

**KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MIDTERM EVALUATION
INTERVIEW RESPONSES¹**

ISSUE	ID NO.	COMMENT
<p>I. WOULD THE SITUATION BE WORSE WITHOUT THE ACT AND TASK FORCE?</p>	3	<p>Yes, would be worse without the Act and TF Only have \$1 million per year to address a huge basin with all kinds of problems The fact that came up with a plan at all, generated with citizen input, with the TF guiding the pen of the author, is a huge success</p> <p>But a plan is only as good as its implementation</p>
	7	<p>Probably would be worse without the Act and TF. At least TF does get interests to the table. If not talking would be suing. Does serve as a forum, attaches faces to names, become better educated on opposing issues. Members don't agree on a range of issues, but the forum has merit.</p>
	13	<p>Act has helped some; would be worse off without it. Provides a starting point, brings information to the table. Failure is weak stock management under current system. Listing was the only alternative.</p>
	14	<p>No, the situation would not be worse without the TF. If TF weren't there we wouldn't miss it. There is a better way to address fisheries problems than putting the money into the political arena. Should spend the money on the fish.</p> <p>Is not proud of the way the TF is operating. Are not addressing the real problems from Iron Gate to the Pacific. Fish problems are also affected by the "black box" of processes in the Pacific, harvests in the ocean, Native American harvest and Trinity diversion, which the TF cannot or will not address.</p>
	34	<p>Stocks are not continually declining, rather are yo-yo. Are only seeing natural fluctuations due to drought, natural ups and downs. Chinook and steelhead coming back after the drought. Coho are pathetically low in last 10 years, but aren't "declining".</p> <p>Fluctuations are influenced little by restoration efforts. Restoration hasn't made much difference. Any gains from restoration are negated by drop in water quality from Klamath Lake due to ag use and algae.</p>

¹ Interview responses include 13 Task Force members, 9 TWG members, 2 KTF staff; and 2 former consultants.

ISSUE	ID NO.	COMMENT
	23	<p>Failure will be most likely outcome of Klamath program. Will read in newspaper in 10 years “\$20 million spent and didn’t solve anything” - like the \$3 billion on the Columbia. This shows how <i>not</i> to set up another TF with consensus rule.</p>
		<p>Act and TF does increase public awareness of the fisheries problems. Are spending money on bandaids (e.g. fish screens), but would be worse without them.</p>
	6	<p>At least are discussing the problems, have started a dialogue. The flow study will bring information to change the way water is allocated. Information will be used during the FERC relicensing.</p> <p>Not many successes to show. Had hoped for more examples of on-the ground successes to generate more money and support.</p>
	18	<p>Only good is that BuRec can’t sweep the fish problems under the rug, but that’s due more to ESA listing than the TF. Would probably be CRMPs anyway. Water rights issues will go to court anyway.</p> <p>Situation is only slightly better than it would be without the Act and Task Force. <u>But</u> it never had the tools to succeed so don’t judge the TF unfairly. Can’t take a 12,000 sq. mile watershed and expect to fix it with \$1 million a year.</p> <p>The alternative is that the agencies would be free to do what they want, with no input from stakeholders. A TF with a broad-based membership and a strong technical TWG can be a powerful mechanism if it has the tools to work with.</p> <p>Temptation is to judge the TF and ask why hasn’t it done more in 10 years, but judging on a starvation diet is unfair. Need to compare this program with others that have received many times more money.</p>
	26	<p>Situation is better with the Act. Question is whether any restoration program has done any good. This program will be a failure too if the big issues are not fixed, but it still does good to pick around the small issues. Are stymied with TF because the big issues aren’t touched, i.e. water allocation, irrigated agriculture, fish passage.</p>
	11	<p>TF is a big plus for the fisheries, habitat and the constituencies that depend on the resource. If there were no TF, we’d be stuck with individual, uncoordinated agency processes, and minimal steps being taken for fisheries. The benefits of the TF outweigh the problems.</p>

ISSUE	ID NO.	COMMENT
	4	<p>Yes, situation would be worse absent the TF and Act. TF and Program have focused concern in the region on the plight of the fish. The CRMPs will do so in time.</p> <p>The anadromous fish stocks in the basin are “drifting toward extinction” overall, but there are “pockets of success” like the Shasta River fall-run chinook salmon.</p>
	5	<p>The TF and Act have been successful in consciousness-raising about the need to conserve the Klamath’s salmon resources</p>
	15	<p>Yes, things are better with the Act and Task Force. But agriculture and timber are missing and should be at the table. Does provide a forum to discuss issues.</p>
	16	<p>No. Does not think the Act and TF have done any good. Can’t think of a single notable achievement except for organizing Scott and Shasta landowners, which the Trinity Program never touched.</p>
	17	<p>The Program has made things better by increasing public awareness of, and concern for, salmon conservation in the basin. Plus there are specific accomplishments like the award-winning French Creek (sediment stabilization) project.</p> <p>The Klamath Basin fish stocks are steady “at worst”.</p>
	22	<p>Public awareness of fisheries issues has increased, mostly due to the CRMPs. Are far better off in terms of public information and education. Poaching is down due to Sal.River Rest.Council. Shasta farmers are more aware of decreasing fish stocks. Would be worse off without the Act.</p>

NATURAL SYSTEM ISSUES

II. WATER MANAGEMENT: QUALITY AND QUANTITY

a. Not enough water for all users

- | | |
|----|--|
| 31 | This is the fundamental issue and the TF has ducked it. Upper Basin was originally outside the jurisdiction.
TF is not authorized to be a water allocation authority, but there is a perception that they are. Therefore the battle is over information on flow; hence divisiveness on instream flow study
Above Iron Gate the IFIM is not funded by the TF |
| 13 | Dealing with water rights, allocations, and buying water are not politically doable, therefore it settles to the bottom as a TF issue. |
| 14 | Problem is too many people wanting fish. Increasing population and demand on resources is the real problem. |
| 6 | Not enough water in most years, but water quality is the issue as much as water supply.
Increase in water supply would mean a change in channel forming processes; can't store and release without creating additional problems. |
| 18 | Is a Water Quality issue as much as one of water supply. Is not enough just to provide water quantity. Temperature and nutrient loads have to be reduced. Klamath main stem is dying; the fish kill of 1997 will be repeated. |
| 26 | The findings of the Long-range Plan capture the causes of the problems in the Basin, plus the original Upper Basin Amendment. Problems are water supply, hydrodams, timber harvest and road building, degradation of water quality through irrigated agriculture etc. Also need to look at change in stock recruitment curves; shape of curve is set by the environment and the shape has changed. |
| 33 | Diversions of natural drainage patterns and conversion to agriculture in Upper Basin are responsible for degradation of Klamath system. Is a historic problem created by early federal reclamation policies. Now Dept. of Interior has conflict of interest managing conflicting interests of agriculture, fish and native water rights. Lack of political will to restore Upper Basin conditions means that the loss of fisheries is a viable option. Feds will put money and lip service into the problem and say "we tried". Public doesn't understand that the government won't modify policy and make the necessary changes to make restoration possible. |

b. Impacts on water quality: temperature, nutrients, pollutants	4	Doubts whether the BuRec controls enough water to 1) protect the federally-listed Klamath Lake sucker; 2) meet down-river (tribal) fish flow demands without 3) destroying irrigated agriculture in the upper basin.
	5	Minimum streamflow reservations may be OK for some of the smaller tributaries, but are simply not sufficient on the key streams. Disagrees with Objective 2.E.8* in the Long Range Plan. Also need to put more effort into developing index of habitat integrity per 2.A.2(a) of LRP.
	16	Water Quality, i.e. from the Upper Basin, is the principal fish-production limiting factor in the Klamath Basin.
	17	Concerned about Jenny Creek which can and should be returned to Klamath River flows. This can and should be done when the present users can obtain alternative supplies from the two new Rogue River reservoirs.
	34	Water quality is almost worse in wet winters than during drought since there is a bigger surface area in Klamath Lake for problems to develop. In wet years, water quality in Trinity goes up, but goes down in Klamath.
	6	Water quality is issue in Upper Basin, Shasta, Seiad. Water is eutrophic naturally, and after it's used to flood cow pastures it is worse and worsening. Are legitimate uses of water: Klamath wildlife refuges are important, but they only receive return water. Should have their own dedicated supply. Oregon as decided that agriculture is the primary use, and as long as they maintain that position nothing can be resolved.
	12	Hot water in main stem more a problem than quantity.
c. Water withdrawals for agricultural use	18	Wetlands in Upper Basin need to be restored as nutrient filters. Need program to purchase ag lands in Upper Basin and above Klamath and Tule lakes in appropriate places. Lakes were always eutrophic, but nothing like now. Species have changed, nutrient loads have changed. Individuals need to take responsibility. There is no regulatory authority on water diversions number or timing, but there is on fish harvesters through KFMC, PFMC, DFG, so they take all the regulatory burden. Is unfair and disproportionate burden.
	32	Need alternative water management. Problem is that it's a legal policy hole. There may be hybrid approaches possible but its hard to embrace change. E.g. Scott CRMP is light on water management. Haven't looked hard enough for alternatives. E.g. a proposition for pumping vs. riparian use, with

d. Water Allocation between Upper Basin vs. Lower Basin		financial assistance on energy costs could be possible solution. But it's a cultural deal and they're not ripe for change; won't let the hard line slip. Won't even talk about the possibility - like NRA on assault weapons.
	23	No creative thinking on water management alternatives. Are flooding fields for alfalfa because that's the way it's been done for generations. Need discussion of alternative uses: higher value crops; buying water. Are exterminating a fish run to grow a low value crop just because land owners are so set in their ways. Need more creative thinking and no one is looking at it. Maybe there is enough water if we use it differently. For example, could purchase flushing flows. Ground water pumping is totally ignored. Seen as disconnected from surface flows. No one is looking at the system.
	6	Ag community is more antiquated than other industries in terms of responding to its public trust responsibilities.
	11	It's a domino effect. Water is consumed by agriculture and what does return is high in nutrients so DO,pH become problems, results in algae blooms.
	14	Agriculture is doing the best they know how and the most they can afford. Have improved and redesigned sprinkler systems; 70% of basin has sprinklers for more accurate water application compared to none in the 1960's. Land owners using their own money for wheel lines, pivots. 85% of water is returned for other uses. Upper Basin is improving: runoff problems are reducing as runoff flows through marshes for nutrient uptake.
	2	TWG is politicized by the Upper:Lower basin issue. Irrigators block progress to goals. Deny access to land. Don't want to find steelhead on land. Shasta Co. is worst
	20	Water allocation between Upper and Lower Basin will not be resolved through the consensus process. Over long term, the IFIM study will be important for flow based issues; and sub-basin plans will be important for non-flow based issues.
	7	This is the #1 issue to increasing fish production, but other TF members won't allow water to be addressed. Flow study is vetoed every time. Is self-serving interest to constituents, not interest of fish. Takes advantage of the consensus process.
	13	Water quality and quantity in the tributaries and main stem is the #1 issue. TF has worked on the fringes and edges of the issue, but has no political will to attack. 10 years ago there was less public scrutiny, no ESA issues.

e. Native American Water Rights		Need to resolve the IFIM study issue. Need to do it right and not hassle with Bureau of Reclamation every year.
	27	Don't carry problems of Trinity over to Klamath; situation is different. Is not an export problem, it's timing.
	3	Not much action on water rights by TF. Only recently doing instream flow study. TF and State Lands Cmsn. should have taken stronger role in acquiring water rights snf/or land of ranch on tributary to Shasta R for the public trust. Other property interests defeated the initiative.
	9	Some tribes are getting out in front of the issue by hiring own water resource consultants to model flows. The TF IFIM and KPOP will take too long. Tribes may be forced to take legal action asserting their own water rights if other users continue to stonewall cooperative reallocation of water.
	34	Issue is Native American water rights vs. 70 yr. old ranchers
	6	Will come down to a legal question. Positions of the upper basin interests are too fixed. Don't know how it will play out. Tribes have the strongest hand, but need to try to work with UB interests. Should not be a "winner takes all" situation.
	33	Yurok and Klamath tribes have identified the minimum flows needed to restore fish habitat and found that even in wet years there is not enough water to support current economic needs of agriculture. There is no way out. To restore fisheries will have to impact agriculture, and the political will is not there.
	2	After IFIM study the Issue will probably go to courts: Tribes vs. irrigation interests; Resource interests vs. agricultural interests
	13	Initiatives on water rights won't come from the agencies. Courts may be the only recourse. Result will be a function of public sentiment. There has been no test of the Public Trust Doctrine yet. Was incomplete adjudication of the Klamath River in the 30's; some users didn't enter; new riparian users are now present.
	12	Tribes argue that they have jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act, Sect. 404. Decision still pending. Tribes don't get state recognition as "co-managers" in California, whereas they do in WA and OR. Have tried MOAs with DFG; are focused on the Trinity now. Need to demonstrate stability.
11	Has already been established in the Upper Basin that Native Americans do have senior water rights	

<p>f. IFIM “Flow Study”</p>		<p>for fishing, hunting and gathering. The adjudication process is currently underway to restore beneficial uses to biologically sound levels. 18 month timeline for ADR process with sunset in Yr. 2000 to complete adjudication. Lower Basin has not entered adjudication process yet.</p>
	18	<p>Success of IFIM will rest on everyone buying into the data, which means the parties need to agree on the tasks; otherwise it will be a waste of the process and money. The TWG responsibility was to go through the scoping process thoroughly so everyone had a chance to contribute. TWG needs to keep stressing it was a technical decision, not a political one.</p> <p>Handling of the Geomorphology study by USFWS bypassed the TWG.</p>
	33	<p>Flow study would be most useful on Shasta and Scott where fish passage is not the issue, but study in tributaries is blocked. IFIM study will try to find a smoking gun, funnel money at it and when over, say they tried. Flow has to actually change before anyone can claim something was done.</p>
	32	<p>IFIM is painfully slow. Keep scrapping on fine points of scoping. Is the 3rd year in a row and know no more now than before. Have to fight the same fights every year.</p>
	12	<p>BuRec says it wants the “best science”. But then what? What are they going to do when they have it? Trinity did 12 year study, peer reviewed, flow report, revisions ready, but litigation will drive the decision, then legislation can unravel that. Need a commitment up front to implement the recommendations.</p>
	34	<p>Even after IFIM study is completed, monitoring money will be needed to implement it. Would the money be better spent fixing something? On the Trinity, IFIM allowed tribes to go to court. On Klamath, there is no surplus to put down the river, so result of study won’t change anything.</p>
6	<p>The Task Force is taking responsibility for doing the IFIM, but really should be the Bureau of Reclamation since they are creating the water allocation problem. BuRec is “selectively interpreting” its responsibility.</p> <p>KRTF was intended to be a restoration program, not a flow study program. Dept. of Interior dictated to TF that it do the IFIM study via the override. OK, was a way to get the process started. But now all the money goes to the study, and there’s no money for restoration. There has been a public investment in highly subsidized water with no acknowledgment of the public trust and tribal rights to water or fish.</p> <p>If got good base info from IFIM then it would be useful. Water quality and water supply are the biggest limiting factors for salmonids. Concern is with who inputs the information : a diverter or water agency</p>	

		consultant gets different answers than pro-fish analyst. Flow studies are limited by perceptions. Need coastal perspective as well as upriver for scoping.
	12	Should be higher priority on IFIM study by Secty of Interior, not the Task Force. Also need commitment that solutions will be implemented
	26	Flow study is addressing a big problem of gathering necessary information. Has been slow process. At first the expense crowded everything else out, then during 92-93 drought almost had agreement from Sacramento USFWS office to do it, but proposal was killed by certain TF parties wanting more control. USFWS found other money, elevated interest at Dept. Interior (with tie-in with KPOP and concern for water needs at Klamath Wildlife Refuge) and got the current process started. The scoping process has been done before for other flow studies, but even if the TWG process is slow you still have to get political buy-in. Consensus in itself is a win.
	35	Would be more efficient if smaller group of technical specialists did the scoping, but TWG needed to go through the process which is important for political buy-in.
	7	Value is questionable since so much variation in data. Hasn't worked elsewhere, so why here. BOR will use it whether it's valid or not. Concerned with potential to misuse the model data.
	34	There is a push to get monitoring programs out of the restoration funds. Monitoring by agencies should not be restoration dollars. e.g. BuRec should fund flow study; USFS should fund own projects.
	2	Irrigators don't want to find steelhead on land, so access is a threat
	23	Lack of Access to private land for the flow study is a huge issue.
	2	Irrigators vote no on everything above IG dam, Chairman has to override irrigators
	17	Not enough attention is being paid to the sidehill and estuary processes in either IFIM, LIAM or the other bells and whistles. The Nat'l Biological Service (USGS) comes at the TF with projects that are too pricey. These projects should be broken down into affordable chunks and doled out to others.
g. FERC Relicensing Iron Gate Dam	3	Know it's coming, but nothing done on it
	7	Will be a test of the TF and TF should make its presence felt.

	14	<p>Will track the process. Especially concerned that power rates not be increased as a result since the electricity is important.</p> <p>Concern re: massive disease from hatchery stocks being passed to native trout if dams were blown out.</p>
	34	<p>Problem is who is going to participate for the Task Force? It takes time and effort to show up at other meetings.</p>
	23	<p>Tribes will have united front to force issues of water rights and fishing rights. Tribes becoming better equipped; have increased staff, expertise, data collection. Tribes have more in common as a group; old disputes between tribes now less important.</p>
	22	<p>Power the dams generate is so small, only about 104 families, so why have hydro on the Klamath? Pac. Corps could do away with the dams and not suffer financial loss.</p>
	18	<p>Need to review both quantity and quality of releases. Dams did more than just block fish passage; also drowned cold water refugia used during warm summer months (creek mouths and springs).</p> <p>PacCorp should be held responsible for the costs of studies they would have had to pay for if IFIM wasn't ongoing. Funds should be used for supplemental studies.</p>
	5	<p>FERC relicensing will be another avenue for more flow study money; applicant can be required to look upstream as well.</p>
	33	<p>If could eliminate the dams then could focus on different problems. Could try to get fish up where agriculture doesn't need the water. If dam passage weren't the issue could work with UB interests to restore spring Chinook</p>
	8	<p>Same kinds of water release requirements could be made at Iron Gate as were made on Trinity. BOR let water out of Trinity to stimulate migration of fall chinook and they had fish 3 days later.</p> <p>Iron Gate is used for peaking; typically power is needed in the fall and winter, but that is when there is the least water available in the dam since it is still stored in the snow pack. There should be some minimum flows in the summer. FERC relicensing will dictate how to operate the hydro.</p> <p>Iron Gate serves 16-20,000 homes; Not a lot but is paid for. Sells some power to Sacto where peak is in the summer, so economically is worth keeping</p>

		Should look for a watershed basis for the studies; doesn't make sense not to look at tributaries. FERC study will have to look up to Klamath or Tule Lake.
	2	Iron Gate blocks the primary run: spring Chinook
	33	Talk about removal of dams is off the table too. Half the original spawning habitat was eliminated by the dams. Spring chinook was the biggest run in the 1850s. That's now wiped out, is lumped with fall.
	23	No discussion so far of mitigation at dams for fish. Traditionally dams were a source of water for fish, and fry could use edge habitat. But if water is warm and DO is low, it's no good.
	11	In comparison with other large anadromous river systems (e.g. Columbia, Rogue) the Klamath has the highest feasibility for reconstructing dams to permit fish passage to the Upper Basin. Looking at half a river (i.e. lower basin only) for restoring fish won't work; need to look at the whole system of water flow, water quality, riparian and wetland habitats. Will be participating in FERC process.
	16	The FERC relicensing procedure should address the need to remove Iron Gate Dam. But the TF is not even beginning to address the need to prepare for relicensing, which is only 8 years away.
	17	The present day FERC flow requirements of the Pacific Power and Light reservoirs are too low. They need to be revisited in time for the relicensing in 2006.
h. BOR KPOP	9	KPOP is not in the business of restoring fish. They want to keep water where it is . May be trying to "guide" or "manage" the use of existing water, but basically is flawed since goal is power production, not fish restoration.
	14	Hates KPOP. Understands why BuRec did it, but water allocation is a State's Rights issue. The US should not be in the business of allocating water. Adjudication will solve the problem.
III. FISH MANAGEMENT ISSUES²		
a. Relationship between fish and water management	3	Not on the table of KRTF; is the domain of KFMC. Have talked about allocation, but not the business of the KRTF.

² Fish harvest issues were excluded from this mid-term program evaluation, but voluntary comments by respondents are included.

b. Wild vs. Hatchery stock	18	Harvest issues are not a part of this mid-term review. But it is galling to see fish harvesters take all the burden of regulation when agricultural users don't take any. There is disproportionate impact on user groups.
	32	Not the business of the TF, but the painfully slow decision-making process of the TF re: flows stymies rational decisions by agencies for fish management. If agencies don't have the data, will act conservatively and cut harvests until have more.
	23	Problem is that peak demand for irrigation in spring is the same as the time of out migration. Juv. fish are flooded onto pastures but return water is low quality. Then need good water quality for maintaining summer coho habitat, and its a dry channel. Eg. Scott: Channel changed by gold mining, diking, draining, elimination of beaver, network of sloughs, ponds, riparian zone. Screening and fencing treat a symptom, not the problem.
	34	Don't use Restoration money for monitoring fish. Fish monitoring needs a separate source.
	16	Haven't seen much improvement in fish numbers on the Klamath or Trinity. Many K-T fish experts are now suggesting the fall-run chinook spawning escapement floor might even be the average or the ceiling given the degraded nature of the habitat. The work of Orlob and Deas (UCD) on Klamath temperature issues needs to be sustained.
	3	TF has an influence on DFG on the issues
	34	If TF really wants to manage based on natural spawners, then it means there won't be fishing some years. Achieving natural production will take a lot longer than 2006. To meet 2006 Goal means would need supplementation, not just natural production. So what is restoration supposed to do?
	23	Concerns re hatcheries and rearing are just symptoms of the real problems.
	6	No definitive answer. TF did a disservice to the Barnhart report by dismissing the report without adequate consideration.
	22	Is problem with residual hatchery fish that stay in upper river and don't go out to ocean. Get big eating hatchery fish; lots of dark grey steelhead with big bellies (not streamlined) between Iron Gate and I5. The rearing conditions in the Salmon are still OK, so either hatchery management or ocean impacts are the problem. There are no steelhead left in the Shasta, used to be one of the best in Calif.

c. Native Americans harvest	5	Strongly believes that hatchery fish compete with natural stock. Need to reform hatchery operations to “place greater emphasis on natural stock replacement”. TF needs to place greater effort on stock differentiation. Also need greater emphasis on community-based monitoring of fish habitat and water quality.	
	8	Still is a huge hole in the statistics on fish take. Can't verify assumptions of pre-dam fish and water modeling of historic flows	
	14	Don't know Native Am. fish harvest numbers. Everyone else has to be checked and have a tag, but there is no tribal accountability for size of their take; is a black hole.	
	16	Doesn't think harvest impacts are significant on a long-term average annual basis.	
d. Ocean Impacts	8	Ocean conditions are major limiting factor for Klamath fish, but can't keep track of Klamath fish to get the data. Ocean conditions are cyclical; the food moves. Fish also affected by bears and sea lions. Coho are affected by 8 years of drought, tribes don't have enough water, which hurts juvenile production and spawners. Carrying capacity is too low for coho juveniles. The listings are political; the coho will be back in 7 years. Since we can't control the ocean factors we go to the watershed and harvest to find problems.	
	14	Pacific is a big box. Feds don't touch it. Is a big piece of the puzzle and is ignored. Harvest by other countries in the Pacific is unknown factor. Can't blame all fish problems on agriculture. Effect of Trinity diversion is also major, and isn't being touched by the KTF.	
	2	Overall plan is needed before structures are placed. Not a fan of instream structures. Need spawning assessments before install structures, but no study plan in place. Should do upslope restoration before do instream structures	
e. Success of Instream Structures	2		
f. Continued need for KFMC	7	Yes, need KFMC. Created by Act and linked as sister agency.	
	-	34	Need a basic communication link, but should not be linkage of funding. There is no allocation for KFMC other than meeting expenses.
		26	Success of TAT shows you can get technical products to support management decisions, on time and with a low budget. Difference with TWG may be that it has a mixed membership and TAT is more truly technical. KFMC and TAT may need a mid-term review as well.

<p>IV. IMPACTS OF SPECIFIC USER GROUPS</p> <p>a. Agriculture</p>		
	2	Scott: 160 diversions, only 50 are screened. Not enough funding. Still have dewatering of streams
	7	Agriculture has the biggest impact of all users
	23	Water quality in upper basin is not well documented. No analysis on discharges as a whole: impacts of sewage treatment plant effluent with raw pulp mill effluents combined with ag runoff. Has always been high nutrient system with natural plant growth and waterfowl excrement, but were 5 times more fish then too. Last years fish kill was due to bad water quality management in the middle stem of Klam.
	6	When have good water in the tributaries, fish move to the mainstem. Last year hit Klamath at 80 deg due to upper basin water and loss of refugia resulting in fish kills. Not a bad water year in terms of supply. Have stress before have dead bodies.
	14	Cannot just say that "fixing agriculture" will fix the problems of the basin. Still have the unknown impacts of the ocean component, native fish harvest, diversion of the Trinity, which no one is willing to talk about.
	18	Agriculture has to change to save the fish. Can't dry up the Scott, have 85° water in the Shasta and high nutrients in Main stem from the Upper Basin and expect to maintain fish.
	27	Fish screens provide a big bang for the buck, but DFG keeps a monopoly on screen technology, unlike Oregon which disperses the technology so it gets done. Are over 100 unscreened diversions in the Scott, and only 2 per year are being fixed. In 1974 Legislature set policy that DFG would be responsible for screening flows <250 cfs, but there is no money.
	11	Agriculture affects the fish resources by 1) reducing water flow in streams 2) adding nutrients which turn Klamath Lack into a cesspool. State and tribes on alert with re-appearance of toxic algae blooms. DO, and pH are chronic problems for sucker and bull trout.
	2	Need alternate water sources for stock: wells and tanks; fencing of riparian
	18	Fencing is good; is not just a band-aid. There are still problems with landowners that refuse to

b. Mining		participate.
	2	No attention on issue and no funding by TF, but DFG calls USFWS for info on presence/absence of fish redds in suction dredge sites.
	13	TF not getting into mining activities. No evaluation of impacts. DFG did do EIR on suctioning dredging.
	6	Some problem now, but mostly a problem of the legacy of mining.
c. Timber Management	5	Suction dredging is not a major problem.
	32	What difference does sediment make if there's no water in the channel? Instream structures are buried in 10 feet of stuff from road decomposition.
	34	Why spend TF money on road decommissioning when that should be a cost of maintenance by the land owner.
	6	Logging practices are under-appreciated as a problem, esp. in lower tributaries and mainstem. FEMAT and moratorium on roads is positive. Hillslope processes are a significant source of problems. Have miles of road failures during normal winters; these aren't 100-yr. storms. Some progress by Fruitgrowers in DG soils - hard to ignore. KRTF doesn't have resources to address more of the problems. USFS and private landowners are ahead of TF; TF is just a sideshow; is not creating change, is not a leader.
	26	Aquatic strategy of Forest Plans will lead to less road impacts, but there is a huge backlog of damage. Even if are good stewards now instability in lower basin wants to come down. Timber sales planned today are much more protective,
	8	Is comfortable with current timber practices since are so much better than in the '20s and '30s. If timber management were a factor impacting fish, then things should be looking better by now with the reduction in harvest and better practices.
	35	Yes, TF could have spoken out more on forestry issues
	5	Better private land forest practice rules are needed. TF is limited, but they could do an analysis of the

<p>d. Upslope impacts</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>problem and submit to the State. Efforts to improve timber guidelines would be shot down by the consensus process.</p>
	<p>7</p>	<p>Funding upslope projects is a waste, since costs are so expensive that funding one wipes out budget for anything else. Putting 5 miles of road to bed or fixing a landslide are huge projects, vs. instream projects at \$20-30,000 per shot. With more funding could get to upslope problems, But sub-basin prioritization is needed first.</p>
	<p>35</p>	<p>TF needs to focus on roads and land management. but have funded instream projects as didn't have enough upslope projects submitted.</p>
	<p>5</p>	<p>Need more focus on upslope problems, cumulative impacts, sources of sediments, large woody debris recruitment, riparian issues Not enough attention is given to upslope problems in grant program</p>
<p>e. Rafters and fishing guides</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Most fishing guides and rafters are out of business. Happy Camp no longer "Steelhead Capitol .of the World"</p>
	<p>6</p>	<p>With abnormal high flows (in excess of natural through dam controls) on Trinity have more rafters.</p>
<p>f. Urban/Rural users</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Many hidden diversions along mainstem now ID'd. Issue is lack of screening. Fish congregate in the low velocity edge of the intake inlet</p>
	<p>7</p>	<p>Shasta and Scott need to address water: These basins have the most potential to produce fish.</p>

INSTITUTIONAL, POLITICAL, ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

V. THE CONSENSUS PROCESS

a. A major barrier to group cohesion or a unique success?

- | | |
|----|---|
| 2 | Personally feels it is used as leverage to kill progress, but the Chairman overrode when necessary
But still can't extend IFIM process above Iron Gate |
| 3 | A very important component of the process and very supportive of it
When have a wide range of competing interests a majority rule won't work as will focus on 1 set of issues, will get alliance building, which leads to mutually assured destruction.

Is an important equalizing tool: tribes like the process, since won't get gored.
This is one of the few federal agencies ever to use it.
Majority rule is quicker. With consensus have to give a lot of opportunity to object, stop and caucus, call a lot of breaks. Mtgs. can be slow and irritating.
Best test of the process is that the TF has never failed to approve a budget. Always get to yes. |
| 14 | Consensus will never work. Chairman can override it anyway. Aren't getting progress with consensus, but don't know if majority vote would help. Is sick of the political posturing. |
| 20 | Because of consensus, every interest group has to get a share of the money regardless of the merits of their project and the overall need in terms of basin priorities.

Have to get away from this "win:lose" mentality. Have to reestablish a commitment to increase the fish resources. Each interest group should not feel they are entitled to some share of money; some will get more than others. Have to accept the verdict and live with it, even if some groups don't get funded |
| 7 | Has provided a structure, a process to look at the needs in basin
But does create a barrier. Is a proponent of consensus, but won't ever get a motion through to fix Shasta and Scott. |
| 9 | Consensus is dysfunctional and frustrating, but ultimately it has to work. It guides what is talked about. If issues are at the table long enough eventually you can leverage your position and get what you want. |

	13	<p>TF members need to listen to other positions. Need to give, listen, pick your opportunity. Works about 95% of the time. Don't see holdouts as much now; biggest problem is upper-basin amendment.</p> <p>Consensus means there is no support for fish restoration, only for your constituency.</p> <p>But Long-Range Plan says do a flow study. IFIM scoping calls for an analysis of where to study.</p>
	32	<p>Very cumbersome. At critical moments when must get something done, can't do it due to minority opponent, no quorum etc. – so takes another 3-4 months up to years to get decisions made. For example, have to do an instream flow study based on poor information because of consensus requirement.</p> <p>Would like to see the difference between how Klamath and Trinity task forces work - Trinity does not use consensus.</p>
	34	<p>TF is stymied by the consensus process: slowed down, cumbersome, non-functional, very slow and awkward. Only serves to heighten the politics (e.g. UBA and flow study). Technical group spends huge amount of time analyzing flow study information to make a recommendation, and is ignored due to consensus deadlock. Could have 80% support but blocked by 1 vote veto.</p>
	23	<p>The process is set up to kill anything meaningful from happening. Barely got flow study, can't study tributaries. Many on TF want increase in fish runs and changes in water allocation, but one vote can kill. Many want good science, but are handicapped.</p> <p>If scrap consensus, 2 UB counties would pull out. Would be better to go the Mono Lake model with judge imposing the process of 8 member panel with 6 carrying the motion. This broke the logjam, all of a sudden got range in minimum flows and lake levels rose.</p>
	6	<p>TF is dysfunctional. For consensus to work need either 1) total distrust among all members and so much disagreement that need to work hard to find the only identifiable common ground, or 2) there is basic agreement among all the members and no one with a vested interest, but just want the best solution. Klamath meets neither criteria. Have abuse of the veto power, and is the Achilles heel in project selection</p>
	6	<p>Consensus means that more time is spent on minor issues, but it gives an opportunity for people to grow and know each other. Supports alternative dispute resolution as means to help with communication.</p>
	22	<p>Consensus is the biggest joke ever seen. Is a major barrier. Why should this decisionmaking be any</p>

	<p>27</p> <p>18</p> <p>26</p> <p>33</p>	<p>different from an elected board of supervisors. Members are only there to protect self interest, and are not deciding on behalf of fish.</p> <p>The TF has never learned how to operate under a consensus form of decision making. They haven't tried it fairly and don't know how to do it.</p> <p>Consensus needs a facilitator to work the group through difficult issues. Consensus is not quick. The tyranny of consensus is that the group gets worn out and settles on the lowest common denominator, mundane, status quo decision just to get on.</p> <p>A true consensus process chooses its own chairman, doesn't have a pre-selected chair. The government model is top down; this doesn't mesh with consensus.</p> <p>The parties at the table aren't participating fairly for a consensus process. They need to put their concerns on the table early in the process so the group can work through them. It's unfair to hold issues to the end and then use the power of the veto to blow up an agreement. Consensus is a give and take process, with agreement to stand aside.</p> <p>Would hope the consensus process would work; but the blocking vote is not being used responsibly, especially by Upper Basin interests. UB has blocked things that would be good for fish, but they are not able to justify their votes in terms of the mission of the TF.</p> <p>In a true consensus process you would keep working on it until a solution is found that is amenable.</p> <p>All "no" votes should be explained in terms of the goals set by Congress to protect fish. If a party is not committed to fish restoration, then should not participate on the TF.</p> <p>The TF needs to hold itself accountable to its own goals.</p> <p>Should look at other ways to operate a consensus process other than using Robert's Rules of Order. Using parliamentary motions and substitute motions is not appropriate for a consensus process. Robert's calls for hearing all views before the majority determines the outcome. Consensus requires a facilitator to work through the issue; find the points of agreement</p> <p>Only got Congressional attention on the Klamath basin when problems got too big for politicians to ignore. Everyone finally came to the table when they realized the cumulative problems were bigger than their individual power. At first accused each other for being the reason for fish decline. Now realize the issues are bigger than individual members. Everyone had a stake and motives to join the process, but also realized that restoration was desirable.</p>
--	---	--

<p>b. The TF avoids politically divisive topics</p>		<p>Although consensus is laborious and frustrating it provided opportunity for education in all directions. The problem now is the high burnout rate of TF and TWG members. Changes in county representatives with elections, PacifiCorp transfers, different agency reps. Membership is a moving target and have to keep re-educating. Most members don't read materials, lots happens between meetings, can't remember what happened at last meeting so each meeting is wide open when you get there.</p>
		<p>No process will overcome a lack of political will to change.</p>
	8	<p>Everyone has to have ownership and participation in the process for it to work.</p>
	11	<p>Should stay with the consensus process. If had majority rule, people would step away from the table from fear that their interest would be overwhelmed by the others. Consensus helps the process to work.</p>
	5	<p>Consensus is a nuisance and it causes unnecessary delay. But it does add balance to the top-down approach. Gives it a "C". Consensus is a moderate to major barrier.</p>
	16	<p>The consensus rule is a "poison pill". Was proscribed by the salmon trollers, and killed the program's prospects from Day 1.</p>
	7	<p>Can no longer avoid politically divisive topics, that's all that left.</p>
	9	<p>Consensus forces motions to be vague, thereby delaying the tough decisions.</p>
	13	<p>Yes, the TF avoids politically divisive topics. Won't (can't) take a position on anything.</p>
	2	<p>True. KRTF doesn't deal with timber issues (private or public lands), decommissioning roads, Feeling that other agencies are dealing with ESA, Forest Plans, CDF Forest Practice Rule issues. Advocates who speak on timber issues are "shined off"</p>
	3	<p>Federal mandate doesn't include telling other agencies what to do. Have stayed out of water allocation issue, since what purpose to raise it if have no authority to do anything about it. Klamath Compact is trying to integrate the interests in spirit of cooperation. TF can help out without direct involvement.</p>
	6	<p>Yes, avoids divisive topics since know they won't agree.</p>
22	<p>Haven't dealt with big conflict between the tribes and the Shasta CRMP re: cause of fish decline. Are</p>	

<p>c. Use of federal override</p>		<p>at war, especially in TWG meetings. Shasta contends Yurok fill their quota of fall run chinook with Shasta stock which enter middle stem Klamath earlier. Yurok claim Shasta is doing nothing to deal with habitat degradation, water quantity and quality. Data are needed to make an objective evaluation, but data collection and dissemination is stonewalled on both sides. Is easy to blame others to avoid doing your share.</p>
	11	<p>Issues are raised anyway and talked about. Doesn't see shying away from controversy just because there is no resolution.</p>
	5	<p>TF does not duck thorny issues. The consensus rule takes care of that.</p>
	17	<p>TF does tackle tough issues.</p>
	3	<p>Almost destroyed the TF when it was used. Broke an unbroken record. Showed the TF really didn't have power; are just now healing. Goes to heart of what TF is. If don't adhere to tenets of citizen participation, why have a TF? Override could have been attained through consensus process, but feds were in a hurry by pressure from above.</p>
	7	<p>Question the ability of FWS in Yreka to be impartial on IFIM. Need more deliberate study plan before jump in. Need to be conscious of feds taking over, not using best scientific information and responding on a political basis</p>
	13	<p>Task Force forgot it was advisory to the Secty. of Interior and was surprised when TF decision was overridden and directed the flow study.</p>
	12	<p>TF is not up to the task to deal with Upper Basin issues; may need federal override. Both Trinity and Klamath TFs are advisory; need DOI to come in and get off the dime.</p>
	11	<p>Was a necessity to get the flow study started. Don't like the idea of the federal override, but can live with it as a last resort.</p>
	5	<p>Retain the use of the federal override, especially for keeping the money flowing smoothly. "Use it or lose it"</p>
<p>VI. RESTORATION PROJECTS</p> <p>a. Fairness of Selection Process</p>	2	<p>Members no longer permitted to vote on projects they are affiliated with Evaluation criteria for projects are more defined and seem to work Politics can override TWG decisions, but is accepted as a reality</p>

	9	Not bothered by the idea of “Self dealing” the money since all the power brokers in the Klamath Basin are included at the table. The people there represent the interests in the basin, so its not a problem that the money is consumed by TF members. Doesn’t understand who the “disenfranchised” people are. The real problem is that the agencies (e.g. DFG, USFWS) get such a big share of TF money for duties that should be part of their own budgets, as part of their own statutory responsibilities. The agencies shouldn’t be subsidized on the Klamath or Trinity side.
	13	Less of a problem than it used to be. Used to be a significant part of budget of some parties. In the last few years the allocation of money has gone pretty well. Is a scatter-gun approach to RFPs, but by and large the projects are OK. IFIM is a big item but TF has made the commitment.
	32	The hard categories are more a problem than the ranking.
	34	Early on there were many more proposals submitted, maybe 100; now around 30-50. The Process has discouraged local community groups who don’t know the system, and is dominated by agency proposals.
	6	Is unfair to public and non-profits to put out bid package since outside projects are mostly blocked by vested interests Should not have a 10-pt. group criteria.
	12	Need to keep science separate from TF policy process. TWG decisions are massaged at the TF but the TWG work is beneficial. Ranking criteria are better now; procedures are good.
	22	Obviously there is conflict.
	18	The system is only as objective as the people who do the ranking. The process is set up with reasonable ranking criteria, and parties cannot vote on their own project
	35	Selection process Is cleaner than it used to be. Applicants can no longer vote on their own projects. Problem with long-term studies vs. short term: Long term studies need multi-year funding which locks a set of projects into place, and reduces amount available for new projects But long-term projects are too valuable to give up: e.g.: USFWS trapping outmigration; spawning surveys.
	7	Is better now than it was, but TWG members still find ways to play the system rather than wear the “technical” label. Political decisions should be at the TF level.

b. Accountability for Project Results		TWG needs a “Code of Ethics” prescribing protocol and behavior.
	6	Project selection process has gotten better, but is not fixed yet. Can still give low rank to others to boost your ratings. Tribes and FWS service have too much at stake in getting their projects funded. The conflict of interest isn’t as obvious but is still a problem.
	22	Project evaluation is clouded with conflict between Tribes and Shasta CRMP.
	26	Could do project ranking with fewer people and be more efficient, but is more democratic to have full process
	2	TWG needs a facilitator for trust problem
	11	TWG ranking process works until the list gets to the TF, when advocates for low-ranking projects start to dicker, which dilutes the TWG rationale. Sometimes adjustments by TF are legitimate to take needs of the whole basin into account. TWG has become politicized. TWG needs to have truly technical members, scientists or persons trained in fisheries and habitat management. When non-technical people are appointed it allows politics to intervene at the TWG level. Would rather see technical, scientific input at TWG level, and let the TF make the policy decisions.
	5	The TF sometimes turns the TWG recommendations upside down. The program should go to a foundation-type arrangement (where screening/selection process is done by others).
	16	It’s not so much self-dealing as a needs-based selection process easily over-ridden by Indian greed and demands under the consensus rule. No Indian vote, no budget for others.
	9	TF does not have good accountability or feedback regarding projects that are funded. This should be a regular function of USFWS administrators.
	6	Can’t get basic reports from some cooperators: e.g. How many adults, egg take, releases? Need standardized data collection. Getting more professional now.
32	TF sees no progress reports or final reports. There is little or no accountability for projects. Data goes into a black hole (e.g. Tribes temperature data). Data is collected but not analyzed. The type of project determines the type of deliverable, but it should be something. ESA requires good information. These are public funds, therefore is public information. Info should	

		put on the Web.
	34	Completion reports for projects are a condition of the contract, but there is no quality control on projects. Are CRMPs doing reports on what they did during the year?
	27	Contracts go on and on; by third year still no completion Final reports are poor quality; have no standards, expectations aren't laid out, lack clarity. Should have a mandated workshop for cooperators on how to write final reports, invoices. Project budget must include preparation of final report. 10% hold-out for final payment is too small. TF funded projects should have mandatory 5 year review; take photos before and after. Should have staff check out proposed projects. TWG often can't tell about a project if no field knowledge.
	18	Need to close the loop on projects. The responsibility to provide final reports is not stressed and its easy to let it slip. Would increase the quality of work if cooperators had to present their findings. Ought to require cooperators to give presentation to TWG on yearly basis. Final reports should be distributed at least to TWG, and to interested TF members. Also FWS annual reports.
	385	Most of the focus is on the front end, cutting up the pie, but don't see much interest on part of TF regarding the follow up, i.e. what was learned from the funded projects. Cooperators are slow to turn in final reports. Agree that more information should get back to the TF. TF probably doesn't realize the administrative load for administering the large number of small projects
	14	No one comes back with results. Should have before and after pictures, numbers. Recipients owe the TF members their results. Process needs more accountability before the TF should ask for more money.
	8	Need an annual report to the Task Force on projects and administration. Need report on project completion, and books of cooperators should be open at any time. Don't fund cooperators again if the can't tell you what you did. Won't get immediate data on success of mitigation projects till 3-4 years after. If nature is good then

<p>c. Project-development</p>	<p>27</p>	<p>fish will be back by Yr. 2006 and TF can take credit.</p> <p>Making projects work needs more help in project development. Need technical advice, workshop to assist project applicants. Need to put together groups of agencies at the local level that are capable and compatible to work with landowners. Should take more advantage of NRCS, UC Coop Extension which are more landowner-friendly.</p> <p>Have gotten good value for the money in many CRMP projects. Locals can often do more for less money working together with agencies.</p>
<p>d. Public Outreach</p>	<p>33</p>	<p>Need more systematic approach to restoration projects. Why leave them up to chance? TF should have dialogue with CRMP coordinators in advance of proposal cycle so have a logical sense of what is needed. Locals should prioritize with TF /TWG interface to provide scientific review; work with public to identify the true limiting factors. TF/TWG would do strategic planning for basin as a whole.</p> <p>Now need CRMP leaders to be at the table to establish what a sub-basin plans would look like. All but Shasta agreed to format and assemble plans. TWG is ready to review the plans they prepare. If lucky, by Yr. 2000 CRMP's will have priorities and will be reflected in project proposals.</p> <p>If knew exactly what to do could go to a RFP/RFQ process to bid on specific tasks. But realistically there are only 6 more years of the program left.</p>
<p>VII. THE CRMPs: Scott, Shasta, Salmon River Restoration Council</p>	<p>11</p>	<p>Had higher public participation In the earlier days of the TF. Public input has deteriorated since iw was perceived as falling on deaf ears. TF should be more pro-active in listening and responding to public, and in articulating how the TF is meeting the public needs.</p> <p>Should have an open mike portion on the agenda at the beginning of each meeting, offering a public forum. This would set the tone for the rest of the meeting of a TF responding to public concerns.</p>
<p>VII. THE CRMPs: Scott, Shasta, Salmon River Restoration Council</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>The TF has lacked direction from the start, and the CRMPs offered a mechanism to bring the mix of jurisdictions and power brokers together within their sub-basins. Before the CRMPs, the basins were paralyzed in the status quo: no one interest had sufficient power to dominate, but each could take others to court. The CRMPs provided a forum for each interest group to see how far it could go without being sued.</p>

		<p>The TF recognized the stalemate and began funding the CRMPs to facilitate their startup. Coordinators were hired and parties brought together. CRMPs offered a structure, eliminated some of the squabbling and concentrated it.</p> <p>CRMPs have been successful in bringing about small cooperative projects (e.g. fencing, occasional flushing flows). But CRMPs have gone almost as far as they can. The fundamental issues of water allocation are still unresolved, and won't be addressed through the CRMP mechanism. The test will be their success in sub-basin planning.</p> <p>The tribes may step in to deal with water issues when the CRMPs peter out. If they don't see progress in water allocation they will be able to use the veto power of consensus to stop further CRMP funding.</p> <p>There are no CRMPs in the mid- or lower Klamath because the land ownership / management is less complex (tribes, USFS, timber companies). Tribes can and will perform the same planning functions as CRMPs.</p> <p>3 There is tension with TWG which wants sub-basin planning, like the Trinity R. technical committee.</p> <p>32 Is ambivalent about continuing support for CRMPs. Frustration in getting deliverables from CRMPs. It's nice to meet and chat, but they aren't accountable for deliverables. Question is whether to continue their funding or do on-ground projects. Hopefully CRMPs can apply for Thompson bill money, but they need more than that.</p> <p>23 Mixed feelings. Shasta CRMP gets ± \$40,000 per yr., but owners refuse access to property to study and suggest improvements. Information is not science-based; are treating symptoms, not problems. Fencing, riparian planting, screens are just treating symptoms, not the real problem of water use.</p> <p>Water diverters should pay for their own screens since are taking a public trust resource.</p> <p>22 Scott CRMP: Has better land owner cooperation. Membership is based on categories rather than limited to land ownership. Has good chairman and staff, develop good agendas, talks about projects. Gets outside funding.</p> <p>Shasta CRMP: Membership is dominated by landowners but has poor landowner cooperation. Major owners deny access to evaluate habitat or stocks and refuse to participate in restoration programs.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Owners are steeped in property rights rhetoric. No objectivity on the CRMP. Those dedicated to fish restoration are hamstrung and getting burned out. Meetings are contentious and hostile. Don't know who will show up at a meeting, and don't know what constitutes a quorum.</p> <p>Great Northern Corp. administers the CRMP, takes 10% for admin costs. Gt.Northern was set up to run community development programs (housing, infrastructure, weatherization etc.) and is not set up to run a fish restoration program, but was the only non-profit around.</p> <p>Accountability: CRMPs get a lot of money but there are no performance standards; can't objectively evaluate their performance. Need to account for the money they receive.</p> <p>CRMPs would probably go away if there were no TF money. Scott did get outside grants incldg. Salmon Stamp. Shasta was denied Salmon Stamp money since had no diversity of membership.</p> <p>TF should get tough. Require diversity of membership by category, not domination by majority of landowners. Won't happen voluntarily.</p>
27		<p>Original idea was that CRMPs would be a short term structure for addressing specific resource issues. CRMPs should not exist just to exist; should respond only to specific issues. CRMPs should not become a quasi-government with authority for final decisions, and Coordinators should not become political advocates.</p>
14		<p>See efforts to eliminate the CRMPs, but they are needed. Everyone is jockeying for their own share of limited money. Tribes don't see the CRMPs as important, but this respondent does.</p>
18		<p>Supports local participation, but CRMPs need standards of accountability. Need to state their goals up front and justify why they should be getting fish restoration money.</p>
		<p>Funding of CRMPs will be a issue this funding cycle . Not all CRMPs are created equal.</p> <p>CRMPs should do better at addressing real issues. Demand for money by CRMPs will outstrip the amount available. TF and TWG will need to set criteria on how they are going to allocate money to CRMPs. Will be difficult when performance of CRMPs varies and when don't address the real problems.</p>
26		<p>Parties are unwilling to look at themselves as part of the problem. Is easier to point blame at others.</p> <p>TF funding for CRMP coordinator is still a good investment. Are a lot of help in developing project proposals and keeping projects together. But the easy stuff with willing landowners has mostly been done. Even if more money is made available there the question of what to do next.</p>

<p>VIII. PLANNING AND PRIORITIES</p> <p>a. No Prioritization of Goals and Objectives in Long Range Plan</p>	33	<p>Need to clarify what the role of the CRMPs is supposed to be. Is the purpose to develop a sub basin plan, or just to keep coordinating forever? When is enough enough? Didn't define their purpose at the beginning; should be revisited in context.</p> <p>CRMPs were thrown out on their own, with no standardized procedures or technical assistance to move forward. Are caught in their own consensus process and can't get to the taboos, so now have CRMPs enforcing their own hen house.</p>
	11	<p>Impression is that CRMPs are trying to get at the issues, but should be more aggressive in tackling the important problems.</p>
	5	<p>Disagrees with some members that it is time to wean the CRMPs.</p>
	20	<p>No attempt in LRP to prioritize spending of a small amount of money over 9 pages and 200 things to accomplish. Measure of success has become how many items are being addressed, rather than a concern for which are done, and how well each is done.</p> <p>Biggest criticism is that KRTF has no recognition of a strategy on how to restore a large, culturally and geographically diverse basin.</p> <p>Long Range Plan was a success at the time, but now knowledge has grown, structure is outdated. Could go to Congress for explicit money for strategic planning purposes, since would be directly towards problem solving.</p>
	7	<p>Need update of LRP e.g.. Clean-up language dealing with tribes</p>
	3	<p>After the Plan was adopted the TF said they couldn't do it all. Instead, decided to focus on a few watersheds, and were criticized for it. Early on, TF approved projects everywhere, then saw would have little discernible effect, and would need to focus. So focused on Salmon, Scott, Shasta and a tribal share, and stayed away from Main Stem.</p>
	34	<p>LRP can't be achieved by 2006; so what happens then? Need a reality check now. Need to prioritize, ID the few places where can do some things</p>
	6	<p>LRP is not pragmatic enough. Policy good but how to do it incrementally. Is no prioritization even at a subbasin level, and no motive to do prioritizing since ESA only punishes the users of fish, not those who impact the fish.</p>

b. Sub-Basin Planning	26	Turnover in TF and TWG membership means that LRP is forgotten or not read by some members. Is not having an impact on how projects are selected. LRP does not prioritize projects so TF/TWG are moving towards sub-regional plans.
	20	KRTF should adopt a strategic plan for the basin based on sub-basin plans which are action plans: 1) Define problems in each basin 2) Assign priorities in some standardized way 3) Prioritize across sub-basins. This will require workshops, consciousness raising. Need short term shift in funding from projects to planning. Once have structure and priorities set, then project funding becomes more rational. This needs to be in place before go to Congress for re-authorization and new money.
	33	The CH2MHill plan created subbasins, relied on an “instream fix approach”. At the time thought that instream was enough. Then was realized a watershed aproach was needed. Long Range plan takes a policy approach, but the policies are too broad, needs more focus. Tells what to do but not how to do it. Gave no direction how to implement, so lost correlation between the Plan and decisions at TF meetings. Have had a series of boring years trying to get back at priorities through sub basin planning. If KFO was more of a mover and shaker office then would have the personnel and resources to move the process forward. Have left the issue to TWG – who have other jobs.
	13	Given the political factors hampering the TF, this is the #1 priority where something can be accomplished. The limiting factors are politics, not information Sub-basin plans should have been done 10 years ago.
	32	Need to get talking and pull them together. A lot of information is available already. Shouldn't re-invent the wheel. Sub-basin plans address sub-populations of fish, so is the most appropriate scale. A local scale is the only scale that locals will buy into, is a more defensible and personal approach. Cookie-cutter doesn't work; need to address problems at the site-specific scale and avoid broad-brush policies.
		Challenge is to avoid finger-pointing at other causes and accept your share of the responsibility.

<p>c. Upper Basin Amendment: Why not adopted?</p>		<p>Need: 1) ID of activities in the basin and how they affect the habitat, with a sense of history; 2) ID where the fish are: spawning and rearing habitats; 3) What are the implications of current management on fish and how to improve management; 4) Rough analysis of limiting factors (DG, DO);</p>
	23	<p>Sub basin planning is necessary to deal with such a huge watershed. Tasks are daunting with so many owners, geology, weather, hydrology. So should pick a sub-basin and try to make something happen so can point to a success story.</p> <p>Shasta is a good place to start. Implementing USGS findings would make a big difference to the fish – but landowners are the most resistant to change.</p>
	27	<p>CH2MHill report was project-specific, but was unrealistic and un-doable. Long-range plan was meant to be a macro- level; to set the big picture; was 3-hole punched so could be updated. Some TF members haven't read the findings that lead up to the objectives in the plan. TF never took the next step to make the plans site-specific. Job was turned over to CRMPs, but TF didn't want to fund "studies" so the planning work never got done; just jumped into specific projects.</p> <p>Sub-regional plans need to set clear criteria for setting priorities. CRMPs have developed criteria for ranking projects, but then have ignored them.</p>
	18	<p>Sub-basin planning process is going slowly in the sub-committee. Need to decide when the process is ready to implement.</p>
	11	<p>Prioritization of projects does occur through the TWG ranking process, but it should be formalized. Supports sub-basin planning to ID specific needs within each basin.</p>
	2	<p>"No" votes come from Upper Basin interests. Klamath Tribes not showing up, are fed up. Questions legitimacy of UB membership on Task Force if only role is to block actions</p>
	3	<p>Biggest unsolved problem. The Upper basin representatives need to get over the idea that blocking is empowerment. The Amendment is an innocuous document that has become a symbol</p>
	13	<p>Upper Basin went ballistic when UB Amendment was considered. UB decided it needed a seat on TF, and got it.</p> <p>Now Hatfield has started and UB will get better deal with Hatfield legislation. If UBA were adopted it would be a signal that Hatfield wasn't needed. So UBA was disavowed; alternates were sent that couldn't act. Now Amendment is watered down and is benign.</p>

	14	<p>The UBA will never be passed as long as the water adjudication process is ongoing in the upper basin. UB interests would be a fool to give away a card during the legal process; it would just muddy the waters.</p> <p>The TF should stop politicking. The TF should realize nothing is going to happen with the UBA and take it off the table as an issue. Is just a distraction away from the real work of the TF and wastes time. TF should focus on their primary responsibility of problems between Iron Gate and the Pacific: i.e. Shasta, Scott, Trinity, Main Stem.</p> <p>Many provisions of the UBA are already being done in the basin. Ag interests are not just sitting on their hands. With their own funds are installing more efficient and targeted irrigation systems. The Restoration office is growing, focusing on water quality and efficient use.</p>
	32.	<p>TF takes incredible time to do a no brainer (i.e. adopt the UBA). Why does the issue keep coming up. Don't mind a hard discussion, but don't drag it on forever. Technical analysis will lead to a logical conclusion, but consensus forces illogical path, so will then have to write a technical explanation for a political decision.</p>
	7	<p>Why do Upper Basin members sit on the TF when only purpose is to block action, hold rest of group hostage? UB group have not offered solutions to address their concerns.</p>
	33	<p>The goal of UB members is to block action, so why be on the TF? "Win or Lose" mentality of farmer constituency means county reps can't change. Allowing the UB membership to change before Congress authorized it has changed the composition of the consensus process.</p>
	11	<p>The ag community and county are balking, don't want changes in Upper Basin. If the current version of UBA were adopted then all parties could work together on the basin as a whole. The objective is to protect water quality from the mountains to the ocean. Need to find a balance between the needs of society and the natural system.</p> <p>UBA is eing held up by 1 group, and the ag interests aren't being resolved.</p>
	17	<p>The UBA would have been adopted if former USFWS Dept. Reg. Director hadn't bungled it from the chair.</p> <p>The linkage with the upper baisn interests will occur in time, through means other than the UBA, and the UBA as a "whipping boy of preference for upper basin interests" will simply fade away.</p>

<p>d. Goals for the Year 2006</p>	<p>34</p>	<p>Long-range plan was unrealistic from the start. Lots of good ideas, but tasks are not prioritized because TF couldn't. Caught in consensus bind - only 1 vote could veto it. TF is kidding itself. Don't have money, staff or political will to meet the Goal of 2006 - which is unrealistic unless management changes radically.</p>
<p>e. Program Evaluation of Task Force and TWG</p>	<p>23</p>	<p>Goal is unrealistic. At least should be producing studies showing what the current condition is and why. Not even doing that well.</p>
<p>IX. THE TASK FORCE AND TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP</p> <p>a. Group Cohesiveness</p>	<p>33</p>	<p>Goal is a farce. Can't even talk about the changes needed for agriculture, tributaries are off the table, can't do flow study above Iron Gate.</p>
<p>d. Goals for the Year 2006</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>Should be done more frequently. This exercise is long overdue. Need benchmarks so can measure success more frequently and cheaper.</p> <p>Don't use goals in LRP as a measure of success (per past Hamilton approach) Only 10% of goals are really important. Question should be: are fish returning to the river? Is riparian area restored" are slopes stabilized? Etc.</p> <p>To have adaptive management strategy need: 1) strategy 2) establish benchmarks 3) revisit the benchmarks every year to reflect new knowledge. TF needs a Strategic plan and Annual Work Plans. When one strategy is implemented and accomplished, then second in line moves up. This is absolutely lacking in TF: can't set objectives, can't adapt; can't evaluate where to go.</p>
<p>a. Group Cohesiveness</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>If reform doesn't come after the mid-term review, will leave the process out of frustration. Currently is an ineffective, inconsequential program.</p>
<p>d. Goals for the Year 2006</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>TF needs less formal workshops, planning sessions, retreats. Needs better social structure e.g. drinks, dinners. Meetings now in a rut, boring. TF needs to be willing to argue: put issues on table and talk about them</p>

	26	Group says it wants social events, but parties didn't show up when it was tried.
	33	The TF and TWG need some closed sessions. Never get an opportunity to let their hair down with one another. Can't get into frank discussions.
	14	Would approve of a closed / executive session for TF to talk candidly. Sick of the posturing and politicking. Time to stop wasting time. TF is responsible to the US government. Are half-way along, and what have we done?
	5	TWG deserves a medal. Whatever has been accomplished the TWG has accomplished it.
	17	Doesn't think TWG is expensive.
b. Turnover in Membership	13	Turnover high for agency reps; leads to poor continuity Only a few "long-termers" on the TF with institutional memory
	35	Frustrated with too much turnover in TF and TWG membership. Representation has been delegated down to lower levels, so departments and agencies are less engaged at the decision-making levels, and are less likely to integrate TF actions and directions into their own programs.
c. Chairman of TF	13	Chairman of TF is always USFWS, and has to be even though is a conflict of interest. The chairman is supposed to be elected, but with USFWS as chair can elevate TF needs and get to a higher level quickly.
d. TWG Workload	18	Need all the members participating to make fair decisions. 3 days/month is too much. Have decided to move to quarterly meetings plus a proposal-ranking session. TF keeps heaping work on the TWG but gives no support. TWG tries to keep costs down. TWG was dumbfounded when were rejected for secretarial help by TF staff. Need some continuity in note-taking, but don't need a full professional staff member. The Yuroks offered to provide note-taking assistance, but the TWG chair (Yurok representative) can't lead a meeting, do flip charts, participate in the discussion and take notes too. Why do so many KFO staff attend the TF meetings? Don't need 4 people there. Should re-deploy one to be a notetaker for TWG.
	14	TWG has grown too large; don't want it to wag the dog. TWG workload is too big. TF should just go ahead and vote, don't keep referring matters to the

e. Low Attendance at TWG meetings		TWG. TF should just learn to say “no”, don’t put off decisions.
	26	TWG has too much work on its plate now, and every meeting has 3 more tasks thrown at them. Nothing has traction to get anywhere.
	23	Shocked at poor respect and treatment of TWG recommendations by TF. TWG members put in long hours, without pay or clerical support. Weakness in ranking system: Need better coordination between various agencies and programs that fund projects in the basin. Agencies and restoration groups submit projects to more than one funding agency. TF/TWG gives most technical evaluation, and even if ranked low by TF (as not science-based), project may still show up again funded by JITW or other agency.
	22	Impressed with quality of people on TWG. Have done a lot, approach their jobs with sincerity for the fish, not politics. TF would be in a sorrier state without them. TWG members don’t get the respect from TF that they deserve. TF runs risk of burning out TWG members. Many dropped out because of intensity of IFIM study. See a breach developing. Is an insult not to give them clerical staff.
	22	Personality problems; Lack of trust between groups; TWG dominated by Tribes; Hum. Co. doesn’t come, are blocked by Klam and Sisk Cos. Del Norte doesn’t come, trollers, Oregon sport fishing don’t come.
	2	Currently are scoping the IFIM (Instream Flow Incremental Methodology) and need the user groups to attend, but aren’t coming.
	20	TWG needs to be paid. TF needs good scientific information, but TWG volunteers are overwhelmed, and non-paid members can’t afford to attend meetings.
	23	Disparity in representation due to ability to pay for representatives to come to meetings; e.g. counties, commercial fishermen reps. can't afford to come. No Klamath Co. representation on TWG for over a year.. Especially important in terms of discouraging expertise on TWG. Sisk. Co. rep comes sometimes, but is not a technical person . Continual turnover in membership means phase-lag as new members get up to speed on issues and procedures. One reason why the flow scoping took so long. Adopted a working rule that missing a meeting can’t stall the process next time (“you snooze, you lose”). Group operates on majority rule.
	32	Attendance at TWG meetings was good, even had upper-basin ag people. Can’t speak to the

f. Agenda and Meeting Locations		problems of citizens and volunteers.
	6	Too demoralizing to TWG members to attend. No incentive. TF decisions not based on policy, just on slicing the melon. Workload is unfair. Non-agencies don't have money to participate
	18	Is difficult for unpaid TWG members to come to meetings, especially when means they are losing earnings. Reduction in number of meetings per year should help; 3 days/month too much.
	20	Meetings in Ashland and Klamath eliminate ½ the people. Makes it a 2-3 day meeting due to drive. Redding is more equidistant. For this reason TWG is dominated by tribes and agencies who can afford to come. County representatives (esp. Hum, Del Norte, Trinity) can't afford to come to Klamath-end meetings, and vice-versa.
	13	Not a major issue, TF and TWG try to move around. There are inequities but it washes out.
	34	Meetings are too inefficient. Too much time spent talking about nothing. If the issue wasn't resolved last time, why talk about it again this time.
	18	TWG makes an effort to move around so everyone shares the burden.
X. KRTF ADMINISTRATION		
a. KFO Workload and Budget	2	Restoration Office is overworked; have already cut the administration budget to \$350,000 and can't afford another staff member
	13	Not much left for habitat and restoration when 40% is taken for administration. Program is underfunded.
	14	Respects Program Leader. Is incredibly responsible and doing yeoman's job. Has kept a low profile, doing his job with what he was given. Doing a good job, but tasks are not well defined. Is responsible for the operations of the office as chief office manager and secretary, and won't go beyond that. Doing more public outreach would only cost more time and paperwork. Job is overwhelmed with problems. Paperwork is huge. Problem is that money has to go through so many layers (scientists, lawyers, aides) that only 23% of money gets to the ground.

	20	<p>Ambivalent on issue. Administration is underfunded too. Field office needs a work plan: Workload is too high, more than they can do; each TF meeting gives a different emphasis on what to do first. Nothing gets done well, no clear direction. Constantly shifting priorities, no discipline within TF to stick with a priority, so staff is caught.</p>
	9	<p>Half of budget now goes for administrative costs. But it is extremely difficult to get information on how administrative money is spent out of the Yreka office. Need disclosure on what the various employees do. Private contractors may be able to do it cheaper</p>
	32	<p>Yreka office is mainly secretarial. Can't tell if share of overhead is reasonable or not. Is not a proactive office; are not drumming up interest outside the 4 meetings. Need a more meaningful agenda. Need an advocate for the task force. Staff needs to have answers "need to check" means it takes another 3 months for an answer.</p>
	34	<p>Administration is perceived as a problem and KFO needs to deal with it. TF needs a clear list of staff functions and cost breakdown: 1) contracts 2) meetings 3) administration</p>
	23	<p>Hamilton is helpful at TWG meetings, usually comes for 1 day per meeting; gives guidance. Quick turnover on paperwork.</p>
	6	<p>Budget Committee is not strong enough. Should be asking the real questions: What are the job descriptions of TF staff? What do they do? What other, non-TF projects do they work on? Portland should not heap other projects on them.</p> <p>Staff is amorphous; mostly a vacuum. Not pro-active; uses no initiative to bring items up on agenda or get Board to work together. Mostly a secretarial function</p> <p>Why is a Yreka office needed? Could the office be combined with other FWS offices (e.g. Klam. Falls, Arcata) to save administrative costs?</p>
	22	<p>Yreka office is a joke, esp. when TWG has no clerical staff. Are to the point where Yuroks are doing the minutes - is ridiculous. TWG members are not getting paid, is grossly unfair to have to do staff work.</p> <p>The success of an advisory group like the KRTF is a function of staff support. TF wanders around without direction. Staff are so afraid of being assertive and paying the consequences that they remain mute. Have abdicated any responsibility.</p>

<p>b. Leadership Style and Program Building</p>		<p>Especially should have staff for Flow study, with staff reports and data backup. TWG could have been done by now. TF keeps piling on the work as TWG membership declines</p>
	6	<p>Doesn't buy the "fixed costs" argument. Has seen bigger programs operate with less administrative money. Does not support top-down federal programs. Only about 20% avail for on-the-ground restoration, CRMPs about 36%, with a chunk of administrative; flow study should be DOI money.</p>
		<p>Program is almost inconsequential, is not addressing the causative problems in any significant way. If the program went away tomorrow, would the fish notice?</p>
	18	<p>Staff could do more, find ways to lighten their load. Need to get projects off the books; put more responsibility on the cooperators.</p>
	26	<p>Portland USFWS executives don't seem to want a pro-active staff</p>
	35	<p>The permit process to implement TF projects is very cumbersome and time consuming, esp. for habitat restoration projects (i.e. EA review, possible ESA consultation, Archaeology review, Toxics compliance). KFO has been trying to get a programmatic consultation / approval process approved through USFWS and NMFS to simplify the permit process but still has received not concurrence</p>
	8	<p>No accountability on expenditures for KFO or Portland.</p>
	33	<p>USFWS should not be the lead agency for Klamath Act. Needs to be an agency with less vested interest in the outcome, budgetary or otherwise. USFWS just follows BuRec lead.</p> <p>There are no checks on how the administrative money is spent. Trinity TF has a much lower percentage. Tried to set an internal cap on funding, but were told it takes money to administer". There's no other money so administration money has to come out of restoration funds.</p>
	35	<p>Process for transcribing and organizing TF meeting minutes is very time consuming. TF should revisit issue as to whether they wish to continue extensive minutes.</p>
	11	<p>Program administration costs are out of line. Have asked for more information about how money is spent and never got the full picture of where the money is going.</p>
16	<p>The program has an "obscene" overhead cost which is the result of the consensus rule. What should take one meeting takes 10-20, and still no product.</p>	

<p>XI. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND EDUCATION</p>	27	<p>Staff has extremely passive style. Waits to be spoken to. Has survived 10 years. Needs to be in the field interacting more with cooperators, generating useful projects, helping projects along, fostering state: federal cooperation and learning . Opportunity to blend projects is missing</p> <p>Portland derived paperwork is horrendous - is USFWS-imposed. Leads to horrible problem administering projects. (e.g. archaeology review takes forever)</p> <p>Project leader does not demonstrate enthusiasm for the program, does not bring new resources to the table, does not generate new funding for the TF. This may be politically purposeful, i.e. protecting USFWS by keeping a lid on the real issues of water allocation.</p>
	13	<p>Program leader is not pro-active; has almost a secretarial role. Is not autonomous, is USFWS employee and does not comment on TF actions. USFWS is rolling-over nationwide.</p>
	34	<p>Communication skills are lacking in the Yreka office.</p>
	22	<p>See mismanagement in Yreka office. Staff are fish biologists, not project managers; don't have training to manage. Need clear organization plan, lines of authority, staffing chart, report on job descriptions, policies and procedures, performance evaluations,-- all regularly updated. Need to evaluate the duties of each staff person. Is there enough for each staff to do for 8 hrs/day?</p> <p>What is the staff doing? Must be working on something else other than TF.</p> <p>No accountability on funded projects. Can't get copies of completion reports. There is no review on the substance of the reports. Projects need tighter monitoring.</p> <p>Evaluation should be on results, not process. What is TF getting out of staff for 40% of total budget? Are there more fish in the system?</p>
	33	<p>Need a mover and shaker, more heart and creativity.</p>
	6	<p>Why is a biologist doing clerical work? If it is just a clerical job, then why is a biologist doing it? Could do better.</p> <p>Project leader is weak as an administrator. Should do more promotion of program.</p>
	11	<p>No problems with staff, but they haven't done much. Should be more proactive.</p>

<p>a. Public is excluded from the process</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>No ongoing effort to encourage public involvement in the process. There is institutional insensitivity to the public: landowners, ranchers, miners, farmers, environmentalists. Disenfranchising local communities means no local support when need to go to Congress for reauthorization.</p> <p>RFP process for projects is so unfriendly to the public that they dropped out. Lack of prioritization of projects by sub-basins means public has no idea of the relative importance of their restoration project. Individuals want to be active, but don't know what is important, perhaps can't write a grant well, so fail and are discouraged. Will find that number of projects has dropped, and a smaller proportion are from non-profits. Individuals not associated with CRMPs lose out. Recommend "Contact meetings"</p>
<p>b. Public perceptions of TF</p>	<p>34</p>	<p>It would be helpful to project applicants if they received written feedback on why they did not get funded as a broad way of helping them next time. Staff is concerned about time required to write the letters and possibility of litigation.</p>
	<p>6</p>	<p>Public is excluded from the process. Has figured this out, aren't excited about the program; has worn out its interest. Program is not showing success; public outreach in terms of press releases is ineffective.</p>
	<p>33</p>	<p>Used to have around 130 project proposals, now down to around 40. Public was enthusiastic in the beginning, were asked to submit proposals. But over the years they haven't gotten funded so there is attrition. Only those in the loop are funded.</p>
	<p>34</p>	<p>Perception from the outside is bad feelings and distrust of the process. Fish are not being restored, status quo still in place. Spent \$35 million and took 10 years to find out there's not enough water in the Trinity.</p> <p>Public is not aware of accomplishments that have been made. Perception is that money is spent to create kingdoms and jobs; don't see money in projects on the ground. In part a fault of the Yreka office for not communicating. Sporadic newsletters are not enough. TF needs to blow its horn.</p> <p>Klamath basin users are basically unaware of each other. Del Norte has no clue about and progress in the Upper Basin and vice versa. 10 years has not breached the fables. Del Norte interested only in estuary and chinook, could are less about water diversion issues up river.</p> <p>Communicating with public has deteriorated; need to do a better job of telling what is good.</p>
<p>c. Education projects of TF</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>In spite of big effort to develop K-12 curricula we don't see it being implemented, at least not in mid- or lower-basin. Have never seen the product in action. There is more to the Klamath Basin than just</p>

<p>XII. PROGRAM FUNDING</p> <p>a. Insufficient Funding</p>		<p>the Shasta and Scott.</p>
	26	<p>Observers do see changes in attitudes and level of knowledge in the Scott over the period of the CRMP program. People are more accepting, understand the rationale for riparian buffers, even if action is limited to little stuff. See reorientation of attitude towards the river and fish habitat, at least among some landowners</p>
	2	<p>Biggest problem is insufficient funding to implement the plan. Goal of restoring fishery by 2006 is impossible. No economic analysis of plan- would cost more than \$100 million to fully implement the LRP.</p>
	20	<p>Program is so vastly underfunded that failure is built in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -funding limits number of meetings, so can't be held when needed -funding limits participation by non -agency, non-paid volunteers who must give up work, pay own nickel to participate. -would easily be a ½ time job to do it right
	7	<p>\$1 million is not enough. Should be at least the size of the Trinity budget.</p>
	3	<p>Too much money early on destroys a program; was good at first to learn how to squeeze every nickel. Now have learned and are now able to step up to \$2 to 5 million per year; that's the magnitude of the task.</p> <p>Need to have a retreat planning session to get back into consensus.</p>
	13	<p>Biggest problem is program is underfunded. 40% administrative costs doesn't leave much for habitat and restoration.</p>
	14	<p>More public outreach would mean more money,time and paperwork.</p>
	32	<p>Would favor more money as long as all kinds of projects are brought to the table, not if only restricted to non-controversial projects.</p> <p>TF is ready to talk about water, but is expensive.</p>
34	<p>TF could handle more money for projects since it now has the structure to administer it.</p>	

		<p>Major new funding should be spent on buying out water rights. Would be more valuable than restoration by instream projects. Question is how to administer a water buyback: TF too politicized.</p> <p>23 TF and TWG are ready to handle more money. Esp. need more for flow model development. Ranking process for projects could handle more.</p> <p>6 No the TF should not get more money. This is the wrong model; is not a good example of how to run a program. Top-down federal programs are not the answer TF needs to realize they don't need to exist. Yes, the funding for the basin is insufficient, but not to this group.</p> <p>26 Yes the program is ready for more money, but only if it is earmarked to meet specified needs of basin and concerns by TF members that their interests get a share.</p> <p>8 There's no way you can restore fish with only \$500,000 per year. In Oregon timber industry alone put in \$1 million for 1 river . \$10 million here may not do it; too many factors.</p> <p>35 As money for projects increases would need some new staff to administer projects, but not at a 1:1 ratio. Total number of projects that are still open is a current administrative problem.</p> <p>16 The Trinity program by comparison has the Central Valley Project "cash cow" to milk, but the Klamath program has nothing similar.</p> <p>11 Yes, the TF is ready for more money. Hatfield program is getting \$1million for projects, TF should get at least that much. But don't put the money into administration; put into projects and rehab.</p>
<p>XIII LINKAGES WITH OTHER FEDERAL AND LARGE-SCALE PROGRAMS</p> <p>a. Lack of Linkages</p>		<p>7 TF does not interact with USFS as much as it could. TF doesn't make the linkage between Clean Water Act, EPA, TMDLs, ESA. TF should be better informed on how to incorporate existing environmental laws into the restoration program.</p> <p>3 Would be great to link into FEMAT. TF has good filtration process for projects.</p> <p>32 TF needs to recognize plans of other agencies. E.g. Klamath NF did a habitat analysis for the basin including the Trinity. Used a priority scheme for restoration opportunities. Was a good draft. TF is not</p>

<p>b. Member Agencies are funding not supplementing their own statutory responsibilities with TF funds</p>		<p>even aware of it and isn't using it.</p>
		<p>Sustained Yield Plans (SYPs) don't have to include other ownerships so are not very useful.</p>
	34	<p>Financially may make sense to link projects together, but gets into turf battles.</p>
	23	<p>RWQCB and DRG are failing to enforce their mandates. ESA under NMFS so far has failed to cause changes for Coho. Landowners are inflexible; just don't want government in their face even though the commercial fishermen, sport fishermen, and tribes are losing.</p>
	5	<p>Have been some linkages between FWS, NMFS and CDFG, but linkages with Cal. Dept. Forestry "just lurk".</p>
	16	<p>As indicated by the Forest Plan and the three National Forests in the basin, the Klamath Act and TF have not been taken into consideration at all.</p>
	7	<p>DFG, USFWS, BOR, DWR etc. have statutory responsibilities to protect resources of the Klamath, therefore should cover administration costs within their own budgets. Restoration dollars are being used for administration and backfilling. Protection of public trust resources is their job, part of their business, and the agencies shouldn't be using restoration dollars for regular business.</p>
	11	<p>Agencies on TF should fund their own projects out of their own budgets. Since TF can't see the budgets of member agencies, can't tell where the TF money is going. Is beneficial to link and coordinate the activities of the various agencies in the basin.</p>
6	<p>Bureau of Reclamation wants the TF to be inconsequential; don't even provide money for investigating their own impacts.</p>	

**KLAMATH FISHERIES MANAGEMENT COUNCIL (KFMC)
Interview Responses**

ISSUE	ID NO.	COMMENT
1. Coordination between Task Force and KFMC	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · There have been efforts to coordinate such as 1992 joint meeting in Hoopa · Three Chairs then Five Chairs meetings also helped on coordination (Three Chairs issued policy guidance for hatchery planting levels) · Hatfield Working Group in the Upper Basin has mandate to coordinate with Trinity Task Force, the Klamath Compact and the Klamath Task Force but not the KFMC.
	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The KFMC has improved its own internal dynamic as allocation patterns have stabilized. Improved cooperation is also the result of chair with good facilitation skills. · KFMC fulfilling its function as a sounding board for the PFMC and meetings in conjunction with PFMC regional meeting help sustain influence. · An exception is in-river sport fish allocation remains the one thorny issue for the KFMC with CDFG Commission intruding on KFMC and PFMC processes in recent years. · KFMC is an integral part of the Klamath Restoration Program and the communication with Task Force needs to be improved. · Improved dynamic of KFMC may provide lessons in process that the Task Force might learn from (i.e. Less struggle for share and more give and take is very positive).
	36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · In spite of membership overlap, communication between the KFMC and Task Force is not very good. · Some Task Force members are not aware of the severe restrictions on fisheries that are causing great hardship on the coast. (Commercial salmon fisheries are currently restricted to 9% of four year old chinook but would get 20% if full fishing were allowed. Haven't had full fishing for a decade.)

ISSUE	ID NO.	COMMENT
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The Task Force has turned over since joint meetings (1993-94) and some new members are not fully aware of KFMC functions and duties. · Even more of a disconnect between the constituencies of both groups with fishing interests and farm interests not communicating well. · KFMC sometimes begins to over-step its role and issue policy statements on habitat issues. This is because fishing constituents do not feel the Task Force is effective in dealing with habitat issues. For example, flow issues in Klamath sub-basins have not been dealt with. · KFMC has carried out its functions in providing guidance to the PFMC. Harvest ranges are fairly narrow with exact quotas in some years. KFMC has done better than Task Force in discharging its responsibilities under the Klamath Act. · KFMC has improved in its chemistry because of changes in representatives and good facilitation from the chair. KFMC members can disagree formally but maintain civility. · KFMC members are frustrated by allocations of at about half of intended because habitat problems have not been remedied.
	37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Need closer working relationship with the Task Force on monitoring fish populations
	40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Cross-membership on the KFMC and Task Force helps convey information to KFMC on Task Force business
	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Task Force is obligated under the Act to coordinate with the KFMC and to meets its requests.
2. Funding Basic Monitoring	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) failure to fund basic monitoring creates problems for the KFMC because they lack basic data for management. KFMC is then in awkward position of asking Klamath and Trinity Restoration Programs for money. · The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) has often helped with funding but only at the eleventh hour. Need a stable funding mechanism for basic data. Should not be the burden of restoration programs. · The KFMC has much different priorities than the Task Force related to monitoring.

ISSUE	ID NO.	COMMENT
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or BOR should have dedicated funds for downstream migrant trapping because the U.S. Solicitor General has ruled that the Department of Interior has full responsibility to manage Indian fisheries. (Solution to problem of KFMC tin-cupping for monitoring dollars). · Committing Task Force money for routine monitoring reduces the effectiveness of the Restoration Program and should not be allowed.
	38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · CDFG is constantly berated on the KFMC and Task Force for not picking up monitoring costs. Department simply does not have the money. · Inland Fisheries Division has consistently requested funds but they have never been favorably considered. · Federal dollars to support activities in the Klamath are drying up; therefore, it is difficult for CDFG to get money from other sources to continue monitoring activities.
	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The Technical Work Group (TWG) for the Task Force and the KFMC Technical Team have diverged with regard to data needs. The TWG has been feeding large amounts of money into the Flow Study while KFMC data needs are ignored. · Problem exists when KFMC can't get basic data on escapement and recruitment (downstream migrant traps) to manage fisheries. KFMC asked Task Force when no other source was available to fund these activities and was turned down. · KFMC requests for funding in RFP process are also turned down. · Data gaps may eventually lead to shut down of fisheries if basic management data needs are not met. · Klamath Restoration Program should fund basic fish monitoring data needs or BOR should make it an O&M line item (\$100,000/year). · IFIM data does KFMC no good because it is not species specific.
	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Need strategic placement of downstream migrant traps in tributary basins like Shasta to better understand production and recruitment.
	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Very disappointed that KFMC request for monitoring budget was turned down by the Task Force as it is one of the few requests made over the life of the Program.

ISSUE	ID NO.	COMMENT
	36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Tired of agencies such as CDFG using budget problems as an excuse for not live up to public trust responsibilities and doing monitoring that is needed. · KFMC and Task Force must reach a consensus on what monitoring budgets are needed annually for these tasks and move to get what is needed through political channels. · Multi-Chair groups (Three Chairs/Five Chairs) are not very productive except with regard to hatcheries · Focused action by Task Force and KFMC can lead to change in resistant bureaucracies such as the CDFG hatcheries. Must continue efforts of this type. Although progress is slow, there has been progress.
	40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Problems getting budget for needed monitoring activities necessary for harvest management
	37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Core funding for routine monitoring of critical population data for fisheries management should be shifted to O&M budget of the Bureau of Reclamation
	39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Concern with regard to funding of critical data needed for fisheries management
3. KFMC - TWG Issues	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The KFMC and Task Force are Federally chartered Advisory Committees (FACAs) but their authority and judgment are being usurped by the TWG.
	39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Budget process on the Task Force is driven too much by the Technical Work Group · Possible that KFMC and Task Force technical teams might meet jointly sometimes
4. Administrative Overhead for KFMC and TF	38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Administrative overhead for the KFMC and Task Force is inordinately high, with \$400,000 of the annual budget going toward these costs. CDFG tries to make overhead a maximum of 20%. · Staffing for KFMC and Task Force is too high. Four people are generally at meetings when two should suffice. · Now USFWS Portland wants administrative overhead out of Klamath Program which is unacceptable.
	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Staff turnover at USFWS Yreka Office has sometimes slowed output of KFMC minutes.

ISSUE	ID NO.	COMMENT
	40	· Administrative overhead is too high for the Restoration Program
5. Specific Issues		
a) CRMPs	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The KFMC gave quality attention (staff time) to Task Force constituents from the Shasta Valley with regard to potential harvest problems and issue of recruitment on Shasta River. · CRMP groups funded by Task Force may use budget to track harvest issues which is not in the work agreement. Sub-basin planning dollars need to go for tasks funded in agreements.
b) Hatcheries	7	· KFMC and Three Chairs lead to improved hatchery operations but problems still exist. Variation in fractional marking has confounded KFMC model outputs. Task Force and KFMC must work together to standardize hatchery practices on both the Klamath and Trinity Rivers.
	37	· Managing fisheries, particularly with regard to hatcheries, should be approached jointly by the KFMC and Task Force because it effects both harvest and the prospect for restoration
c) Water	36	· Task Force may never be effective on water issues; therefore, those fishing interests who are not satisfied with the process may need to take other courses of action. Some Task Force members are too conflicted in dealing with these issues and will never allow progress.
d) Restoration Priorities	37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Has some concern about the effectiveness of the way current resources are allocated regarding restoration · Task Force should agree in principal on the strategy for restoration and prioritization then partner with other agencies for expanded implementation (i.e. NRCS/USFS) as additional dollars for salmon restoration become available