

**FINAL MINUTES**

**KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE  
MEETING  
February 10-11, 2000  
Best Western Brookings Inn  
Brookings, Oregon**

**February 10, 2000**

**Agendum 1. Convene and Opening Remarks**

**Representative Seat**

California Commercial Salmon Industry  
California Department of Fish and Game  
California In-River Sport Fishing Community  
Del Norte County  
Hoopa Valley Tribe  
Humboldt County  
Karuk Tribe  
Klamath County  
Klamath Tribe  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Siskiyou County  
Trinity County  
U.S. Department of Interior/Task Force Chair  
U.S. Department of Agriculture  
Yurok Tribe

**Members Present**

Glen Spain (Dave Bitts alternate)  
Mike Rode  
Kent Bulfinch  
Chuck Blackburn  
Mike Orcutt  
Paul Kirk  
Ronnie Pierce (Leaf Hillman alternate)  
Don Russell  
Not represented  
Don Reck  
Keith Wilkinson  
Jim De Pree (Joan Smith alternate)  
Chris Erikson  
John Engbring, Chair  
Al Olson  
Mike Belchik

The following members were not present: Elwood Miller, Jr., Klamath Tribe. Chuck Blackburn, Del Norte County, attended the first day only. Mike Rode served as Vice-Chair.

Chair John Engbring made the opening remarks. He presented Mike Belchik with a Certificate of Appreciation recognizing his excellent work as the Technical Work Group Chair for two years. John Engbring commended him for his instrumental work and skill with the TWG to produce the Klamath Flow Study proposal.

**Agendum 2a. Business. Adoption of agenda**

John Engbring noted that additional public comment sessions have been added, as requested at the last meeting. Ron Iverson noted the addition of 5f Handout to Agendum 5, a letter to the Task Force from Rep. Wally Herger.

**\*\*Motion\*\* Keith Wilkinson moved to adopt the amended agenda.**

**\*\*Second\*\* Chris Erikson seconded the motion.**

**\*\*Motion Carried\*\* unanimously.**

**Agendum 2b. Business. Adoption of minutes from October 1999 meeting**

The following changes were requested for the October 1999 meeting minutes:

- Agendum 2b should read AOctober 1999@and not AJune 1999@
- Mike Orcutt noted that he attended the second day only. (James Wroble was his alternate on the first day.)

**\*\*Motion\*\* Keith Wilkinson moved to adopt the amended minutes of the last meeting.**

**\*\*Second\*\* Chris Erikson seconded the motion.**

**\*\*Motion Carried\*\*** unanimously.

Agendum 2c. Business. Vice-Chair selection for the June 2000 meeting

Mike Rode will serve as Vice-Chair for the June 2000 meeting.

**Agendum 2d. Business. Web Site**

Ron Iverson briefly explained the new Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office (Yreka FWO) Web site, which he said will contain restoration information as well as other functions of the Yreka FWO office. The site is linked to the FWS home page and the URL is noted on the agenda.

**Agendum 3. Introductions of Congressional Staff in attendance**

Julie Rubinstein from the office of Senator Ron Wyden, Oregon, addressed three pertinent pieces of legislation, which can be reviewed on the following Websites: Thomas.gov or Congress.gov. The bills were:

- S 188. The Water Quality and Incentives Act. Authored by Sen. Wyden and Sen. Conrad Burns, Montana, the bill addresses the use of funds for water conservation. There was a hearing in October but nothing since then.
- S 1723. The Irrigation Mitigation Partnership Act. Authored by Sen. Wyden and Sen. Gordon Smith, Oregon. This bill calls for funding for fish streams to prevent fish from being swept into irrigation ditches. This January meeting was rescheduled due to storms in the East.
- HR 2798. The Pacific Salmon Recovery Act provides funding for Alaska, Washington, California and Oregon. This bill was referred to the House Resources Subcommittee and is stuck there. Julie Rubinstein recommended House members be lobbied to move this bill along.
- Julie Rubinstein also discussed the Wyden Amendment, which allows federal funds to be used for restoring private lands where they affect stream quality/riparian quality on public lands. Keith Wilkinson commented that this Act has been beneficial in watershed recovery by recognizing the integrity of the ecosystem without regard to ownership. He asked Julie Rubinstein about the lack of funding as specified in the Pacific Salmon Recovery Act. She said, when applying for funding, it is vital to quantify the negative local economic impact caused by salmon loss.

**Agendum 4. Brief Review of last meeting actions/general correspondence/program update**

Laurie Simons reviewed the list of assignments and motions from the October 1999 meeting.

- (Agendum 7a) Yreka FWO Staff spoke to Reid Goforth regarding adding on a funding request for stream gauges through the DOI Science Support Board. Reid Goforth said the Science Support process was not funded for FY 1999-2000. However, Tom Shaw drafted a request for stream gauge funding to go to this program for next year.
- (Agendum 7b) Dr. Yvonne Everett, HSU, will speak at the February Task Force meeting.
- (Agendum 7c) TWG was asked to develop recommendations for funding categories for review by the Budget Committee. James Wroble will report on this.

- (Agendum 7c) TWG reviewed the list of representatives to ascertain actual attendance at meetings. There are some changes in TWG members. (see below)
- (Agendum 8) The list of topics for CRMPS presentations in June was prepared, including comments from Task Force members. (see Handout Agendum 11)
- (Agendum 9) Karl Wirkus, Bureau of Reclamation, will address the Task Force on the long-term Klamath Project EIS.
- (Agendum 16) Task Force members need more time to review the recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation Oversight Committee.
- (Agendum 17a) The Task Force has signed the cooperative agreement with the Klamath Watershed Coordination Group, Klamath Basin, Oregon/California.
- (Agendum 18) The economic report on anadromous fish in the Klamath Region will not be available for another year.
- (Agendum 18) The Long-Term Funding Subcommittee is working on developing documentation for a congressional initiative to receive additional funds for this program.
- (Agendum 18) The loss of unspent funds was discussed with the Budget Committee and a handout (see Handout Agendum 4) was prepared detailing three-year projects with funds yet to spend. It looks as if the FY2000 funds will be spent. The Hoopa Tribe project will be completed this summer. Laurie Simons said this review will minimize the problem of lost funds due to unspent project funds by making everyone aware of unspent funds before they are lost to the program.

Laurie Simons noted that the Agendum 4 correspondence handouts are in order by date and discussed each one. She reviewed the motions from the last meeting and provided the following information:

- The California Sport Fishing representative to the TWG, Blair Hart, has been replaced by Terry Anderson. A letter is in the Agendum 4 handouts introducing Terry Anderson.
- The new Yurok Tribe representative to the TWG is Dan Gale. An assignment letter for Dan Gale is also included in the Agendum 4 handouts.
- A table was provided detailing the cost accounting of the Yreka FWO.
- TWG members will receive a copy of the abstract of the Salmon River Sub-basin Restoration Strategy. Task Force members can review this on the Web site. There will be a six-week comment period.

#### **Agendum 5a. Old Business. Status of letter to Secretary Babbitt**

John Engbring discussed the responses to the Task Force letter to Secretary Babbitt regarding the use of Klamath Task Force funds for administrative costs by the Regional Office (see Agendum 5 handouts). Solicitors were asked to review the Task Force letter for legal comment on the use of Klamath Task Force funds. Response from the solicitors indicated that The Klamath Act establishes the FWS as the agency that administers and supports the Task Force, and that the funds are being appropriately spent. John Engbring mentioned the limitation that DOI members of the Task Force can not use funds to reimburse themselves for Task Force duties.

**Agendum 5b. Old Business. Status of appointment letters/charter**

The Charter was signed on October 14, 1999, which John Engbring noted Amade the Task Force legal@during the last meeting. This charter officially recognizes the Task Force as a committee. He added that appointment letters have not be received for the following members: John Engbring (DOI), Mike Rode (CA Dept. Fish & Game), Dave Bitts (CA Salmon Fishing Industry), Kent Bulfinch (State of CA), Elwood Miller, Jr. (Klamath Tribe), Al Olson (Dept. of Agriculture) and Mike Orcutt (Hoopa Tribe).

**Agendum 5c. Old Business. Status of funding for Klamath River Flow Study**

John Engbring explained that the President-s Budget was released February 7 and designates \$1.8 million for the Klamath River Flow Study and \$1 million for the Trinity River Restoration Program. He cautioned against assumptions that this amount will be in the FY 2001 Budget when U.S. Congress approves the final budget. The original request was for \$4.5 million for the first of five years of the flow study. He suggested that non-federal Task Force members inform their congressional representatives about the flow study. John Engbring said that if funding does go through, the Task Force will need to coordinate with the TWG to see what needs to be finished; he estimates 10% of the flow study is complete.

**Task Force Comments**

- Don Reck cautioned against looking at the Phase 2 Report as a final answer to the flow/water quality issue. He said much more fine-tuning work needs to be done.
- Kent Bulfinch said that the data received so far needs to be coordinated. Mike Rode stated that, to date, there has been good coordination through a lot of meetings. There is no data overlap at this point, only data gaps.
- Glen Spain said he thinks it will be extremely difficult to get funding; non-federal members must approach members of Appropriations Committees to convince them of the flow study-s vital importance. Chris Erikson said the Task Force needs to look at long-term funding for Klamath River projects, as there will be competition from other regions where the salmon is imperiled.

**Agendum 5d. Old Business. Task Force Signature on Cooperative Agreement with Klamath Watershed Coordination Group**

John Engbring signed the agreement with the Task Force. Alice Kilham said this was sent to the Secretary-s office and she believes it will receive a positive response.

**Task Force Comments**

- Mike Orcutt pointed out that the Task Force only has one representative to the Klamath Watershed Coordination Group (KWCG). The group has not been active and there are vacancies. He said the basin restoration efforts should be a coordinated and comprehensive process but the potential is not being utilized.
- John Engbring said Mike Belchik would assume Troy Fletcher-s seat. Mike Belchik and Mike Rode are the Task Force members on the coordination group.

- \_ Glen Spain said there should be a dedicated staff position to coordinate the KWCG.
- \_ Mike Rode said Alice Kilham and Jim Carpenter have made the effort to come to Task Force meetings but this has not been reciprocated.
- \_ Mike Orcutt said the BOR has funded a coordinator in the past and may do so again.
- \_ It was noted that there is a Water Quality meeting for the entire Klamath Basin, to be held on the morning of the Alternative Dispute Resolution meeting on April 2.

The group discussed ways to make the group more effective, which follow:

- \_ Each group could receive meeting summaries from the other four coordinating groups
- \_ A consolidated newsletter/calendar of meetings would be useful to all groups involved in the Klamath Basin.
- \_ All documents above could be posted on the Internet.
- \_ Ronnie Pierce suggested that the coordination group discuss procedures to enhance communication among the groups.

**Agendum 5e. Old Business. Response to letter to Secretary Babbitt on funding of harvest monitoring and gauges**

The letter was discussed and it was decided to ask Karl Wirkus about some of the issues raised in this letter. Glen Spain said this is a vital issue as real-time funding for the stream gauges is not happening and vital information is being lost. The problem, he said, is one of underfunding of data collection and management. Mike Orcutt said the appropriate agencies should be approached (i.e. BOR and/or USGS) about funding these gauges. James Wroble said there are funds within the USGS (about \$3 million annually) to support special projects. TWG asked Tom Shaw to draft a memo to the Science Board. The memo is intended as a means for each Task Force member to approach DOI Science Board representatives about funding the stream gauges. Glen Spain said clarification is needed to find out which agencies have what funding for what projects. The letter should be re-done for the upcoming President's budget process; this is a high priority. Ronnie Pierce said that DWR is putting together natural resources for 17 new gauge stations in Northern California. Mike Rode said that DWR is aware of this situation but the money is not forthcoming. Jim De Pree said a two-pronged approach is needed. John Engbring said Tom Shaw's memo should be updated and circulated to Task Force members; Glen Spain and Mike Belchik can update. Jim Wroble asked if DWR can meet with TWG on this issue. Mike Orcutt said letter writers should remember the issue of harvest management.

**\*\*Assignment\*\* Glen Spain and Mike Belchik will update Tom Shaw's memo to the DOI Science Board regarding funding of stream gauges. This will then be circulated to Task Force members. The issue of harvest management will be addressed in this updated letter.**

**Agendum 5f. Old Business. Rep. Herger letter response**

Ronnie Pierce said the Task Force needs to seek funding for administrative costs on top of restoration costs, given the response to Rep. Herger's letter. John Engbring said the exact percentage is being reviewed. Jim DePree said this letter was just received, time is needed to review it. Dave Bitts said that theoretically there should be \$2 million received when the act ends in

2006, as the Act was instituted in 1986 but funding did not begin until 1989. John Engbring said this issue can be further explored in upcoming budget discussions.

#### **Agendum 6. Public Comment**

- Larry Toelle, Scott River Watershed Council member, said he wanted to remind the Task Force that political clout comes from the grassroots. He rebutted several points in the letter sent by the Klamath Forest Alliance to the Task Force (*see Agendum 4 handouts*), saying that the Watershed Council is well represented by the community. He stated that the council is working positively and urged to Task Force to ignore the KFA letter.
- Ric Costales, president, People for the USA, Scott Valley chapter, said the Scott River Watershed Council has good community support and he provided a letter in response to the KFA letter. (*see Agendum 4 handout*).
- Felice Pace, KFA, discussed funding limitations of the Task Force, adding that he no longer supports further funding for the Task Force. He believes that the Task Force is not going to receive any of the \$7 million given to California for salmon restoration because the state and counties are jockeying for control of those funds. He said the Task Force's strength is guidance from TWG and its strong long-term plan. He added that restoration interests should supercede interests of landowners and other special interest groups. He asked the Task Force to look at the concerns raised in the KFA's Jan. 3 letter, and said he is concerned about politicization of the watershed councils.

#### **Agendum 7. Summary of Recent KFMC Meeting**

Paul Kirk gave an update on the KFMC meeting held on December 8-9, 1999, in Ashland. A meeting summary was given to all Task Force members. (*See Agendum 7 handout.*) He expanded on the following topics:

- Past Fishing Season. Paul Kirk discussed the mega-table in detail, which is used to establish actual fishing catches. The mega-table showed the in-river catch to be 103% over pre-season projection. The DCFG commission made the decision to make the surplus of fish available to the in-river anglers. Paul Kirk pointed out that this mega-table is an internal document that shows pre-season estimates and actual catches. The pre-season projection of natural spawner escapement for 1995 was 500 above the 35,000 floor. Only 52.5% of this projection was estimated to have returned to the river. This is the first time the floor has not been met in a number of years.
- Paul Kirk discussed the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model. Technical groups are working to revise the model; however, the updated model will not be ready for another year, therefore, the existing model is being used.
- Keith Wilkinson said he was invited to speak before TWG to deliver his perspective on the need for continued harvest monitoring information.
- The next meeting of the KFMC will be February 23-24 in Brookings, CA.
- State informational meeting will be held February 22 in Santa Rosa.
- The California Fish and Game Commission is holding a meeting with Klamath River fishermen in Crescent City in order to include in-river fishermen in the process.

Paul Kirk praised Don McIsaac's role as chair and said Dr. Mary Ellen Mueller will be taking over this position.

### **Agendum 8. Report from Arcata FWO on field studies and Trinity River Flow Evaluation**

Bruce Halstead, Project Leader Arcata FWO, first discussed the Trinity River Flow Evaluation Report, which has been underway since 1981. He said this has been completed in conjunction with the tribes and agencies. This project determines how to correct declining fish population in the Trinity River. The staff members who had been working on the flow studies in the Lewiston office when it closed were moved to the Arcata office. He highlighted some points of the Flow Evaluation:

- The reduction in the flood flows have resulted in channelized river morphology that doesn't allow for adequate spawning or juvenile rearing. Currently, only patchwork mechanical restoration projects address this. The project is recommending different flow regimes based on the water year. In extremely dry years, a maintenance flow is recommended. In wet years, flood flows are recommended; this flood flow would rip out banks and flush out spawning gravel. Because of the dams blocking the flow of new gravel, mechanical means will have to emulate the natural gravel process. Currently, 340,000 acre feet are released from the reservoir to the Trinity River. The Flow Report recommends a water flow of a low of 369,000 acre feet in dry years to 815, 000 acre feet in extremely wet years. Mechanical restoration in the form of side channel construction would continue and be reviewed. Side channels would be replaced and the edges feathered. These have been identified as necessary by the Adaptive Environmental Assessment Management Program.
- An environmental impact statement will assess impacts on the human environment; the Arcata FWO Web site has more information on this. Bruce Halstead explained the six alternatives that were evaluated. (*See Agendum 8 handout*). The EIS/EIR addresses the entire watershed below the Lewiston Dam. The draft preferred alternative is the flow report recommendation with restoration projects. There were 6,500 comments on the EIS, with about 500 from the Friends of the Trinity River. The public comment period ended on January 20.

### **Task Force Comments**

- Jim De Pree asked about the different flow levels and whether there is a monitoring system in place that collects data on its effectiveness. Bruce Halstead replied that this would be the first task of a monitoring team.
- Keith Wilkinson asked how Joe Polos' reassignment will affect this process. The reply was that he will not leave until the EIS is completed.
- Mike Orcutt clarified the history of the Flow Study, saying that it was mandated by CVPIA for completion by December 31, 1996. However, all work in the river was halted in order to complete the Flow Study. Pacific Fisheries Management Council and KFMC is on record as supporting the preferred alternative. Friends of Trinity has supported 70% inflow alternative. All of this is contingent upon receiving adequate funding. The budget has been reduced by the OMB and he said there is not adequate funding.

Bruce Halstead discussed the dam removal alternative, which he said was determined to be infeasible during the early discussion phase. The Task Force commented on the issue of dam removal.

## Task Force Comments

- Mike Orcutt said harvest management and dam removal were not fully explored. Ronnie Pierce said the Karuk Tribe advocated a full analysis of removing dams. She said the decision to reject this alternative was based on two factors: lost revenue and that fish recovery would not fall within the EIS timelines. However, she said the Karuk Tribe disagrees with this decision not to further analyze this option.
- Mike Belchik said there was risk to downstream fisheries. He agreed that no detailed analysis of dam removal was done. The preferred alternative can not be implemented until the three affected bridges are raised at a cost of \$6 million. He added that the budget cuts to below \$7 million is extremely disappointing, given the projected \$11 million cost.
- Mike Rode asked if Arcata FWO was concerned about the lower number of water year types being evaluated on the Klamath River (4 year types), as compared to the Trinity River (5 year types). Bruce Halstead said yes.

Bruce Halstead also discussed field studies of the Arcata FWO on the Klamath. The office has been working with Dr. Thom Hardy to create an interim flow evaluation on the Klamath, and this has been coordinated by Tom Shaw. He said he is not sure of the status of Hardy's Phase 2 Report. The spawning surveys to determine habitat suitability criteria for fall chinook, as well as for juvenile chinook are finished; however there is not much information on steelhead or coho at any stages of development. As well, there is no consensus on which existing information to use and from what area (i.e. Trinity or another basin). Mike Belchik noted that data has been collected on 1 plus (life stage one) steelhead. Funding is being sought for FY2001 to complete the flow study.

Bruce Halstead discussed habitat suitability on the Klamath River. There were 989 redds, the lowest count since 1993 (highest was 3,200 in 1995). Mike Belchik said that salmon spawn in deeper, larger substrate in Klamath. Bruce Halstead listed the age breakdown for returning salmon age 2 fish: -27%; age 3 fish - 42%, age 4 fish - 29% and age 5 fish - 2.5%.

Bruce Halstead said that the Arcata FWO has moved to Guintoli Rd. exit near NMFS, USGS, Park Service offices. The phone number is the same.

Bruce Halstead said that Tom Shaw is attempting to tie in his efforts with Dr. Hardy's work and move further downstream on the river to look at micro habitat sites. There is no funding for this, however. He has received an agreement with BOR for screwtrap funding.

## **Agendum 9. Public Comment**

- Felice Pace asked if there is money in the budget for FERC relicensing, and that much of the existing information can be used for licensing. The \$1.8 million funding is for the flow study. He said the coordination of information among the federal agencies should be addressed. John Engbring briefly explained the relicensing procedure.

## **Agendum 10. Report from Technical Work Group (TWG)**

James Wroble updated the Task Force on the work of TWG. He directed members to his handout, which outlined the following points:

- The status of stream gauge needs and funding are outlined in a draft letter (*Attachment 1/Letter*) to the Science Board. TWG recommended that the Task Force review the letter and

representatives from the participating DOI agencies approach representatives on the Science Board. The gauges on the Trinity side have been addressed for this year, but long-range commitment to funding needs to be addressed.

- Sub-basin planning and implementation. TWG is now working with sub-basins on their draft plans, and all sub-basins, except Scott, are expected to complete draft plans this year. (*Attachment 2/Plan Outline*) He said overall, the sub-basins have benefited from assistance by HSU, but HSU has not received funding for FY2000. Help is needed with technical writing and assembling reports. TWG recommendation is that support for sub-basin planning should be strengthened and sub-basing planning group funding should be continued. He said the Task Force needs to look at how they can support the sub-basins with expanded technical support and facilitation for sub-basin plans.

### Task Force Comments

- Glen Spain asked whether the sub-basins have schedules for project completion. James Wroble replied they are all projected to finish, except for the Scott Watershed Council. He said the lower Klamath draft plan will be an outline and that the mid-Klamath plan has not been reviewed yet and is especially challenging due to the areas diversity.
- Kent Bulfinch said the California Coastal Salmon Watershed Program provides support for local watershed solutions and that the California handout should be reviewed to ensure that the California required elements are included.
- Mike Belchik said that it is likely that more funding sources will contain their own formats. The TWG came up with their own outline, and once it was approved the sub-basins asked for funding of reformatting of plans.
- Jim De Pree said there is a larger issue of trying to get resolution between state and local entities on how to distribute monies for salmon restoration. There is still work to be done to resolve those issues.
- John Engbring suggested retaining the existing TWG outline.
- Mike Rode said he is willing to initiate contact to investigate if the TWG outline complies with state requirements.

James Wroble spoke about the overall direction of funding and said there must be short-range planning for the remainder of the current restoration program to consider the most productive and wisest use of remaining funds. There are 6 years and about \$3.6 million remaining, which is not much for restoration work. One of the objectives was to provide seed money to attract other funding. TWG looked at the top priorities, including the following: harvest monitoring (\$150,000 for FY2001), Flow Study (\$1.8 million for FY2001), gauges (\$120,000 for FY2001 for main-stem) and additional monies for sub-basin monitoring. He also outlined the priorities for monitoring. The top five priorities were #1) water quality, #2) water quantity (flow), #3) harvest monitoring, #4) juvenile survival and #5) habitat conditions. The TWG recommends that the Task Force reconsider the current allocation process for funds among categories 1, 2 and 3. He also listed the following TWG Recommendations to the Task Force:

- A budget format page change that would be consistent with the California Department of Fish and Game. (*Attachment 4*)

- A focus on Category 2. TWG should work with the Task Force to set standards and annual work products.
- An RFP Category 2 language change to the following: The top priority of proposers to Category 2 in FY2000 must complete a sub-basin plan consistent with Task Force sub-basin plan guidelines. Proposals should detail the current status of proposer's sub-basin plan, list specific steps/tasks, timelines and funding requirements needed to complete an approved plan.

### **Task Force Comments**

- Keith Wilkinson said endorsement of plans by NMFS is necessary. NMFS feel they will be beneficial for developing multi-species recovery plans. It is vital to get the involvement of local interests.
- Mike Rode commented that the present level of funding for sub-basin groups is barely enough for their goals.
- James Wroble said Categories 2 and 3 need more support.
- Ronnie Pierce asked if the same person will coordinate the planning effort. James Wroble replied that this differs at each sub-basin.
- James Wroble said there needs to be a more directed RFP as sub-basins have varying degrees of need from TWG and the Task Force. The dilemma is how much to budget for planning and how much to budget for implementation.
- Mike Rode said there should be a unifying person who can work with sub-basins to streamline the process, especially during the writing phase. John Engbring asked if a HSU person could be this facilitator.

James Wroble discussed how TWG can provide data assistance and coordination. TWG has seen more progress with HSU assistance this past year. TWG recommends the following set-asides: Category 1: HSU \$50,000 (including Yvonne Everett as Resource Planning Specialist and Steven Steinberg as GIS Website development) and Klamath Symposium \$10,000. In Category 2: TWG technical support \$10,000 and Sub-basin technical support \$10,000. He noted that this technical support has been vital to TWG.

James Wroble updated the Task Force on TWG attendance and named two new TWG members, Terry Anderson (In-River Sportfishers) and Dan Gale (Yurok Tribe).

### **Task Force Comments**

- Keith Wilkinson said there should be a special budget meeting to address the issue of funding set-aside requests made by TWG. (The Budget Committee had a quorum and decided to meet after the day's Task Force session.)
- John Engbring said a decision needs to be reached on categories so as to move forward on RFPs.
- Jim De Pree said it is important to hear from NMFS on the long-range plan and the schedule for feedback from that agency.

- Don Reck said said recovery planning is not the top NMFS priority for the Klamath Basin; however, this position is receiving substantial pressure. He believes there will be change. Presently, Southern California is the top priority as they do not have an existing plan.

**\*\*Motion\*\* Ronnie Pierce moved to use the CDFG budget page format in the RFP instead of the current budget page format as recommended by TWG.**

**\*\*Second\*\* Mike Belchik seconded the motion.**

**\*\*Motion Carried\*\* unanimously**

**\*\*Motion\*\* Glen Spain moved to finalize the memo to DOI Science Board members drafted by TWG member, Tom Shaw, regarding the FY 2001 DOI Science Priorities. Mr. Spain and Mr. Belchik will update the May 5, 1999 letter to DOI requesting funds for stream gauge operations and maintenance and harvest monitoring and attach it to the memo. Keith Wilkinson added an amendment to distribute the memo to members for review and approval. Glen Spain added an amendment that the letter should be distributed to other relevant agencies. (BIA, Dept. of Commerce, relevant state agencies, etc.)**

**\*\*Second\*\* Keith Wilkinson seconded the motion.**

**\*\*Motion Carried\*\* unanimously.**

#### Agendum 11. Criteria for Sub-basin Planning Group Performance and Annual Presentation Contents for Next Year

This discussion was postponed for a future meeting.

#### Agendum 12. Report from the Budget Committee

##### Agendum 12a. Recommendations to the Task Force

John Engbring covered the recommended Budget Allocation for FY2001 (*Handout Agendum 12.*) This budget is the same as last year's and was agreed to by the Budget Committee prior to TWG input.

##### Agendum 12b. FY2001 RFP development

The Budget Committee decided to meet in the evening to discuss the TWG recommendations. They reported on their findings in the meeting; see Agendum 14, below.

##### Agendum 12c. Recision for FY2000

In mid-January, the Task Force was told that there would be an across-the-board 1.38% reduction in federal funding for the FWS. This equals about \$6,800. Ron Iverson commented on this, saying this will effect the internal operating costs in Yreka and FY2000 restoration program projects, now funded at \$578,700. The Klamath Restoration Program is subject to this. Ron Iverson said the following solution was proposed: Great Northern Corporation in Shasta Valley volunteered to give up \$6,800 of their funding for the planning/design of irrigation diversion project for FY2000. They did this with the understanding that in FY2001 the funds would be provided to them. Ronnie Pierce asked if this 1.38% will also be levied against administrative costs. Ron Iverson said yes.

#### Agendum 13. Public Comment

- Larry Toelle, Scott River Watershed Council asked why all the problems and solutions have not been identified. He requested a simple plan and simple solutions. Glen Spain suggested he

review the Task Force-approved sub-basin plan format and provide comments to the Task Force and TWG chair.

— Felice Pace, KFA, commented on several issues. He noted that the long-range plan is not a recovery plan. The spring chinook plan starts to approach a recovery plan. He commended Mike Belchik and TWG for their sub-basin planning outline. Felice Pace said he believes there is confusion about the sub-basin funding; their contracts end September 30, 2000 but they can be extended. Some FY2000 contracts are already entered into; they start work on them about October 1, 2000. The state and federal criteria for the salmon project must include an adopted watershed plan and local support. The sub-basin planning funds can be used to fund assessments and planning. Felice Pace said a strong direction is needed on how to spend the existing funds. The information exists to develop a good sub-basin plan; the Scott River plan could be done in a month because the data is already there. He recommended that the FWS negotiate contracts to ensure sub-basin plans by the end of FY2000. He recommended that the Task Force discontinue funding sub-basin groups that do not develop a plan within this time frame.

— Ric Costales, Scott River Watershed Council, said there is difficulty in developing solutions when the watershed processes and problems are not understood. All that is known is that watershed is impaired for temperature and sediment, and that there is an endangered species problem, but the solutions are not understood by the public, and there is a need for unity in the community as to solutions. The public must first be educated. He believes that the Scott River Watershed Council cannot produce a plan this year.

#### **Agendum 14. Task Force Decision on FY2001 Restoration Program**

This was postponed for the next day's session.

#### **Agendum 15. Update from the Long-Term Funding Subcommittee**

Keith Wilkinson said the original goal of the long-term funding subcommittee was to increase funding for the remaining years of the program. FY2003 is the first year that the Task Force can realistically request this additional funding. He said this subcommittee needs more members. He suggested a two-pronged approach to obtain both additional funding starting in FY2003 and re-authorization for the Task Force by FY2006.

The Yreka FWO staff was asked to add descriptions of the sub-basin needs to the long-term funding proposal (*Agendum 15 Handout*). Laurie Simons asked that the Task Force recognize Jennifer Silveira and Brie Darr and all of the sub-basin planning coordinators for their work in organizing the summaries of sub-basin restoration needs provided in the proposal. (*Agendum 15 Handout*). This is the first draft of a proposal that could be reformatted for different uses. It is currently in the form of a USFWS budget initiative.

#### **Task Force Comments**

— Ronnie Pierce asked if any funds from Salmon Initiative's \$58 million could be used for the Task Force. Keith Wilkinson said he believes most of this money is going to Alaska.

— Glen Spain said political backing is necessary, particularly those on House Appropriations Committees. It is not impossible to affect FY2001 and FY2002 budgets by re-routing some funding. However, there is competition for these funds from East Coast watershed/waterway interests.

- \_ John Engbring said private citizens will have to pressure for additional funding.
- \_ Glen Spain said money will be given to states and the Task Force has support from states and counties; this is probably the best bet.
- \_ Mike Belchik and Paul Kirk offered to work with Keith Wilkinson on the Long-Term Funding Subcommittee.

**\*\*Assignment\*\* Mike Belchik and Paul Kirk will work on the Long-Term Funding Subcommittee with Keith Wilkinson.**

**Addendum 16. Public Comment**

- \_ Bill Bennett, California Department of Water Resources (DWR), said that California Department of Fish and Game and DWR are conducting out-migrant fish counts on the Shasta River. DWR is providing equipment and Fish and Game is providing labor. He believes that the TWG supports this. In the current California Governor's Budget, there is about \$6.8 million for North Coast Watershed Assessment. DWR is asking for \$337,000 to establish gauges on the North Coast Watersheds. Proposition 13 is the new Clean Water Bond which provides up to \$1.9 billion in loans and grants for water conservation and ground water recharge. There is some money that goes through Fish and Game that deals with salmon restoration. He recommended that the Task Force be aware of this.

**February 11, 2000 Reconvene**

Attendance was the same as February 10, 2000, except that Chuck Blackburn, Del Norte County, was not present.

**Agendum 14. Task Force Decision on FY2001 Restoration Program**

The Budget Committee met at the end of the first day's meeting to further discuss changes to budget allocations decided upon at the November 1999 Budget Committee meeting. John Engbring asked Task Force members to look at the handout (*Agendum 12 Handout*) and review recommendations made by the Budget Committee.

The main recommendation from the Budget Committee was to shift the category funding from a 40-30-30 percentage distribution for categories 1, 2 and 3, respectively, to a 30-40-30% funding distribution. Although there would be a \$2,000 reduction in funding for the sub-basin groups (from \$34,000 last year to \$32,000 this year), they would be receiving additional support from TWG and others. The Budget Committee told the Task Force that it recognizes this is a shift in focus, however, they believe it is a move in the right direction. This shift also calls for \$70,000 in funding for proposals such as HSU, as well as TWG/sub-basin support. The 1.38% recision would be taken from category 1.

**Task Force Comment**

- Don Reck commented on the \$2,000 reduction in funding for the sub-basin groups. John Engbring noted that the added HSU and TWG technical support would fill in the gaps.
- Jim De Pree expressed concern that there is not enough support for sub-basin coordination activity. He is concerned that the mechanism is not in place to meet the needs of the sub-basin groups. Money for focused planning is necessary. Al Olson said that it would be important to see what the expectations are for the sub-basin groups.
- John Engbring said the sub-basin plans are in differing stages of development, and that strong language should be included in the RFPs to encourage completion of draft plans.
- Jim De Pree asked if the 30-40-30 split should be changed to 25-45-25 %. Mike Belchik said it is important to remember there is not enough money to fund any of the existing categories. Jim De Pree said it is important to allocate percentages so the sub-basin groups can meet Task Force expectations, and he is not sure how the \$50,000 to HSU will cover planning expectations of the Task Force regarding the sub-basin groups. Mike Rode said that the sub-basin groups will receive extra support through HSU work. Jim De Pree said he sees value in HSU's work, however he is concerned about reduced support for the sub-basin groups. John Engbring said that many of the sub-basin groups have managed to meet expectations with essentially the same budgets.

James Wroble described HSU's role, adding that HSU's work can be tailored to meet the needs of individual watersheds. At the last meeting with HSU, the watersheds were asked what kind of technical support they need with the following responses: the lower Klamath does not need technical support, as they have writing/planning capabilities in place. Most of HSU's technical support has been given to the Scott, Shasta and Salmon watersheds. There is concern about the mid-Klamath plan, so attention will be focused there. Ron Iverson was asked whether the sub-basin groups have complained about their funding and he said he is not aware of any communication from watersheds.

**Task Force Comment**

Mike Orcutt commented on sub-basin group funding. He said it is difficult to know what is enough funding when expectations are unclear. The expectation and coordination mechanism must be firmly in place before they can be funded. He proposed the Budget Committee stay with the original proposal.

John Engbring said Task Force can make decisions when funding totals come in in June, but that setting priorities now will make the RFP process more efficient. Ronnie Pierce asked James Wroble about the \$10,000 set-aside for additional technical support for sub-basin plans, and if this can be considered a contingency fund. James Wroble said HSU could use this for additional work that could be sub-contracted.

James Wroble said it is important to remember these are approved plans, and that the Task Force might want to decide what is an approved plan. Mike Rode said the Task Force is dealing with sensitive political issues; 7 years ago CDFG was going to write a recovery plan for Shasta River, but it was then determined inappropriate to sign off on a plan that was so drastic. These unfinished plans still exist.

Mike Orcutt suggested the Budget Committee meet before the June meeting to set priorities such as harvest management. James Wroble said because TWG has not received any direction from the Task Force, there is no criteria to differentiate between categories. Mike Belchik explained that shifting funding percentages was easier than shifting categories.

Ronnie Pierce asked for historical information on CRMP funding and was told that the original funding was \$25,000, which was then increased to \$34,000. Ronnie Pierce then asked if it is possible to fund CRMP operations at \$25,000 and then take the additional money in Category 2 and request proposals for sub-basin plans, for which the CRMPs can compete. Mike Belchik said if this is done, it leaves \$46,000, which may not be enough for sub-basin proposals.

Chris Erikson said the Task Force must decide if HSU is the most important project.

Jim De Pree said if the CRMPs received direction/expectations in advance, they could submit integrated proposals. John Engbring said this can be put in the RFP language.

Glen Spain said expectations must be clear, as TWG is being given more and more duties for the sub-basin groups. It is important to specify what HSU will do for sub-basin groups. John Engbring said the Task Force recognizes the value in assisting sub-basin groups in completing their sub-basin plans. Glen Spain said he is concerned that the Task Force is not offering enough support to TWG.

Glen Spain urged the Task Force to adopt the Budget Committee recommendations.

Regarding specific language in the budget, Mike Belchik proposed \$70,000 for planning support with the remainder for sub-basin groups within Category 2. Mike Orcutt expressed concern that there might not be projects worth funding.

Al Olson suggested \$125,000 for sub-basin groups, \$10,000 for TWG operations and the remainder of \$96,000 for proposals such as the HSU program.

Ronnie Pierce said funding should include a deliverable date for draft sub-basin plans to be submitted to TWG. Ron Iverson said existing agreements can be modified to include a mutually agreed timeline and specific task. Mike Belchik read from TWG recommendation handout, which he said has specific requirements as to time and content of the plan. Kent Bulfinch said it

is important to remember there may be other watershed councils needing funding. John Engbring said it is the intent to include this in this year's contract, FY2000, with a draft report due by Sept. 2000.

### Public Comment

- Larry Toelle, Scott River Watershed Council, said that it is likely that Scott River will not be able to deliver a plan until June 2001.
- Felice Pace said that it is important to remember there might be new watershed groups, including one in Orleans. The money should be thought of not as an entitlement but as an investment in the watershed groups. Most of the CRMP funding comes from other sources. He said he encourages the Task Force to require that the sub-basin groups submit a plan by the end of FY2000. He also recommended the following: language in the contracts that focus on development of sub-basin plans and the requirement for a sub-basin plan by the end of FY2000. He added that TWG should receive support for the planning process. In addition, the Task Force should consider allocating money specifically for the planning process in the FY2001 budget.

**\*\* Motion \*\* Glen Spain moved to change the allocation of project funding to 30% for category 1, 40% for category 2 and 30% for category 3.**

**\*\* Kent Bulfinch seconded.\*\***

**\*\* Motion Carried \*\* unanimously. Mike Orcutt abstained. Keith Wilkinson was not present.**

**\*\* Motion \*\* Glen Spain moved to designate \$10,000 of the Category 2 funds for TWG support.**

**\*\* Mike Belchik seconded.\*\***

**\*\* Motion Carried \*\* unanimously.**

**\*\* Motion \*\* Al Olson moved to designate \$125,000 in Category 2 for sub-basin operational support with the balance of \$96,000 for planning projects, to be conducted through the competitive process. A friendly amendment states that all sub-basins can now apply for the \$125,000 that would have formerly been divided among them five ways.**

**\*\* Chris Erikson seconded.\*\***

**\*\* Motion Carried \*\* unanimously. Mike Orcutt, Ronnie Pierce and Mike Belchik abstained. Mike Orcutt said for the record he abstained because there was too much uncertainty.**

**\*\* Assignment \*\* Staff will schedule a meeting of the Budget Committee the day before the June meeting to go over TWG recommendations for project funding.**

### **Agendum 17. Update from Mid-term Evaluation Oversight Committee**

Mike Belchik said the Committee has not met since the last Task Force meeting, but he suggested that members review the report he gave them at the October 1999 meeting. (*Agendum 16 Handout/Oct. 1999 meeting*). Ronnie Pierce said there were significant recommendations calling for Task Force action, as well as policy items, and that members need to review these carefully before commenting. During their review they should refer to the Mid-term Evaluation. Glen Spain recommended a facilitated meeting and/or all-day retreat. The members discussed the possibility of a retreat, however, it was felt the Task Force should first review the recommendations, as well as the Mid-Term Review itself. Mike Belchik commended Ronnie Pierce for her work on the recommendations.

**\*\* Assignment\*\* Task Force members will review the Recommendations of the Mid-term Evaluation Oversight Committee and present their feedback at the June 2000 meeting. YFWO will schedule approximately 2 hours for this on the next meeting agenda.**

**\*\* Assignment \*\* TWG members will receive a copy of the Recommendations of the Mid-term Evaluation Oversight Committee. TWG members will review those portions of the recommendations that pertain to TWG and respond at the June 2000 meeting.**

### **Agendum 18. Strategy Session: Brainstorming**

Due to Joan Smith's absence, this was folded into the expanded discussion of sub-basin planning and budget funding. (*Agendum 14, above*).

### **Agendum 19. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

### **Agendum 20. Strategic Planning Process of the Sub-basin Planning Groups**

Yvonne Everett, HSU, gave a brief report to the Task Force on planning activities during the past year. Steven Steinberg, HSU, then spoke about the Web GIS.

Yvonne Everett explained that HSU began its work by seeking to develop a priority list of projects within the sub-basins. After finding the sub-basins in differing stages of development, they decided to focus on the Scott and Shasta groups as they were in the most need of support. Working with an HSU graduate student, the sub-basin groups identified the limiting factors to healthy fish in their regions. To do this, they pulled together existing data, including data from private landowners. The focus was to identify and preserve the healthiest remaining habitat. Yvonne Everett pointed out the challenge of the mid-Klamath basin, due to its diverse components. She suggested breaking this basin down into smaller units.

Yvonne Everett said the focus is to combine conservation biology approach with monitoring plans that would allow people to know when significant change occurs. It is important to spread emphasis among all basins and to maintain a constant level of support among all basins. HSU has recommended that TWG work more closely with sub-basins and she said this has happened. She said the plan is to use existing federal guidelines and conservation/management approach on federal land within sub-basins. She said HSU has incorporated existing information and local knowledge in the process. In addition, they plan to produce map layers of key watersheds.

Yvonne Everett outlined the following ways in which HSU can continue to assist the Task Force:

- Provide continued plan development with Scott and Shasta sub-basins.
- Continue its collaboration with TWG on fisheries conservation and management approach to basin planning.
- Organize a conference at HSU in the spring 2001.
- Provide a neutral information site for a data warehouse/library.
- Continue to conduct research at the university.

Steven Steinberg, Assistant Professor, GIS (Graphical Information System), spoke about the webGIS system being developed at HSU. In 1999, work was focused on developing a Web-based, user-friendly GIS data repository. This data is not only compiled but used to set priorities. The focus is on taking current data layers, collected from agencies and other sources, and putting them on-line in a visual format. So far, 30 layers have been developed, such as roads, land ownership,

hydrology, etc. These data sets will be used to develop an example analysis for individual areas. In 2000, the focus is on making the data Web-accessible. This encourages access by minimizing computer requirements, creates an easy-to-use interface and makes data downloads available to GIS users.

Steven Steinberg then gave more details about the GIS being developed, (*Agendum 20 handout*), which he suggested naming K2R.iMAP:

- Stands for Klamath River Restoration InteractiveMAP
- New name. He asked the Task Force for any suggested name changes.
- Currently a demonstration webGIS site
- Features an initial view of the data and lets user in real-time choose data selection and layering as well as allowing basic query functions
- Will continue to improve interface design, add appropriate data sources, add capabilities for Areal queries, and allow users to download selected data sets

Steven Steinberg said the power of webGIS is that it does not expect the user to be a GIS user or have GIS software; it also allows those users to define their own Adata view. He briefly explained the server technology, both hardware and software. He explained the role of MapServer, which is an application for delivering dynamic GIS and image processing content via the Web. He briefly outlined HSU's Advanced Spatial Analysis Facility (ASAF), which recently received a hardware grant.

Steven Steinberg outlined future work, which includes expanding the data library, defining additional webGIS applications that meet specific needs and adding scale/resolution options. In addition, the data gaps will be defined. In summary, he said webGIS enables access to and interaction with large spatial data libraries. This benefits users because this is a single, central location to view and access current spatial data, as well as allowing users to download data for use with their own software.

Steven Steinberg finished his talk by demonstrating the current prototype site (<http://pixel.cnrs.humboldt.edu/>) to Task Force members.

### Task Force Comments

- Several Task Force members asked specific questions about data. Mike Rode asked about quality control and was told this is an ongoing issue and a disclaimer may be included to the site that the quality of specific data is unknown.
- Keith Wilkinson asked if landowners are using this Website and was told the general public may not be aware of the site yet.
- Bill Bennett, DWR, spoke of his concern that this process be inclusive of all data. He mentioned the extensive data on KRIS (Klamath Resource Information System), as well as the information collected by the Oregon Institute of Technology in Klamath Falls on the upper Klamath Basin. The existing GIS must be included. He urged the Task Force to stress mutual agreement before future funding of HSU. He recommended a GIS conference and a memo of understanding (MOU) to ascertain existing information and data. Steven Steinberg said that HSU can be an impartial data repository.
- Keith Wilkinson expressed his concern about the issue of confidentiality. Steven Steinberg said that this is a concern for HSU as well and that protections can be placed on data access.

– Mike Belchik asked about the correlation between KRIS and GIS. Steven Steinberg replied that the plan is to integrate the two.

– Jim De Pree asked about HSU facilitation capacity and was told that the University has resources for facilitation and planning processes, such as the Center for Environmental Resolution.

### **Agendum 21. Public Comment**

Felice Pace said that there is a great deal of information, such as the data collected by HSU, that is not available to the public, although it is supposed to be.

### **Agendum 22. Status of Klamath Project and Long-Term EIS (Karl Wirkus)**

Karl Wirkus gave an update of the Klamath Project and Long-term EIS. He responded to the questions the Task Force had asked him to address, including the following:

– Dr. Thom Hardy will begin work again February 22, after a break in funding. The schedule calls for mid-June for completion of consultation. Interim decisions need to be made as irrigation starts in mid-March/April.

– Modifications to the KPOPSIM model need to be made for completion by mid-March. This will depend on water year type. The criteria to be used with the onset of irrigation will depend on run-off and what is known about effects to species.

– The Ag Economics Model, done by Susan Burke is an extensive breakdown of hydrology done by the Denver office, and should be available soon for external review.

– Discussions are underway with the Klamath Water Users Assn. about developing a water marketing study/plan to conduct water transfers. Although this is fairly common in the West (including the upper Snake River district and the Rio Grande), this study would be specific to the Klamath region.

– The preliminary settlement legislation, associated with settlement discussions going on in Klamath ADR process, is something the Task Force may want to be aware of.

– Details of the current water supply: 98% of average snowpack, 87 % of precipitation. The conditions are average presently, with Upper Klamath filling to the upper end of flow envelope.

– The next meeting on the Klamath EIS will be held in Redding on March 15-16, and is being sponsored by the cooperating agencies.

### **Task Force Comment**

– John Engbring asked about the water marketing plan and was told this is a process in which a willing seller sells water to a willing buyer. Karl Wirkus said the study plan is in the initial stages and could include the California Department of Water Resources, government agencies and individuals, to determine all possibilities.

– Mike Belchik thanked Karl Wirkus for providing funding for Dr. Hardy for all eight sites. He asked him to address future funding requests as well as the future of the Anadromous Fisheries Program and what is/is not in the President's Budget. Karl Wirkus explained that the President's Budget for FY2001 contains a \$1 million request for Klamath River instream flow

studies. He said, fortunately, he believes that FWS also has a little more than a million dollars in the President's budget for Klamath River instream flow studies. There is no priority on how those funds would be used; TWG's help would be useful with this. Currently, a FY2002 budget plan is not asking for more than the \$1 million plus inflation.

- Mike Orcutt referred to the \$12.6 million funding and the budget cut of \$2 million. Karl Wirkus said this cut was taken from Fish and Wildlife Development Management. A little more than \$1 million is now earmarked for total anadromous program.
- Ronnie Pierce asked about the remaining \$9 million in the budget. Karl Wirkus replied that the balance is spent on operations and maintenance, research and monitoring of suckers, water supply initiative, water quality monitoring, meetings, etc.
- John Engbring asked about the NEPA process, and Karl Wirkus said they are hoping to complete the draft EIS by fall 2000. This year they will be operating on existing NEPA documents.
- Ronnie Pierce asked whether the FONSI on the Clear Lake Dam will look at increased storage. Karl Wirkus said no, that the safety of dams action is separate from increasing storage. There is less emphasis on Clear Lake; previous studies show a high degree of seepage and water loss in the area.

#### **Public Comment**

- Bruce Halstead said the FWS requested more for the flow study than received and asked if BOR could help by keeping their \$1 million for the flow studies.
- Glen Spain asked if longterm trends such as global warming are being taking into account. Karl Wirkus said a meteorologist is working on this.
- Mike Rode asked about the BOR commitment to the flow study and said it seems tht BOR is hedging by stating that it depends on the results from Dr. Hardy's study. Karl Wirkus said the direction of the flow study may change as more information is released, and will be affected by regulatory relationships. TWG will continue to be consulted.
- Jim De Pree said more frequent updates are needed, if possible.
- John Engbring said TWG and BOR need to meet more frequently to coordinate the flow study.
- Felice Pace mentioned several points that came up in the discussion. He said an interested party could block a flow regime because of the lack of NEPA at this time. Upper Basin interests are planning on legislation that may be counterproductive if challenges are then proposed. Environmental groups will be proposing their vision which differs from the settlement presented to the Upper Basin group. There is concern in the conservation community over fragmenting of NEPA. He also mentioned the upcoming Bald Eagle Conference, held in February.
- Karl Wirkus agreed there is vulnerability from lack of NEPA documents.

#### **Agendum 23. Status of Consultations on the Klamath Project and Long-term EIS**

This was postponed until a later meeting.

#### **Agendum 24. Update on Department of Interior Instream Flow Needs Assessment**

This was postponed until a later meeting.

**Agendum 25. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**Agendum 26. Recap and summary of assignments and motions.**

John Engbring summarized the list of assignments and motions. (*See attached list*).

**Agendum 27. Date and Location for October 2000 meeting.**

The October 2000 meeting will be held in Yreka on October 18 and 19. (The next Task Force meeting is June 28-29 in Eureka.)

**Adjourn**

**Attachment 1**

**GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS**

***KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE  
MEETING  
February 10-11, 2000  
Best Western Brookings Inn  
Brookings, Oregon***

Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office - AFWO  
Bureau of Indian Affairs - BIA  
Bureau of Reclamation - BOR  
California Department of Fish and Game - CDFG  
California Department of Water Resources - DWR  
Coded Wire Tags - CWT  
Coordinated Resource Management Planning - CRMP  
Ecosystem Restoration Office - ERO  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission - FERC  
Irongate Dam - IGD  
Klamath Basin Water Users - KBWU  
Klamath Fisheries Management Council - KFMC  
Klamath Forest Alliance - KFA  
Long Range Plan - LRP  
Memorandum of Understanding - MOU  
National Marine Fisheries Service - NMFS  
Pacific Power and Light - PPL  
Request for Proposals - RFP  
Siskiyou Resource Conservation District - RCD  
Task Force - TF  
Technical Advisory Team - TAT  
Technical Work Group - TWG  
Trinity Coordinating Committee - TCC  
U.S. Department of Agriculture - USDA  
U. S. Department of Interior - DOI  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - FWS

U.S. Geological Survey - USGS

Upper Basin Amendment - UBA

Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office - YFWO

**LIST OF ATTENDEES**  
**(Non-members)**  
**KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE**  
**MEETING**  
**February 10-22, 2000**  
**Best Western Brookings Inn**  
**Brookings, Oregon**

**Name**

Ron Iverson  
Laurie Simons  
Sarah L. Pattee  
Juanita Quijada  
Dave Hill  
Bruce Halstead  
James Wroble  
Mike McCain  
Julie Rubenstein  
Jim S. Welter  
Felice Pace  
Larry Toelle  
Ric Costales  
Earl Danosky  
Alice Kilham  
Tessa Stuedli  
Karl Wirkus  
Yvonne Everett  
Steve Steinberg  
Bill Bennett

**Organization**

U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service - YFWO  
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service - YFWO  
Recorder for U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service - YFWO  
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service - YFWO  
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service - AFWO  
Technical Work Group/Hoopa Tribe  
Technical Work Group/U. S. Forest Service  
Senator Wyden's Office  
Oregon State Commercial Fishing  
Klamath Forest Alliance  
Scott Valley (People for USA)  
Scott Valley (People for USA)  
Tulelake Irrigation District  
U. S. Bureau of Reclamation  
Klamath Water Users Association  
U. S. Bureau of Reclamation  
Humboldt State University  
Humboldt State University  
California Department of Water Resources

*FINAL AGENDA*

***KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING  
February 10-11, 2000  
Brookings Inn  
Brookings, Oregon***

**February 10, 2000**

- 8:00 am 1. Convene and opening remarks. John Engbring, chair and Mike Rode, vice chair.
- 8:15 2. Business
- a. Adoption of agenda
  - b. Adoption of minutes from October 1999 meeting
  - c. Vice chair for next meeting is Mike Rode
  - d. New web site for Yreka FWS - [www.r1.fws.gov/yreka](http://www.r1.fws.gov/yreka)
- 8:45 3. Introductions of Congressional staff in attendance
- 9:00 4. Brief review of last meeting actions/general correspondence/program update (Simons)
- 9:15 5. Old business (Engbring)
- a. Response to letter to Secretary Babbitt on administrative costs
  - b. Status of appointment letters/charter
  - c. Status of funding for Klamath River Flow Study
  - d. Task Force signature on Cooperative Agreement with Klamath Watershed Coordination Group
  - e. Response to letter to Secretary Babbitt on funding of harvest monitoring and gauges
  - f. Letter from Congressman Herger regarding administrative costs
- 9:45 6. Public Comment
- 10:00 Break
- 10:15 7. Summary of December KFMC meeting (Kirk)
- 10:45 8. Report from Arcata FWO on field studies (Halstead) and Trinity River Flow Evaluation (Polos)
- 11:30 9. Public Comment
- 11:45 Lunch
- 1:00 10. Report from Technical Work Group (Wroble)
- a. Status of stream gauge needs and funding
  - b. Sub-basin planning and implementation
  - c. TWG attendance update
  - d. New TWG members
  - e. RFP recommendations

- 2:00 11. Criteria for sub-basin planning group performance - annual presentation contents for June meeting (Simons)
- 2:15 12. Report from the Budget Committee (Engbring)  
a. Recommendations to Task Force  
b. FY2001 RFP development
- 2:45 13. Public Comment
- 3:00 Break
- 3:15 14. TF Decision on FY2001 Restoration Program  
a. Set-asides  
b. Funding levels for Categories  
c. RFP revisions
- 4:00 15. Progress toward an organized community effort to secure more funding  
Update from Long-term Funding Sub-committee (Wilkinson)
- 4:30 16. Public Comment
- 5:00 - 7:00pm Social Hour - Join us in the Lounge of the Brookings Inn

**February 11, 2000**

- 8:00 am 17. Update from Mid-term Evaluation Oversight Committee (Belchik)
- 8:30 18. Strategy Session - brainstorming solutions to further the goals of the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force - recommended by the Budget Committee (Engbring)
- 10:30 19. Public Comment
- 10:45 Break
- 11:00 20. Strategic planning process of the sub-basin planning groups (Yvonne Everett, HSU)
- 12:00 21. Public Comment
- 12:15 Lunch
- 1:15 22. Status of Klamath Project and Long-term EIS (Wirkus)
- 1:30 23. Status of consultations on the Klamath Project and Long-term EIS (Reck and Steve Lewis)
- 2:00 24. Update on Department of Interior Instream Flow Needs Assessment (Doug Tedrick)
- 2:30 25. Public Comment
- 2:45 26. Recap and summary of assignments and motions. Identify agenda to include in the next meeting. (Engbring)

3:00 27. Set the date and location of the meeting after next (next meeting is Eureka/Arcata June 28-29, 2000).

3:15 Adjourn

*LIST OF HANDOUTS*

*KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE*

*MEETING*

*February 10-22, 2000*

*Best Western Brookings Inn*

*Brookings, Oregon*

- Agendum 4 Letter to Ron Iverson, Yreka FWO, from the Klamath Forest Alliance, dated January 3, 2000
- Agendum 4 Letter to Klamath River Basin Task Force, from Kent Bulfinch, dated January 6, 2000, subject: CA In-River Sports Fishery TWG Representative
- Agendum 4 Letter to Ron Iverson, Yreka FWO, from Scott Valley People for the USA, dated January 8, 2000
- Agendum 4 Table listing ATask Force Unspent Projects - 3 Year Cutoff@
- Agendum 4 Letter to Task Force Chairman, from the Yurok Tribal Fisheries Program, dated January 24, 2000 appointing Dan Gale as the Tribes' TWG representative.
- Agendum 4 Table, Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Restoration Program Cost Accounting
- Agendum 4 Salmon River Sub-basin Restoration Strategy: Steps to Recovery and Conservation of Aquatic Resources
- Agendum 5 Letter to John Engbring, Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force Chairperson, from Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, dated September 15, 1999
- Agendum 5a Letter to Dave Bitts, Vice Chairman, Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force, from Elizabeth Stevens, Acting Manager, USFWS CNO, dated December 23, 1999
- Agendum 5b Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force Charter, dated October 14, 1999
- Agendum 5d Cooperative Agreement, Klamath Watershed Coordination Group, Klamath Basin, Oregon/California
- Agendum 5f Letter to Task Force, from Congressman Wally Herger, dated January 31, 2000
- Agendum 7 Memorandum to Klamath Fishery Management Council and Technical Advisory Team members from Project Leader YFWO, dated January 3, 2000
- Agendum 8 Final Report: Trinity River Flow Evaluation. Prepared by the Coastal California Fish and Wildlife Office (Arcata FWO) and the Hoopa Valley Tribe, dated April 1999

Agendum 8	Klamath River Basin Juvenile Salmonid Monitoring Program, A Summary Report for the 1999 Monitoring Season. Prepared by the Arcata FWO, dated October 13, 1999
Agendum 8	Letter to Secretary of the Interior, from Klamath Fishery Management Council, dated January 20, 2000
Agendum 10	Technical Work Group Report to the Task Force, dated February 10, 2000
Agendum 11	Sub-basin Planning and Coordination Annual Presentations to the Klamath Task Force, Draft, dated December 2, 1999
Agendum 12	Table, Budget Allocation Task Force FY 2001
Agendum 14	Request for Proposals format
Agendum 15	Draft: Klamath River Basin Fishery Resources Restoration Act - Enhanced Implementation (Long-Term Proposal Draft)
Agendum 20	Humboldt State University GIS Slide Show Presentation

#### Informational Handouts

Siskiyou Daily News, October 15, 1999, Article AFish Tales: River task force tours hatchery@

Siskiyou Daily News, October 15, 1999, Voice of the People, AKlamath River a disaster@

Letter to Scott River Watershed CRMP Council, from Siskiyou County Farm Bureau, dated October 18, 1999

Letter to Scott River Watershed CRMP Council, from Siskiyou County Cattleman's Association, dated October 18, 1999

Siskiyou Daily News, October 18, 1999, article AEnvironmental language poses challenge to learn@

Siskiyou Daily News, October 20, 1999, article ACounty update on NMFS falls short of expectations@

Siskiyou Daily News, October 21, 1999, article AFarm bureau, cattlemen's group quit watershed council@

Siskiyou Daily News, October 22, 1999, article ABudget concerns occupy task force@

Medford Mail Tribune, October 24, 1999, article AA River Reborn@

Siskiyou Daily News, October 25, 1999, article ARestoration puts groups on same side@

Siskiyou Daily News, October 26, 1999, article AScott River CRMP membership dwindles@

Siskiyou Daily News, October 28, 1999, article AStill thinks NMFS lawsuit best idea@

Siskiyou Daily News, October 29, 1999, article ALanding the Big One@

Siskiyou Daily News, November 2, 1999, Opinion Page, AUSF&W director should resign@

Siskiyou Daily News, November 9, 1999, article AGroup protests agenda change@

Siskiyou Daily News, November 9, 1999, article ASupervisors urged to withdraw from plan@

Siskiyou Daily News, November 9, 1999, article **A**House Oks bill that helps farmers build fish screens@

Siskiyou Daily News, November 9, 1999, Opinion Page, **AA** government fish story@

Siskiyou Daily News, December 8, 1999, article **A**Fishermen blame declining salmon on sea lions@

Siskiyou Daily News, December 8, 1999, **A**Plea was ignored@ Testimony of Congressman Wally Herger  
House Committee on  
Resources Hearing on  
Roadless Area  
Regulations

Siskiyou Daily News, January 5, 2000, Opinion Page, **A**Don't miss next Supes meeting@

Siskiyou Daily News, January 7, 2000, article **A**New fishing regs influenced by the last 100 years@

Siskiyou Daily News, January 7, 2000, article **A**Groups claim five county plan is bad for area@

Siskiyou Daily News, January 17, 2000, CORRECTION: **A**Cattlemen, Farm Bureau calling for more study into  
Five County Plan@

California Coastal Salmon and Watersheds Program, [www.ceres.ca.gov](http://www.ceres.ca.gov) web site document

Remarks of Deputy Assistant Director Rowan Gould, Pacific Northwest Fish Culture Conference, Seattle,  
WA, December 6, 1999

Remarks by Jamie Rappaport-Clark, Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, at the American Sportfishing  
Association, October 27, 1999

Letter to the Editor, North American Fisherman, undated, from Director of FWS

Siskiyou Daily News, January 20, 2000, Opinion Page, **A**Fed actions are not justified@

Siskiyou Daily News, January 21, 2000, Opinion Page **A**Supes meeting was disappointing@

Pioneer Press, January 19, 2000, article, **A**KFA complains to feds about CRMP dissolution@

Draft MOU for first year allocation of Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Program between National Marine  
Fisheries Service and the California Resources Agency, dated January 27, 2000

NOAA Restoration Network, Objectives and Draft Agenda for a National Meeting



**ASSIGNMENTS AND MOTIONS**

**KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE  
MEETING  
February 10-11, 2000  
Best Western Brookings Inn  
Brookings, Oregon**

**Assignments:**

- Agendum 14 \*\* Assignment \*\* Staff will schedule a meeting of the Budget Committee the day before the June meeting to go over TWG recommendations for project funding.
- Agendum 15 \*\* Assignment\*\* Mike Belchik and Paul Kirk will work on the Long-Term Funding Sub-Committee with Keith Wilkinson.
- Agendum 17 \*\* Assignment\*\* Task Force members will review the Recommendations of the Mid-term Evaluation Oversight Committee and present their feedback at the June 2000 meeting. YFWO will schedule approximately 2 hours for this on the next meeting agenda.
- Agendum 17 \*\* Assignment \*\* TWG members will receive a copy of the Recommendations of the Mid-term Evaluation Oversight Committee. TWG members will review those portions of the recommendations that pertain to TWG and respond at the June 2000 meeting.

**Motions:**

- Agendum 2 \*\*Motion\*\* Keith Wilkinson moved to adopt the amended agenda for this meeting and approve the amended minutes for the last meeting.  
 \*\*Second\*\* Chris Erikson seconded the motion.  
 \*\*Motion Carried\*\* unanimously. Glen Spain abstained from approving the last meeting minutes because he was not in attendance..
- Agendum 10 \*\*Motion\*\* Ronnie Pierce moved to use the CDFG budget page format in the RFP  
 \*\*Second\*\* Glen Spain seconded the motion.  
 \*\*Motion Carried\*\* unanimously. inst
- Agendum 10 \*\*Motion\*\* Glen Spain moved to finalize the memo to DOI Science Board members drafted by TWG member, Tom Shaw, regarding the FY 2001 DOI Science Priorities. Mr. Spain and Mr. Belchik will update the May 5, 1999 letter to DOI requesting funds for stream gauge operations and maintenance and harvest monitoring and attach it to the memo. Keith Wilkinson added an amendment to distribute the memo to members for review and approval. Glen Spain added an amendment that the letter should be distributed to other relevant agencies. (BIA, Dept. of Commerce, relevant state agencies, etc.)  
 \*\*Second\*\* Keith Wilkinson seconded the motion.  
 \*\*Motion Carried\*\* unanimously.
- Agendum 14 \*\* Motion \*\* Glen Spain moved to change the allocation of project funding to 30% for category 1, 40% for category 2, and 30% for category 3.  
 \*\* Kent Bulfinch seconded.\*\*

\*\* Motion Carried \*\* unanimously. Mike Orcutt abstained. Keith Wilkinson was not present for the vote.

Agendum 14 \*\* Motion \*\* Glen Spain moved to designate \$10,000 of the Category 2 funds for TWG support.  
\*\* Mike Belchik seconded.\*\*  
\*\* Motion Carried \*\* unanimously.

Agendum 14 \*\* Motion \*\* Al Olson moved to designate \$125,000 in Category 2 for support of sub-basin planning and coordination with the balance of approximately \$96,000 for planning projects, to be conducted through the competitive process. A friendly amendment states that the \$125,000 that would have been divided five ways is now available for all sub-basin planning groups to apply for.  
\*\*Paul Kirk seconded.\*\*  
\*\* Motion Carried \*\* unanimously. Mike Orcutt, Ronnie Pierce and Mike Belchik abstained. Mike Orcutt said for the record he abstained because there was too much uncertainty.