’t take care of one spot in a watershed without looking at the entire basin. The issue of the fall pulse flow is an example of that kind of coordination. There is also a need to determine a hydrograph for the Klamath River (the big elephant).”

2006

March 29-30th

“The TAMWG also noted the sand problem and renewed its perennial request that the program move away from just the mainstem restoration and deal with sediment and watershed control measures.”

“[Rod] Wittler: Watersheds and the multiple burn areas are contributing to sediment in the mainstem.”

“[Tom] Stokely: I have planned a watershed tour on April 14 to areas upstream of Weaver Cr., including Browns Mountain Rd, which traverses across numerous small and unnamed tributaries that have been “burping” sediment into the mainstem from the north side of the river. The Lowden Fire area (Lewiston Burn) will also be looked at. Some of Trinity County’s proposed work for this year will be reviewed.”

“Wittler explained that the program has now been restructured into four work groups, watershed, riparian, fish and wildlife, and physical.”

“[Doug] Schleusner: Watersheds, harvest management and the like are major policy issues. I would like any policy guidance now that will narrow the disagreements at the technical level that should prove valuable.”

“[Arnold Whitridge] TAMWG would say that the issue of watersheds is a huge policy issue that is important now. The sand coming out of watersheds is a big problem now. It’s an obstacle to restoration. Therefore, should the TRRP try to figure out the problems in watersheds, or should we let somebody else be in charge? Who is in charge? It’s too bad if budget decisions are made without technical priorities; instead drive the budget by the science, not fitting the science into the budget. [Tom] Weseloh said the Budget shouldn’t drive science.”

“A review of the program goals and objectives was given [Doug Schleusner] and linkages between the program and budget. There is a new conceptual basis of TRRP program of work, with watersheds now being a component of that work.”

“Sid Michelson, an Indian Creek Floodplain Rehabilitation Project (ICFRP) Landowner, has a concern with sediment coming out of Indian Creek. He estimates that 49k cubic yards of material comes out of the Indian Creek watershed & deposits into his section of the river, with 1/3 of that sediment being fines. He is not sure that the Indian Cr. project will take care of his problems, such as the island build-up in the river on his property. Sid would like the islands removed as part of the project to help flush sediment out of the river instead of building up at his property. He would like the delta opened up, some regulation of logging within the watershed, would like more restoration & sediment reduction within the Indian Creek watershed, and thinks that capturing larger rocks will help solve the delta problem. After many years of low flows, a lot of sediment has built up in-river. He doesn’t believe the 8.5k or 11k cfs fishery flows will work to move that sediment downstream without mechanical assistance. He is not sure of the correct solution. Indian Cr. has had lots of clear-cutting of the forest; where does it end?”

June 19-20th

“[Arnold Whitridge] A discussion took place about watershed efforts and ongoing challenges; this has been a chronic topic for the TAMWG. The stakeholders are impatient and dissatisfied with progress that has taken place in regards to watershed work. The group is hopeful that the approach by staff and the incipient CRMP will provide an effective means of grappling with the watershed needs. There is some responsibility from the TRRP for watersheds, based upon the ROD, but all the ducks aren’t lined up yet.”

“[Doug] Schleusner: This is an example where a project is extended for another year. Do we need to fund the equivalent amount for the next year? Another example is watershed grant program through Trinity Co., whereby funds haven’t been fully expended.”

“[Schleusner] In order to be able to accommodate extremely wet year flows for next year, the Indian Creek Rehabilitation Project and the Browns Mountain Road repairs must be completed by spring 2007.”

“[Schleusner] FY2007 budget: \$100k for Browns Mountain. Rd improvement

- Watersheds funding is close to last year.”

September 20th-21st

“Approval of FY2007 Budget (w/ Increments). *Adjustments/counterproposals by TMC members.*

Options

1. reallocate \$155k to watersheds
3. Make WS and RST top priorities if additional FY 07 \$

Of the remaining \$985k, the following is what the named members propose:

	RST	Wildlife	Watersheds
• Orcutt:	\$570k	\$40k	\$375k
• Brock:	\$570k	\$155k	\$260k
• Person:	\$500k	\$155k	\$330k”

“Stokely moved to go with Brian’s modified proposal: ...increase watershed funding by \$130k to bring the amount to \$330k. Brock made a second to the motion. The motion passed.”

“I [Mike Long] want to thank my fellow TMC members and alternates for so much hard work;
○ Roger Jaegel and Tom Stokely for their work on watershed grants, roads and floodplain issues.”

“The TAMWG is on record from past meetings for recommending that wildlife monitoring and watershed restoration be fully funded and implemented, and that recommendation is still in effect.”

“[Doug] Schleusner: They also discussed USFWS leftover funding which would have gone into the Indian Cr. Project and watershed work.”

“[Ed] Solbos emphasized a few accomplishments:

- Increased CEQA lead by \$25k and increased watersheds by \$50k to \$200k.”

“[Rod] Wittler: For 2007, we are taking in the watershed line items, 45-49, which are administratively done by the TMAG, but it will remain in the RIG budget.”

“[Tom] Stokely: There’s inadequate funding for TMC participation. We will have a shortfall in FY2008. Due to the grant process we always get funding in one year for the next future year which sets us back a few quarters in spending it, then Reclamation says we are not spending it fast enough, and we lose the next year’s grant which is precisely what happened this year with \$200,000 for watershed restoration. On top of that, the expenses are not static and grow with each year due to increased costs, yet the grant stays the same amount. We can’t do business that way, it needs to take into account the length of the application process, the time it takes to process and award, inflation, and cost increases. The County would also like to see an increase of \$250k for watersheds; we can’t do the watershed grant program with only \$200k.”

“[Dave] Hillemeier: I may have some now [deal breakers]. They would be wildlife funding, the rotary screw traps, watershed funding, and Trinity Co. TMC participation funding.”

“[Wittler] Watersheds, rotary screw trapping, and wildlife are areas of disagreement. No apparent consensus on cutting some of the TMAG items identified in Long’s memo on the budget.”

-Discussions about the FY 2007 Budget Allocations-

“Of the \$345k difference [Mike] Orcutt proposed to reallocate \$175k to RST, the other \$175k to watersheds.”

“[Bill] Brock: There are a few members who are uncomfortable about eliminating wildlife; could we consider eliminating watershed increases? We can make watersheds a priority for increased funding.”

“[Brian] Person: I’d consider bringing the RSTs to \$500k with another \$100k, then backfill \$70k into watersheds.”

“Brock said he might be able to get the USFS to come up with another \$45k for watersheds from the USFS budget.”

“Orcutt: Would the projects lost be a high priority if more funding becomes available, or would they just go into the TMAG budget?”

“Stokely asked that a watershed presentation be added to the December agenda to show what has been done with the funding.”

December 14th

“Tom Weseloh presented the letter from the TAMWG Chair, Arnold Whitridge, who was unable to attend. He expressed support for the IAP and a collective watershed presentation to the TMC.”

2007

March

“FY 2008 Budget (Review/Approval). [Tom] Weseloh made a recommendation:

OPTION #1 PRIORITIES

- Watersheds \$200

OPTION #2 PRIORITIES NEEDS

- Watersheds \$100k”

“MOTION #1. Motion failed.”

“MOTION #2. [Brian] Person moved to adopt Weseloh’s Option #2 for the budget. The motion was seconded by [Tom] Stokely. The motion was withdrawn.”

“MOTION #3. Person moved to approve the Administration and RIG portions of the budget as presented in the budget packet. The motion was seconded by Stokely. The motion passed as amended.”

“Report from TAMWG Chair [Arnold Whitridge]: We recommend that the full program cost of watershed work be identified as \$2 million per year, as specified in the ROD.”

“Watershed Restoration Issues and Projects (Information and Proposal):

[Tom] Stokely gave a brief presentation about watersheds that was given at a previous TAMWG meeting. It included an overview of P.L. 96-335 about the protection of Grass Valley Creek (GVC) watershed. He specified that there is a Decomposed Granite Grading Ordinance as required by P.L. 96-335, but there is not a County-wide grading ordinance. The County does not have its own rules affecting timber harvest in sensitive soils such as GVC, as the State legislature took away the ability of counties to do so in 1983. Many timber harvests put roads before applying for a Timber Harvest Plan so they don’t have to comply with any regulations on road building. There has been a long line of watershed issues that have needed a response. Stokely also gave background about the TRMFR EIS/EIR and its development of the ROD. Based upon the ROD, the watershed component should include \$2 million in the TMC budget; though

this component is not full restoration being that it only focuses upon sediment and roads and does not include activities known to be successful in the recover of fisheries such as riparian habitat improvements or fish migration barrier removals. Stokely also reviewed TMDLs within the basin, which for some reason was omitted out of the first drafts of the IAP. Stokely explained why the watershed group got together as an “ad hoc” group, which was due to funding running out, yet there was a need to prioritize and recommend watershed projects for TMC budgeting. All projects are in the upper 40 miles of the watershed (i.e. NF to Lewiston). If additional funding were to become available, there are easily multi-million dollar projects that could be done yearly. If we have identified projects with a match, the County and TCRCD can apply for DFG Fisheries Restoration Grant Program funds. He also gave an overview of the County’s IRWMP grants and the Hayfork project which will give more flows to Hayfork Creek by reducing irrigation water diverted directly from Hayfork Creek, and also reducing demand for treated water by providing a parallel untreated water line for major irrigators such as the high school, Fair, park and elementary school. An overview of the priorities and funding needed was given. An explanation of the EPA Targeted Watersheds Grant Program partnership between the Yuroks, TCRCD, and the County was given. Stokely is concerned that there is too much money in the TMAG and not enough in the RIG. The County is concerned that the implementation program will not get completed if funds continue to be delegated as they have been. He would like to see more funding in watersheds so it is a more defensible program because it’s holistic.”

[Bill] Brock has the same concerns as DFG. He agrees with the TAMWG position about full watershed program funding at \$2M. He agrees with the County regarding watershed funding and projects.”

<u>“Issue</u>	<u>Proposed \$</u>	<u>Revised \$/Scope</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Effect</u>
Minor				
Watersheds (H-23)	\$100k	\$200k (TC)	+\$100k	From M.S. Sed.
M.S. Sediment Monitoring	\$333k	\$233k	-\$100k	Goes to Watersheds
\$2M Full ROD Funding for Watersheds				
TOTALS	\$3.8M	\$2.382M	+\$1.177M”	

June

“Tom Stokely won’t support budget, as proposed. Wants \$100,000 more for watersheds. Feels it’s unfair to put watersheds in direct competition with TMAG science and monitoring projects. Stokely said he agreed with Irma and would not vote for the proposed budget unless another \$100,000 is added to the watershed implementation budget. Brian Person noted that about

half of the TMC would have voted for it, and another if watershed restoration had gotten additional funding. He wouldn't characterize that as dysfunctional. Frustration among partners is a mischaracterization. He [Arnold Whitridge] suggests adopting a budget today, even the proposed budget, or tweaking for more watershed work. Tom Weseloh agreed with what Arnold had to say. One of his biggest concerns as an individual is that the inability to make decisions has delayed important project - it's a logjam for the TRRP in several areas. While he has problems with the budget and hopes for more for money in watersheds, he would like to see it adopted. Stokely moved to adopt the proposed staff budget, with the change to adopt the FY 2008 budget, with \$100k to watersheds, with offset coming from juvenile outmigration. The Hoopa Valley Tribe opposes the motion with the comment that it's a democratic concept of "paygo" to get any funds to offset the \$100,000 for watersheds. The Yurok Tribe doesn't know why watersheds are in the TMAG portion of the budget. Curtis [Anderson] would need more justification to move money to watersheds, as opposed to leaving in RSTs. [Bill] Brock suggested that any increases in funding or savings from RSTs, IAP or mainstem sediment transport monitoring could be used for watersheds. The Yurok Tribe thinks watersheds should be in the RIG budget and doesn't understand why it's in TMAG. [Mike] Orcutt- putting \$100k for watersheds. Stokely seconded the motion. Motion fails to pass."

"Orcutt- Trinity wants \$100k for watersheds. [Dave] Hillemeier - made a motion to increase watersheds by \$50k. No second to the motion. Motion dies for lack of second."

"Curtis - made a motion to increase watersheds by \$53k. Seconded by Bill Brock. Trinity County can support it. Motion fails to pass."

September 26-27th

"[Arnold Whitridge] The TAMWG recommends that implementation activities (channel rehabilitation, watershed projects, gravel augmentation...) be given priority for new or redirected funding in 2008."

"Approximately \$990,000 was available for year end obligation (\$550,000 for Browns Mountain, \$180,000 from the Klamath Basin Area Office...

2) \$130,000 to the Trinity County Resource Conservation District for watershed coordination (two option years @ \$50,000 = \$100,000) and Hamilton Ponds Dredging Supervision (two option years @ \$15,000 = \$30,000); both tasks are within an existing cooperative agreement;

- Watershed Restoration: The implementation process is off to a very good start. A grant was recently awarded, initial projects have been proposed and screened, and the

grantee is now working to implement the first set of projects. Funding will enable this portion of the program to increase in scale; the process is now in place.”

“[Mike] Orcutt said the watershed restoration component is grossly underfunded, as is the science portion of the program.”

“[Rod] Wittler: Rather we are only managing habitat restoration through channel rehab, gravel augmentation, watershed, and flow which are our management action that we are authorized under the ROD. It’s why prioritization is important.”

“[Mike] Long: Yeah, that small passionate Watershed Group has been in fact hijacking the Program...”

“[Doug] Schleusner: I think we would have to do a few things differently than to this point. One of the larger elements, being the full watershed funding of \$2 million that has been identified in the ROD, which has been underfunded up to this point. It has been assumed in the past that this would be a cost share item and the numbers used in the legislation assumes this as well. When you get into watershed restoration you look at if there are enough projects in the mix to award. Whether or not it would be instantly available is another topic. Certainly there are a lot of other activities associated with such work in the RIG and TMAG, and that would need some staffing changes.”

“[Dave] Hillemeier: We can substantially help the watershed restoration, as per the ROD, including the Lower Klamath River. (Inaudible...)”

2008

January

“[Tom] Stokely said watershed work group and watershed council will meet later this month. We should have a list of prioritized projects by the end of the month to fund whatever amount. [Tom] Weseloh- it’s important to spend this money on on the ground restoration project. He thanked Doug and Brian and their staffs for putting this together. [Bill] Brock- USFS would like a 5 year watershed agreement to “hit the ground running” and have an opportunity to fund additional work with year- end funds, if available. [Arnold] Whitridge – no questions, but would guess that TAMWG would like to fund watersheds at great than \$350k.”

January 10th Report

“2008 Budget: Doug Schleusner outlined his proposal for allocation of the extra \$3 million that is apparently available to TRRP in the current fiscal year. No big arguments. Suggestions were

floated that more funding than the proposed \$350,000 should be devoted to watershed projects.”

March

“[Arnold] Whitridge - The ROD says \$2 million/year for watersheds, but without dropping it, it would be handy to make people upstairs aware of what’s going on. Everybody should think about how it’ll work in the hierarchy to get more watershed funding. [Brian] Person- when they report back on the 2008 extra funding, there will be an expression of support for watersheds- not \$2 million, but substantial support.”

“Bill Brock said he has had a USFS watershed presentation ready for a year, perhaps the June TMC meeting would be a good time to give that?”

“FY2008 and FY2009 Budget Updates, Brian Person, Mike Long, Doug Schleusner

Watershed restoration needs were taken into account for \$500k.”

June

“Agenda Item – Watershed Restoration, Bill Brock, USFS. Refer to attached PowerPoint presentation. This was a very thorough presentation. Discussion focused on the types of “storm proofing”, road maintenance and funding issues. Estimated need of \$90 million over next 20 years. Mike Orcutt said this reinforces the need for a cross-cut budget (multi-agency responsibility).”

2009

September

“Mike Hamman will search for any clarification in the ROD regarding prohibition of work in tributaries.”

“Mark Lancaster made a presentation on watershed restoration that the Five Counties program is undertaking. [Arnold] Whitridge said that TAMWG recommends that TMC budget \$0.5 million per year for watershed restoration. Whitridge commented on the problems of contracting and the need for creating an easy way for funds to be carried over to future years. He also said that watershed restoration should be interpreted broadly and should include sediment reduction, barrier removal and habitat restoration in the tributaries. Whitridge asked if the TMC agrees with the opinion that the tributaries are indeed important to fish restoration.”

“Upon returning to the agenda item TAMWG chair report, Whitridge brought up the issue of whether the restoration program considers watershed restoration important. The ROD mentioned a need for \$2 million of work and listed a variety of funding sources. Responding to [Gary] Stacey’s question, [Brian] Person said that the ROD did not forbid work in the tributaries, but it focuses on the main stem. Bill Brock mentioned that the Forest Service has been spending about \$2 million in the South Fork Trinity largely in fish passage and road work. Irma Lagomarsino said her agency has focused on coho and also recognizes tributaries. She did recall some type of prohibition for work in the tributaries. She thought some sort of policy statement might help. Person asked if Mike Hamman might be able to provide some clarity from the ROD. Gary Stacy said it is fairly clear to most people that restoration in tributaries is important. He cautioned that the funding such an effort may turn out to be huge. Irma Lagomarsino thought that such spending may be wise as it could leverage more funding.”

December

“Bill Brock reported on watershed issues that included roads, the potential for failure, and that there is \$72 million of needed work with a good portion of that required in the South Fork watershed. Whitridge cautioned against planning to allocate \$0.5 million per year for watershed work in years in which the full program funding level of \$2 million for watershed work is requested and received.”

“Sharon Heywood asked what the TAMWG views as watershed activities. Whitridge listed sediment reduction, fish passage, water quality, water quantity, and other activities that would help the fish. George Kautsky noted that the lack of watershed funding was raised at the last B Team meeting.”

“Mike Hamman opened the discussion by referring to a copy of a TMC letter mailed to the TAMWG chairman on December 11. The letter was a response to three assertions of the TAMWG: ...3) TMC has not focused on implementation of specific areas (watersheds, mainstem, carryover storage, and hatchery).”

“Mike Hamman reviewed a document provided that he was asked by the TMC to prepare that addresses program authority allowing work in the watershed (i.e., beyond the main stem channel). He noted areas within the foundation documents that mentioned watershed work. He thought it was clear, from an authority perspective, that the program can address all the tributaries from Lewiston Dam down to the estuary. Work can address both sediment control and habitat for fish. It gets interesting when it discusses funding sources. The Solicitor determined that certain Bureau of Reclamation funding (A30 funds) can only be used for mainstem ROD functions, but CVPIA restoration funds have a broader authority and could be

used in the watershed. Limits on Fish and Wildlife appropriations are not known, but these funds may be useable for watershed activities as well.”

“Roger Jaegel thought it is the job of the TMC to restore fisheries, and if the tributaries are important to the success of fisheries, then he did not see why work was not occurring in the tributaries. There was discussion about the rationale and Solicitors’ roles in limiting A30 funds to just the mainstem of the Trinity.”

“Whitridge noted that he hoped the TMC would weigh in on the principle of achieving full program funding. He gave as an example the TMC using watershed funding for something else. This should be clear in any requests made.”

2010

March

“[Jennifer Faler] noted several consistent “themes” in the action tracker...watershed issues.”

“Irma Lagomarsino noted the \$25,000 budgeted to NOAA could be used to help the under funded public outreach or watersheds.”

“Roger Jaegel asked if the sediment sources from recent fires are being considered. Faler did not know of any programs or funding sources. Arnold Whitridge appreciated that a foot note was added for watersheds but noted that \$2 million is not an opinion but comes from the Record of Decision (ROD). Mike Orcutt asked if the watershed group has revisited the question of what exactly is full watershed funding. Arnold Whitridge noted that Tom Stokely had prepared a white paper that showed a nexus of cause that demonstrated that TRRP funding can be used in tributaries. Irma Lagomarsino asked if outside grants are being sought for watersheds.”

“Roger Jaegel brought up the role of the tributaries and that tributaries are not being given enough consideration. Mike Orcutt noted concerns that the coho are listed under ESA, the Tribe has a right to harvest coho, and that the Tribe be properly consulted per the tribal trust responsibility.”

September

“[Jennifer Faler]: Sediment management is “on track,” watershed efforts are “consistent” with the foundation documents.”

“Mike Orcutt noted that the program has been under-funded in the past. Our challenge is to put all the pieces together. He suggested they look at the foundation documents. He noted

the failure of the watershed restoration group to identify \$2 million for watershed work. The synthesis needs to be distilled down so the policy people can understand it.”

“There was some discussion on tributary work and restriction of funding. [Arnold] Whitridge commented on the existence of a white paper written by Tom Stokely on the “nexus for cause” for nearly every square feet of the watershed. Faler was encouraged to take a look at it.”

December

“Jennifer Faler gave an update on ongoing discussions about projects and efforts focused on the tributaries or what is known, collectively, as the “watershed.” Dave Hillemeier argued for the value of protecting the spring chinook stock in the South Fork Trinity and thought a limiting factors analysis would be useful. Tim Hayden said the work group considered this and wanted guidance whether such as project would be part of the 2012 work plan. Mike Orcutt said the tribes are concerned over the clarity of authorization of budgeting for work in the South Fork and whether the intent of the agreement is being followed. Faler thought that additional legal interpretations are needed. Brian Person, responding to questions from Arnold Whitridge, said that statues allow spending of restoration funds in the tributaries, but he did not know what extent of spending is allowed. One issue is that 830 funds cannot be used for “extensive” work in tributaries. Roger Jaegel thought the logic is in place for spending funds in the South Fork. Mike Orcutt questioned the value of a limiting factors analysis on the South Fork. Dave Hillemeier, Larry Hanson and Seth Naman added their voices for support given that only 100 spring chinook thought to be returning currently and the long-term trend of population abundance appears to be on the decline. Joe Polos said the fish work group was looking for policy guidance about how far to proceed in taking on South Fork issues. There was discussion whether to make motion or to wait to discuss this further at the January conference call.”

“Dave Hillemeier made a motion to direct the fish work group to consider adding to the list of projects a plan to perform a limiting factor analysis on the South Fork Trinity spring chinook that would emphasize the use existing information, identify data gaps, identify bottlenecks, and identify short term solutions to help prevent a downward trend. This motion would be subject to concurrence of NEPA compliance and statutory authority. The motion was seconded by Roger Jaegel. The motion passed by a vote of seven ayes and one nay. The Hoopa Valley Tribe opposed.”

“Before the vote, there was discussion about some of the ongoing work by the South Fork watershed council, about whether NEPA would prevent such a motion and the authority to use restoration funding. An amendment was added to address authority. It was further pointed out that passing this motion would place this effort higher up on the list of priorities and therefore could supplant other projects. The motion was amended to let the work group

decide the priority. Finally it was suggested that the analysis determine the causal nexus for authority, but no amendment was added.”

2011

April

“There was discussion of watershed efforts and [Arnold] Whitridge noted that the TAMWG doesn’t know what the TMC is thinking. [Brian] Person asked that the TMC members take a final look at the 11-page “mega-letter” that was drafted to explain the thinking and positions of the TMC to see if it correctly captures the positions of the TMC. Mike Orcutt supported more communication and also noted that the communication needs to “work both ways.” He cited an instance where the TAMWG did not respond or provide support for a particular Hoopa Valley Tribe effort (HR-2733) that pertained to full funding and watersheds. A discussion continued and it centered about some of the problems with (e.g., whether or not) the TMC was communicating their positions or following through with requests by TAMWG. The discussion started with the recognition that different views exist among the TMC members regarding policy and position on various issues. The TMC chair sometimes has difficulty in simply stating the policy for the TMC without first hearing from them. Jaegel agreed with Whitridge and expressed his confusion about certain positions on policy of the TMC on issues such as temperature. Hillemeier supported Person’s position and opined that the TMC has taken positions on issues such as seeking a determination that the program cannot do restoration in the South Fork Trinity.”

“There was discussion about watershed efforts and the problems that could be addressed with sediment, particularly roads.”

“Responding to questions, Faler noted that the budget issue resulted in one channel rehabilitation project and one watershed project being lost and also that it caused some consternation and lost time in planning and contracting.”

“Bill Brock cited a recent research that showed that, despite being quite similar in magnitude, the 1964 flooding caused much more damage than the 1955 flooding. This result suggests that the accelerated forest harvests and associated road building between these two time periods were the cause of the large damage in 1964. This result further belies the conclusion that watershed restoration is needed. Regarding watershed work, Bill Brock noted that the Forest Service has spent about \$20 million over the past 10 years, mostly in the South Fork.”

“The guides stated that they believed the projects were having adverse impacts to the holding habitat of adult fish in the river and they asked that \$2 million should be allocated for tributary work to address fine sediment problem.”

September

“[Arnold Whitridge] Mike Orcutt’s proposal to transfer \$2 million from RIG to science and also to decrease the watersheds portion dismays TAMWG – such a large-scale shift is “more than a variance.” TAMWG thinks variance or flexibility is much less than \$2 million.”

“During 2011, watersheds did not get funded until last August. This caused a bottle neck and they could not do the assessments that were needed, so they are not prepared for 2012. Watersheds can have prioritized projects for 2012; any additional funding is for planning a basin wide “gap” or assessment or rapid assessment analysis to help prioritize projects in 2013 and future.”

“Roger Jaegel noted...that watershed funding should be increased. Bill Brock noted that a decision should be made on the South Fork Trinity—whether or not to include it in watershed restoration. Mike Orcutt thought that watershed restoration should be a RIG portion and that a potential “fix” is to convene the group and prioritize what they can do. He thought that the gap analysis is extremely inflated and that the upper 40 miles mainstem should be the focus. There was more discussion on the funding of watersheds. Mike Orcutt noted that most of the land is in USFS in the Trinity and in private holdings in the Klamath—he questioned what might be accomplished. Arnold Whitridge noted that there hasn’t been full funding of watersheds and that TAMWG thinks watersheds has been underemphasized.”

“Dave Hillemeier made a motion to approve the work plan with the caveat that the \$500K earmarked for watershed planning be contingent upon a plan being developed and presented to the TMC for approval. The motion passed.”

“Next the watershed projects were discussed regarding the source of funding and whether such projects should be limited to only sediment control or whether other projects are allowed. Roger Jaegel said he would review the Record of Decision (ROD). Jaegel also opined that the South Fork Trinity has a huge impact on fisheries. Person responded that the TMC cannot make decisions that cause work to be done outside the authority of the Secretary.”

December

“[Dave] Hillemeier noted it may be good to assess the role of tributaries as providing habitat and fish passage.”

“Robin Schrock noted the following activities: ...Five watershed projects are being selected. Responding to another question by Orcutt, Schrock noted \$500,000 is slated for watersheds.”

“[Tom] Stokely said CWIN does not want to stop funding but they may ask Congress to redirect funding away from the main channel. He cited what he saw as problems with the programs [including] lack of watershed work.”

“Mike Orcutt noted that there are budget implications for watershed work. Travis Michel said they are supportive of watershed work.”

“Robin Schrock noted there are five watershed projects selected. Dave Gaeuman is heading up the watershed projects and he described two implementation projects: the Trinity RCD is performing a roads repair project and there is some channel restoration at Weaver creek. He cited three other projects in the planning stages: the reinforced channel at Sidney Gulch at the Forest Service compound, Connor Creek fish passage, and acquisition of LiDAR tributary data at Indian Creek and East Weaver Creek. These five projects cost \$496,000 in TRRP funding and have \$115,000 in matching funds. Not funded was a West Weaver Creek tailing piles and a fish passage issue in a creek above the Forest Service compound. Responding to Mike Orcutt, it was noted that the watershed Group is now a Workgroup of the TRRP. Orcutt noted the need for coordination of projects as the County removed some material that is now being put back in. Gaeuman said they could do \$1 million in work but it is his understanding that they are limited to the Middle Trinity River. Another issue is the costs for applicants to develop proposals. Tom Stokely suggested a programmatic NEPA/CEQA permit.”

“Robin Schrock described the plans for a watershed assessment and referred to a handout. The level of funding proposed was \$500,000 and would be limited to the area between Lewiston Dam and the North Fork Trinity River. The IDT and Program partners wish this initial project be limited, but Schrock’s hope that the project would be expanded over time. Mike Orcutt expressed his concerns. He cited two issues: 1) overlap with other ownerships and other studies or analyses that have already been performed throughout the basin and 2) he did not know what the budget actually would be. Schrock responded that this analysis would be different from the other studies or analyses in the basin in that it would create a geo-spatial database that will help watershed planning. Market analysis suggests that a “Cadillac version” of the geo-data base would cost about \$250,000. Dave Hillemeier asked if the current Program data base development could contribute to this geo-data base. Schrock said that Program data would be used along with other available sets and that main focus would be to create the data as layers for GIS. Hillemeier surmised that this effort would produce plans for future work but he did not see exactly how this would occur.”

“Given the questions on budget and some of Orcutt’s concerns, Person did not think the TMC was ready to make a motion on this item. Person asked Schrock to have the Watershed Workgroup review the scope of work and re-write as needed. The budget should be refined if possible. The hope was to have a re-written plan for the planned January 4 TMC meeting.”

2012

January

“Robin Schrock presented an update on the Watershed Assessment and referred to a handout she prepared for the TMC members. She went over several edits to the tasks of the proposed Watershed RFP that were recommended by the TMC such as changes to the budgeted amounts, focus only on the 40 miles, or objections to the project, and habitat work would not be funded by TRRP funds. Schrock commented that she thought it was important to move forward with this project. Roger Jaegel noted that up to \$700 K of funding may be deferred based on the reduced channel work and could be used for such as project. Mike Orcutt thought the TRRP office needs to research what is contained in the ROD because Interior’s interpretation of its funding authority does not support funding of restoration activities that do not have a “causal linkage” to operation of the Trinity River Division. The Watershed Project needs to follow budget realities and interface with other partners and their processes. He questioned if fancy photographs would provide value. Schrock responded that this would provide an organize entity to reach out to partners and obtain funding for work in watersheds. Orcutt thought they need to decide if they can work in watersheds below the North Fork Trinity River and he thinks the regional directors said the program should look to different authorities to fund watershed work. There was discussion about use of the funding and how the watersheds fell on the priorities list. Orcutt stated he desired to compare this project to all the other needs and the potential funding surpluses. Schrock noted that it is good idea to have this project ready to go because the regional director supports watersheds work and is a good way to garner extra resources. Tim Hayden said they have some concerns about costs and the data base portion and past data base efforts but there is strong need for watershed work to drive planning. Number 6 is the most important part of the work and he wants to look at the budget. Schrock asked for more comments from other TMC partners.”

“Mark Lancaster said much of the work of identifying the priority areas are done and an assessment is not needed so much as to identify areas but it is needed to better provide specific details and priorities about sites needing work. Alex Cousins thought that much of the watershed assessment could be done among the existing partners and it may not be necessary to pay a consultant large fees if they simply came back to ask the RCD or Five Counties for their existing GIS layers. Danny Hagans argued in favor of watershed assessments and that elements of prioritization are done but you need more detail. An assessment helps to get the money on the ground quicker. He stressed that the Program needs to address the uplands area and not just the channel. Schrock asked for inputs on what is needed in the assessment and not so much on budget issues. Orcutt said he is not real clear where we come to closure on it and there have been revisions but it is premature to invest money at this point. Schrock said she will move forward with the watershed group to develop an assessment scope for the March meeting.”

“Tom Stokely stated his recommendations to hire someone with a Ph.D. to establish the causal link between the South Fork and the effects to the Trinity River and this could be used to overturn the Solicitors opinion.”

March

“Robin Schrock said the outstanding item in the 2012 budget is the watershed assessment. There was an extended discussion about the budget and if there were savings that would cover the watershed assessment. Mike Orcutt and Dave Hillemeier thought a review of the budget would help to better understand the status of the budget and what funds are available.”

“[Brian] Person reviewed some of the discussions and the solicitors’ opinions on the watershed assessment. He reported that the solicitor said there are restrictions on “brick and mortar” work in the watershed (e.g., the South Fork Trinity) but “studies” on the watershed has greater latitude (e.g., to established a biological nexus between tributaries and mainstem). Roger Jaegel thought that when they get a solicitors’ opinion they should also give the solicitor their opinion on how this affects their ability to restore fisheries. He is “tired of playing games” with these opinions when they need to focus on how to spend the dollars most effectively. Curtis Milliron said that the solicitor did not give a “yes or no” but it appeared to give the TMC some charge in deciding what to do. They have not been able to overcome the issue of 120 miles of inaccessible habitat given the brick and mortar prohibition. Mike Orcutt noted that when federal folks talk there is an ESA re-consultation on the biological opinion. He thought they might clarify the issue with a proposed project in the watershed.”

“Person asked Arnold Whitridge for his opinion. Whitridge commented that it not possible for the rest of the group to know what exactly the solicitor was asked except by “you four.” He thought it was important to preserve and propagate fisheries and that seems to include work in tributaries. He would like to hear this addressed “directly” by the solicitor. These “vague discussions” act to derail the budget discussions every year.”

“Several other TMC members commented on tributary work. Gil Saliba said the SAB may be able to offer on opinion. Wade Sinnen thought that sediment control projects were allowed in the watersheds. Whitridge again stated his opinion that this issue should be clarified. Bill Brock asked if the solicitor would consider work in the tributaries as a way to protect work that has gone on it the mainstem. Ed Duggan noted that since tributaries enter the mainstem, he did not understand why the Program would not allow funds to open up the mouths of tributaries for fish access.”

“Person noted that, today, Schrock was seeking approval of the scope of work for the watershed assessment and the approval of specific language in the scope. Mike Orcutt noted that this has been a prolonged discussion and that the TMC does not have a budget estimate

for the project. He asked for “more specificity” on this. Person said that budget issues could be addressed later after these technical issues were decided. There was a discussion on how to estimate costs. Nancy Finley suggested that costs be worked out once a contractor works out a more defined scope of work. It was pointed out that there was an urgent need for a decision today in order to meet the budget deadline for 2012. Andrea Hilton asked if the bid process could go out to the open bid process and not just an IDIQ. Schrock said it would. Person pressed the group to craft a motion. Bill Brock started a motion and this started discussion on the wording and adding of amendments. Mike Orcutt proposed a cap on the price of the contract of \$25,000 but then agreed it could be revisited after the project was awarded. There was discussion about the specific words in the scope of work. But the solicitor did not say there were restrictions on the language according to the ROD. Eventually the motion was crafted. Bill Brock made a motion to adopt the scope of work for the watershed assessment. The Program Office will prepare a purchase request for a competitive bid. The language of the scope of work would keep the original language of aquatic habitat and ecosystem function. The final decision on the award would be conditional pending approval by the TMC. Ann Garrett seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.”

“[DJ Bandrowski said] there are five projects underway for the watershed implementation program.”

June

“Robin Schrock noted...watershed assessment is still in the queue and nothing is happening right now. Schrock next reviewed the activities of the Wildlife and Riparian Workgroup and Watershed Workgroup.”

“Mike Orcutt asked about the \$250,000 for the watershed assessment and if the funds may be rolled into something else if the project is not performed. Schrock said the project is in the competition queue but has not been awarded; it should be awarded August or September and would go into 2013 funding.”

“Two public acknowledgements were made for the career service in Trinity River restoration to two members of the Trinity County RCD—Cynthia Tarwater who received the national Two Chiefs Award from the Forest Service and BLM chiefs for her contributions to promoting roads restoration and reducing sediment in the uplands, for success in leveraging funding, and work in the South Fork of the Trinity River. Pat Frost, who is retiring from the RCD, was recognized by the TRRP for his community efforts and collaboration on river and watershed restoration projects.”

August Approval of Watershed Assessment fails during special call.