



United States Department of the Interior



FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Klamath River Fishery Resource Office
P.O. Box 1006
Yreka, CA 96097-1006
(916) 842-5763

July 7, 1992

Dear Interested party,

Enclosed, please find a copy of summarized minutes of the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force meeting, held June 15-17, 1992, in Arcata, California. If you desire more detailed information or would like to have a full set of the minutes, including attachments, please contact this office at the above telephone number.

Sincerely,

Ronald A. Iverson
Project Leader

Enclosure

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE
JUNE 15-17, 1992
ARCATA, CALIFORNIA

June 15:

Task Force members present: Bingham, Lara, Farro, Franklin (for Orcutt), Orcutt, Hillman, Holder, McInnis, Rohde (for Hillman), Shake, Stokely (for Leffler), Sumner, Wilkinson

Absentees: Thackeray, Leffler, DeVol

Meeting called to order at 1:40 pm. Meeting agenda (Attachment 1) approved. Minutes of April, 1992 meeting approved and accepted.

Agenda item: Report on development of a prioritization scheme for project selection by the Technical Work Group (TWG). (Jack West).

Jack West provided a detailed summary of events that occurred at the TWG meeting. (Contact KRFR0 for a copy of the detailed TWG meeting minutes.) He also identified some unfinished TWG tasks, to be discussed at this meeting. These tasks were: 1) to provide information to proposers regarding why their proposals did not rank very high, 2) the Task Force should consider funding proposals listed by absolute rank rather than by category (as in the past), 3) the TWG needs to develop work activities for each list of objectives for each subbasin, to be incorporated into a more specific Fiscal Year 1994 Request For Proposals (RFP), 4) all TWG members should be compensated financially for their participation.

Agenda item: Report on budget committee FY1993 workplan budgeting process (Nat Bingham).

Nat Bingham described what occurred at the budget subcommittee meeting to discuss the FY1993 work plan. The subcommittee agreed to recommend the Task Force approve for funding, the list of projects organized by absolute rank (and including target employment preference points). (See attachment 2)

A discussion ensued regarding how preference points are added, resulting in the following action:

*** Action ***

Agenda item for November (or February) meeting -- have a Task Force discussion of adding preference points to proposals employing target groups.

Agenda item: Task Force discussion of FY1993 Work Plan.

Yurok representative, Walt Lara, pointed out that many proposals for funding in the FY1993 work plan had been developed by the USFWS offices in Yreka and Arcata. He recommended that both USFWS field offices consolidate their funding requests into one large proposal.

Discussion was deferred to a later time at this meeting.

Agenda item: Adequacy of budget expenditures, by category.

The recommendation from the budget subcommittee was to consider the list of proposals organized by absolute rank, with preference points added. The remainder of the Task Force discussion during the meeting was on this list. (Other alternatives were consider funding proposals listed by restoration category, or listed by subbasin.)

Agenda item: Application of action plan to proposal selection.

The action planning subcommittee had not met since the Task Force meeting held in Yreka. However, the subbasin action planning work accomplished by the TWG was reflected in the "absolute rank" list of proposals.

Agenda item: Public Comment on FY1993 RFP and Proposal Selection Process.

Peter Brucker: Tricia Whitehouse's assistance was valuable in developing the workshops held last year.

Agenda item: Task Force Discussion of FY1993 Work Plan (continued):

The Task Force discussed some of the recommendations made by the TWG. One issue brought up was whether TWG members could be financially compensated for their participation in this group.

***** Action item *****

KRFRO staff to research the issue of compensating TWG members financially for their participation in TWG meetings. Report to be on the next meeting agenda of the Task Force.

The Task Force also discussed unfinished assignments given to the TWG in past meetings. Particularly, the TWG had been asked to develop a carrying capacity estimate for the basin, and to develop a set of timber harvest guidelines to be used when reviewing timber harvest plans within the basin.

***** Motion *****

(Reynolds): I move that we request the TWG to formulate a draft set of preferred management techniques, guidelines, criteria, for timber harvest activities. The Task Force can review these recommended guidelines, and possibly come to agreement or modify them so that when we comment on harvest plans, and be consistent.

Motion carried.

(West): The TWG is to "write down what we feel is necessary to protect streams". My personal recommendation is for the Task Force to comment on rules packages as they do on release strategies at Iron Gate Dam. This body provides input on rules, I agree with the idea to have a report by CDF on the recommended rules. I would suggest having TWG people there to have dialogue.

(Shake): OK, the assignment to the TWG is that we're expecting a discussion by the TWG, with a report, by next Task Force meeting, with guideline recommendations. I suggest that you start with our plan policies.

*** Action item ***

TWG will develop functional timber harvest guidelines that will provide adequate protection for streams. To be placed on next Task Force meeting agenda.

The Task Force concluded that basin carrying capacity was variable, and highly dependent on changing environmental conditions. The request to formulate this carrying capacity estimate came from the Klamath Fishery Management Council (KFMC). More clarification is needed from the KFMC before this can be accomplished. This would be a good discussion item at the meeting of the three chairs.

*** Action item ***

KRFRO to research this issue and provide briefing information for discussion at meeting of the chairs.

Public Comment:

Bob Dean (representing a local landowner): Regarding the motion, the TWG should know what the current rules are, and what proposed changes are. I suggest input from private industry.

Jim Hundly (Orleans Rod and Gun Club): A comment on this year's proposal by the Orleans Rod and Gun Club -- there was discussion by the TWG regarding our group not wanting to mark fish raised in our program. We've wanted to mark our fish for two years, but have not received any approval from the state to do so. We are willing to mark fish in the future.

Meeting adjourned for the day.

June 16

Agenda item: FY1993 Work Plan development.

Walt Lara again brought up the issue of the USFWS developing funding proposals

in addition to the program administration funding requirement. He suggested that some of the USFWS proposals be reviewed by the Task Force, and if found acceptable, be put out for bid.

Discussion ensued regarding the function of the public information specialist position at KRFRO.

*** Motion ***

(Lara): I move that projects submitted by the USFWS should be put out for bid, (after being discussed by the Task Force). Specifically projects FP-04, 06, E-10, 11, 12, 13, and 14.

*** Motion failed. ***

*** Motion ***

(Wilkinson): I move to accept the recommendation from the budget subcommittee on the order of rank on the absolute list (Attachment 2).

Motion seconded.

(Bingham): I would ask the author of the motion to include the purchase of the sound system.

(Wilkinson): I'm not willing to do that. I would recommend we deal with these issues separately.

Ronnie Pierce pointed out that some of the specific language of the Klamath Act was not being implemented if this FY1993 work plan were approved, as recommended.

(Wilkinson): My motion is open ended. It is to fund projects in descending order until all federal and state money is expended. I'll restate the motion -- I move to approve the findings of the TWG and budget subcommittee on the ranking for funding, and order that funding to occur by the ranking presented.

*** Motion failed. ***

A discussion ensued regarding establishing policy and direction to ensure the restoration program followed the specific wording of the Act.

*** Motion ***

(Lara): Unless we take care of the underlying policy issues regarding the intention of the Act, I move to adjourn the meeting.

*** Motion failed. ***

Leaf Hillman brought up three issues for Task Force discussion. The issues were: 1) continuity of the public education program, and how well it follows

the education plan, 2) KRFRRO annual budget requests (How are they generated? Are costs justified?), and 3)

Wilkinson suggested that KRFRRO staff incorporate a regular report from the education committee/coordinator into future meeting agendas.

*** Motion ***

(Reynolds): I move that those specifically identified proposals for education, be deferred until a review by the education committee, to be submitted again to this Task Force for consideration.

Motion seconded.

*** Motion failed. ***

[Budget and education committees met separately over lunch to discuss these issues.]

The education committee expressed their concern regarding the education component, including the annual costs of \$40,000 for the public information specialist position and \$69,000 for curriculum development. Curriculum development has not come up as a budget request each year, but the \$40,000 component has come up as a budget item. The committee suggested that this be discussed at the meeting of the chairs. The issue is that there should be equity of funding commitment for all components.

The budget committee recommended approving for funding, the list of absolute ranked proposals as originally presented. Administrative costs reflected in PA-1 and PC-9 would be subject to budget committee review. The committee will meet with KRFRRO staff and Jerry Grover to assess the budget situation.

Public comment on the Fiscal Year 1993 Work Plan:

Peter Brucker: Two projects submitted by the Salmon River Fisheries Restoration Council dovetailed with each other, and with Art Frazier's proposal for the Hammel Creek rearing pond project. How will it work if Frazier's proposal is funded, and the others are not, when they depend on one another?

(West): I proposed that we would recommend to CDFG that spring chinook would be captured in-river, transported to that facility, spawned, and the progeny would be released at a later time. We haven't come up with a capture proposal yet.

Mary Rigosa: I teach elementary aged children in Pecwan. We have 45 to 55 kids, from the Weitchpec community, and upstream we have the Orleans school. Earlier this spring, we had teachers get together to develop a proposal. Right now we don't have much material available regarding local custom and cultural use of the fishery. We've been looking at getting supplies for this work. The printer was discussed at the TWG and thought to be too expensive. We've looked at a less expensive printer. If you don't support the use of

this equipment, we can negotiate to get supplies for the upper grade program.

Unidentified (Weitchpec teacher) I teach upper grade levels, emphasizing stream ecosystems. The three schools together have put this proposal together to get the kids more involved with this restoration program. (Speaking specifically about Project E-9.)

(Diane Higgins): I attended the TWG discussions, and one of the debates was over the proposed purchase of a printer. I have worked with them to negotiate costs, and suggest that you consider this proposal separately. The other proposal I would like to talk about came from the Gazelle elementary school (E-08). This proposal includes equipment purchase because they want to do water quality analyses. They are willing to renegotiate down to about \$250 for continuation of their habitat typing project.

(Iverson): Seems to be a great deal of bitterness on the education proposals, and I offer a possible way out. If I understand everybody, the issue regarding the five proposals by KRFRO is not a question of their technical merit, it is just whether KRFRO should fund those. Now that they've been ranked high by the TWG, the budget subcommittee, and the education subcommittee, we'll ensure that these projects are accomplished with our proposed budget. If that helps, I offer it to you all.

(Rohde): I appreciate the offer that Ron has made, and am sure that the budget subcommittee will address it. The root of the issue here is to evaluate the role of the KRFRO, they may never have had to submit these individual proposals in the first place.

End of public comment.

*** Motion ***

(Lara): I move to approve the projects as ranked, with the exception that the budget subcommittee will look at PA-01, PC-09 and then report back to the Task Force on that.

Motion seconded.

(Lara): The motion is to exclude the education proposals which will be reviewed by the budget subcommittee as a cost in the KRFRO budget.

*** Motion carried (one abstention). ***

*** Motion ***

(Bingham): I move that the Hoopa Tribe's Pine Creek downstream migrant project be funded with 1993 dollars. (To fund it out of FY1992 funds, if available.)

*** Motion carried. ***

*** Motion ***

(Stokely): I move that proposers with multiple year projects be required to submit proposals each year for review by the TWG and Task Force.

*** Motion carried. ***

Agenda Item: Report on status of work plans for FY1990-FY1992 (Alcorn):

Alcorn handed out a short summary of each project funded in the FY1991 and FY1992 work plans. Alcorn also pointed out that KRFRO has identified a surplus of \$32,000 from the FY1992 budget, which will be available for expenditure. A potential surplus of an additional \$43,000 exists because of possible cooperative agreement defaults. The potential surplus for FY1992 funds totals \$75,000.

(Farro): I take it that the first commitment for spending these FY1992 funds would be \$24,128 for the Hoopa Tribe's Pine Creek project?

(Shake): I also suggest that we identify specs for the sound system, and acquire it with remaining FY92 funds. If any funds surplus remains, this would be applied to the FY93 workplan, beginning at the top of the list.

*** Motion. ***

Motion to obligate \$24,128 of FY1992 funds to fund the remainder of the Pine Creek outmigrant monitoring project by the Hoopa Valley Tribe; to purchase a sound amplification/recording system for advisory committee meetings; to apply remainder of surplus FY1992 funds to the FY1993 work plan.

*** Motion carried. ***

*** Motion ***

(Bingham): I move that we buy the PC-06, \$8,500 system.

*** Motion carried (three abstentions). ***

Agenda item: Status of the non-federal workplan (Reynolds):

(Reynolds reported that the State would have complete information after the close of their fiscal year at end of June. He will mail the report on these projects to KRFRO and to all Task Force members.

*** Action item ***

Forrest Reynolds to compile information on 1991-1992 CDFG Klamath basin restoration projects and send to KRFRO and to all Task Force members.

Agenda item: Report on status of upper basin amendment (Alcorn):

Alcorn identified milestone dates for completing the plan amendment publication process. These dates are as follows:

- Aug 11 Complete editorial work, send copies to Task Force members for comment.
- Sep 11 Review period (for Task Force and TWG members only) ends.
- Sep 25 Publish Federal Register Notice of availability.
- Oct 23 Print and mail amendments to all parties possessing a copy of the long range plan.

Agenda item: Fish restoration activities proposed for Fiscal Year 1993:

U.S. Department of Agriculture:

Jack West explained that the USFS would receive substantial FY1993 funding to implement the Salmon River recovery program. He indicated that the USFS is approaching resource and fish habitat management more holistically, trying to reduce impacts on fish habitat by preventing excessive erosion. Three new staff biologist/resource manager positions have been approved, and will be filled in the upcoming year. The USFS is also going to develop a conservation strategy for summer steelhead in FY1993. This will be similar to the spring chinook recovery strategy developed last year.

Karuk Tribe of California:

Bob Rohde reported that the Karuk Tribe is going to continue working cooperatively with CDFG in fish rearing projects on Karuk ancestral territory. The Fisheries Department is surveying past fishery restoration projects located in their ancestral territory and evaluating their effectiveness. Historic water quality and flow conditions are being researched, as well as monitoring of present conditions, to correlate with other fish habitat, population, and clean water assessments to help target the potential causes of salmon and steelhead declines. Most importantly, the Karuk Tribe is attempting to ensure that Klamath River flow releases at Iron Gate Dam are adequate for fish needs.

Yurok Tribe:

Walt Lara reported that Yurok Tribe's Natural Resource Committee is still in the developmental stages. He will report on the developments as they occur.

State of California:

Forrest Reynolds reported that the State has some money to spend on Klamath River fishery projects. Cooperative agreements to implement the 1992 workplan are now being completed.

Shasta Valley Coordinated Resource Management Plan (CRMP):

Dick Sumner described and presented a Memorandum of Agreement drafted by the Shasta Valley CRMP, which commits the USFWS and the Task Force to communicate and possibly coordinate some efforts. Dick asked the Task Force to sign the agreement.

(Discussion ensued regarding what agencies should be signatory, and who becomes a cooperator.)

(Sumner): It is an effort to get information sharing going. This is one way to accomplish this, signatories don't have to formally participate. This is a local organization, planning to have local meetings trying to get more participation from locals. We feel if we get more participation by the signatories, it will make it better.

*** Motion ***

(Reynolds): I move that the Task Force approve this, and sign it after the signature page is complete.

*** Motion carried. ***

Report of 1993 fishery restoration activities, Trinity County:

Tom Stokely reported that Trinity County is actively involved in the Trinity River Restoration Program. The county was instrumental in developing the temperature objectives that were amended into the State Water Resources Control Board's Trinity Basin Water Quality Plan. The County has also been actively involved in other restoration activities, such as developing timber harvest plans for the Grass Valley Creek watershed, and the ongoing instream flow study.

(Discussion ensued regarding flows and temperatures in the mainstem Klamath River, and that something must be done by the Task Force.)

A working group composed of Bob Rohde, Dick Sumner, Bill Chesney (CDFG biologist), Leaf Hillman, and Doug Alcorn was asked to draft a letter to Secretary of Interior requesting increased flows in the Klamath River at Iron Gate Dam.

Agenda item: Report from action planning committee (Bingham):

Bingham reported that the committee has not met since the April Task Force meeting. The committee felt that it would be better to meet after this Task Force meeting. They hope to have an exchange of ideas at the next TWG meeting. Nat suggested a concurrent meeting with the TWG and the action planning committee. (Agreed to by TWG chairman Jack West.)

June 17

Discussion item: Draft letter to Secretary of Interior.

The Task Force agreed to send the letter drafted by the working group.

*** Action ***

Letter will be prepared by USFWS and sent, with copies to appropriate individuals and organizations.

Agenda item: Presentation of long range plan amendment process (Wilkinson):

*** Motion ***

(Wilkinson): I move to adopt the amendment process as described and recommended by me in our last meeting. The process would open the plan up for comment every five years, beginning in 1995.

*** Motion failed. ***

*** Motion ***

(Bingham): I move to add this to the next meeting's agenda. We will ask those opposing this process to study and make recommendations.

*** Motion carried (one abstention). ***

*** Action ***

Place the amendment process on the fall meeting agenda. Members opposing the proposed process will review and make recommendations.

Agenda item: Update on Iron Gate and Trinity River spring hatchery releases and long-term operation policy changes (Reynolds).

Reynolds reported that the Department reviewed the performance of the fish produced at Iron Gate Hatchery, and reviewed hatchery operations. After review, the recommended operation strategy is almost a duplication of the original set of goals and constraints developed earlier. Iron Gate fish are to be 90/lb, or larger, before release.

Bingham brought up for discussion, the issue of marking all hatchery reared fish. He brought this up in response to a request from the California Salmon, Steelhead, Trout Restoration Federation. (No action was called for on this issue.)

*** Action ***

CDFG to send an updated Iron Gate and Trinity River hatchery review report to Task Force members. Will also provide the copies of the current natural stocks report.

Wilkinson mentioned that ODFW sent a letter to CDFG requesting a coordination

meeting between both agencies, regarding the issue of Iron Gate and Trinity River Hatchery management.

Public comment:

Jim Walters (charter boat operator): I'm impressed with what Forrest Reynolds has brought to the table. We don't have access to mixed stocks in the ocean. Some years over 70% of fish harvested come from the Sacramento system, which is dominated by hatchery fish. I'm glad to hear you say the Klamath hatchery program has potential to provide fish for the fisheries.

End of public comment.

*** Motion ***

(Farro): I move that we compose a committee to address the topic of hatchery operations, compiled of members of agencies, the scientific community, and this Task Force. (I'm not responding to the letter, but would ask the Task Force chair to respond.) My motion is based on the clear recognition by the TWG that this is something that needs to be considered to come up with a strategy to define problems and solutions. It is not responding to the letter from ODFW.

*** Motion carried. ***

Agenda item: Final report on FY1990/91 Karuk subsistence monitoring project (Hillman).

Postponed until next meeting.

Agenda item: report from North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board on establishing temperature objectives for the Klamath, Trinity, Scott and Shasta Rivers (Theresa Wistrom).

Theresa Wistrom provided a detailed account of temperature objectives established for the Trinity River system. She also stated that temperature objectives are developed with extensive input from fisheries experts, and this kind of input will be needed for developing objectives for the Klamath River. If general temperature objectives are not protecting the Klamath River fish, the Water Quality Control Board needs to hear about it so they can do something about it. The Task Force can provide useful and powerful input. If Task Force decides that they want to pursue a basin-wide water quality plan amendment, they must develop a formal request. Specific and achievable objectives must be recommended.

*** Motion ***

(Rohde): I move that we request the Regional Water Quality Control Board to amend their basin plan to include temperature objectives, and would ask staff to prepare a letter.

(Wistrom): The request is to address temperature objectives in the mainstem Klamath, Shasta, and Scott Rivers. I stress that you must specify what you want, and give recommendations for how it can be achieved. An Interstate Task Force might be one suggestion.

*** Motion carried. ***

*** Action ***

Bob Rohde, Dick Sumner, appointees from CDFG, NMFS, and USFWS, will compile water quality data and develop fish protection standards for the mainstem Klamath, Shasta, and Scott Rivers. Report to be reviewed at next Task Force meeting, then sent to State Water Quality Control Board with a request to amend the basin water quality plan.

Agenda item: Report of changes to suction dredge mining regulations in the Klamath Basin (John Hayes).

John Hayes reported that the Region is recommending changes to the suction dredge mining regulations for the 1993 season. Region 1 recommends to the Department that the start day of the Klamath basin dredge season be moved up to July 1, from approximately June 1. If an area has steelhead and fall chinook present, the proposed general season is July 1 to September 30. If spring chinook are present, the season would only extend to September 15. The recommendation is also to limit dredge intake size to a maximum of 4" on small tributaries, 6" on medium sized tributaries, and 8" on the Klamath and Trinity River mainstems. Recommendations will go to Sacramento after July 1. The Department will hold public hearings on those proposed changes, and if found acceptable, regulations will go into effect January 1, 1993.

*** Motion ***

(Farro): I move that we send a letter supporting the proposed changes to CDFG.

Public comment on this report, and motion:

(Brian Hill): I've been dredging for more than 20 years now. Regulations have become more restrictive each year. I suggest that the industry can actually help the stream. We submitted a 1993 proposal to demonstrate this, but it ranked low. I would like to get the biological and mining people together to show how the industry can improve fish habitat. If this doesn't occur, the mining industry will be put out of business, and the restoration program could lose this potential habitat restoration opportunity.

*** Motion failed. ***

Bob Rohde requested more time to review the proposed changes.

(Shake): There appears to be agreement that when we receive a copy of the proposed mining regulations change, we will distribute copies to Task Force members for future action. As soon as we get those proposed changes, KRFRO

staff can send them out to Task Force members. We will send comments to KRFRO, and staff will compile them and draft a letter for our review. If there is consensus we'll send the letter to the Department.

*** Action item ***

KRFRO staff to mail proposed changes to dredge mining regulations to Task Force members for comment. KRFRO will compile comments, draft a letter to CDFG for review by the Task Force. If there is consensus to send the letter, KRFRO will send with chair's signature.

Bruce Halstead (Project Leader, CCFRO) reported on the downstream migrant trapping work by the USFWS, Arcata Office. They caught the first coded wire tagged (CWT) chinook Friday, June 12. They've trapped 48 fish with CWTs. The fish do not appear to be stressed. They're not catching many CWTagged fish but they are beginning to show up in our traps.

Agenda item: Task Force discussion of agenda for meeting of advisory committee chairs.

Shake announced that the meeting would be to discuss general issues affecting all three advisory committees. The meeting is in Sacramento at the Federal building, on June 26, from 10:30 am to 2:00 pm. Any Task Force members wishing to attend are welcome. A report of the meeting will be provided.

Agenda item: New business and discussion of next meeting.

Mike Orcutt opened a discussion of the FY1992 Hoopa Valley Tribal Fisheries Department's green sturgeon tagging project. He stated that there were unanticipated problems associated with working on the Yurok Reservation and gaining access to captured adult sturgeon. He proposed that, with \$10,000 additional funding, they could hire fishermen to target this species, with consistent handling and release strategies.

*** Motion ***

(Bingham): I move that this request for additional funding be given to the TWG for timely review, by mail, resulting in a report back to KRFRO. KRFRO will send this report out to Task Force members for review. If comments are not received back within 3 weeks of the mailing date, it will constitute approval for the project. One objection will prevent the increase.

*** Motion carried (one abstention). ***

(Jud Ellinwood): In establishing a precedent, I suggest you adopt a formal procedure so all proposers can know what to expect in the future.

Agenda item: Agenda items and dates for next Task Force meeting.

(Shake): We will meet November 4-5, 1992, in Yreka. We will request that Fruit Growers Company prepare a presentation for that meeting.

*** Action ***

At each Task Force meeting, the final agenda item will be discussion and development of the agenda for the succeeding meeting. Each meeting shall be equipped with a speaker's podium. KRFRO will provide at least 20 copies of each discussion item handout, for audience use.

[The Task Force agreed to meet February 3-4, 1993, in Brookings, Oregon.]

Public comment:

Jud Ellinwood: I'd like to ask the Task Force to consider as an agenda item for your next meeting, a discussion on marking hatchery fish, with support in mind.

(West): To review the TWG assignments, we are to: 1) answer the timber harvest plan question of what we think is necessary to protect streams, 2) review the green sturgeon proposal for cost effectiveness, 3) meet with the planning committee to finalize the action plan, to include development of a target audience for the FY1994 RFP. KRFRO is to prepare a catalogue of potential sources of funding, which might accompany the RFP. Funding information should be provided to KRFRO from all members.

Meeting adjourned.

REVISED FINAL AGENDA
FOR THE
KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE
MEETING, JUNE 15-17, 1992
ARCATA, CALIFORNIA

(6/03/92)

June 15 --- The Quality Inn, conference room behind the restaurant, 3535
Janes Road, Arcata, CA.

1:00 to 2:30 pm Call to Order. Correction and approval of minutes and agenda.

Report on development of a prioritization scheme for project selection by the TWG (West).

- o Review of TWG assignments.
- o Identification of subbasin/planning areas.
- o Description of subbasin critical objectives.
- o Description of basinwide aggregated objectives.
- o Identification of key players for each subbasin.

Report on TWG FY1993 proposal ranking process (West).

- o Review of proposal ranking criteria and process.
- o Discussion of outstanding assignments and TWG recommended options.
- o Suggestions for improvement.
- o Description of results of the meeting.

2:30 Break

2:45 to 4:30 pm Report on budget committee FY1993 workplan budgeting process (Bingham).

- o Description of results.
- o Rationale for recommended funding allocation.
- o Recommendations to Task Force for development of the FY1993 workplan.
- o Suggestions for improving the process.

Task Force discussion of FY1993 Federal workplan.

- o Adequacy of budget expenditures, by category.
- o Application of action plan to proposal selection.

4:30 pm Public comment on FY1993 RFP and proposal selection process.

5:00 pm Adjourn for the day

June 16

8:00 to 10:00 am FY1993 Workplan development -- Task Force discussion continued.

10:00 am Break

10:15 to 12:00 n FY1993 Workplan development -- Task Force discussion continued.

12:00 n Lunch

1:00 pm Task Force recommendations on final FY1993 workplan.

- o Assignments to staff, members, committees.

2:00 pm Public comment on the Fiscal Year 1993 Workplan.

2:30 pm Break

2:45 to 5:00 pm Report on status of work plans for Fiscal Years 1990-92.

- o Non-Federal work plan (Reynolds).
- o Federal work plan (Alcorn).

Report on status of upper basin amendment (Alcorn).

Fish restoration activities proposed for Fiscal Year 1993

- o Department of Agriculture
- o Karuk Tribe
- o Yurok Tribe
- o Sate of California
- o Other Task Force members

Report from planning committee (Bingham).

5:00 pm Adjourn for the day.

KLAMATH FISH RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROJECT PROPOSALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993
(BY ABSOLUTE RANK, WITH BUDGET EMPLOYMENT POINTS ADDED)

PROJECT NUMBER	COOPERATOR	SUBBASIN/PLAN AREA	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	COMMENT	RANK
PC-02	USFWS-Klamath River PRO	Basinwide	Technical/operational support for watershed-based restoration planning.	16000	Additional funding to support watershed-based planning.	78
HR-38	USFS-Klamath NF, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	Native seed collection - Salmon River Drainage.	4544	To collect native riparian vegetation seeds for germination and growth to seedlings.	77
HR-25	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Member riparian fence construction.	19021	3,600 feet of high tensile wire cattle exclusion fence along Shasta River.	77
E-10	USFWS-Klamath River PRO	Shasta River	Salmon Education Community Workshops.	1500	To inform the public about the values of anadromous fish and gain support for the restoration program.	77
HR-13	Siskiyou RCD	Scott River	Scott River streambank protection - island area.	107985	Comprehensive riparian restoration.	76
HR-12	Siskiyou RCD	Scott River	Scott River streambank protection - Mason Ranch.	18280	To riprap bank and install riparian fencing along Scott River.	76
FR-08	NCIDC	Lower Klamath River	Yurok reservation late run fall chinook accelerated stocking program.	156810	To trap and spawn sufficient late fall run chinook to provide enough green eggs to produce 25,000 fingerling and 75,000 yearling chinook. To rear juveniles in lower Klamath River tributaries to target size before release.	76
E-15	USFWS Klamath River PRO	Salmon River	Salmon River salmon festival.	4000	An educational festival accompanied with recreational activities to inform the public about the value of anadromous fish and gain local support for the restoration program.	76
FR-09	NCIDC	Basinwide	Mid-Klamath chinook restoration/acceleration	200767	To rear 120,000 yearling chinook in various tributaries.	75
FP-05	USFWS Coastal California PRO	Mainstem Klamath River	Monitoring of Klamath River yearling juvenile salmonid emigration.	9000	To collect and analyze data regarding abundance, outmigration timing, and use of natural rearing areas of juvenile hatchery and natural salmonids.	75
FP-13	Nakamoto/Kisanuki	Mainstem Klamath River	Age and growth of Klamath River green sturgeon.	8340	To document age structure and provide descriptive growth data related to past life history.	75
E-01	Kidder Creek Outdoor School	Scott River	Kidder Creek restoration and education.	2900	To develop and implement a restoration project on Kidder Creek.	74
HR-20	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Easton riparian vegetation planting.	1650	To plant 1,300 feet of Shasta River bank with willow slips.	74

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROJECT PROPOSALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993
(BY ABSOLUTE RANK, WITH TARGET EMPLOYMENT POINTS ADDED)

PROJECT NUMBER	COOPERATOR	SUBBASIN/PLAN AREA	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	COMMENT	RANK
FR-03	Orleans Rod and Gun Club	Lower Klamath River	Orleans community anadromous fish rearing.	12476	To rear rescued steelhead and/or hatchery salmon for placement into Klamath River tributaries.	73
FP-07	USFWS Coastal California PRO	Mainstem Klamath River	Mainstem Klamath River fall chinook spawning escapement.	15228	Identify and quantify spawning habitat in the mainstem Klamath River, estimate number of fall chinook spawners in same.	73
HR-27	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Terry riparian fence construction.	3338	950 feet of electric wire cattle exclusion fence along Shasta River.	72
FP-10	USFWS-Coastal California PRO	Lower Klamath River	Status of salmon and steelhead stocks, Blue Creek	39942	Continuation of Blue Creek habitat and fish population investigations.	72
PR-05	Robert Will	Salmon River	Little North Fork Pond chinook rearing	16774	To rear 35,000 chinook fingerlings to yearling size before release.	72
HR-35	USPS-Klamath NF, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	Big Flat slide stabilization.	23960	To reduce erosion rate and sediment supply to Salmon River.	72
HR-30	Calif. Cons. Corps-Del Norte Center	Lower Klamath River	West Fork Blue Creek habitat restoration.	22840	To enhance fish habitat at 15 sites.	72
HR-29	Calif. Cons. Corps-Del Norte Center	Lower Klamath River	Hunter Creek habitat restoration	43898	To enhance fish habitat at 36 sites.	72
HR-13	USPS-Klamath NF, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	Watershed inventory of Crapo Creek.	16150	WIN Inventory.	71
HR-01	USPS-Klamath NF, Happy Camp Dist	Middle Klamath River	Indian Creek Winter Habitat Restoration #2	7690	To provide complex winter, spring, summer rearing habitat for juvenile salmon and steelhead.	71
HR-03	USPS-Klamath NF, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	Salmon River large wood cover structures.	19400	To enhance summer rearing and overwintering habitat for juvenile salmonids while preserving existing riparian condition.	70
E-08	Gazelle Elementary School	Shasta River	Classroom/field fisheries studies.	880	To purchase field and laboratory equipment to enhance biological studies in Gazelle Elementary School.	69
HR-14	USPS-Six Rivers NF, Orleans Dist	Lower Klamath River	Red Cap Creek instream habitat enhancement.	15255	To improve steelhead habitat.	68
E-09	Klamath/Trinity Unified School Dist	Lower Klamath River	Klamath River monitoring and education project.	5288	To purchase laboratory and field equipment for three elementary schools in Orleans-Weitchpec area.	68
E-04	USPS-Klamath NF, Salmon River Dist	Basinwide	Klamath N.F. Education Coordinator	12737	Temporary position to coordinate education program focusing on fishery resources and	68

KLAMATH FISH RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROJECT PROPOSALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993
(BY ABSOLUTE RANK, WITH TARGET EMPLOYMENT POINTS ADDED)

PROJECT NUMBER	COOPERATOR	SUBBASIN/PLAN AREA	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	COMMENT	RANK
PA-01	USFWS Klamath River PRO	Basinwide	Administer contracts and cooperative agreements to implement restoration program	149500	Operate Klamath River Fishery Resource Office.	
PC-09	USFWS Klamath River PRO	Basinwide	Logistical support for advisory committees, coord. of restoration activities.	272300	Includes personnel and travel costs for staff, and travel costs for nonagency advisory committee members, and logistical costs for advisory committee meetings.	
HR-06	Siskiyou County Office of Education	Shasta River	Propagation of native seedlings in riparian zone of Shasta River.	6059	To establish an ongoing nursery to grow 13,000 seedlings, annually.	91
PP-04	USFWS CA/NV Fish Health Center	Mainstem Klamath River	Health and physiology monitoring of hatchery and natural outmigrating chinook.	14000	Disease monitoring and impacts on hatchery and wild chinook.	90
PC-05	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Shasta River CRMP Field Projects Coordinator.	26095	Field coordinator for Shasta Valley habitat restoration projects.	90
HR-24	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Flock riparian fence construction.	13980	2,640 feet of 5-strand barbed wire cattle exclusion fence along Shasta River.	88
HR-26	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Peters riparian fence construction.	31046	6,000 feet of barbed wire, 2,400 feet of electric cattle exclusion fence along Shasta River.	87
PC-01	Siskiyou RCD	Scott River	Scott Valley Coordinated Resource Management Plan.	24134	To sponsor development and operations of the Siskiyou CRMP.	87
PP-06	USFWS Coastal California PRO	Basinwide	Age composition/scale analysis of Klamath River fall chinook run - 1992.	7350	To provide the KRTAT with age composition estimate of Klamath fall chinook (natural and hatchery combined).	86
HR-23	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Egan riparian fence construction.	14155	2,640 feet of 5-strand barbed wire cattle exclusion fence along Shasta River.	85
HR-33	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Parker riparian fence construction.	41456	7,900 feet of 5-strand barbed wire cattle exclusion fencing.	84
HR-21	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Nicoletti riparian area planting.	2649	To plant 3,960 feet of Shasta River bank with willow slips.	84
FR-02	Art Frazier	Salmon River	Hammel Creek chinook hatching/rearing	7709	To rear 35,000 fingerling chinook before transfer to another rearing project on Little North Fork Salmon River.	84
HP-15	Karuk Tribe of California	Mainstem Klamath River	Water temperature monitoring of the Klamath River Mainstem.	36740	To determine if streamflows from Lost River and Iron Gate Dam affect temperatures in Klamath River.	84

**KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROJECT PROPOSALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993
(BY ABSOLUTE RANK, WITH TARGET EMPLOYMENT POINTS ADDED)**

PROJECT NUMBER	COOPERATOR	SUBBASIN/PLAN AREA	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	COMMENT	RANK
E-13	USFWS Klamath River PRO	Basinwide	Salmon Education Community Workshops.	1000	To inform the public about the values of anadromous fish and gain support for the restoration program.	84
PC-03	Salmon River Concerned Citizens	Salmon River	Develop and implement Salmon River Community Restoration Program.	9828	Education, program planning, habitat restoration included.	84
PP-03	PSMFC	Basinwide	Temporary help for Yreka fisheries habitat improvement shop.	31118	Increased construction and maintenance of diversion ditch screens in Shasta, Scott, and upper Klamath tributaries.	83
E-11	USFWS Klamath River PRO	Scott River	Salmon Education Community Workshops.	2000	To inform the public about the values of anadromous fish and gain support for the restoration program.	83
E-12	USFWS Klamath River PRO	Middle Klamath River	Salmon Education Community Workshops.	2000	To inform the public about the values of anadromous fish and gain support for the restoration program.	82
E-08	Fisheries Focus - Paula Yoon	Basinwide	Portable information display for upper Klamath watershed.	8500	To develop informational display on upper Klamath River watershed fishery restoration and land management issues.	81
E-02	USFS-Six Rivers NP, Orleans Dist	Lower Klamath River	Public fisheries education through nonconsumptive enjoyment.	2750	Provide education experiences which enhance understanding, stewardship and nonconsumptive use of our local fish resources.	81
E-14	USFWS Klamath River PRO	Lower Klamath River	Salmon education community workshops.	1500	To inform the public about the values of anadromous fish and gain support for the restoration program.	81
HR-02	USFS-Klamath NP, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	Whistlebear side channel.	6600	To enhance summer rearing and overwintering habitat for juvenile salmonids by enhancing a recovering side channel.	81
HR-34	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Volunteer support package.	5911	To buy tools and materials to facilitate volunteer restoration projects.	80
E-03	CA Salmon Stlhd Trt Rest Federation	Basinwide	Annual restoration conference.	3000	To sponsor Restoration Federation annual conference. Focus on fishery restoration work.	79
HR-19	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Brooks riparian vegetation planting.	532	To plant 800 feet of Shasta River bank with willow slips.	78
HP-02	USFS-Klamath NP, Happy Camp Dist	Middle Klamath River	Coarse Woody Debris Survey of Mid-Klamath tributaries.	4800	Survey of woody debris in W. Fk. Clear, upper Clear, Rainy Valley, upper Elk, upper Dillon Creeks.	78

KLAMATH FISH RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROJECT PROPOSALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993
(BY ABSOLUTE RANK, WITH BUDGET EMPLOYMENT POINTS ADDED)

PROJECT NUMBER	COOPERATOR	SUBBASIN/PLAN AREA	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	COMMENT	RANK
					watershed management.	
HR-36	USFS-Klamath NF, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	Black Bear mine tailing reclamation.	7040	To abate water quality problems associated with abandoned mines.	65
FR-01	Paul and Joanne Luckey	Middle Klamath River	Eagle Ranch steelhead trout rescue rearing facility.	19676	To rescue juvenile steelhead from Bogus Creek, Cold Creek, and others, and rear fish to smolt.	64
HR-42	Trout Unlimited-Klamath Chapter	Middle Klamath River	Selad Creek juvenile rearing structures.	34500	To construct instream structures to enhance juvenile rearing habitat.	64
HR-28	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Truttman riparian fence construction.	14025	2,300 feet of 6-wire high tensile cattle exclusion fence along Shasta River.	63
HR-04	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Ekstrom Riparian Fencing.	9180	1,320 feet of 5-strand barbed wire cattle exclusion fencing.	63
HP-12	USFS-Klamath NF, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	Watershed inventory of South Russian Creek.	7425	WIN Inventory.	63
HR-32	USFS-Klamath NF, Happy Camp Dist	Middle Klamath River	Eagle 6 landslide stabilization.	105000	To prevent further sediment delivery into Indian Creek.	63
HP-03	Scott Valley Irrigation District	Scott River	Feasibility study to evaluate conversion of SVID's ditch to a well system.	13650	To study feasibility of project to ultimately provide instream flows for migrating fish.	63
HR-15	USFS-Six Rivers NF, Orleans Dist	Lower Klamath River	Camp Creek instream habitat enhancement	13563	To improve steelhead habitat.	63
HR-11	Siskiyou RCD	Scott River	Scott River riparian fencing, revegetation and alternate livestock watering.	20856	To install cattle exclusion systems, with associated management plans for riparian restoration.	62
HP-08	Clearwater BioStudies, Inc.	Scott River	Water Diversion Catalog of streams in the Scott River Basin.	47348	To conduct a survey and develop a catalog of unscreened diversion sites in the Scott River Basin.	62
EP-01	USFS-Six Rivers NF, Orleans Dist	Lower Klamath River	Red Cap Creek downstream-migrant trapping.	9538	To evaluate salmonid juvenile production and outmigration timing.	62
HR-16	USFS-Six Rivers NF, Orleans Dist	Lower Klamath River	Bluff Creek instream habitat enhancement.	13660	To improve instream habitat for steelhead.	61
HR-09	Deborah Callagan Construction	Lower Klamath River	Lower Red Cap Creek instream habitat enhancement (Project II).	49000	To improve chinook and steelhead habitat.	59
HR-08	Deborah Callagan Construction	Lower Klamath River	Lower Red Cap Creek habitat enhancement (Project I)	69788	To improve steelhead and chinook habitat.	58

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROJECT PROPOSALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993
(BY ABSOLUTE RANK, WITH TARGET EMPLOYMENT POINTS ADDED)

PROJECT NUMBER	COOPERATOR	SUBBASIN/PLAN AREA	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST COMMENT	RANK
E-05	NIXE TV - Discover the West	Basinwide	Television series "Discover the West" sponsorship.	1667 Partial sponsorship of Public television documentary.	50
HR-10	Deborah Callagan Construction	Lower Klamath River	Camp Creek instream habitat enhancement.	74967 To improve steelhead and chinook habitat.	54
HR-37	USFS-Klamath NF, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	King Solomon mine tailing reclamation.	7040 To abate water quality problems associated with abandoned mines.	57
HP-04	USFS-Klamath NF, Happy Camp Dist	Middle Klamath River	Assessment of dissolved heavy metals and acidic drainage in Indian Creek.	5000 To assess potential impacts on fish populations.	57
HP-16	USFS-Klamath NF, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	Salmon River subbasin spawning ground survey.	52990 To monitor habitat and spawner escapement.	57
E-07	Committee for Irish Ethnicity, Inc.	Basinwide	Mining and habitat education.	33750 To educate local mining community about fish restoration techniques.	56
HP-05	Six Rivers NF, Orleans Ranger Sta.	Lower Klamath River	Riparian inventory of Camp, Red Cap, and Bluff Creeks.	23354	56
PP-12	Nakamoto/Kisanuki/Mulligan	Mainstem Klamath River	Mitochondrial DNA characterization of Klamath R and Columbia R green sturgeon.	35527 To improve stock identification techniques by identifying distinct DNA characteristics.	56
HR-17	North Coast Fisheries	Lower Klamath River	Camp Creek spawning and rearing habitat enhancement.	33079 To construct four boulder spawning weirs and nine boulder cluster cover structures.	56
HR-43	Quartz Valley Reservation	Scott River	Mill and Shackelford Creeks riparian revegetation.	11921 To plant riparian vegetation on 1/2 mile of Shackelford Creek and 1/4 mile of Mill Creek, and assess effectiveness of project.	56
HP-11	USFS-Klamath NF, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	Fines in pools inventory.	13605 Evaluate volume of fines in pools, apply information to potential impacts to fish habitat.	54
FP-11	USFS-Six Rivers NF, Orleans Dist	Lower Klamath River	Summer steelhead monitoring program.	25930 To standardize methodology for adult salmonid population surveys.	53
PP-08	USFWS Coastal California FRO	Mainstem Klamath River	Status of Klamath River Eulachon.	19433 To obtain information on status of eulachon runs into the Klamath River.	53
HR-39	USFWS-Portland Field Office FWE	Basinwide	Upper Klamath Basin Water Quality Improvement.	30000 To implement riparian restoration projects to improve water quality of upper Klamath Lake.	53
HP-10	USFWS Klamath River FRO	Basinwide	Citizen monitoring of Klamath basin streams.	16111 To enlist and enable volunteer workforce to monitor fish habitat parameters.	52

KLAMATH FISH RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROJECT PROPOSALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993
(BY ABSOLUTE RANK, WITH TARGET EMPLOYMENT POINTS ADDED)

PROJECT NUMBER	COOPERATOR	SUBBASIN/PLAN AREA	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	COMMENT	RANK
HR-31	Calif. Cons. Corps-Del Norte Center	Lower Klamath River	Tarup Creek habitat restoration.	28440	To enhance fish habitat at 14 sites.	52
FP-09	USFWS Coastal California PRO	Mainstem Klamath River	Age composition of green sturgeon harvested from the upper Klamath River.	7836	To collect age/growth information on green sturgeon harvested above Weitchpec.	51
HP-09	USFS-Klamath NF, Happy Camp Dist	Basinwide	Integrated monitoring and assessment of sed. production and fish habitat quality	4600	To describe sediment assessment methods and their utility in fish restoration.	51
HP-14	Energy Resource Advocates	Upper Klamath River	Remote Sensing & GIS feasibility analysis for upper Klamath Basin.	38288	To complement prior work on lower Klamath Basin (FY91 project).	50
HR-41	Trout Unlimited-Klamath Chapter	Middle Klamath River	Horse Creek juvenile rearing structures.	34500	To construct instream structures to enhance juvenile rearing habitat.	49
HR-18	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	BLM riparian vegetation planting.	13004	To plant 4 miles of Shasta River bank with willow slips.	48
HR-07	Eagle Springs Hatchery	Middle Klamath River	Cold Creek Fish Passage.	2107	To provide chinook and steelhead passage over a 5 foot diversion dam. Cold Creek is tributary to Bogus Creek.	48
HR-22	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Webb riparian vegetation planting.	3967	To plant 2,500 feet of riparian area with willow slips in lower Shasta River canyon.	47
FR-08	Fisheries Restoration Council	Salmon River	F.R.C. - Methodist Creek Unit.	37157	To rear 20,000 fall run chinook salmon in Methodist Creek, a tributary to South Fork Salmon River.	47
HP-18	California Dept. of Water Resources	Scott River	Scott River instream flow needs study.	229000	First phase of IPN study to include initial scoping work, along with selecting transects for data collection.	45
HR-05	USFS-Klamath NF, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	Indian Creek riparian planting.	11125	To plant 60 acres of conifers within the riparian zone.	45
HP-07	California Dept. of Water Resources	Basinwide	Water Quality Monitoring in the Klamath River System.	13608	Nutrients and minor element monitoring on mainstem Klamath River and tributaries.	44
HP-21	California Dept. of Water Resources	Mainstem Klamath River	Klamath River instream flow needs scoping and funding.	15000	To begin scoping of IPN study on mainstem Klamath River and to seek funding to initiate IPN studies in the Klamath basin.	44
HP-19	California Dept. of Water Resources	Scott River	Scott River stream restoration design.	39800	To design a pilot project to modify a 3,500 foot section of mainstem below Callahan.	44
FR-07	Fisheries Restoration Council	Salmon River	F.R.C. - Fall trapping.	9913	To trap adult fall run chinook in mainstem Salmon River to provide 65,000 eggs to two	44

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROJECT PROPOSALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993
(BY ABSOLUTE RANK, WITH TARGET EMPLOYMENT POINTS ADDED)

PROJECT NUMBER	COOPERATOR	SUBBASIN/PLAN AREA	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	COMMENT	RANK
					rearing projects.	
HR-40	Trout Unlimited-Klamath Chapter	Middle Klamath River	Humbug Creek - open fish passage at the mouth.	63075	To provide access to fish spawning and rearing habitat.	12
HP-06	California Dept. of Water Resources	Mainstem Klamath River	Evaluation of effects of suction dredging on benthic sediments and insects.	50000	Assess impacts of suction dredge mining on macroinvertebrate population and substrate composition at 4 sites.	11
HP-20	California Dept. of Water Resources	Scott River	Scott River sediment pool feasibility study.	38600	To determine the feasibility of controlling impacts of decomposed granite sand in the Scott River, by construction of sediment control pools.	10
HP-17	California Dept. of Water Resources	Mainstem Klamath River	Klamath River instream flow needs study.	236000	First phase of IFN study to include initial scoping work, along with selecting transects for data collection.	9
HP-02	California Dept. of Water Resources	Mainstem Klamath River	Competition for food resources between hatchery and wild steelhead in Klamath R.	47000	To examine differences in feeding between hatchery and natural steelhead, to determine if excessive competition occurs and if hatchery fish convert from artificial to natural feeding behavior.	8
HP-01	California Dept. of Water Resources	Shasta River	Shasta River Temperature Evaluation.	19260	To assess diurnal and seasonal water temperature data and associated impacts on anadromous fish.	7
PC-04	USFWS-Portland Field Office FWE	Upper Klamath River	The Oregon Ecosystems Program.	50000	To provide comprehensive ecosystem recovery plan to supplement the recovery plan for the endangered sucker species in the upper Klamath River basin.	6
PC-08	Quality Sound	Basinwide	Portable conference and public address system.	15399	Portable, voice-activated sound amplification system for 12 stations. To be used in advisory committee meetings.	5
PR-04	USFS-Six Rivers NF	Basinwide	Willow Creek chinook rearing	48987	To produce fall chinook in one of three different scenarios on Willow Creek, tributary to Trinity River.	4
PC-06	JHA-Custom Entertainment Systems	Basinwide	Sound amplification and recording equipment.	8496	Cost includes set-up and training.	3
PC-07	JHA-Custom Entertainment Systems	Basinwide	Sound and recording services.	1795	Cost is per (each) three-day meeting.	2

*** Total ***

3414125



United States Department of the Interior



FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Klamath River Fishery Resource Office
P.O. Box 1006
Yreka, CA 96097-1006

July 7, 1992

Memorandum

TO: Task Force members

FROM: Project Leader, Klamath River FRO
Yreka, California

SUBJECT: Minutes from the June 15-17, 1992, Task Force meeting

Attached, please find the minutes from the most recent Task Force meeting. We will prepare a summary of these minutes for public distribution. To save paper and mailing costs, the summary version will not contain the attachments as provided in this package. A comprehensive minutes package will be provide to anyone upon request.

Ronald A. Iverson

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE
JUNE 15-17, 1992
ARCATA, CALIFORNIA

June 15:

Task Force members present: Bingham, Lara, Farro, Franklin (for Orcutt), Orcutt, Hillman, Holder, McInnis, Rohde (for Hillman), Shake, Stokely (for Leffler), Sumner, Wilkinson

Absentees: Thackeray, Leffler, DeVol

Meeting called to order at 1:40 pm. Meeting agenda (Attachment 1) approved. Minutes of April, 1992 meeting approved and accepted.

Agenda item: Report on development of a prioritization scheme for project selection by the Technical Work Group (TWG), (Jack West).

(West): The TWG met for four days in May. I was elected to chair the TWG. Trinity Co. and the Yurok tribe representatives were not present. Our assignments were to: 1) identify subbasin planning boundaries, 2) identify authorities and needs within those subbasins, 3) develop a list of key players, 4) prioritize watersheds needing restoration work, 5) determine activities and priorities within each subbasin, 6) and develop a list of criteria for ranking proposals. We deferred action on some old, unfinished assignments until we receive further instruction from this Task Force.

Assignment 1: The seven subbasins identified were: 1) Mainstem -- the estuary and the main river all the way to Klamath Lake, 2) Lower Klamath -- all tributaries/watersheds from the mouth to Salmon River, 3) Middle Klamath -- all tributaries/watersheds from Salmon River to Iron Gate Dam, 4) Upper Klamath -- all tributaries/watersheds from Iron Gate Dam to Link Dam, 5) Salmon River -- the Salmon River watershed, 6) Scott River -- the Scott River watershed, 7) Shasta River -- the Shasta River watershed. A Basinwide category was also defined, which includes activities appropriate to all subbasins.

Assignment 2 & 3: We believe the subbasin planning groups would be best suited to determine who should take the lead role in these subbasin restoration efforts. We identified a list of key players for each subbasin (in minutes of TWG meeting).

Assignment 4: We determined that it was inappropriate to make one subbasin higher priority than another. Many have similar needs with similar priorities. So, we developed a list of objectives for each subbasin. The lists are not all-encompassing. We picked what we felt were the most critical objectives within each subbasin. To get a basinwide perspective, each TWG member identified 10 most-critical objectives from all objectives listed. The results of that effort will be published in the minutes from the TWG meeting.

Assignment 4: We left the proposal ranking criteria the same as last year, and had a discussion of how to apply these criteria to the list of objectives we'd come up with earlier in our meeting. We agreed that each TWG member was to consider the objectives list (developed earlier) while ranking proposals. The objectives are not inconsistent with the ranking criteria. Chuck Lane reported the results of the Federal Panel Review group (Attachment 2). Of the 104 proposals, 26 were flagged as needing further clarification for suitability as a government contract. We decided to rate all proposals, regardless of being flagged by the Federal Panel. In the event that a flagged proposal rated high and was to be recommended for funding, Klamath River Fishery Resource Office (KRFRO) staff would gather more information from proposers to alleviate any contracting problems. We categorized proposals by subbasin and considered them in these groups, not by activity categories as in the past.

Outstanding assignments/suggestions for future improvement: 1) provide information to proposers regarding why their proposals did not rank very high, 2) the Task Force should consider funding proposals listed by absolute rank rather than by category (as in the past), 3) the TWG needs to develop work activities for each list of objectives for each subbasin, to be incorporated into a more specific Fiscal Year 1994 Request For Proposals (RFP), 4) all TWG members should be compensated financially for their participation.

Q: How many members are not compensated?

(West): I don't know, but can come up with that number. It's all the non-agency representatives. About 3 or 4.

Outstanding activities (continued): It would be appropriate to schedule a TWG meeting for this fall to develop the list of specific activities needed in each subbasin, to be incorporated into the FY1994 RFP.

Another assignment to the TWG from the Task Force was to review timber harvest plans. We need to know what your expectations are. We were also asked to develop a protocol in coming up with the biological carrying capacity of the basin. We're not sure we can do that. We're also assuming that we are to provide technical assistance on a "by request" basis to subbasin planning groups. We also want to publicize what sources of money are available for fishery restoration work. We have an assignment to KRFRO to generate a table of funding sources which would describe the proposal process, constraints, etc.

Q: You said you discussed each proposal with proponents. Was this a worthwhile expenditure of time?

(West): Yes and no. Some of the proponents showed up, but we didn't need additional information from some of them. Other proposals were not clearly written, and more information was needed. I don't know how that impacted ranking.

Q: Do you have a more specific request or need for meeting in the fall, so this Task Force can give clear direction?

(West): I would suggest this group look at our BIN list, so we can deal with unfinished assignments. If you want full Task Force representation on the TWG, members must be financially compensated for their time.

(Wilkinson): It's difficult to compensate the TWG when Task Force members are not compensated.

(Holder): If we have an increased need for the Task Force or the TWG to become more involved with these newly developing subbasin groups, we should find a way to keep this TWG going. I see a need for TWG services increasing, not decreasing.

(Farro): We have to come up with a way to fund the TWG to get full participation from all members. Otherwise we won't have their participation.

Q: Would it be possible to make an estimate of how much money is needed to fund their work, so we can consider it tomorrow?

(West): Yes.

(Bingham): You asked us to come up with more specific directions for the TWG to comment on timber harvest plans. I would like to defer this until Wednesday for discussion.

Agenda item: Report on budget committee FY1993 workplan budgeting process (Nat Bingham).

(Bingham): Budget subcommittee participation is always open to any Task Force member. Forrest Reynolds, Leaf Hillman, and I participated. Jack West reported on the TWG process, and recommended that we consider the ranked list of proposals. We had three alternatives from which to decide, which were: 1) the absolute rank list, 2) the list of proposals broken out by category, or, 3) the list of categories broken out by subbasin. After much discussion we agreed with Jack's recommendations to accept the ranked list. We feel we're about 1 year away from developing a focused list of proposals through the RFP process. Having decided that, we added points to proposals employing target group employees (native americans, commercial fishermen, and others affected by the restoration program. We stayed with last year's process which was to add 5 points to projects attempting to employ or partially employ target groups, and 10 to those that clearly employed target employees. After that, we asked staff to re-rank the list. We assumed that since last year's KRFRO costs came out of programmatic money, this year would be the same. Looking at this list (Attachment 3) it appears that we'll hit \$1 million somewhere between FR-6 and E-15. That completes the budget committee report. What remains for us to do is for us to go in and maintain the line at \$1 million. In order to improve next year's process, I recommend separating the meetings in the future so we can get more participation in this budget subcommittee process.

Q: California Department of Fish and Game's (CDFG) contribution will affect where we draw our line. Is anyone going to report on state funding?

(Bingham): The Salmon Stamp and Prop. 70 committees will meet next week. You're right that we really can't set the line until we know that.

(Farro): A comment on how bonus points are added... I think there should be room to assign points to proposals employing target groups, but I believe presently too much scoring emphasis is placed on this. I would rather see proposals ranked more by their technical merits.

(Bingham): This should be a discussion item at a future Task Force meeting, to provide some direction to the budget subcommittee. No one is comfortable with that process, the budget subcommittee made their best effort to define those that got bonus points. Further direction would be welcomed. I would like to see people be a little more serious about participating. It's a little uncertain how to assign points.

***** Action *****

Agenda item for November (or February) meeting -- discussion of adding preference points to proposals employing target groups.

Agenda item: Task Force discussion of FY1993 Work Plan.

(Chairman Shake arrived at this time, late because of air transportation scheduling.)

(Bingham): The budget subcommittee recommendation was to use the aggregate list of ranked proposals, with target points added, rather than taking the list of proposals broken out by restoration category. The subcommittee felt that the TWG reflected the subbasin priorities in their absolute ranking.

(Wilkinson): I would like to know what the long term staffing plans are for KRFRO?

(Iverson): We have three biologists and two administrative assistants. We just filled our vacant secretary's position, and will have a vacated administrative assistant position next month. Our staffing plan is five people, the only revision to that is that Chapter 7 of the long range plan looks at adding a watershed specialist to KRFRO staff. The Task Force has never made recommendations.

(Wilkinson): We should be cautious about how much more we add to KRFRO staff functions. If we keep increasing their workload, we should be prepared to increase staff, or develop a method to respond to increased workload.

(Lara): Are any USFWS-Arcata Office (CCFRO) costs included in the KRFRO budget of \$421,800?

(Shake): Not on this list for KRFRO and administrative costs.

(Iverson): You have an analysis of our costs in your package of handouts.

(Lara): Are CCFRO's technical services reflected as a cost here? Are they

going to continue to get funding to help us?

(Shake): Yes. If the Task Force recommends proposals submitted by that office. If the Task Force doesn't approve their proposals, they wouldn't be there to provide other technical services. They receive money from the Task Force, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the USFWS.

(Lara): Instead of running CCFRO proposals through the system, It seems that they should identify their funding needs to provide technical services, and submit a budget request.

(Shake): I'm not sure how the Task Force feels about that. Any comments?

(Bingham): Are you proposing to have CCFRO be funded out of program money the same as KRFRO?

(Lara): It appears that they are one of the prime contractors in this program. They should submit one proposal identifying their funding needs and specifying what their projects will be. It might be easier for the Task Force to rank one combined funding proposal from KRFRO and CCFRO. Administration for this program might exceed 75% if all USFWS costs were displayed. It seems that by combining efforts we could save money. For example, outmigrant monitoring is being proposed by many groups.

(Bingham): Walt, if you're addressing this year's process, we'll have to go with what we've got. If you're talking about next year's process, we hope that the subbasin approach will help in this situation. If you're asking what will happen with CCFRO, we don't know.

(Rohde): It may be difficult for the public to understand how KRFRO consumes a major portion of the budget, while another USFWS office in Arcata is submitting proposals for remaining funds. Since it's the same agency, it might be more efficient to see proposals that have more of a comprehensive approach to the needs of the basin.

(Shake): The two offices have entirely different functions, and are separate in their budget needs. KRFRO is administrative, CCFRO is technical. Technical proposals should have to stand on their own technical merit and compete with other proposers.

(Lara): KRFRO staff also submitted proposals for additional funding.

(Iverson): There are some proposals in that list that originated with us, but none that bring us any salary. The money we've identified for administration and coordination doesn't include any funding for CCFRO. When they send people to assist in the TWG, it doesn't cost the Task Force any money. Walt's recommending one budget from USFWS for technical and administrative services. My response to that is that there is no charge from CCFRO for technical services unless funded separately.

(Lara): I'll defer until a later time.

Agenda item: Adequacy of budget expenditures, by category.

(Shake): It sounds like everybody likes the ranked list rather than the list broken out by category.

(Bingham): The budget subcommittee looked at that list, and we certainly could do it that way, but no lines are drawn. As we move toward the subbasin approach, what kind of work is done is less and less relevant.

Agenda item: Application of action plan to proposal selection.

(Shake): Nat, did your group address that issue?

(Bingham): The action planning committee did not meet since our last Task Force meeting, but I believe the TWG applied their subbasin action plans to their ranking list.

(Shake): Any other comments on that item? Since we've been talking about the Fiscal Year 1993 budget, I propose we hear public comment on this issue.

Agenda item: Public Comment on FY1993 RFP and Proposal Selection Process.

Peter Brucker: Tricia Whitehouse's assistance was valuable in developing the workshops held last year.

Agenda item: Task Force Discussion of FY1993 Work Plan (continued):

(Holder): I've heard several recommendations from the TWG report regarding the 1994 RFP process. It seems to me that this is something for us to discuss, but I don't see a time for it on the agenda.

(Shake): Let's discuss this now.

(Wilkinson): Jack mentioned other recommendations such as the TWG meeting schedule for fall, financial compensation for TWG members, and the BIN list. We might ask Jack to lay them all out for us again.

(West): The first item, compensation of non-agency members of TWG. We've developed a list of objectives, and think we can develop an action list for KRFRO to use in their 1994 RFP. This will take a couple of 3 day meetings to accomplish, and we believe members should be compensated for their work.

(Shake): What do you mean by compensation?

(West): The agency people on the TWG are financially compensated, non-agency people are not. So, they are not as likely to fully participate in the meeting.

(Franklin): Why shouldn't Humboldt County, for example, pay their representative for being there?

(Shake): Ron, what's the legal regulatory issues regarding something like

this?

(Iverson): The Klamath Act states the Task Force members can't be paid for participation. If you recommend paying somebody as a consultant, that's a highly regulated federal contracting process. I've never been involved in paying somebody for an ongoing service like this, except as a consultant. I think it will be difficult to do.

(Shake): I suggest further review by KRFRO staff to see if it would be possible to compensate TWG members.

(Holder): Maybe we should also request that alternatives be developed for getting these technical services. If funding is not available, we still have the needs for these technical services, so we should ask KRFRO to come up with additional services. Are there ways that we can access technical expertise from KRFRO?

*** Action item ***

KRFRO staff to research the issue of compensating TWG members financially for their participation in TWG meetings. Report to be on the next meeting agenda of the Task Force.

(West): The second discussion item is the TWG's need for clarification and direction on some unfinished assignments. TWG comments on timber harvest plans and how to determine carrying capacity are two specific assignments for discussion.

(Wilkinson): Regarding carrying capacity, I think that might be an exercise in futility. Present environmental conditions may not give a true picture of carrying capacity.

(McInnis): The carrying capacity issue was passed to us by the KFMC. If we intend to put it off, this should be discussed at the Chairman's meeting.

(Reynolds): The KFMC must give us more defined direction.

(Bingham): Environmental conditions affect carrying capacity to such a great extent that maybe we should tell the KFMC that it is something that we cannot produce an immediate answer to. On the other hand, the timber harvest issue is one that we can directly influence because the State Board of Forestry is considering this issue right now. They are looking at what the USFS is doing right now. They will be adopting new rules in a few months. We should try to engage in a dialogue.

(Holder): This group should provide input to existing and proposed rules, rather than develop our own standards and guidelines.

*** Motion ***

(Reynolds): I move that we request the TWG to formulate a draft set of preferred management techniques, guidelines, criteria, for timber harvest activities. The Task Force can review these recommended guidelines, and

possibly come to agreement or modify them so that when we comment on harvest plans, and be consistent.

(Lara): Would it be profitable to have CDF come and tell us what they're trying to improve upon?

(Wilkinson): It might be a better if we take Barbara's recommendation, to comment on existing guidelines.

(Bingham): There is presently a rules package before CDF that is to include environmental input as well as forest industry input. I agree with Walt, we should have a presentation at our next meeting.

(Wilkinson): As I understand the motion, it is to outline a set of preferred harvest rules.

(Reynolds): If our group is to comment on harvest rules, we should know what we agree on in this body. What standards and guidelines are agreed on by this group, before we make comment as a body. That's what I'm looking at as coming from the TWG, a recommendation for technical guidelines.

Motion carried.

(Holder): It is going to be very difficult to get consensus on acceptable timber harvest rules from this group. This is something that the CDF or USFS has not been able to do. An alternative would be for us to take either the USFS proposed rules or CDF rules and provide policy level comments. There are many other things the TWG can do.

(West): I wrote down that the TWG is to "write down what we feel is necessary to protect streams". My personal recommendations is for the Task Force to comment on rules packages as they do on release strategies at Iron Gate Dam. This body provides input on rules, I agree with the idea to have a report by CDF on the recommended rules. I would suggest having TWG people there to have dialogue.

(Shake): OK, the assignment to the TWG is that we're expecting a discussion by the TWG, with a report, by next Task Force meeting, with guideline recommendations. I suggest that you start with our plan policies.

*** Action item ***

TWG will develop functional timber harvest guidelines that will provide adequate protection for streams. To be placed on next Task Force meeting agenda.

(Shake): Another issue to be discussed is carrying capacity of the Klamath River system. How are carrying capacity and the spawning escapement floor related?

(Reynolds): I remember when the assignment first came out, when we tried to

determine how many spawners were needed. The answer was based on spawning capacity, not carrying capacity.

(Shake): Do we have an assignment for the TWG?

(Wilkinson): I'm not ready to charge the TWG with this assignment. I assume that there have been enough studies on carrying capacity that we could formulate an estimate, and environmental conditions change so much we really can make an absolute recommendation.

(Shake): This could be raised at the meeting of the chairs.

*** Action item ***

KRFRO to research this issue and provide briefing information for discussion at meeting of the chairs.

Public Comment:

Bob Dean (representing a local landowner): Regarding the motion, the TWG should know what the current rules are, and what proposed changes are. I suggest input from private industry. Secondly, does the tribe need state approval for harvest plans?

(Franklin): No, but the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) has specific review procedures. The BIA also has a review responsibility. The process is much the same as on USFS forested lands. The State Board of Forestry has no jurisdiction on tribal lands.

(Dean): Who does quality control on the projects funded by the Task Force?

(Shake): Agencies have the responsibility to ensure that these projects are done correctly. KRFRO ensures that the cooperators do their job correctly, and staff evaluates these projects.

(Reynolds): Everything that is funded by the state must have an evaluation and accounting of what was funded. Regarding the fencing on private lands, if landowners are causing water quality problems, the landowner may be required to reduce impacts.

Jim Hundly (Orleans Rod and Gun Club): A comment on this year's proposal by the Orleans Rod and Gun Club -- there was discussion by the TWG regarding our group not wanting to mark fish raised in our program. We've wanted to mark our fish for two years, but have not received any approval from the state to do so. We are willing to mark fish in the future.

Meeting adjourned for the day.

June 16

Agenda item: FY1993 Work Plan development.

(Shake): Yesterday we received a copy of the recommended list of proposals. Now that we've had time to review it, are there any comments?

(Lara): The USFWS should be making recommendations to the Task Force for work needing to be done, not submitting proposals for additional work. If the Task Force determines that the recommendations have merit, then the projects should be put out for bid. Target groups could bid on these types of projects, so they could get jobs. This makes sense, especially since KRFRO is having a staffing shortage.

(Shake): We have already identified high priority actions in the long range plan. Everybody took the long range plan and prepared proposals accordingly. So, I believe we're doing what you're suggesting.

(Lara): Right. But there appears to be a duplication of effort in the KRFRO function and some proposals. Public information workshops, for example.

(Shake): You're lumping Tricia Whitehouse and her role as the public outreach specialist, with Program Administration, which are two different roles. She is responsible to develop public outreach programs. She prepared these proposals to accomplish public outreach. It's not a function of KRFRO. It's a function of Tricia's contract to develop public outreach.

(Iverson): Most of the budgets on those particular proposals include hiring a local coordinator.

(Lara): If the USFWS continues to submit proposals, they will be the largest contractor in the entire program, target groups excluded.

(West): Projects E-11, 12, 13, and 14 are duplicates of what was done last year at Forks of Salmon. Tricia coordinated that, and it took a lot of time to put it together. There were folks who were interested in playing the coordinator role in putting on workshops next year, but no proposal was submitted from them. So, Tricia submitted those proposals to fill the need. The coordinator was to be hired from local groups.

(Lara): There needs to be an opportunity for other groups to submit their proposal to do this work.

(Bingham): I suggest you specifically identify the projects you want to throw out, then let the Task Force discuss these. I am opposed to doing this, but it's up to the Task Force to decide.

*** Motion ***

(Lara): I move that projects submitted by the USFWS should be put out for bid, (after being discussed by the Task Force). Specifically projects FP-04, 06, E-10, 11, 12, 13, and 14.

(Shake): Haven't we already done that through the long range plan?

(Lara): Yes, but the way I understand the Act is the KRFRO is to take care of

Program Administration, not to submit proposals to do additional work.

(Wilkinson): Second the motion, for discussion.

(Reynolds): The budget subcommittee recommends the entire list.

(McInnis): If E-13 were approved, how would KRFRO decide where the money goes?

(Iverson): We haven't done this before, but done similar things, where we go out for professional services, our Contracting and General Services Office (CGS) solicits three bids and selects one.

(McInnis): So we'd be doing what Walt is suggesting, putting these projects out for bid. Walt, does that take care of your concern?

(Lara): I'm concerned that Salmon River concerned citizens proposal is a duplication of effort from KRFRO proposals.

(Rohde): The TWG determined that it was best for the communities to come up with these proposals themselves, in order to provide the opportunity for them to share their feelings among themselves and with agencies. I think there's a real value to understanding that relationship. Workshops work better when local folks put them on.

(Farro): Walt, in your motion you include FP-04, which is a very specific pathological study. How could that be put out to bid?

(Lara): Many agencies are conducting fish gathering and sampling projects, they could coordinate efforts and become more efficient.

(Bingham): I speak against the motion. I agree that agencies should not receive all of the money. I support getting this money to local proposers/contractors. However, everybody had the same opportunity to submit proposals. We trusted the TWG to rank all proposals received. The process is in place, I have a real problem sending these proposals out for bid after they've been ranked.

(Lara): I don't think the product would be excluded from the FY93 workplan. Specifically, education is being accomplished in other projects.

*** Motion failed. ***

*** Motion ***

(Wilkinson): I move to accept the recommendation from the budget subcommittee on the order of rank on the absolute list (Attachment 3).

Motion seconded.

(Orcutt): The Hoopa Tribe had a project partially funded in the FY1992 work plan, with a commitment to fund the remainder of the project with FY1993

funds. Where does it fit in?

(West): We only ranked proposals that presented to us.

(Bingham): I would ask the author of the motion to include the purchase of the sound system.

(Wilkinson): I'm not willing to do that. I would recommend we deal with these issues separately.

(Pierce): There are some things I would like to say for the Yurok Tribe. I'll read from the Act. Some of it reads as follows: "We will monitor and coordinate research, evaluating anadromous fish populations." It also says we will "implement an intensive, short term stocking program while maintaining genetic diversity and integrity of stocks." It says "to the extent practicable, any restoration work would employ target groups", and "CDFG and USFW will provide administrative support for the Task Force." What this list says today is that we're spending \$421,000 to administer the remaining \$500,000. The Act states that \$1 million is to be spent on the river, and that program administration is supposed to be provided by agencies, and Indian people and other affected groups are to be employed. If this workplan is accepted, I am extremely concerned that we're not following the law.

(Bingham): These rearing pond proposals are where they are on the list because they got 10 additional points. The ratings they got reflect the technical evaluation of those projects. I believe that your concerns have been addressed in this process. When it comes to the issue that Walt raised about putting proposals out to bid, I think it's appropriate for the 1994 process.

(Reynolds): The state has about \$3 million of Prop. 70 funds, \$350,000 of other money, and \$1 million of salmon stamp money. We don't know what amount will be approved for spending in the basin.

(Lara): Is there any reason why we can't wait to finish this process until we know what the state is going to do?

(Wilkinson): My motion is open ended. It is to fund projects in descending order until all federal and state money is expended. I'll restate the motion -- I move to approve the findings of the TWG and budget subcommittee on the ranking for funding, and order that funding to occur by the ranking presented.

(Hillman): I'm uncomfortable adopting the entire list. The last part of the motion, "to fund by the ranking presented", in my mind, precludes any opportunity to fine tune the work plan. There are times when we need to discuss and fine tune each work plan. Your motion appears to exclude that process by adopting this list.

(Wilkinson): It is to adopt the recommended list, and approve the process, and to fund projects as ranked.

(Shake): If this motion carried, we could entertain a motion to include

discussion and inclusion of other projects, if necessary.

(Farro): If we do the fine tuning, we'll compromise the entire restoration program.

(McInnis): We should make use of what the TWG and budget subcommittee has done. However we committed to funding the Pine Creek project last year with this year's money, and the TWG didn't rate the sound system proposals because they were not technical proposals.

(Hillman): There's a third issue that should be put on the table, which is, Walt and Ronnie's concern. It is a policy issue and is not something for the TWG to address. I'm not trying to discredit their work. Their assignment had specific sideboards, and it wasn't part of their assignment to address policy issues.

(Farro): It's a messy issue no matter how it's dealt with. I recognize clearly what's written in the Act. Let's face it, it was an election year when the Act was passed, and was part of the congressional process. I have concern when a lower ranking project is funded before a higher ranking project because of added bonus points for employing target groups. I believe target group employment points should only be used for tie-breaking. All projects should be ranked fairly.

(Orcutt): I believe the Pine Creek project should be discussed before Keith's motion is voted on.

(Wilkinson): If we adopt the motion on the table, the next motion on the table would be to request the TWG to consider the Pine Creek proposal separately.

(Shake): We have a motion on the table, please restate it.

(Wilkinson): I move to approve the findings of the TWG and budget subcommittee on the ranking for funding, and order that funding to occur by the ranking presented.

*** Motion failed. ***

(Shake): We have a suggestion to turn the list of education proposals over to the education subcommittee for review. The committee would bring a report back to the Task Force for discussion.

(Lara): I accept that suggestion. We're going to have to develop a policy on the agency proposal issue. I suppose we could discuss that at the same time when dealing with the specific proposals and education list.

(Wilkinson): The suggestion is to review all of the education proposals mentioned by Walt?

(Bingham): Yes. Regarding the other policy issue of agency proposals, I'm not addressing this in my suggestion.

(Farro): I'm unclear on what we're doing... We're taking all of the education proposals out of the list?

(Wilkinson): We're asking the education subcommittee to review the list, (only education proposals), to see if they concur with the list.

(Farro): A question for the TWG chairman. I'm sure they looked at these proposals for redundancy and overlap. Did it enter into their ranking?

(West): Yes. We looked at every proposal on this list, from a subbasin standpoint, not by category. I fail to see overlap between PC-1 and 5, FP-4 and 6, and with the education proposals. The TWG was very thorough, and the ratings reflect that level of review. The TWG questions whether there needs to be a TWG if politics tear apart all of their products.

*** Motion ***

(Lara): Unless we take care of the underlying policy issues regarding the intention of the Act, I move to adjourn the meeting.

*** Motion failed. ***

(Hillman): The bottom line with this issue is that the budget subcommittee is not charged with dealing with policy issues.

(Shake): What are the policy issues we're talking about here. Let's write them down and discuss them here.

(Hillman): The first policy issue is education in the basin. The way that we used to approach this was that we had an education plan and an education committee. The strategy was to implement the education plan with a set aside budget of \$109,000 each year. This was to be coordinated by the committee. I assume that the education plan was forgotten, or thrown out. The result is that, for the past three years, we've been faced with education proposals but with no coordination. I have abstained from voting on those particular issues in past years for the sake of compromise, and have let those things go, assuming the education committee would coordinate. I haven't seen it.

(Lara): My concern is the Act didn't say that agencies were to be the sole restoration agencies. Target groups were to do the restoration work when possible. In looking at proposals, there appears to be overlap from USFWS and other groups, primarily in the education category. The policy issue is the question: "Are we going to continue funding agencies, or target groups?" If we're to let the USFWS do this restoration, let's give them the \$1 million and let them go.

(Hillman): The first two proposals on the list (for KRFRO's budget) do not have rankings. This group has refused to deal with this budget issue each year. Everybody is well aware that these administrative costs are unacceptable. No budget breakout is provided for ranking or comment. These costs are excluded from comprehensive budget readouts, we don't know where it's going. Every year we hear we're going to address that issue. We're

getting close to having a program that is not following the Act.

(Shake): Any other issues? Hearing none, let's deal with the education issue as mentioned. There appears to be a lack of education plan implementation, and no coordination by the education committee.

(Wilkinson): If you're asking the education committee to meet immediately and review those items on this list, I agree to do that. I would ask the TWG chair to participate and provide information on how they were rated.

(Hillman): The problem is not that those projects are not technically sound. The problem is that the approach to the education program is a mess.

(Holder): Leaf, you weren't here yesterday when the report was given by the TWG chair. Jack stated that the new strategy was to begin the subbasin approach, not deal with categories, such as education. The projects were rated by technical merit and priority of need within each subbasin, that's why its laid out here that way.

(Hillman): I'm clear about this year's process. That's not the issue.

(Shake): Did I state the issue correctly?

(Hillman): The issue at hand is that there is no continuity to the education component of this restoration program. You never know what projects will be implemented each year. Education was a major component in earlier years, and now appears to be going to waste. As I've stated in the past, I want to see a coordinated effort toward the education component.

(Wilkinson): I disagree with your statement of discontinuity of the education program. The education curriculum development for the upper grades is almost complete. Education is ongoing, and is being implemented. I am keeping close tabs on that project. That program is just as firm and important as it always has been. In my opinion, it's probably the most effective way to spend Task Force money. I don't see a conflict between the workshops and the education program, because of the good reports that I've heard on the two workshops. I don't share your concern regarding discontinuity or conflict.

(Shake): It's my sense that we're using that plan in the program.

(Hillman): In the past, I asked for clarification on education program coordination. My questions have not been answered. I've asked for the coordinator's position in KRFRO to work in concert with the education committee in following the education plan.

(Wilkinson): Tricia and I have had considerable amount of conversation about the education program. I apologize for not sharing this with you. Tricia and I converse often about the program.

(Shake): How much of this KRFRO budget is for Tricia's program and salary?

(Iverson): I could go back and calculate that, but do not have it readily at

hand. I'll have to get back to you on that. There is an erroneous assumption here, that we have a staff person who works full time on the education program. What we actually have are five people working full time on the restoration program. Tricia Whitehouse works as staff to the KFMC. If we were to pull out all of her costs, it would not be accurate to say that it is all for education. She has other duties.

(Wilkinson): I would suggest that KRFRO staff incorporate a regular report from the education committee/coordinator into future meeting agendas.

(Pierce): To clarify the background on this issue, there was an education program developed at the very start, committing \$109,000 per year. Originally it contained 3 components: 1) environmental education, 2) special interest group education, and 3) public information. The original intent was for those components to be contracted out. Due to federal constraints, the KRFRO chose to take the information component into their office as a full time position. The remaining \$69,000 was contracted out for the environmental education component. The issue now is that we have \$40,000 being put into KRFRO for public information. We're getting the subbasin public information programs going and the KRFRO coordinator is asking for additional money. This 5-year information education program is now up, and I don't know what that will do with the \$40,000 going to KRFRO.

(Hillman): My request is to clarify what the education component is. We should convene the education committee to get a handle on this.

*** Motion ***

(Reynolds): I move that those specifically identified proposals for education, be deferred until a review by the education committee, to be submitted again to this Task Force for consideration.

Motion seconded.

Q: Is the intent to have the committee certify that they concur with the ranking?

(Reynolds): To determine if there is unnecessary overlap in staffing or overlap with past programs and newly developing education programs. I also move that everything else goes forward, except the education proposals.

(Farro): I'm concerned that we're pulling them out and making them go through a separate review. I support a review for consistency with the education program, as established. It's not fair to these proposers to mix their proposals with the issue of a functional review of KRFRO.

(Hillman): I agree with your comments, Mitch. It's unfortunate that they are thrown into this issue, but the Task Force has been held up on dealing with this issue. Failing to address it and not holding them up won't work anymore.

*** Motion failed. ***

[Budget and education committees met separately over lunch to discuss this issue.]

After lunch:

(Shake): We'll start with a report from the education subcommittee.

(Wilkinson): The committee endorses the five education proposals, and do not find overlap. The five proposals are E-10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 (as mentioned in Walt's motion). Our concerns are in the difference in allocation of money and time in curriculum development and the environmental education package. Ronnie's correct in stating that this commitment was a 5-year effort, which this constitutes the 5th year. The committee also wishes to express their concern regarding the original \$109,000 slotted annually for the education component, including \$40,000 for the public information specialist position and \$69,000 for curriculum development. Curriculum development has not come up as a budget request each year, but the \$40,000 component has come up as a budget item. We suggest that this be discussed at the meeting of the chairs. The issue is that there should be equity of funding commitment for all components.

Q: Could you give us an idea how much has been spent on curriculum development?

(Wilkinson): Not off the top of my head.

(Diane Higgins): \$60,000 and \$68,000 in two successive years.

(Shake): Hearing no other comments, let's hear the report from budget committee.

(Bingham): We reached agreement to approve the list of ranked proposals as originally recommended, and that we pull out administrative items (PA-1, PC-9) for budget committee review. We will reconvene with KRFRRO staff and possibly Jerry Grover, to assess the budget situation, and find out where we want to go. We also propose that the education proposals from KRFRRO be pulled out as a part of the review process. The fish health study and watershed support proposals for \$16,000 would both stay in the ranked list. Rod McInnis would serve on the committee to provide Federal administrative review of the process.

(Wilkinson): I resent usurping the education committee's recommendation by this report. I stated that we do not find conflict, and endorse those education proposals.

(Shake): I think that is a useful piece of information the budget subcommittee could use in reviewing the program administration function.

(Bingham): The concern of the budget subcommittee was that the cost of doing that work should be paid by part of the \$40,000 public education component, not a separate funding amount.

(Shake): I think everybody agreed that those kinds of workshops were very valuable. There is a perception that those meetings would not be as effective as independently initiated meetings.

(Wilkinson): The committee understood what the proposals were for and what the money was to be spent on. I must repeat that we endorse the proposals as presented and ranked.

(Shake): I will open the floor for public comment on this issue before entertaining a motion to deal with the 1993 work plan.

Public comment on the Fiscal Year 1993 Work Plan:

Peter Brucker: Two projects submitted by the Salmon River Fisheries Restoration Council dovetailed with each other, and with Art Frazier's proposal for the Hammel Creek rearing pond project. How will it work if Frazier's proposal is funded, and the others are not, when they depend on one another?

(West): We discussed the proposals extensively. The Hammel Creek facility was to get broodstock from the Oak Bottom Weir which is not going to be operated by CDFG this year. I proposed that we would recommend to CDFG that spring chinook would be captured in-river, transported to that facility, spawned, and the progeny would be released at a later time. There was quite a bit of concern about taking fall run fish from the mainstem, not knowing where those fish were destined to spawn. We believe that capturing and rearing spring chinook is a better deal. We haven't come up with a capture proposal yet. It will be a cooperative effort between agencies. Regarding the rearing project on the Little North Fork, this branch is only used by about 15% of the spring chinook in the Salmon River basin. If the utilization was proportionate, it would be logical to use the facility to rear spring chinook. However, there's some disagreement between TWG members about rearing wild fish. We do recommend that facility be utilized for some purpose, but we don't have a specific recommendation.

Q: Was rearing to a spring smolt release ranked higher than rearing to yearling?

(West): Naturally, the outmigration pattern for spring chinook is in October. There are very few spring chinook fry rearing in the spring chinook spawning areas, so we hope to improve recruitment from egg to fry by artificially spawning and rearing for a short period.

Q: So it's underutilization of rearing habitat that makes this rank high?

(West): It's one aspect. There was lengthy discussion about broodstock handling and rearing protocol which affected rank more significantly.

Public comment continued:

Mary Rigosa: I teach elementary aged children in Pecwan. We have 45 to 55 kids, from the Weitchpec community, and upstream we have the Orleans school.

Earlier this spring, we had teachers get together to develop a proposal. Right now we don't have much material available regarding local custom and cultural use of the fishery. We've been looking at getting supplies for this work. The printer was discussed at the TWG and thought to be too expensive. We've looked at a less expensive printer. If you don't support the use of this equipment, we can negotiate to get supplies for the upper grade program.

Unidentified (Weitchpec teacher) I teach upper grade levels, emphasizing stream ecosystems. The three schools together have put this proposal together to get the kids more involved with this restoration program. (Speaking specifically about Project E-9.)

(Diane Higgins): I attended the TWG discussions, and one of the debates was over the proposed purchase of a printer. I have worked with them to negotiate costs, and suggest that you consider this proposal separately. The other proposal I would like to talk about came from the Gazelle elementary school (E-08). This proposal includes equipment purchase because they want to do water quality analyses. They are willing to renegotiate down to about \$250 for continuation of their habitat typing project.

(Iverson): Seems to be a great deal of bitterness on the education proposals, and I offer a possible way out. If I understand everybody, the issue regarding the five proposals by KRFR0 is not a question of their technical merit, it is just whether KRFR0 should fund those. Now that they've been ranked high by the TWG, the budget subcommittee, and the education subcommittee, we'll ensure that these projects are accomplished with our proposed budget. If that helps, I offer it to you all.

(Rohde): I appreciate the offer that Ron has made, and am sure that the budget subcommittee will address it. The root of the issue here is to evaluate the role of the KRFR0, they may never have had to submit these individual proposals in the first place.

End of public comment.

(Shake): We'll move on to the final decision for the 1993 budget. Do we have a motion for approval?

*** Motion ***

(Lara): I move to approve the projects as ranked, with the exception that the budget subcommittee will look at PA-01, PC-09 and then report back to the Task Force on that.

Motion seconded.

(Wilkinson): Are you open ending it for the entire ranked package, with exception of the PA-01 and PC-09?

Q: What will the motion do with the education proposals submitted by KRFR0?

(Shake): They would stay as ranked but remain a part of the budget subcommittee review process.

(Wilkinson): I didn't understand the motion then. There was no mention of excluding all KRFRO education proposals.

(Lara): The motion is to exclude the education proposals which will be reviewed by the budget subcommittee.

(Shake): I understood the motion to be that the KRFRO-submitted education proposals would be part of the KRFRO administration and coordination budget. They still have a high ranking, therefore they would be implemented.

*** Motion carried (one abstention). ***

*** Motion ***

(Bingham): I move that the Hoopa Tribe's Pine Creek downstream migrant project be funded with 1993 dollars.

(Farro): This came about by negotiation last year, it was ranked high last year. It's just honoring our verbal commitment from last year.

(McInnis): It wasn't the lowest ranking proposal in the list. It was partially funded to get money for other projects on the FY1992 work plan.

(Shake): We could talk about the FY1992 budget now, perhaps take care of that with the '92 funds report.

(Bingham): I'll amend my motion that we fund it out of FY1992 funds, if available.

(Holder): We need to decide how to handle next year's project.

(Orcutt): \$24,128 would cover the remaining 2 fiscal years' needs.

(Holder): It seems like an opportune time to clarify for proponents whether they should resubmit multiple year projects each year.

(Shake): I would like to call for the question on this motion, and perhaps amend our procedures later.

*** Motion carried. ***

(Reynolds): On the issue of multiple year projects; I suggest that we advise the proponents that re-submittal is necessary each year, even if they've been funded for the full term of the project. I also suggest that when projects get approved for a portion of their multiple year budget, they should resubmit proposals each year. The state uses this strategy in order to evaluate merits of the project each year.

(Wilkinson): This issue should also be addressed by the Task Force for how we

will deal with our "sacred cows." Would this be something the budget subcommittee can discuss and make recommendation on?

(Bingham): We can talk about it.

(Farro): I think we resolved it by requesting proponents come back each year for review annually.

(Shake): We can decide right here.

(Bingham): We've learned, for example in the Blue Creek study, that cost effectiveness for better data confidence intervals decreases with additional years of studies.

Q: How did the TWG deal with this issue?

(West): We discussed it extensively. Someone asked "What would happen if it didn't get funded?" The answer was that it would affect confidence intervals.

(Farro): The proposal was initially to define the carrying capacity of Blue Creek. Is there that kind of confidence?

(West): I can look through the notes to answer that.

(Wilkinson): I think we must recommend to proposers to submit annually. I use the educational contract as an example. It was misinterpreted the first year as to how long it would take to develop and implement. I would hate to see some of these be thrown out.

*** Motion ***

(Stokely): I move that proposers with multiple year projects be required to submit proposals each year for review by the TWG and Task Force.

Motion seconded.

(Rohde): If multiple year projects need review, if it is considered by TWG and ranked high, what's the intent of the Task Force review if work is proceeding as planned?

(Farro): I think we've had people propose multiple year studies, but because they were too expensive, they didn't get approved. If someone wants to submit a multiple year proposal they should be able to.

(Reynolds): No budget is automatic, there's always a potential for receiving less than anticipated, that's why CDFG usually issues single year contracts.

(Rohde): As we move into the subbasin management approach, it will become more important to look at multi-year projects. It will be important to tackle the entire restoration problem. Where's the dividing line during the transition? I can see potential for dropping a project that is soon to come to fruition before it's completed. We could undermine our attempt to resolve these large

problems.

(Shake): The Task Force is saying that for this point in time, this is the way we'll deal with projects. When we get to the subbasin approach, we'll have opportunity to amend the process.

*** Motion carried. ***

*** Motion ***

(Bingham): I move to include purchase of the sound system. It will be inserted at the very bottom of the line for the FY1993 budget.

Motion seconded.

(After discussion of funding with surplus FY1992 funds or with FY1993 funds...)

(Bingham): I will table my motion until we hear the financial report later today.

(McInnis): One proposal is to provide a recording system and one is for a public address system. Are we wanting to record these meetings?

(Wilkinson): Yes, for the historic record.

(Shake): The motion is tabled for right now. Let's have the status report for the FY1992 work plan.

Agenda Item: Report on status of work plans for FY1990-FY1992 (Alcorn):

(Alcorn): The handouts provided in your package cover FY1991 and FY1992 (Attachments 4 and 5). I will answer questions regarding the status of any of the projects listed. Hearing none, I will move on to discuss surplus FY1992 funds. We have identified a surplus of \$32,000 in FY1992 funds at KRFRO. These funds can be made available for funding FY1993 projects or for picking up the FY1992 project on Pine Creek, thereby leaving a smaller surplus. We have also identified four projects in the FY1992 work plan that may result in some level of funding surplus, which could add up to an additional \$43,000. The four projects are: 1) FP-11, the Hoopa Valley green sturgeon tagging project, 2) FR-5, the Hammel Creek chinook rearing project, 3) FR-4, the Orleans Rod and Gun Club rescued steelhead rearing project, and 4) HR-19, the Siskiyou RCD Paradise Hollow fencing project. Problems associated with implementing each of these could leave some surplus funds, but we do not know how much it will be at this time. The potential surplus for FY1992 funds totals \$75,000.

(Farro): I take it that the first commitment for spending these FY1992 funds would be \$24,128 for the Hoopa Tribe's Pine Creek project?

(Shake): I also suggest that we identify specs for the sound system, and

acquire it with remaining FY92 funds. If any funds surplus remains, this would be applied to the FY93 workplan, beginning at the top of the list.

*** Motion. ***

So moved (unidentified).

*** Motion carried. ***

(Iverson): I think that once you decide on what level of quality you want, this will become a GSA contracting item. Our contracting office would invite 3 bids. It is cheaper to purchase equipment off of the GSA list.

*** Motion ***

(Bingham): The proposal from JHA looks the best for me. It's got what we need. I move that we buy the PC-06, 8500 system.

Motion seconded.

*** Motion carried (three abstentions). ***

Agenda item: Status of the non-federal workplan (Reynolds):

(Reynolds): We funded all contracts as reported to you last year. We're finishing up our 1991-92 contracts. All grants have been written (some may not have final signature), but that's about all I can report at this date. We don't get information on contracts until the state's books close right around July 1, each year. I will mail the report on these to Ron's shop and to all Task Force members.

*** Action item ***

Forrest Reynolds to compile information on 1991-1992 CDFG Klamath basin restoration projects and send to KRFR0 and to all Task Force members.

Agenda item: Report on status of upper basin amendment (Alcorn):

(Alcorn): I have yet to begin editorial work on the amendment. I've established milestone dates for completion of this project. These dates are as follows:

- | | |
|--------|--|
| Aug 11 | Complete editorial work, send copies to Task Force members for comment. |
| Sep 11 | Review period (for Task Force and TWG members only) ends. |
| Sep 25 | Publish Federal Register Notice of availability. |
| Oct 23 | Print and mail amendments to all parties possessing a copy of the long range plan. |

Agenda item: Fish restoration activities proposed for Fiscal Year 1993:

U.S. Department of Agriculture:

(West): (Discussing Attachment 6.) The SCS and USFS chose to break down our proposed projects by category. This summarizes the information we received from SCS, and our proposals. The total program is for approximately \$3.1 million in FY1993. On U.S. Forest Service lands, the overall focus is for sediment reduction, reduction of summer water temperatures in streams, and we're backing off of instream structure construction. We're trying to manage the resources from a more holistic approach. The lion's share of the program is for habitat protection, which some of this work includes restoration planning and inventories of existing conditions.

Q: You developed the spring chinook initiative at an earlier date. Is that included in this report for 1993 activities?

(West): In 1992 we had an addition of \$250,000 for implementing the spring chinook recovery plan. I'm anticipating about \$800,000 for spring chinook recovery in 1993. The full amount is not presented in this report, but it reflects an increase of about \$500,000.

(Holder): We are committing to employ a wildlife management program officer. We're hiring a threatened and endangered wildlife/fisheries person as well. A third position will deal primarily with anadromous fish.

(West): We are going to develop a conservation strategy for summer steelhead in FY1993. This will be similar to the spring chinook recovery strategy developed last year.

Karuk Tribe of California:

(Rohde): I was just hired by the Karuk tribe as the natural resource manager. As one of my first duties, I was directed to come up with this report. One of my duties is to come up with a long range plan. I've highlighted some activities coming up in 1993. (Rohde read from his report, see Attachment 7).

Yurok Tribe:

(Lara): The Yurok Tribe's Natural Resource Committee is still in the developmental stages. I can report later on the developments as they occur, but have nothing to report at this time.

State of California:

(Reynolds): As I reported earlier, we have some money to spend on Klamath River fishery projects. Cooperative agreements to implement the 1992 workplan are now being completed. (See Attachment 8).

Shasta Valley Coordinated Resource Management Plan (CRMP):

(Sumner): (Discussing Attachment 9.) Problems in the Shasta have occurred primarily since the construction of Dwinnell Reservoir. Fish passage may be an alternative because there is good habitat above that reservoir. (Sumner also described the MOU, Attachment 10). I'm asking this group to sign this MOU.

Q: By signing this, does it become effective now?

(Sumner): Yes.

(Reynolds): This MOA came to CDFG several months ago for review. I'm wondering why we need to sign off on it now. Are all people who sign off considered cooperators?

(Sumner): Yes. All irrigation districts have signed the original, we've yet to hear from the Task Force.

(Discussion ensued regarding what agencies should be signatory, and who becomes a cooperator.)

(Sumner): It is an effort to get information sharing going. This is one way to accomplish this, signatories don't have to formally participate. This is a local organization, planning to have local meetings trying to get more participation from locals. We feel if we get more participation by the signatories, it will make it better.

Q: Has this MOU had USFWS Regional review?

(Iverson): No, but we've looked it over at KRFR0 and provided comment to the CRMP.

*** Motion ***

(Reynolds): I move that the Task Force approve this, and sign it after the signature page is complete.

*** Motion carried. ***

Report of 1993 fishery restoration activities, Trinity County:

(Stokely): We have two programs pertinent to this report (one through the Trinity Restoration Program). We administer the grant program for that project. We spend about 1% of the money on private cooperators/contractors and 99% on agency work. We're involved in an instream flow study, and we have a contract to develop forest practice rules for Grass Valley Creek. This rules package may not be developed because we may purchase the watershed, thereby ending all timber harvest. Trinity County is also developing an "adopt a watershed" program, and we're developing education curricula. We're the lead agency for developing the environmental impact report on the side channel construction and feather edging projects. Environmental review is necessary under NEPA (National Environmental Protection Act) and CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act). In addition to restoration money, our

Board of Supervisors has committed to hiring a nonprofit law firm to work on environmental issues. We're working with the Hoopa Valley Tribe to get more instream releases from Trinity Reservoir. Flows are being considered by House Conference Committee in Washington D.C. Trinity County was instrumental in getting the State Water Quality Control Board to develop temperature standards for the mainstem Trinity River. Trinity County is going to request establishment of minimum pool standards for Trinity Lake. We're participating in an economic study to look at the economic values of cold water in Trinity Lake. We're looking at spills at Iron Mountain Mine, and the EPA is also involved. We may intervene in a lawsuit to protect Sacramento River fish, in order to protect Trinity River fish.

(Bingham): PCFFA is a party in the lawsuit just mentioned. We have to prove personal injury, and we're not wanting to jeopardize Trinity River stocks. We also want to protect the fall run Sacramento fish. The Sacramento is expected to go as high as 70°F. We've sent a letter with a notice of intent to file suit, provided Reclamation doesn't take remedial action now.

(Stokely): We think we can protect Trinity River water because it's warmer than Sacramento water when it gets there. Reclamation has increased deliveries to water contractors at the expense of the Sacramento fall chinook run.

Q: Can you describe the role the Trinity River Task Force took in successfully negotiating increased flows?

(Stokely): An IFIM study identified minimum flow needs. If the Klamath River had the same type study, the tribes could get water in a concerted effort. It took us about 3 1/2 years getting our plan through the legislation and agencies.

(Reynolds): One advantage they have is that the Trinity River and Sacramento River are both inside the state. It's easier for the State Water Board to deal with water quality issues. In the Klamath River, we're dealing with other state and water control agencies. Regarding an IFIM, it would be great to have this information for the river from Iron Gate Dam down to the Scott River. It will tell you about instream habitat, but won't tell you the importance of flows for migrating fish in and out of the tributaries.

(Sumner): The Bureau of Reclamation reported that by July 1, they will have reduced flows to 100 cfs at Keno. CDFG just completed the release of 4.1 million chinook into the Klamath last week.

(Rohde): Don Treasure (Project Manager, Klamath Project) said that he contacted all agencies but had only received one letter commenting on this action. Since he had only one letter, he took that as an OK. If Reclamation doesn't get a response, we'll be in big trouble.

(Shake): USFWS is between a rock and a hard spot on that flow issue because of the endangered suckers upriver. I understand that we've worked out a compromise on how to deal with that situation, but it doesn't include minimum flows in the Klamath River.

(Franklin): Something should be said indicating 100 cfs at Keno is not enough water.

(Hayes): I was assured that a letter from CDFG was signed by our director regarding the reduction of flow at Keno. PPL has committed to providing 3,000 acre-feet to help flush fish downstream.

(Rohde): There's more than enough justification to let BOR know that further reductions are not justified. I propose the Task Force direct the USFWS to pull together all the available biological information and prepare a letter to be sent to Reclamation indicating that 100 cfs is inadequate. The letter should also request that Reclamation work with CDFG and USFWS to identify needs and provide additional water.

(Iverson): A letter requesting increased flows was sent earlier, but the request was not complied with.

(Shake): Your suggestion is the Task Force send a letter to USFWS requesting they work with Reclamation to increase flows. If you want to ask the USFWS to do something, ask them to write a letter indicating this has been discussed, and requests additional flows in the Klamath.

(Hillman): I suggest the letter come from this Task Force calling this issue to their attention, with a copy going to PFMG. A second letter should go to USFWS asking them to do what is necessary to get water for anadromous fish. The compromise by the USFWS was at the expense of anadromous fish.

(Shake): The problem is implementing the Endangered Species Act. It calls for protecting the endangered suckers at the expense of all other uses. I ask that Leaf Hillman, Bob Rohde, Doug Alcorn, and Dick Sumner get together and draft a letter to be sent to the BOR and USFWS. The Task Force will review and discuss it tomorrow.

(Reynolds): The letter should be addressed to the Secretary of Interior.

(Hillman): We have a public information officer who should be focusing the public eye from all other communities on this issue. It's appropriate that the public information officer be directed to dedicate time and effort to make the public aware of this issue.

(Rohde): I would amend my proposal that we send the letter to the Secretary of Interior, with copies going to USFWS, and Reclamation.

(Reynolds): Whatever letter goes out, if handled by the KRFR staff information person, I would like a newsletter to go to the conservation education program in Sacramento.

Agenda item: Report from action planning committee (Bingham):

(Bingham): We've not yet held our meeting. We felt that it would be better to meet after this Task Force meeting. We hope to have an exchange of ideas at the next TWG meeting. I suggest a concurrent meeting with the TWG and the

action planning committee.

(West): OK with me.

(Bingham): I'll work with Jack West to establish a date.

June 17

Discussion item: Draft letter to Secretary of Interior.

(See Attachment 11.)

(Sumner): The economic impact is \$100 million rather than 50 million, we will change. (Consensus.)

(Bingham): I suggest we strike "local" from the reference to "local economy." (Consensus.)

(Wilkinson): Copies should go to congressmen Defazio, Riggs, Herger, Miller, Fazio, Seymour, and the state assemblyman.

(Shake): Any other folks? We'll go ahead and put this letter together and send out by the end of the week.

***** Action *****

Letter will be prepared by USFWS and sent, with copies to appropriate individuals and organizations.

(Orcutt): I would reference Trinity flows and call attention to the lack of instream flow information in the Klamath.

(Bingham): We need to get this to the press as a press release.

Agenda item: Presentation of long range plan amendment process (Wilkinson):

***** Motion *****

(Wilkinson): I've handed out a written suggestion for the process (Attachment 12). I move to adopt this process.

Motion seconded.

(Rohde): Leaf feels that the amendment period should stay open all the time, not staggered over a 5-year period. Given the discussions yesterday, I think this process is out of tune with our needs.

(Wilkinson): Local critical issues, immediate and emergency items can be considered at any time. Administratively, the different processes would be difficult to accomplish having it open all the time. Amendment to this living document is at the prerogative of the chair.

Q: Is this being recommended for the whole plan?

(Wilkinson): Yes.

(Shake): If we just leave it open, you never have a formal period of review and conscious decisions to consider amendments. This process is simply establishing a formal period for that. In my opinion, any Task Force member can bring the need for amendment before this body.

(Bingham): I would consider it appropriate to table the motion until the next meeting. I don't see the immediate need to proceed with this action today.

(Shake): Leaving the amendment period open continually would add to that workload of KRFRRO staff. This is a recommendation of the review committee in consultation with staff. We have a suggestion to table the motion.

(Bingham): Keith, would you be willing to table the motion?

(Wilkinson): No.

*** Motion failed. ***

*** Motion ***

(Bingham): I move to add this to the next meeting's agenda. We will ask those opposing this process to study and make recommendations.

*** Motion carried (one abstention). ***

*** Action ***

Place the amendment process on the fall meeting agenda. Members opposing the proposed process will review and make recommendations.

Agenda item: Update on Iron Gate and Trinity River spring hatchery releases and long-term operation policy changes (Reynolds).

(See Attachment 13.)

(Reynolds): The Department reviewed the performance of the fish produced at Iron Gate Hatchery, and reviewed operations. After review, the recommended operation strategy is almost a duplication of the original set of goals and constraints developed earlier. Iron Gate fish are to be 90/lb, or larger, before release.

(Wilkinson): Has the USFWS conducted downstream migrant trapping? Have any hatchery stocks been trapped?

(Iverson): I will call CCFRO for a report, to be presented later today.

(Bingham): I'd like to raise a parallel issue presented in the letter from CSSTRF (Attachment 14). It calls for marking all hatchery reared fish. This was sent to CDFG. PCFFA is not endorsing this, but asking that this suggestion be considered. It might also give more information regarding contribution of hatchery stocks. A growing school of thought is that wild

stocks migrate farther down the coast than hatchery stocks. Marking hatchery produced fish would begin answering this question.

(Hayes): We released fish over a longer period of time, and monitor survival, this year. We now have 1 million chinook at IGH, 250,000 at the Fall Creek facility, and 160,000 at the mid-Klamath ponds, all 1.35 million to be reared to yearling size and released this fall. The fish have been sighted at Beaver Creek, about 25 miles downstream, we're monitoring their progress.

*** Action ***

CDFG to send an updated Iron Gate and Trinity River hatchery review report to Task Force members. Will also provide the copies of the current natural stocks report.

(Wilkinson): We have a letter from ODFW (Attachment 15) regarding concerns of fish management on the Klamath River. One concern not mentioned in the letter is that we're having similar experiences on the Rogue River. Some suggestions from ODFW may be applicable in the Klamath system.

(Reynolds): For five or six years I've been trying to work with ODFW to establish some sort of review and coordination in our hatchery systems. This letter provides a good opportunity to have dialogue.

(Wilkinson): The letter indicates offering services of the KFMC, who is also participating on the stock identification committee.

(Franklin): Did your review cover the impacts hatcheries have on natural stocks by releasing surplus adults back into the river to spawn, and whether the rearing pond program is affecting natural stocks?

(Reynolds): These issues are different than those covered by the hatchery review. Our intent is to minimize impacts on natural stocks, that's why we determined it would be inappropriate to truck fish. Regarding the Klamath rearing pond program, we have long desired to establish a natural broodstock to provide eggs for this program. We've had geneticists determine whether IGH fish would modify the genetic structure of the fish in these tributaries, they indicate not at this level of stocking. Camp Creek is an attempt to rear late fall fish, with marginal success.

(Hayes): Looking at hatchery records for past 30 years we've had surplus eggs in only a few years. So, releasing surplus adults hasn't been a severe problem in the past.

(Bingham): The scientific community indicates that hatchery production could be impacting natural stocks, and should be reduced. My industry has wanted to rear surplus fish in the past in a way to prevent impacts on natural stocks. No one has really supported this or looked at this issue. Why do we refuse to deal with this?

(West): The TWG talked about hatchery practices and over-production. One of our top five objectives was to ensure that hatcheries don't impact natural

stocks. I would suggest a non-biased committee look at this to suggest strategies. The Stock Identification Committee is a suggestion.

Public comment:

Jim Walters (charter boat operator): I'm impressed with what Forrest Reynolds has brought to the table. We don't have access to mixed stocks in the ocean. Some years over 70% of fish harvested come from the Sacramento system, which is dominated by hatchery fish. I'm glad to hear you say the Klamath hatchery program has potential to provide fish for the fisheries.

(Walters read written comment provided by Mr. Jim Welter. See Attachment 16.)

End of public comment.

(Bingham): I suggest forming another committee to work on this issue of hatchery production, including the stock identification group members.

(Wilkinson): I endorse what you're saying, but ask that you defer until we read the letter from ODFW.

(Shake): (Read letter from ODFW). I suggest that we respond back to Randy Fisher, and call for a meeting of this group soon.

(Bingham): I suggest we refer this matter to the three chairs meeting. Tribes also need to be involved.

Q: Didn't the KFMC assign the Klamath River Technical Advisory Team to look at coast-wide hatchery practices. Does anyone remember this?

(Shake): I don't remember. I would have to look at past meeting notes.

(Lara): I would like some time to come back with some thoughts on this. Are we proposing to act on this today?

(Shake): The Yuroks should have gotten a copy of this letter, but I hear this group saying that we support the idea, and would wish to participate in this planning meeting. Other interested folks should also be asked to participate.

(Lara): Would this come back to the Task Force? Or would it be put directly into CDFG operations/ordinances?

(Shake): I'm sure the Task Force would want to discuss the outcome, but CDFG maintains that it's their management decision on hatchery operations. However, they're open for suggestions to improve their operations.

(Reynolds): I didn't hear ODFW suggesting we discuss operation of their Rogue River hatcheries. The letter indicates that they will offer to advise us in our operations. CDFG will respond, probably favorably.

(Wilkinson): The letter came about after our last Task Force meeting. I made a statement for ODFW regarding our concern for hatchery operations on the

Klamath. We have a similar situation on the Rogue River, so my intention is for significant comparisons between rivers and programs be made.

(Pierce): Some time back, someone mentioned that there was going to be a coast-wide restoration program, making money available to look at salmon problems.

(Shake): There has been considerable discussion among fisheries managers in the northwestern states, about putting together a coast-wide salmon restoration initiative. It's still in the formative stage. We've discussed this with congressional representatives. ODFW has discussed it with the Governor, there is general support for the idea, but we shouldn't count on that for immediate help.

(Pierce): This Task Force could initiate formal communication with parties involved.

(Shake): Yes we can do that.

(Orcutt): I wish to remind you the long range plan of the KFMC included this at the request of the Hoopa Tribe. I'm glad to see ODFW coming forward and recommending working together. The KRTAT has discussed a variety of items regarding hatchery management, and have made recommendations. I hope that this will be discussed at the meeting of the chairs.

(Jud Ellinwood): There are legal constraints on CDFG with regard to how they operate their hatcheries. Within the Department there are differing opinions of what constitutes good management. Politics often drive management decisions. It would be in the program's best interest to develop scientific information to drive decisions, rather than having politics drive decisions.

(Reynolds): Regarding Mike Orcutt's comments, I want to point out that we have specific policies regarding operations. Some actions requiring sign-off by the deputy director, chief, and others. Many times decisions are made at higher levels, based on direction from superiors. I agree that an outside group looking at this is good. I'm reminded about moving fish from Trinity River Hatchery to the Hoopa Reservation. It makes us nervous, and we would like input from the Task Force whether this is good or bad.

(Bingham): I'd request that this issue be discussed by the three chairs. I would request a report, to be heard and considered by this Task Force.

*** Motion ***

(Farro): I move that we compose a committee to address this topic, compiled of members of agencies, the scientific community, and this Task Force.

Motion seconded.

(Lara): I'm concerned that the answer would go directly to decision makers and not come back to the Task Force for discussion.

(Shake): The letter was not sent to the Task Force. I don't think it's inappropriate, because all of the addressees sent this letter have representatives on the Task Force. It could be suggested that this issue come back to the Task Force for implementation. If we do that, I'd pass on the concern that we look at management of Rogue River stocks. Also, there is a sense of urgency here and this may not wait until the three chair meeting. The meeting may occur whether we do anything about it or not. We should be involved.

(Reynolds): I'd like to understand what is proposed here. Are we addressing this letter with the motion?

(Farro): I'm not responding to the letter, but would ask the Task Force chair to respond. My motion is based on the clear recognition by the TWG that this is something that needs to be considered to come up with a strategy to define problems and solutions. It is not responding to the letter from ODFW. I will restate my motion: I'd like to form a committee to look at the issue of artificial propagation and wild stock interaction. The committee will be composed of lead agencies, members of the scientific community, and members of the Task Force and TWG.

(Lara): If the Task Force proposes to do this it should require a report back to the Task Force from this committee.

*** Motion carried. ***

(Shake): Now we should discuss how we'll do it.

(Wilkinson): I suggest it's the prerogative of the chair.

(Shake): I won't make a decision now, but will send thoughts out to the Task Force with suggested approaches. This issue is addressed by the long range plan, and was discussed at La Jolla. We've identified our objectives, and should keep them in mind, and not deviate.

(Wilkinson): We've talked about two separate groups meeting. The interstate group and the one suggested by this motion.

(Shake): I will take the views of the Task Force to the meeting proposed by ODFW, and offer our support. I will also suggest the Rogue River system be part of this review, since they are interrelated.

Agenda item: Final report on FY1990/91 Karuk subsistence monitoring project (Hillman).

Postponed until next meeting.

Agenda item: report from North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board on establishing temperature objectives for the Klamath, Trinity, Scott and Shasta Rivers (Theresa Wistrom).

(See Attachment 17. Wistrom provided a detailed account of temperature

objectives established for the Trinity River system.)

(Wistrom): Temperature objectives are developed with extensive input from fisheries experts, and this kind of input will be needed for developing objectives for the Klamath River. If general temperature objectives are not protecting the Klamath River fish, we need to hear about it so we can do something about it. This group can provide useful and powerful input. If you decide you want to pursue a basin-wide water quality plan amendment, you must develop a formal request. Specific and achievable objectives must be recommended.

(Farro): It's pretty well recognized by the Task Force that we have water quality problems on the Klamath River. More water of poor quality won't do us much good. How would amendment of the process deal with the fact that much of the water quality problems are coming from sources outside of the state?

(Wistrom): It's not easily controlled. I'm not completely familiar with the Klamath River situation.

(Wilkinson): Is the Water Control Board a member of the Klamath compact?

(Wistrom): I don't know.

(Rohde): Are you familiar with your counterpart in Oregon, and do they have a similar basin plan?

(Wistrom): Yes. We've made contact with Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) but haven't discussed the issue of the Klamath River. We need to identify the biological needs, such as dissolved oxygen, maximum temperatures, etc. before we open discussions of water quality impairment.

(Shake): Theresa, our long range plan has just been amended to include the upper basin. I don't see how you can begin amending your water quality plan without considering the entire basin, including the Oregon side.

(Iverson): The Klamath Forest Alliance requested the State Water Quality Control Board to establish water quality standards for the Klamath, Shasta, and Scott Rivers. What is the status of a response to that request?

(Wistrom): We have to be shown how our general objective is not satisfactory.

Q: Do we have a copy of the basin water quality plan?

(Iverson): No.

(Wistrom): I'll provide it to you.

Q: Is there a coordinated effort to monitor water quality?

(Hayes): We need better data, but I suspect that water temperatures are the most important parameter.

(Franklin): States can promulgate standards for beneficial uses, which can be

considered and resolved between two states. The Hoopa Tribe has recently been recognized with "state" status, which will allow negotiation for water quality improvement. The tribe is sampling water quality this year during low flow season, to determine if contaminants exist. The Karuk tribe also has a project to monitor temperatures.

*** Motion ***

(Rohde): I move that we request the Regional Water Quality Control Board to amend their basin plan to include temperature objectives, and would ask staff to prepare a letter.

Motion seconded.

(Farro): Are we talking for the Shasta and Scott Rivers too?

(Rohde): For Klamath Basin, including those tributaries.

(Wistrom): The request is to address temperature objectives in the mainstem Klamath, Shasta, and Scott Rivers. I stress that you must specify what you want, and give recommendations for how it can be achieved. An interstate Task Force might be one suggestion.

(West): It seems that there is not a single place where all the knowledge of water quality on the Klamath River is housed. It would be prudent for staff to gather all existing temperature and flow data from gaging stations, look at it and incorporate it into the amendment request.

(Wilkinson): I agree. I believe we're ill informed about the problems. It's known that there are problems, but I don't think we're able to make a recommendation at this time.

*** Motion carried. ***

(Shake): I suggest we call for volunteers to convene technical folks to put together this type of request. I don't want to hand it to staff, but suggest a volunteer effort by a work group.

Rohde and Sumner volunteered. Others identified by the chair: representatives from CDFG, NMFS, USFWS.

(Shake): Bob, would you take the lead on putting that group and report together.

(Wistrom): The deadline for requests is sometime in October.

*** Action ***

Bob Rohde, Dick Sumner, appointees from CDFG, NMFS, and USFWS, will compile water quality data and develop fish protection standards for the mainstem Klamath, Shasta, and Scott Rivers. Report to be reviewed at next Task Force meeting, then sent to State Water Quality Control Board with a request to

amend the basin water quality plan.

(Jud Ellinwood): I suggest that your public information officer keep all public involved in this, especially the counties.

(Wilkinson): I think we should keep the Klamath Tribe involved, suggest Elwood Miller to participate.

(Hayes): I suggest getting BOR involved too.

(Shake): The assignment is to have a draft for review by September.

(Orcutt): We can offer suggestions for this effort too.

(Rohde): I ask that everyone having information send it to me.

Agenda item: Report of changes to suction dredge mining regulations in the Klamath Basin (John Hayes).

(Hayes): Suction dredge mining regulations are dealt with much like fishing regulations. Specific waters and seasons are identified. In recent years we've been getting more and more concerns expressed regarding impacts of dredging on incubating salmonid eggs. Because of that concern, Region 1 recommends to the Department that the start day of the Klamath basin dredge season be moved up to July 1, from approximately June 1. If an area has steelhead and fall chinook present, the proposed general season is July 1 to September 30. If spring chinook are present, the season would only extend to September 15. Dredge size was also discussed, and we decided to limit the intake size to a maximum of 4" on small tributaries, 6" on medium sized tributaries, and 8" on the Klamath and Trinity River mainstems. Our recommendations will go to Sacramento after July 1. The Department will hold public hearings on those proposed changes, and if found acceptable, regulations will go into effect January 1, 1993.

*** Motion ***

(Farro): I move that we send a letter supporting the proposed changes to CDFG.

Motion seconded.

(Bingham): I think it's a good suggestion, but would like to hear from the member from the mining community before we vote. I believe there is one in the audience.

(Brian Hill): I've been dredging for more than 20 years now. Regulations have become more restrictive each year. I suggest that the industry can actually help the stream. We submitted a 1993 proposal to demonstrate this, but it ranked low. I would like to get the biological and mining people together to show how the industry can improve fish habitat. If this doesn't occur, the mining industry will be put out of business, and the restoration program could lose this potential habitat restoration opportunity.

Q: Are there any demonstration projects to show that mining can improve fish habitat?

(Hill): We did a demonstration on the Trinity River last year, but it was not very successful. The project was not set up properly. The process we've designed will allow for mineral extraction, and accomplish gravel cleaning.

(Wilkinson): How would you get around the problem of dredging eggs?

(Hill): I don't want them to dredge redds.

(Sumner): It's my experience that holes created by mining fill in each winter. Tailings from mining are clean, but easily moved. The problems I have with some miners is that they disturb the banks. Somewhere in the regulations there should be something that protects the banks.

(Hill): It's my goal to make regulations constructive rather than restrictive.

(West): These are proposed changes to the standard mining regulations. There are special provisions to get special permits.

(Hayes): Special permits are only issued after an on-site inspection by a CDFG biologist.

(Franklin): The Trinity Restoration program has dealt with this issue. In some spawning areas mining is allowed year 'round. What is the CDFG going to do regarding mainstem mining?

(Hayes): Zone F allows dredging all year, and that may be the area you're talking about. We propose changes to allow mining in that area beginning June 1 through Sept 30 from the South Fork Trinity River to the North Fork.

(Rohde): I question the importance of the Task Force sending a letter of support. Sounds like the Department will make a decision regardless of our input.

(Hayes): The decision will be made using input from all groups.

(Bingham): The letter should support developing solutions with the mining industry to improve the communications and reduce impacts.

(Farro): I will amend my motion to include that we "write a letter supporting the regulations, including recommending development of solutions."

(Hill): I will be a liaison between the Task Force and CDFG and the industry.

*** Motion failed. ***

(Rohde): I feel CDFG is doing an adequate job, you're asking all of us to sign off on this without review. I want to consider that the mining industry may be doing something good.

Q: Would you be willing to review the regulations then reconsider?

(Rohde): Yes.

(Shake): There appears to be agreement that when we receive a copy of the proposed mining regulations change, we will distribute copies to Task Force members for future action.

(Farro): John, what's the time-line?

(Hayes): We need to get this to Sacramento by July. The Department will send this out for a 30-45 day public review.

(Farro): We may be too late if we delay.

(Shake): I suggest that as soon as we get those proposed changes, KRFRO staff can send them out to Task Force members. We will send comments to KRFRO, and staff will compile them and draft a letter for our review. If there is consensus we'll send the letter to the Department.

*** Action item ***

KRFRO staff to mail proposed changes to dredge mining regulations to Task Force members for comment. KRFRO will compile comments, draft a letter to CDFG for review by the Task Force. If there is consensus to send the letter, KRFRO will send with chair's signature.

(Shake): Brian, I appreciate your time and patience. You've heard our discussion, and you will find that our long range plan addresses mining, and emphasizes the importance of working with the community.

(Shake): It's not on the agenda, but I'd like a report from Bruce Halstead (USFWS-CCFRO) on trapping of Iron Gate Hatchery fish at Big Bar.

(Halstead): We caught our first coded wire tagged (CWT) chinook last Friday, June 12. We've trapped 48 fish with CWTs. Yesterday we captured 3 CWT fish out of 110 fish caught. The fish don't appear to be stressed. We're not catching many but they are beginning to show up in our traps.

Agenda item: Task Force discussion of agenda for meeting of advisory committee chairs.

(Shake): Ron, do we have a draft agenda for the meeting of the chairs?

(Iverson): That was sent out to all members, but it may not be pertinent now.

(Shake): I suggested the meeting be more general, concentrating on key issues, primarily coordination and communication between all advisory committees. If the chairs agreed, I thought we could have future meetings. The meeting is in Sacramento at the Federal building, on June 26, from 10:30 am to 2:00 pm. Any Task Force members wishing to attend are welcome. Any suggestions for the meeting?

Hearing none, we'll proceed and provide a report of that meeting.

Agenda item: New business and discussion of next meeting.

(Orcutt): I'd like to provide more detail on the green sturgeon project discussed yesterday. There were questions regarding FP-11 in Doug Alcorn's presentation. The project was to begin collection of green sturgeon data by applying tags to adult green sturgeon. The cost (\$14,000) was to access green sturgeon on the Hoopa and Yurok reservations. To date we've purchased tags and submitted letters to the Yurok Tribal Council requesting that we perform some work down river. The council has directed Ronnie Pierce and I to work on a cooperative approach to insure that the project gets underway. The Hoopa Tribe intends to work cooperatively with the Yuroks. After discussing the problems of the lack of control for how the fish are handled by fishermen, we decided to request \$10,000 of 1992 funds to focus on a directed, experimental fishery. Yurok fishermen would target these fish and handling would be more controlled. I would add that BIA is willing to work with us on that as well. We didn't anticipate the difficulty in applying and recovering the tags from fishermen.

(Pierce): One concern is that tag application and handling would be inconsistent. The second concern was that Hoopa biologists would be working on the Yurok reservation. The request is to pay fishermen to capture green sturgeon, tag, correlate the data (by BIA at no additional cost), and transfer the data to the Hoopa Fisheries Department for monitoring tag recoveries.

(West): So, the project has gone from \$14,000 to \$24,000?

(Orcutt): Yes. That's a rough estimate to get tags applied. The spring fishery is still occurring. In July, some regulatory changes may be initiated to protect the fall chinook fishery.

(McInnis): The project objectives don't appear to be expanded, however the cost are. One of the TWG's ranking criteria is cost effectiveness, which will be impacted by this cost increase.

(Farro): It may set a bad precedent to change a contract in the middle of implementation. Is it impossible to carry out the project as written?

(Orcutt): The tribes and agencies were to coordinate efforts, which didn't happen.

(Wilkinson): This is to resolve a social problem between two tribes. This is not our charge. The proposal was designed with biological concerns, and not social concerns.

***** Motion *****

(Bingham): I move that this be given to the TWG for timely review, by mail, resulting in a report back to KRFR0. KRFR0 will send this report out to Task Force members for review. If comments are not received back within 3 weeks of the mailing date, it will constitute approval for the project. One objection

will prevent the increase.

Motion seconded.

(West): Can you leave the process of how it's done to me?

(Bingham): I'll amend motion to allow chair to coordinate the process.

(McInnis): Regarding nonexpended 1992 funds, the first priority is to fund the Pine Creek outmigrant project, the second is to purchase the sound system, and the third priority is the addition of funds to the green sturgeon project. Any surplus beyond this amount would go to fund the 1993 list of proposals.

(Bingham): I'll incorporate those priorities into the motion.

(Shake): There's a possibility that there may not be surplus funds.

(West): A decision won't come until August, is that too late?

Q: Mike, will that allow enough time to fish?

(Pierce): It will allow about one month of fishing time. If the research fishery is occurring during the chinook run, some incidental harvest of chinook may result. These will be kept, and counted as Yurok harvest. I don't know what the open or closing dates of the subsistence fishery will be.

(Shake): Wouldn't \$10,000 allow for more than a month of fishing?

(Pierce): I can reassess the budget. There may be less money needed if the fishing effort is reduced.

*** Motion carried (one abstention). ***

(Jud Ellinwood): In establishing a precedent, I suggest you adopt a formal procedure so all proposers can know what to expect in the future.

Agenda item: Agenda items and dates for next Task Force meeting.

(Shake): We will meet November 4-5, 1992, in Yreka. We will request that Fruit Growers Company prepare a presentation for that meeting.

(Holder): On future meeting agendas, I suggest that we allow for public comment before decisions on critical issues are voted on. I also suggest that additional copies of handouts discussed at these meetings be provided to the audience. We should provide a speaking podium with a microphone for speakers addressing this group. Finally, I would request that we schedule meetings at least a couple in advance.

(Wilkinson): The chair handles public comment prior to decisions on critical issues. I suggest that the chair take public comment, at his discretion.

(West): A draft agenda for the following meeting could be developed as the

last item of each Task Force meeting.

(Shake): Hearing no further discussion, we'll implement those.

*** Action ***

At each Task Force meeting, the final agenda item will be discussion and development of the agenda for the succeeding meeting. Each meeting shall be equipped with a speaker's podium. KRFRO will provide at least 20 copies of each discussion item handout, for audience use.

[The Task Force agreed to meet February 3-4, 1993, in Brookings, Oregon.]

(Shake): One final thing, Lila is going to be leaving us, and will be gone before our next meeting. I'd like to thank her for her contribution at KRFRO.

Public comment:

Jud Ellinwood: I'd like to ask the Task Force to consider as an agenda item for your next meeting, a discussion on marking hatchery fish, with support in mind.

(Wilkinson): I suggest we have Dr. Hankin here for that discussion.

(West): To review the TWG assignments, we are to: 1) answer the timber harvest plan question of what we think is necessary to protect streams, 2) review the green sturgeon proposal for cost effectiveness, 3) meet with the planning committee to finalize the action plan, to include development of a target audience for the FY1994 RFP. KRFRO is to prepare a catalogue of potential sources of funding, which might accompany the RFP. Funding information should be provided to KRFRO from all members.

(Rohde): Regarding your assignment on developing forest practice rules, it was suggested that CDF and private industry would be asked to provide input on that. This will allow for a more comprehensive package.

(West): I heard that was to be a presentation to the Task Force. I understood the assignment to be for the TWG to develop a functional response of what is best for stream protection.

(Bingham): The rules package will probably be completed by our next meeting.

(Shake): I would like to compliment the TWG and chair on your work.

Meeting adjourned.

Attendance Roster:

Name:

Representing:

Jim S. Welter	Klamath Management Zone Fishery Coalition
Fred W Strutsman	BHCC
Jack Simmons	Orleans Rod and Gun Club
Michael Wallace	CDFG
Bob Dean	Self
Bob Rohde	Karuk Tribal Fisheries Department
Robert Will	Little North Forck Rearing Project
Judy Spunningham	Self
Jim Walters	Self
John Wheeler	Orleans Rod and Gun Club
Jim Hundley	Orleans Rod and Gun Club
Jud Ellinwood	California Salmon Steelhead and Trout Restoration Fed.
Norman Mclemore	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Peter Brucker	Salmon River Concerned Citizens
Roger Barnhart	USFWS
Desma M. Williams	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Craig Bienz	Klamath Tribe
Elwood Miller	Klamath Tribe
Phil Towle	Self
Brian Hill	Trinity Alps Mining Co.
William Chesney	CDFG
Matt Longenbaugh	USFWS
Diane Higgins	Klamath River Education Program

REVISED FINAL AGENDA
FOR THE
KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE
MEETING, JUNE 15-17, 1992
ARCATA, CALIFORNIA

(6/03/92)

- June 15 --- The Quality Inn, conference room behind the restaurant, 3535 Janes Road, Arcata, CA.
- 1:00 to 2:30 pm Call to Order. Correction and approval of minutes and agenda.
- Report on development of a prioritization scheme for project selection by the TWG (West).
- o Review of TWG assignments.
 - o Identification of subbasin/planning areas.
 - o Description of subbasin critical objectives.
 - o Description of basinwide aggregated objectives.
 - o Identification of key players for each subbasin.
- Report on TWG FY1993 proposal ranking process (West).
- o Review of proposal ranking criteria and process.
 - o Discussion of outstanding assignments and TWG recommended options.
 - o Suggestions for improvement.
 - o Description of results of the meeting.
- 2:30 Break
- 2:45 to 4:30 pm Report on budget committee FY1993 workplan budgeting process (Bingham).
- o Description of results.
 - o Rationale for recommended funding allocation.
 - o Recommendations to Task Force for development of the FY1993 workplan.
 - o Suggestions for improving the process.
- Task Force discussion of FY1993 Federal workplan.
- o Adequacy of budget expenditures, by category.
 - o Application of action plan to proposal selection.
- 4:30 pm Public comment on FY1993 RFP and proposal selection process.
- 5:00 pm Adjourn for the day

June 16

8:00 to 10:00 am FY1993 Workplan development -- Task Force discussion continued.

10:00 am Break

10:15 to 12:00 n FY1993 Workplan development -- Task Force discussion continued.

12:00 n Lunch

1:00 pm Task Force recommendations on final FY1993 workplan.

- o Assignments to staff, members, committees.

2:00 pm Public comment on the Fiscal Year 1993 Workplan.

2:30 pm Break

2:45 to 5:00 pm Report on status of work plans for Fiscal Years 1990-92.

- o Non-Federal work plan (Reynolds).

- o Federal work plan (Alcorn).

Report on status of upper basin amendment (Alcorn).

Fish restoration activities proposed for Fiscal Year 1993

- o Department of Agriculture

- o Karuk Tribe

- o Yurok Tribe

- o Sate of California

- o Other Task Force members

Report from planning committee (Bingham).

5:00 pm Adjourn for the day.

MAY 28 1992



United States Department of the Interior
U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

TRINITY RIVER BASIN FIELD OFFICE

P.O. Box 1450

Weaverville, CA 96093

(916) 623-3931

TRB-400

MAY 27 1992

MEMORANDUM

TO: Project Leader, Klamath River FRO, Yreka, CA

FROM: Project Leader, Trinity River FRO, Weaverville, CA

SUBJECT: Federal Review Panel - Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force Proposal Review for FY93 Work Plan

The panel convened May 18 and 19, 1992 at the Oxford Suites Motel in Redding, Ca. Only two of the three people selected for the panel, Chuck Lane and Dick Irizarry, participated. Ronnie Pierce was unavailable. Doug Alcorn, Klamath River FRO Evaluation Biologist, provided logistical support.

The panel reviewed 110 proposals (not including funding for the field office) for adequacy to receive Federal funding. Three criteria were utilized - applicability to the program long-range plan, cost effectiveness, and experience and capability of proposers to carry out the work identified. Proposals were evaluated primarily on the material contained therein supplemented by information on past performance provided by Doug Alcorn.

Those proposals, either judged inadequate or for which insufficient information was available for one or more criterion, were flagged as not having passed the Federal review. There were 26 proposals flagged and for which evaluation forms were completed. The reasons for flagging were noted on the forms. Copies of these forms were given to Doug Alcorn and Jack Weest, Chairmen of the Technical Work Group.

On May 19 I attended the Technical Work Group meeting and summarized the results to members and proposers who had come to support their proposals.

My understanding is that most of the flagged proposals would also be rated by the work group. Should a flagged proposal receive high enough priority to be eligible for funding, the proposer would be contacted by the Field Office and given the opportunity to provide information sufficient to meet flagged criteria. The Field Office will then submit the new data to me for review.

I will be available to report on the review process at the Task Force meeting scheduled for June 16.

Charles B. Lane
Charles B. Lane

KLAMATH FISHERY COOPERATION PROGRAM
PROJECT PROPOSALS FISCAL YEAR 1993
(BY ABSOLUTE RANK, WITH TARGET EMPLOYMENT POINTS ADDED)

PROJECT NUMBER	COOPERATOR	SUBBASIN/PLAN AREA	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	COMMENT	RANK
PA-01	USFWS Klamath River PRO	Basinwide	Administer contracts and cooperative agreements to implement restoration program	149500	Operate Klamath River Fishery Resource Office.	
PC-09	USFWS Klamath River PRO	Basinwide	Logistical support for advisory committees, coord. of restoration activities.	272300	Includes personnel and travel costs for staff, and travel costs for nonagency advisory committee members, and logistical costs for advisory committee meetings.	
HR-06	Siskiyou County Office of Education	Shasta River	Propegation of native seedlings in riparian zone of Shasta River.	6059	To establish an ongoing nursery to grow 13,000 seedlings, annually.	91
PP-04	USFWS CA/NV Fish Health Center	Mainstem Klamath River	Health and physiology monitoring of hatchery and natural outmigrating chinook.	14000	Disease monitoring and impacts on hatchery and wild chinook.	90
PC-05	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Shasta River CRMP Field Projects Corrdinator.	26095	Field coordinator for Shasta Valley habitat restoration projects.	90
HR-24	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Flock riparian fence construction.	13960	2,640 feet of 5-strand barbed wire cattle exclusion fence along Shasta River.	88
HR-26	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Peters riparian fence construction.	31046	6,000 feet of barbed wire, 2,400 feet of electric cattle exclusion fence along Shasta River.	87
PC-01	Siskiyou RCD	Scott River	Scott Valley Coordinated Resource Management Plan.	24134	To sponsor development and operations of the Siskiyou CRMP.	87
PP-06	USFWS Coastal California PRO	Basinwide	Age composition/soale analysis of Klamath River fall chinook run - 1992.	7350	To provide the KRTAT with age composition estimate of Klamath fall chinook (natural and hatchery combined).	86
HR-23	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Eagan riparian fence construction.	14185	2,640 feet of 5-strand barbed wire cattle exclusion fence along Shasta River.	85
HR-33	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Parker riparian fence construction.	41456	7,900 feet of 5-strand barbed wire cattle exclusion fencing.	84
HR-21	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Nicoletti riparian area planting.	2649	To plant 3,960 feet of Shasta River bank with willow slips.	84
FR-02	Art Frazier	Salmon River	Hammel Creek chinook hatching/rearing	7709	To rear 35,000 fingerling chinook before transfer to another rearing project on Little North Fork Salmon River.	84
HP-15	Karuk Tribe of California	Mainstem Klamath River	Water temperature monitoring of the Klamath River Mainstem.	36740	To determine if streamflows from Lost River and Iron Gate Dam affect temperatures in Klamath River.	84

**KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROJECT PROPOSALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993
(BY ABSOLUTE RANK, WITH TARGET EMPLOYMENT POINTS ADDED)**

PROJECT NUMBER	COOPERATOR	SUBBASIN/PLAN AREA	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	COMMENT	RANK
E-13	USFWS Klamath River PRO	Basinwide	Salmon Education Community Workshops.	1000	To inform the public about the values of anadromous fish and gain support for the restoration program.	84
PC-03	Salmon River Concerned Citizens	Salmon River	Develop and implement Salmon River Community Restoration Program.	9828	Education, program planning, habitat restoration included.	84
PP-03	PSMPC	Basinwide	Temporary help for Yreka fisheries habitat improvement shop.	31118	Increased construction and maintenance of diversion ditch screens in Shasta, Scott, and upper Klamath tributaries.	83
E-11	USFWS Klamath River PRO	Scott River	Salmon Education Community Workshops.	2000	To inform the public about the values of anadromous fish and gain support for the restoration program.	83
E-12	USFWS Klamath River PRO	Middle Klamath River	Salmon Education Community Workshops.	2000	To inform the public about the values of anadromous fish and gain support for the restoration program.	82
E-06	Fisheries Focus - Paula Yoon	Basinwide	Portable information display for upper Klamath watershed.	8500	To develop informational display on upper Klamath River watershed fishery restoration and land management issues.	81
E-02	USFS-Six Rivers NF, Orleans Dist	Lower Klamath River	Public fisheries education through nonconsumptive enjoyment.	2750	Provide education experiences which enhance understanding, stewardship and nonconsumptive use of our local fish resources.	81
E-14	USFWS Klamath River PRO	Lower Klamath River	Salmon education community workshops.	1800	To inform the public about the values of anadromous fish and gain support for the restoration program.	81
HR-02	USFS-Klamath NF, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	Whistlebear side channel.	6600	To enhance summer rearing and overwintering habitat for juvenile salmonids by enhancing a recovering side channel.	81
HR-34	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Volunteer support package.	5911	To buy tools and materials to facilitate volunteer restoration projects.	80
E-03	CA Salmon Stlhd Trt Rest Federation	Basinwide	Annual restoration conference.	3000	To sponsor Restoration Federation annual conference. Focus on fishery restoration work.	79
HR-19	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Brooks riparian vegetation planting.	532	To plant 800 feet of Shasta River bank with willow slips.	78
HP-02	USFS-Klamath NF, Happy Camp Dist	Middle Klamath River	Coarse Woody Debris Survey of Mid-Klamath tributaries.	4800	Survey of woody debris in W. Fk. Clear, upper Clear, Rainy Valley, upper Elk, upper Dillon Creeks.	78

KLAMATH FISH RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROJECT PROPOSALS FISCAL YEAR 1993
(BY ABSOLUTE RANK, WITH TAX EMPLOYMENT POINTS ADDED)

PROJECT NUMBER	COOPERATOR	SUBBASIN/PLAN AREA	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	COMMENT	RANK
PC-02	USFWS-Klamath River PRO	Basinwide	Technical/operational support for watershed-based restoration planning.	16000	Additional funding to support watershed-based planning.	78
HR-38	USFS-Klamath NF, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	Native seed collection - Salmon River Drainage.	4544	To collect native riparian vegetation seeds for germination and growth to seedlings.	77
HR-25	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Member riparian fence construction.	19021	3,600 feet of high tensile wire cattle exclusion fence along Shasta River.	77
E-10	USFWS-Klamath River PRO	Shasta River	Salmon Education Community Workshops.	1500	To inform the public about the values of anadromous fish and gain support for the restoration program.	77
HR-13	Siskiyou RCD	Scott River	Scott River streambank protection - island area.	107965	Comprehensive riparian restoration.	77
HR-12	Siskiyou RCD	Scott River	Scott River streambank protection - Mason Ranch.	16280	To riprap bank and install riparian fencing along Scott River.	76
FR-08	NCIDC	Lower Klamath River	Yurok reservation late run fall chinook accelerated stocking program.	156810	To trap and spawn sufficient late fall run chinook to provide enough green eggs to produce 25,000 fingerling and 75,000 yearling chinook. To rear juveniles in lower Klamath River tributaries to target size before release.	76
E-15	USFWS Klamath River PRO	Salmon River	Salmon River salmon festival.	4000	An educational festival accompanied with recreational activities to inform the public about the value of anadromous fish and gain local support for the restoration program.	76
FR-09	NCIDC	Basinwide	Mid-Klamath chinook restoration/acceleration	200767	To rear 120,000 yearling chinook in various tributaries.	75
FP-05	USFWS Coastal California PRO	Mainstem Klamath River	Monitoring of Klamath River yearling juvenile salmonid emigration.	9000	To collect and analyze data regarding abundance, outmigration timing, and use of natural rearing areas of juvenile hatchery and natural salmonids.	75
FP-13	Nakamoto/Kisanuki	Mainstem Klamath River	Age and growth of Klamath River green sturgeon.	8340	To document age structure and provide descriptive growth data related to past life history.	75
E-01	Kidder Creek Outdoor School	Scott River	Kidder Creek restoration and education.	2900	To develop and implement a restoration project on Kidder Creek.	74
HR-20	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Easton riparian vegetation planting.	1650	To plant 1,300 feet of Shasta River bank with willow slips.	74

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROJECT PROPOSALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993
(BY ABSOLUTE RANK, WITH TARGET EMPLOYMENT POINTS ADDED)

PROJECT NUMBER	COOPERATOR	SUBBASIN/PLAN AREA	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	COMMENT	RANK
FR-03	Orleans Rod and Gun Club	Lower Klamath River	Orleans community anadromous fish rearing.	12476	To rear rescued steelhead and/or hatchery salmon for placement into Klamath River tributaries.	73
FP-07	USFWS Coastal California FRO	Mainstem Klamath River	Mainstem Klamath River fall chinook spawning escapement.	15228	Identify and quantify spawning habitat in the mainstem Klamath River, estimate number of fall chinook spawners in same.	73
HR-27	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Terry riparian fence construction.	3338	950 feet of electric wire cattle exclusion fence along Shasta River.	72
PP-10	USFWS-Coastal California FRO	Lower Klamath River	Status of salmon and steelhead stocks, Blue Creek	39942	Continuation of Blue Creek habitat and fish population investigations.	72
PR-05	Robert Will	Salmon River	Little North Fork Pond chinook rearing	16774	To rear 35,000 chinook fingerlings to yearling size before release.	72
HR-35	USFS-Klamath NP, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	Big Flat slide stabilization.	23960	To reduce erosion rate and sediment supply to Salmon River.	72
HR-30	Calif. Cons. Corps-Del Norte Center	Lower Klamath River	West Fork Blue Creek habitat restoration.	22840	To enhance fish habitat at 15 sites.	72
HR-29	Calif. Cons. Corps-Del Norte Center	Lower Klamath River	Hunter Creek habitat restoration.	43898	To enhance fish habitat at 36 sites.	72
HP-13	USFS-Klamath NP, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	Watershed inventory of Crapo Creek.	16150	WIN Inventory.	71
HR-01	USFS-Klamath NP, Happy Camp Dist	Middle Klamath River	Indian Creek Winter Habitat Restoration #2	7690	To provide complex winter, spring, summer rearing habitat for juvenile salmon and steelhead.	71
HR-03	USFS-Klamath NP, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	Salmon River large wood cover structures.	19400	To enhance summer rearing and overwintering habitat for juvenile salmonids while preserving existing riparian condition.	70
E-08	Gazelle Elementary School	Shasta River	Classroom/field fisheries studies.	880	To purchase field and laboratory equipment to enhance biological studies in Gazelle Elementary School.	69
HR-14	USFS-Six Rivers NP, Orleans Dist	Lower Klamath River	Red Cap Creek instream habitat enhancement.	16285	To improve steelhead habitat.	68
E-09	Klamath/Trinity Unified School Dist	Lower Klamath River	Klamath River monitoring and education project.	5288	To purchase laboratory and field equipment for three elementary schools in Orleans-Weitchpec area.	68
E-04	USFS-Klamath NP, Salmon River Dist	Basinwide	Klamath N.F. Education Coordinator	12737	Temporary position to coordinate education program focusing on fishery resources and	68

Klamath Fish Restoration Program
PROJECT PROPOSALS FISCAL YEAR 1993
(BY ABSOLUTE RANK, WITH TARGET EMPLOYMENT POINTS ADDED)

PROJECT NUMBER	COOPERATOR	SUBBASIN/PLAN AREA	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST COMMENT	RANK
				watershed management.	
HR-36	USFS-Klamath NF, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	Black Bear mine tailing reclamation.	7040 To abate water quality problems associated with abandoned mines.	65
FR-01	Paul and Joanne Luckey	Middle Klamath River	Eagle Ranch steelhead trout rescue rearing facility.	19676 To rescue juvenile steelhead from Bogus Creek, Cold Creek, and others, and rear fish to smolt.	64
HR-42	Trout Unlimited-Klamath Chapter	Middle Klamath River	Seiad Creek juvenile rearing structures.	34500 To construct instream structures to enhance juvenile rearing habitat.	61
HR-28	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Trutman riparian fence construction.	14025 2,300 feet of 6-wire high tensile cattle exclusion fence along Shasta River.	63
HR-04	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Ekatrom Riparian Fencing.	9180 1,320 feet of 5-strand barbed wire cattle exclusion fencing.	63
HP-12	USFS-Klamath NF, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	Watershed inventory of South Russian Creek.	7425 WIN Inventory.	63
HR-32	USFS-Klamath NF, Happy Camp Dist	Middle Klamath River	Eagle 6 landslide stabilization.	105000 To prevent further sediment delivery into Indian Creek.	63
HP-03	Scott Valley Irrigation District	Scott River	Feasibility study to evaluate conversion of SVID's ditch to a well system.	13650 To study feasibility of project to ultimately provide instream flows for migrating fish.	63
HR-15	USFS-Six Rivers NF, Orleans Dist	Lower Klamath River	Camp Creek instream habitat enhancement	13563 To improve steelhead habitat.	63
HR-11	Siskiyou RCD	Scott River	Scott River riparian fencing, revegetation and alternate livestock watering.	20856 To install cattle exclusion systems, with associated management plans for riparian restoration.	62
HP-08	Clearwater BioStudies, Inc.	Scott River	Water Diversion Catalog of streams in the Scott River Basin.	47348 To conduct a survey and develop a catalog of unscreened diversion sites in the Scott River Basin.	62
FP-01	USFS-Six Rivers NF, Orleans Dist	Lower Klamath River	Red Cap Creek downstream-migrant trapping.	9538 To evaluate salmonid juvenile production and outmigration timing.	62
HR-16	USFS-Six Rivers NF, Orleans Dist	Lower Klamath River	Bluff Creek instream habitat enhancement.	13880 To improve instream habitat for steelhead.	61
HR-09	Deborah Callagan Construction	Lower Klamath River	Lower Red Cap Creek instream habitat enhancement (Project II).	49000 To improve chinook and steelhead habitat.	59
HR-08	Deborah Callagan Construction	Lower Klamath River	Lower Red Cap Creek habitat enhancement (Project I)	69788 To improve steelhead and chinook habitat.	58

**KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROJECT PROPOSALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993
(BY ABSOLUTE RANK, WITH TARGET EMPLOYMENT POINTS ADDED)**

PROJECT NUMBER	COOPERATOR	SUBBASIN/PLAN AREA	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST COMMENT	RANK
E-05	KIXE TV - Discover the West	Basinwide	Television series "Discover the West" sponsorship.	1667 Partial sponsorship of Public television documentary.	58
HR-10	Deborah Callagan Construction	Lower Klamath River	Camp Creek instream habitat enhancement.	74967 To improve steelhead and chinook habitat.	58
HR-37	USFS-Klamath NF, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	King Solomon mine tailing reclamation.	7040 To abate water quality problems associated with abandoned mines.	57
HP-04	USFS-Klamath NF, Happy Camp Dist	Middle Klamath River	Assessment of dissolved heavy metals and acidic drainage in Indian Creek.	5000 To assess potential impacts on fish populations.	57
HP-16	USFS-Klamath NF, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	Salmon River subbasin spawning ground survey.	52990 To monitor habitat and spawner escapement.	57
E-07	Committee for Irish Ethnicity, Inc.	Basinwide	Mining and habitat education.	33750 To educate local mining community about fish restoration techniques.	56
HP-05	Six Rivers NF, Orleans Ranger Sta.	Lower Klamath River	Riparian inventory of Camp, Red Cap, and Bluff Creeks.	23354	56
HP-12	Nakanoto/Kisanuki/Mulligan	Mainstem Klamath River	Mitochondrial DNA characterization of Klamath R and Columbia R green sturgeon.	35527 To improve stock identification techniques by identifying distinct DNA characteristics.	56
HR-17	North Coast Fisheries	Lower Klamath River	Camp Creek spawning and rearing habitat enhancement.	33079 To construct four boulder spawning weirs and nine boulder cluster cover structures.	56
HR-43	Quartz Valley Reservation	Scott River	Mill and Shackleford Creeks riparian revegetation.	11921 To plant riparian vegetation on 1/2 mile of Shackleford Creek and 1/4 mile of Mill Creek, and assess effectiveness of project.	56
HP-11	USFS-Klamath NF, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	Fines in pools inventory.	13605 Evaluate volume of fines in pools, apply information to potential impacts to fish habitat.	54
FP-11	USFS-Six Rivers NF, Orleans Dist	Lower Klamath River	Summer steelhead monitoring program.	25930 To standardize methodology for adult salmonid population surveys.	53
FP-08	USFWS Coastal California FRO	Mainstem Klamath River	Status of Klamath River Eulachon.	19433 To obtain information on status of eulachon runs into the Klamath River.	53
HR-39	USFWS-Portland Field Office FWE	Basinwide	Upper Klamath Basin Water Quality Improvement.	30000 To implement riparian restoration projects to improve water quality of upper Klamath Lake.	53
HP-10	USFWS Klamath River FRO	Basinwide	Citizen monitoring of Klamath basin streams.	16111 To enlist and enable volunteer workforce to monitor fish habitat parameters.	52

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROJECT PROPOSALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993
(BY ABSOLUTE RANK, WITH TARGET EMPLOYMENT POINTS ADDED)

PROJECT NUMBER	COOPERATOR	SUBBASIN/PLAN AREA	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	COMMENT	RANK
HR-31	Calif. Cons. Corps-Del Norte Center	Lower Klamath River	Terup Creek habitat restoration.	25440	To enhance fish habitat at 14 sites.	52
FP-09	USFWS Coastal California PRO	Mainstem Klamath River	Age composition of green sturgeon harvested from the upper Klamath River.	7836	To collect age/growth information on green sturgeon harvested above Weitchpec.	51
HP-09	USFS-Klamath NP, Happy Camp Dist	Basinwide	Integrated monitoring and assessment of sed. production and fish habitat quality	4800	To describe sediment assessment methods and their utility in fish restoration.	51
HP-14	Energy Resource Advocates	Upper Klamath River	Remote Sensing & GIS feasibility analysis for upper Klamath Basin.	38288	To complement prior work on lower Klamath Basin (FY91 project).	50
HR-41	Trout Unlimited-Klamath Chapter	Middle Klamath River	Horse Creek juvenile rearing structures.	34500	To construct instream structures to enhance juvenile rearing habitat.	49
HR-18	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	BLM riparian vegetation planting.	13004	To plant 4 miles of Shasta River bank with willow slips.	48
HR-07	Eagle Springs Hatchery	Middle Klamath River	Cold Creek Fish Passage.	2107	To provide chinook and steelhead passage over a 5 foot diversion dam. Cold Creek is tributary to Bogus Creek.	48
HR-22	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Webb riparian vegetation planting.	3967	To plant 2,500 feet of riparian area with willow slips in lower Shasta River canyon.	47
FR-08	Fisheries Restoration Council	Salmon River	F.R.C. - Methodist Creek Unit.	37187	To rear 20,000 fall run chinook salmon in Methodist Creek, a tributary to South Fork Salmon River.	47
HP-18	California Dept. of Water Resources	Scott River	Scott River instream flow needs study.	229000	First phase of IPN study to include initial scoping work, along with selecting transects for data collection.	45
HR-05	USFS-Klamath NP, Salmon River Dist	Salmon River	Indian Creek riparian planting.	11125	To plant 60 acres of conifers within the riparian zone.	45
HP-07	California Dept. of Water Resources	Basinwide	Water Quality Monitoring in the Klamath River System.	13608	Nutrients and minor element monitoring on mainstem Klamath River and tributaries.	44
HP-21	California Dept. of Water Resources	Mainstem Klamath River	Klamath River instream flow needs scoping and funding.	15000	To begin scoping of IPN study on mainstem Klamath River and to seek funding to initiate IPN studies in the Klamath basin.	44
HP-19	California Dept. of Water Resources	Scott River	Scott River stream restoration design.	39800	To design a pilot project to modify a 3,500 foot section of mainstem below Callahan.	44
FR-07	Fisheries Restoration Council	Salmon River	F.R.C. - Fall trapping.	9913	To trap adult fall run chinook in mainstem Salmon River to provide 65,000 eggs to two	44

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROJECT PROPOSALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993
(BY ABSOLUTE RANK, WITH TARGET EMPLOYMENT POINTS ADDED)

PROJECT NUMBER	COOPERATOR	SUBBASIN/PLAN AREA	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	COMMENT	RANK
					rearing projects.	
HR-40	Trout Unlimited-Klamath Chapter	Middle Klamath River	Humbog Creek - open fish passage at the mouth.	63075	To provide access to fish spawning and rearing habitat.	17
HP-08	California Dept. of Water Resources	Mainstem Klamath River	Evaluation of effects of suction dredging on benthic sediments and insects.	50000	Assess impacts of suction dredge mining on macroinvertebrate population and substrate composition at 4 sites.	41
HP-20	California Dept. of Water Resources	Scott River	Scott River sediment pool feasibility study.	38600	To determine the feasibility of controlling impacts of decomposed granite sand in the Scott River, by construction of sediment control pools.	10
HP-17	California Dept. of Water Resources	Mainstem Klamath River	Klamath River instream flow needs study.	236000	First phase of IPN study to include initial scoping work, along with selecting transects for data collection.	39
FP-02	California Dept. of Water Resources	Mainstem Klamath River	Competition for food resources between hatchery and wild steelhead in Klamath R.	47000	To examine differences in feeding between hatchery and natural steelhead, to determine if excessive competition occurs and if hatchery fish convert from artificial to natural feeding behavior.	36
HP-01	California Dept. of Water Resources	Shasta River	Shasta River Temperature Evaluation.	19260	To assess diurnal and seasonal water temperature data and associated impacts on anadromous fish.	34
PC-04	USFWS-Portland Field Office FWE	Upper Klamath River	The Oregon Ecosystems Program.	50000	To provide comprehensive ecosystem recovery plan to supplement the recovery plan for the endangered sucker species in the upper Klamath River basin.	31
PC-08	Quality Sound	Basinwide	Portable conference and public address system.	15399	Portable, voice-activated sound amplification system for 12 stations. To be used in advisory committee meetings.	00
FR-04	USFS-Six Rivers NF	Basinwide	Willow Creek chinook rearing	48987	To produce fall chinook in one of three different scenarios on Willow Creek, tributary to Trinity River.	00
PC-06	JHA-Custom Entertainment Systems	Basinwide	Sound amplification and recording equipment.	8496	Cost includes set-up and training.	00
PC-07	JHA-Custom Entertainment Systems	Basinwide	Sound and recording services.	1795	Cost is per (each) three-day meeting.	00

*** Total ***

3414125

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
FEDERAL WORK YEAR 1991

files: 91fedwp.dbf.ndx.frm

PROJECT COOPERATOR NUMBER	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST COMMENT
** CATEGORY: Education			
E-R U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Basinwide	Public Information Program.	40000 Project complete.
E-3 USFWS - Contract		Develop education program for school children.	67335 Draft final report for grades 7-8 received 5/92.
E-1 USFWS - Contract	Kidder Creek	Educational field study of fish requirements and riparian restoration.	2500 Underway. Final report expected 6/92.
E-4 USFWS - Contract		Portable information display for Klamath Fishery Restoration Program.	7500 Project complete.
** Subtotal **			117335
** CATEGORY: Fish Protection			
FP-193 CDFG	Shasta River	Modify and repair Shasta River fish counting facility.	17777 Project complete.
FP-1 Karuk Tribe of California	Klamath River, Ishi-Pishi Falls	Estimate, by species, Karuk subsistence harvest.	19537 Field work complete. Expect final report 6/92.
FP-3 USFWS, FAO Arcata	Lower tributaries to Klamath River	Estimate spawning, juvenile production, habitat.	40500 Project complete.
FP-4 USFWS, FAO Arcata	Blue Creek	Estimate chinook stock status and potential for enhancement.	57400 Field work complete. Expect final report 7/92.
FP-5 USFWS, FAO Arcata	Klamath River at Big Bar.	Monitor juvenile salmonid emigration.	2750 Field work complete. Expect final report 7/92.
FP-6 USFWS, FAO Arcata	Lower Klamath River and estuary.	Estimate juvenile fish standing crop and outmigration.	27750 Field work complete. Expect final report 7/92.
** Subtotal **			165714
** CATEGORY: Fish Restoration			
FR-3 CDFG	Klamath River, several tributaries.	Estimate adult contribution of pond reared salmon.	27600 Project complete.
FR-1 NCIDC	Klamath River, Yurok reservation	Late run fall chinook accelerated stocking program.	99818 Project complete.
FR-2 NCIDC	Klamath River, Yurok reservation	Late run fall chinook gillnet capture project	33498 Project complete.

06/11/92

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
FEDERAL WORK PLAN, FISCAL YEAR 1991

files: 91fedwp.dbf,ndx,frm

PROJECT COOPERATOR NUMBER	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST COMMENT	
** Subtotal **			160916	
** CATEGORY: Habitat Protection				
HP-1	Energy and Resource Advocates	Klamath Basin, Salmon River & west.	Remote sensing and GIS feasibility analysis.	36830 Project complete. Expect final report 6/92.
HP-3	HSU/CCPRU	Salmon River	Estimate spawning and rearing habitat for spring chinook.	10281 Second phase of research complete. Expect progress report 6/92.
HP-10	Siskiyou RCD	Scott River, Scott Valley	Inventory riparian zone.	7054 Project complete. Expect final report 7/92.
HP-7	USFS, Klamath NF	Salmon River, South Fork	Conduct watershed improvement needs inventory (WINI).	18500 Project complete.
HP-9	USFS, Klamath NF	Salmon River Subbasin	Analyze sediment delivery.	38190 Project complete. Expect final report 7/92.
** Subtotal **			110855	
** CATEGORY: Habitat Restoration				
HR-65	Hoopa Valley Tribal Council	Pine Creek	Control or prevent erosion of sediment into Pine Creek.	61811 Field work to begin again 6/92 and continue through summer. Final report expected 9/92.
HR-15	PSMFC	Klamath River, various tributaries.	Provide one work year of diversion screen maintenance.	27589 Project complete. Final report received 4/92.
HR-112	USFS, Klamath NF	Salmon River, North & South Forks.	Provide native plants to reseed riparian zones.	13957 Seedlings planted under separate contract. Expect final report 9/92.
** Subtotal **			103357	
** CATEGORY: Program Administration				
PA-3	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service		Operation of Klamath Fishery Resource Office.	262000 Funding year complete.
PA-4	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service		USFWS Regional Office overhead.	80000 Funding year complete.
** Subtotal **			342000	
*** Total ***			1000177	

KLAMATH FISHERY COOPERATION PROGRAM
FEDERAL WORK FISCAL YEAR 1992

files: 92fedwp.dbf,ndx,frm

PROJECT NUMBER	COOPERATOR	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST COMMENT
** CATEGORY: Education				
E-14	Calif. Salmon and Steelhead Rest.	Northern Calif.	10th Annual Conference	2500 Project complete.
E-6	Diane Higgins	Basinwide	Curriculum development for grades 9-12.	0 Curriculum development initiated. Expect final report 9/92.
E-13	Klamath Forest Alliance	Salmon River	Poaching prevention workshop.	1600 Project complete.
E-	Native American Fish & Wild. Societ	Klamath River Basin	Annual conference to discuss fish and wildlife issues affecting tribal resources	1000 Project complete.
E-11	U.C. Extension-Davis	Klamath River Basin	Conference on decomposed granitic soil: Problems and solutions.	4000 Conference planned for 10/21-22/92. In Redding.
** Subtotal **				
				9100
** CATEGORY: Fish Protection				
FP-8	Cal Poly State Univ Foundation	Salmon River	Population Differentiation of Spring and Fall Chinook.	16109 Adult tissue samples taken and analyzed. Outmigrant collection and laboratory analysis underway.
FP-11	Hoopa Valley Tribal Council	Klamath River below Trinity River	Estimate population size and range of green sturgeon.	14058 No fish tagged. Fishermen have not provided fish in response to HVT Fisheries Department's request for adult fish for tagging and release.
FP-12	Hoopa Valley Tribal Council	Pine Creek	Monitoring outmigrating salmonids.	25000 Outmigrant sampling ongoing. Additional funding (\$24,128) required to fully fund 3-year monitoring project.
FP-10	PSPMC	Scott and Shasta Valleys	Temporary help for the Yreka Screen shop.	29118 Project underway.
FP-7	USFWS- Fish Health Center	Basinwide	Disease Survey of Salmonid Smolts	10105 Steelhead and wild chinook samples taken. Awaiting arrival of Iron Gate Hatchery chinook at Big Bar for sample collection.
FP-2	USFWS-CCPRO	Blue Creek	Status of Salmon and Steelhead Stocks of Blue Ck.	58729 Coded Wire Tagging of outmigrants underway. Will continue until outmigration ceases.
FP-4	USFWS-CCPRO	Klamath River at Big Bar	Monitoring of Yearling Salmonid Emigration.	3000 Monitoring outmigration of wild chinook stock. No Iron Gate Hatchery chinook trapped as of 6/5/92.
FP-5	USFWS-CCPRO	Basinwide	Age composition/size analysis of Klamath fall chinook.	5450 Analysis and report complete.

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
FEDERAL WORK PLAN, FISCAL YEAR 1992

files: 92fedwp.dbf,ndx,frm

PROJECT COOPERATOR NUMBER	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST COMMENT
** Subtotal **			181569
** CATEGORY: Fish Restoration			
FR- 5 Art Frazier	Hammel Creek	Chinook hatching/rearing project	8074 CDFG may not operate adult collection weir on Salmon River in fall 1992. No FY1992 money obligated yet.
PR- 2 NCIDC	Lower Klamath River	Late run fall chinook gillnet capture.	13184 Project complete.
PR- 3 NCIDC	Lower Klamath River Tributaries	Fish rescue and rearing project.	2750 Project not yet begun.
PR- 6 NCIDC	Mid-Klamath River tributaries	Pond rearing program for mid-Klamath River chinook	101712 160,000 Iron Gate Hatchery chinook transferred to Indian Creek and Bluff Creek (80,000 each site) in May, with 50% of each lot CWtagged. Camp Creek facility has 10,700+ late fall chinook on hand.
PR- 9 NCIDC	Lower Klamath River	Accelerated Stocking Program, Late Fall Run Chinook	133058 CWtagging completed 8/9 on 14,000+ chinook at High Prairie Creek facility. Will CWT 25,000+ chinook at Spruce Creek, and 18,000+ chinook at Cappell Creek in June/July. Approximately 57,000+ fingerlings on hand.
PR- 1 Orleans Rod and Gun Club	Orleans	Upgrade fish rearing facility	9550 Materials ordered, work to be completed 8/92.
PR- 4 Orleans Rod and Gun Club	Orleans	Rescued steelhead rearing project	11297 Facility ready for fish, but few are being rescued by CDFG crews. No fish anticipated for this program.
** Subtotal **			279625
** CATEGORY: Habitat Protection			
HP- 1 Hoopa Valley Tribal Council	Pine Creek	Sediment monitoring	38662 Project underway.
** Subtotal **			38662
** CATEGORY: Habitat Restoration			
HR-24 NCIDC	Tarup Creek	Migration barrier removal.	10192 Program to be initiated in July, 1992. In accordance with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' 404 permit, a riparian restoration plan may be required before the project can begin.
HR-17 Shasta RCD	Shasta River	Easton bank protection and	7191 Project not yet underway. Ongoing negotiation.

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
FEDERAL WORKING CAPITAL FISCAL YEAR 1992

files: dbf, ndx, frm

PROJECT COOPERATOR NUMBER	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST COMMENT
		riparian fencing.	on scope of work, with possible change. Bank sloping may be favored over rip-rap.
HR-19 Siskiyou RCD	Paradise Hollow, French Ck Drainage	Cattle exclusion fencing.	10340 Cooperative agreement still being considered for signature by cooperator. Landowner willingness questionable.
** Subtotal **			27723
** CATEGORY: Program Administration PA- 4 USPWS-KRPRO	Basinwide	Administer contracts and cooperative agreements to implement restoration program	145000 Includes costs to administer contracts, cooperative agreements, and KRPRO operating costs.
** Subtotal **			145000
** CATEGORY: Program Coordination PA- 6 Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Shasta River CRMP Field Projects Coordinator	24785 Survey of riparian areas 50% complete. Coordinator has contacted most landowners with projects in mind. Good reception so far.
PA- 5 Shasta Valley RCD	Shasta River Basin	Operating expenses for Shasta Valley CRMP to coordinate restoration work.	2090 Money being used for postage and office supplies.
PA- 1 Technical Work Group	Basinwide	Three year action plan	26600 Subbasin planning units identified and restoration objectives prioritized.
PA- 4 USPWS-KRPRO	Basinwide	Logistical support for advisory committees, coord. of restoration activities.	280000 Includes personnel and travel costs for staff, and travel costs for agency advisory committee members, and logistical costs for advisory committee meetings.
** Subtotal **			313475
*** Total ***			975154

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

PROGRAM OF WORK AND

EXPENDITURE ESTIMATE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993

APPLICABLE TO KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERY RESTORATION

INTRODUCTION

Approximately 3.1 million dollars will be spent by the United States Department of Agriculture in fiscal year 1993 toward the restoration of the Klamath River Basin. This money will be spent within three USDA offices: the Soil Conservation Service, the Klamath National Forest, and the Six Rivers National Forest.

Forty-five percent of the 3.1 million dollars will be spent on the protection of habitat and salmonid species populations. The other fifty-five percent is distributed between habitat restoration (27%), education and communication (3%), and administration (25%). Included in habitat protection and management costs are fisheries biologists' and earth scientists' input to timber, engineering, mining, recreation, and range activities. Fish population protection work involves spawning counts, bioenhancement planning and project implementation, law enforcement support, and population censuses. Riparian revegetation, bank stabilization projects, instream structure placement, and regulation of mining activities are all part of the habitat restoration effort. The public is educated about the unique qualities and resources of the Basin through field trips and presentations given by National Forest staff, and interpretive displays. Program administration work includes personnel management and training, development of partnerships, inter-agency coordination and support, safety awareness, contract administration, and program development.

AGENCY SUMMARIESSOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE (SCS)

The majority of the funding for fishery restoration work by the Soil Conservation office at Yreka, California comes from the California Department of Fish and Game and the Klamath River Basin Task Force and is not included in this report. Much of the work that the SCS is associated with is performed by volunteers representing Resource Conservation Districts or Coordinated Resource Management Planning groups.

The District Conservationist at the Yreka office, Bob Bartholamew anticipates that 10-15% of the office's work load will involve Klamath River Basin fishery restoration efforts. The nature of this work is technical review and support

services to private land owners. The SCS office does not have any planned project work for FY 93. At the present time, the office's work is focused on farmers' compliance with regulations pertaining to the Food Security Act rather than protecting and improving fisheries habitat conditions.

KLAMATH NATIONAL FOREST

The staff at the Supervisors Office and at 5 of the 6 Ranger Districts are actively involved in the restoration of anadromous fisheries in the Klamath River Basin. The fisheries resource on four of the Districts are managed by zone biologists and are grouped into two zones. Therefore, budget and project planning covers two Districts and has been reported in that way.

Happy Camp/Ukonom Ranger Districts

Fall and/or Spring spawner surveys will be conducted on about 55 stream miles, and habitat restoration will occur on the Salmon River, Indian, Elk, Clear, West Branch, East Fork Indian, and East Fork Elk Creeks.

Oak Knoll Ranger District

Like most districts, funding for the Oak Knoll Ranger District's Fisheries program comes from a number of sources. These sources include Federal funds, State funds, donated funds and volunteer labor from partnerships with groups such as the California Conservation Corps, Trout Unlimited, Discovery High School, Yreka Union High School, Dead Wood Conservation Crews and private individual volunteers.

The Oak Knoll Ranger District work focuses on sediment reduction projects within the Beaver Creek drainage and rearing/overwintering habitat improvement projects on Horse Creek in 1993. Summer thermal and low flow refugium projects are planned on Humbug Creek.

Salmon River/Scott River Ranger Districts

Fall and Spring spawner surveys will be conducted on about 110 stream miles in the Salmon River Basin, and 20 stream miles in the Scott River Basin. Restoration activities occur mainly in the upper reaches of the forks of the Salmon River, its tributaries, and the tributaries to the Scott River.

Goosenest Ranger District

The majority of the work on the Goosenest District is related to Inland fisheries.

Supervisors Office

In fiscal year 1993, one additional position will be established and another outstanding vacancy will be filled at the Supervisors office. The positions (Fisheries Program Manager and Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species Program Coordinator) will work directly on the restoration of the Klamath Basin fishery. The Fish/Earth Science Staff officer, Jack West, will continue to serve as chairman of the Klamath River Basin Task Force Technical Work Group. Forest Supervisor Barbara Holder will continue to serve as USDA representative on the Task Force. A Conservation Strategy for summer steelhead will be complete in early FY 1993, and on-going administrative studies will continue.

SIX RIVERS NATIONAL FOREST

Only one Ranger District is directly involved with the restoration of the Klamath River Basin Fishery. The Supervisors Office is involved in the long range plan for the Klamath River Basin with 80% to be spent on Program Administration with the presence of Jerry Barnes on the Klamath River Management Council Technical team.

Orleans Ranger District/Supervisors Office

The main creeks under management are Bluff Creek, Red Cap Creek and Camp Creek with annual Chinook and Steelhead surveys.

EXPENDITURE ESTIMATES

	<u>AGENCY SUMMARY</u>	<u>SCS</u>	<u>KNF</u>	<u>SRNF</u>
Habitat Protection and Management -	\$1,077,111	\$0	\$981,111	\$96,000
Fish Population Protection -	\$ 333,500	\$0	\$321,000	\$12,500
Habitat Restoration -	\$ 836,267	\$10,000	\$678,267	\$148,000
Education and Communication -	\$ 83,500	\$0	\$ 68,500	\$15,000
Program Administration -	\$ 772,806	\$0	\$717,806	\$55,000
Sum	\$3,103,184	\$10,000	\$2,766,684	\$326,500
	<u>USDA TOTAL.....</u>	<u>3,103,184</u>		

EXPENDITURES BY WORK CATEGORY

I. HABITAT PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT

USDA TOTAL.... 1,077,111

Soil Conservation Service

0

Yreka Office

0

Klamath National Forest

981,111

Happy Camp/Ukonom

204,492

Oak Knoll

86,078

Salmon/Scott

282,000

Goose Nest

7,348

Supervisor's Office

401,193

Six Rivers National Forest

96,000

Orleans

~~56,000~~

~~50,000~~

Supervisor's Office

~~40,000~~

II. FISH POPULATION PROTECTION

USDA TOTAL.... 333,500

Soil Conservation Service

0

Yreka Office

0

Klamath National Forest

321,000

Happy Camp/Ukonom

64,000

Oak Knoll

40,000

Salmon/Scott

177,000

Goose Nest

0

Supervisor's Office

40,000

Six Rivers National Forest

12,500

Orleans

10,000

Supervisor's Office

2,500

II. HABITAT RESTORATION

USDA TOTAL.... 836,267

Conservation Service:

10,000

Yreka Office

10,000

Klamath National Forest

678,267

Happy Camp/Ukonom

153,000

Oak Knoll

97,900

Salmon/Scott

350,000

Goose Nest

0

Supervisor's Office

77,367

Six Rivers National Forest

148,000

Orleans

90,000

Supervisor's Office

58,000

IV. EDUCATION AND COMMUNICATION

USDA TOTAL.... 83,500

Conservation Service

0

Yreka Office

0

Klamath National Forest

68,500

Happy Camp/Ukonom

12,500

Oak Knoll

20,000

Salmon/Scott

26,000

Goose Nest

0

Supervisor's Office

10,000

Six Rivers National Forest

15,000

Orleans

5,000

Supervisor's Office

10,000

V. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

USDA TOTAL.... 772,806

Soil Conservation Service

0

Yreka Office

0

Klamath National Forest

717,715

Happy Camp/Ukonom

96,656

Oak Knoll

91,757

Salmon/Scott

100,000

Goose Nest

3,600

Supervisor's Office

425,793

Six Rivers National Forest

55,000

Orleans

15,000

Supervisor's Office

40,000

REPORT TO THE KLAMATH RIVER FISHERIES TASK FORCE, JUNE 15-17, 1992.

TITLE: FISH AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ACTIVITIES TO BE IMPLEMENTED IN FISCAL YEAR 1993 BY THE KARUK TRIBAL FISHERIES DEPARTMENT IN THE KLAMATH BASIN.

The Karuk Tribal Harvest Monitoring Program, that began in the fall of 1990, will continue to be an on-going core program of the Karuk Tribal Fisheries Department in fiscal year 1993. The primary objective of the Karuk Tribal Harvest Monitoring Program is to obtain biological and habitat information needed by the Klamath Fishery Management Council for harvest management purposes. Specifically, the objective of the project is to quantify the number of fish species harvested for subsistence use by the Karuk Tribe.

As in previous years, the Karuk Tribal Fisheries Department will continue to provide technical assistance and expertise to the Northern California Indian Development Council and the California Department of Fish and Game in identifying appropriate fish rearing and restoration projects, such as those projects which have occurred in Camp and Bluff Creeks.

The Karuk Tribe has recently initiated a cooperative fish spawning survey effort with the California Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Forest Service throughout the Salmon River. It is our intent to continue this level of cooperation into fiscal year 1993 and expand our participation into the Lower and Mid-Klamath River sub-basins.

The Karuk Tribe will continue to work with the Yurok, Hoopa and Klamath Tribes into 1993 to identify ways in which we can work together. We look forward to the opportunity to develop a joint solution to studying and managing such fish species as the green sturgeon.

We will also continue to participate in the U.S. Forest Service Environmental Impact Statement and Land Management Planning process. By fiscal year 1993, we will be tracking forest land management practices from a watershed perspective.

As part of our efforts to develop a watershed perspective, the Karuk Tribal Fisheries Department has acquired a computerized copy of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Klamath River Basin Report, which is a list of all Klamath River Basin Fisheries Restoration Projects up to February 1988. We will continue into fiscal year 1993 to identify the geographic location of previous fisheries restoration projects, within the Karuk Ancestral Territory, in order to compare the effectiveness of previous restoration efforts with future restoration needs.

The Karuk Tribal Fisheries Department has been researching water flow and water quality conditions in the Klamath River Basin. During this years research, we identified that the Long Range Plan for the Klamath River Basin, which the Task Force approved in January of 1991, had overemphasized the importance of the FERC

relicensing of Iron Gate dam for improving water releases into the Klamath River. The fact is, that the Bureau of Reclamation controls the amount of water entering the Upper Klamath River from Keno Dam not Iron Gate. The Bureau of Reclamation is currently meeting all of it's class 'A' water allocation commitments, and has been releasing 200 cubic feet per second (cfs) of water below Keno Dam since April 21 of this year. The 200 cfs discharge from Keno Dam is based on a request by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife for at least 250 cfs to maintain adequate flows for a native population of rainbow trout between Keno and Boil Dams. Starting yesterday (June 15, 1992), the Bureau of Reclamation has begun dropping the flow of water below Keno Dam in 25 cfs increments until the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife can demonstrate that the reduced flows are adversely impacting the native rainbow trout.

Meanwhile, the California Department of Fish and Game is trying to monitor the movement of Iron Gate hatchery and native juvenile fish migrating down the Klamath River during this period of extremely low flows. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has been successful in convincing Pacific Power and Light Company to discharge additional water from Iron Gate reservoir at night for approximately the next five days to help newly released hatchery fish move downstream. However, no one has yet identified a solution to increased flows after this Friday, and there is growing concern about the effects that reduced flows, increased water temperatures and reduced water quality will have on anadromous fish populations later this summer and fall.

As part of our efforts to evaluate water flow and water quality conditions in the Klamath Basin, the Karuk Tribal Fisheries Department has been monitoring water temperature conditions at Ishi Pishi Falls for over a year. In fiscal year 1993, we will establish a permanent basin-wide system of monitoring water temperatures in the Klamath River mainstem. These water temperature measurements will be correlated with other systematic sampling of fish habitat, population and clean water assessments to help target the potential causes of salmon and steelhead declines.

One of the most important efforts the Karuk Tribe will be engaged in this year and fiscal year 1993 will be to assure that the Klamath River receives adequate water flows and a high quality of water from the Upper Klamath River during drought years. Some of you may be aware that the Bureau of Reclamation is currently releasing over twenty-five times the water from Trinity Dam than what the Bureau is releasing into the Klamath River. Due to the efforts of the Hoopa Tribe along with Federal, State and County agencies, the Bureau of Reclamation is releasing 6000 cfs into the Trinity River as they prepare to drop below 200 cfs on the Klamath River. The Karuk Tribe looks forward to the opportunity to work with the Task Force to develop solutions for acquiring adequate flows from the Upper Klamath Basin so that 1993 will not be a repeat of this years water allocation problems.

REPORT ON PLANNED
STATE FY 1992-93 ACTIVITIES
OF THE
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME'S
KLAMATH-TRINITY PROGRAM 1

BACKGROUND

The Klamath-Trinity Program (KTP) is a unit within the California Department of Fish and Game's, Inland Fisheries Division. The KTP was established in the early 1970's. Its continuing mission is to generate information on population sizes, harvests and life histories of Klamath River basin salmon and steelhead stocks needed to manage these resources and the fisheries operating on them.

The KTP is made up of four field research projects, plus a fifth, administrative project. It is staffed by 21 permanent, full-time professional and technical personnel, plus (in FY 1991-92) 23.5 person-years of temporary help. Permanent personnel are variously headquartered in Arcata (7), Weaverville (7), Yreka (3) and Sacramento (4).

While information generated by the KTP serves the Klamath River Fisheries Task Force in achieving many, if not most, of the goals stated in the January, 1991, "Long Range Plan for the Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Restoration Program", data produced appear to most directly address three of the Objectives. These are:

Objective 4: Strive to protect the genetic diversity of anadromous fishes in the Klamath River Basin;

Objective 5.A: Iron Gate Hatchery and Trinity River Hatchery should be operated to produce salmon and steelhead to mitigate for the losses of habitat above their dams and, at the same time, strive to reduce impacts on native fish; and,

Objective 5.B: Small-scale rearing programs should be temporary measures, primarily for the purpose of accelerating the rebuilding of locally adapted native salmon and steelhead populations and operated to maintain the genetic integrity of such populations. Ideally, small scale rearing programs should be operated in conjunction with habitat restoration projects.

1 Prepared by Paul M. Hubbell, California Department of Fish and Game, Inland Fisheries Division. Presented to the Klamath River Fisheries Task Force at its June 15-17, 1992 meeting at the Quality Inn, Arcata, California.

- Determine the length, age and mark/tag compositions of chinook and coho salmon spawners returning to TRH in fall 1992, as part of continuing evaluations of the contributions to the fisheries and spawning escapements made by TRH-produced salmon.

Trinity Fisheries Investigations Project

- Determine, through a system of spawning ground surveys, the 1992 distributions of naturally spawning chinook and coho salmon in the main stem Trinity River and its tributaries upstream of and including the North Fork Trinity River, and determine the size and sex composition, incidence of marked/tagged individuals and incidence of pre-spawn mortalities among spawners in the survey area.
- Capture, mark (Ad+CWT) and release, in spring 1993, representative groups of naturally produced 1992 BY chinook salmon fry/fingerlings in the main stem Trinity River, for use in subsequent determinations of their survival and contributions, as adults, to the ocean and river fisheries and spawning escapements.
- Fin clip all 1991 and 1992 BY steelhead produced at TRH and scheduled for spring 1993 release, as part of continuing evaluations of the contributions to the fisheries and spawner escapements made by TRH-produced steelhead.
- Determine the size, composition, distribution and timing of the 1993 adult spring chinook salmon run in the South Fork Trinity River (SFTR) basin.
- Determine the angler harvest, in FY 1992-93, of spring chinook salmon in the SFTR basin.
- Continue investigations directed at determining the life history patterns of spring chinook salmon produced in the SFTR basin.

Natural Stocks Assessment Project

- Determine the size, composition, distribution and timing of 1992-93 season adult steelhead runs in the SFTR basin.
- Determining the angler harvest, in FY 1992-93, of adult steelhead in the SFTR basin.
- Continue investigations directed at determining the life history patterns of steelhead produced in the SFTR basin.

- Continue investigations directed at describing seasonal use patterns by juvenile steelhead of various habitat types within selected SFTR tributaries, and defining relationships between habitat parameters and seasonal variations in juvenile steelhead standing crops in these areas.
- Continue, in FY 1992-93, ongoing investigations directed at defining, on the basis of scales analysis, the age and size compositions of naturally spawning chinook salmon returning to selected Klamath River tributaries, and the size and age at ocean entry, and other juvenile life history characteristics of the returning spawners.
- Continue investigations directed at determining the contributions to the fisheries and spawning escapements made by naturally produced chinook salmon captured, marked (Ad+CWT) and released in selected Klamath River tributaries (excluding the Trinity River basin).
- Determine, over-time, the instream distributions and growth, and the instream rearing patterns and emigration timing of naturally produced juvenile chinook salmon at selected locations in the Klamath River system; determine whether natural and hatchery stocks of juvenile chinook salmon in the system can be distinguished on the basis of scale circuli patterns; and categorize juvenile chinook salmon by age and scale circuli patterns.
- Continue year-round investigations directed at: determining the use of the Klamath River Estuary by juvenile salmonids, including seasonal patterns of entry, abundance, residency, growth, food abundances and preferences, and sizes at and times of ocean entry; describing, by season, general water quality parameters in the estuary; quantifying and ranking, by relative use by juvenile salmonids, various habitat types occurring within the estuary.
- Determine the relative annual productions of pre-smolt and smolt chinook salmon in selected Klamath River tributaries (excluding the Trinity River basin).
- Continue investigations directed at quantitatively describing salmonid spawning habitat, and assessing juvenile summer pool rearing habitat, in selected areas of the Klamath River basin.

Research Planning/Supervision Project

- Continue to provide, in FY 1992-93, required supervision and administrative oversight to Klamath-Trinity Program research projects, and necessary intra- and inter-agency coordination of program activities.
- Continue, in FY 1992-93, to provide technical and editorial support to the research projects, as needed, to insure that results of the various investigations are made available to managers and scientists of the California Department of Fish and Game and other interested parties.

**OUTLINE FOR SHASTA RIVER CRMP
3 - 5 YEAR PLAN
DRAFT**

*** Protect / Restore Water Quality**

- 1) Reduce temperatures during warm weather
 - a) Vegetate banks
 - b) Cool tailwater
 - i) Clarify definition with NCRWCB
 - ii) Engineer tailwater cooling systems
 - c) Find additional sources of water
 - i) Reduce water consumption
 - ii) Support agency purchase of water rights
- 2) Support and encourage IFIM study

*** Riparian Restoration**

(Riparian "restoration" may not be restoration since there is a lack of historic evidence of a riparian area in the region of the Shasta Valley. Restoration may in fact be a mitigation for Dwinnell reservoir)

- 1) Establish Riparian areas
- 2) Explore possibility of, and promote if practical, fish passage around reservoir

*** Protect Stocks at Risk**

- 1) Promote and encourage stock I.D.
- 2) Complete I.D. of fish screen needs

*** Further CRMP Development**

- 1) Increase landowner education efforts
- 2) Review and update current plan of operations
 - a) Increase landowner attendance in the CRMP
 - b) Discuss Plan of Operation at each meeting

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

BETWEEN

SHASTA VALLEY RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
SISKIYOU COUNTY,
SHASTA RIVER WATER USERS ASSOCIATION,
MONTAGUE IRRIGATION DISTRICT,
GRENADA IRRIGATION DISTRICT,
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME,
CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD,
NORTH COAST REGION;
CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS.,
KLAMATH TRIBE,
KARUK TRIBE,
HOOPA TRIBE,
YUROK TRIBE,
U.S. SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,
U.S. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
KLAMATH RIVER TASK FORCE,
AND
GREAT NORTHERN CORPORATION.

REGARDING

A COORDINATED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE SHASTA RIVER

PARTICIPANTS

This is a Memorandum of Agreement, by and between; Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District, County of Siskiyou, Shasta River Water Users Association, Montague Irrigation District, Grenada Irrigation District, California Department of Fish and Game, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region; California Conservation Corps, Klamath Tribe, Karuk Tribe, Hoopa Tribe, Yurok Tribe, U.S. Soils Conservation District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Klamath River Task Force and Great Northern Corporation.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) is to establish guidelines for coordinated resource management and planning (CRMP) among the participants in an effort to improve riparian habitat along and water quality in the Shasta River while maintaining agricultural uses.

AREA OF COVERAGE:

The Shasta River from below Dwinell Reservoir downstream to the confluence with the Klamath River and all tributaries in this section.

GOALS:

The objectives of the parties signing this MOA are:

1. Identify and prioritize the problems associated with fisheries habitat along the Shasta River.
2. Develop improved riparian conditions while having the lowest possible impact (least intrusive) to the landowner.
3. Improve landowner awareness of the problem along and in the Shasta River and the benefit potential for improvements.
4. Coordinate agency activities and funding for projects and actions on the Shasta River.
5. Improve public awareness of the work being done to improve Shasta River fisheries.
6. Evaluate all restoration efforts in the CRMP area.

RESPONSIBILITIES

The parties agree to the following responsibilities in order to achieve the above goals:

SHASTA VALLEY RESOURCES CONSERVATION DISTRICT

1. Prioritize SCS time and resources toward watershed study and project implementation.
2. Provide input to the development of a CRMP.
3. Seek CRMP input into project or management decisions effecting the Shasta River Basin.

SHASTA RIVER WATER USERS ASSOCIATION

1. Participate in the development and implementation, of the CRMP and CRMP projects. .
2. Enlist participation by private landowners in the development and implementation projects.
3. Seek resources for projects
4. Seek CRMP input into project or management decisions effecting the Shasta River Basin.

MONTAGUE IRRIGATION DISTRICT

1. Participate in the development and implementation of the CRMP and CRMP projects.
2. Enlist participation by private landowners in the development and implementation projects.
3. Seek resources for projects
4. Seek CRMP input into project or management decisions effecting the Shasta River Basin.

GRENADA IRRIGATION DISTRICT

1. Participate in the development and implementation of the CRMP and CRMP projects.
2. Enlist participation by private landowners in the development and implementation projects.
3. Seek resources for projects
4. Seek CRMP input into project or management decisions effecting the Shasta River Basin.

SISKIYOU COUNTY

1. Provide funding through the Shasta Valley Conservation District, if feasible.
3. Enlist participation by private landowners in the development and implementation projects.
4. Seek resources for projects through County Commissions.
5. Seek CRMP input into project or management decisions effecting the Shasta River Basin.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

1. Provide results of previous studies on the Shasta River.
2. Conduct or participate in additional habitat studies, when feasible.
3. Provide funding sources for stream restoration and habitat improvement on Federal lands within the watershed through the Sykes Act and the Wallop-Dreaux Sport Fishery Restoration etc, if feasible.
4. Participate in analyzing and developing possible stream restoration activities, including the siting, design, and layout of structures.

5. Assist in seeking potential labor sources, including the California Conservation Corps, conservation camp crews administered by the California Youth Authority and California Department of Corrections, and heavy equipment operation by California National Guard Engineering Battalions.
6. Seek funding for IFIM Flow Study for the Shasta River
7. Participate in evaluating fish populations before and after implementation of habitat improvement projects.
8. Enforce provisions of the Fish and Game Code, including Section 5650 dealing with pollutants, including sediment under certain circumstances, and Section 1603 dealing with streambed alterations, such as gravel extraction, dam construction, etc..
9. Expedite the issuance of CDFG permits as necessary for habitat improvement projects.
10. Participate in follow-up studies to monitor the effect of habitat improvement projects on aquatic and terrestrial resources.
11. Seek CRMP input into project or management decisions effecting the Shasta River Basin.

CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD

1. Provide results of studies on the Shasta River.
2. Provide input to the development of a CRMP.
3. Seek CRMP input into project or management decisions effecting the Shasta River Basin.

CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS.

1. Provide labor crews and supervision in order to achieve the goals of the CRMP
2. Coordinate with any planning groups as necessary to effectively commit and utilize such pools of labor.

KLAMATH TRIBE,

1. Provide input to the development of a CRMP.
2. Seek CRMP input into project or management decisions effecting the Shasta River Basin.

KARUK TRIBE,

1. Provide input to the development of a CRMP.
2. Seek CRMP input into project or management decisions effecting the Shasta River Basin.

HOOPA TRIBE,

1. Provide input to the development of a CRMP.
2. Seek CRMP input into project or management decisions effecting the Shasta River Basin.

YUROK TRIBE,

1. Provide input to the development of a CRMP.
2. Seek CRMP input into project or management decisions effecting the Shasta River Basin.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

1. Provide results of previous studies on the Shasta River.
2. Conduct or participate in additional studies, when feasible.
3. Participate in the identification of sources of habitat degradation the watershed.
4. Provide technical assistance to private landowners on erosion, sediment control, and habitat improvement riparian practices.

5. Provide assistance in obtaining cost-shared funds for private landowners through Public Law 566 and/or the Resource Conservation and Development Program.
6. Provide qualified technical personnel from the state, area, and field offices to assist with the development and implementation of habitat improvement projects and a CRMP.
7. Participate in follow-up studies to evaluate the effectiveness of projects on private lands.
8. Participate in this MOA to the extent annually approved by the SV RCD.
9. Seek CRMP input into project or management decisions effecting the Shasta River Basin.

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

1. Provide input to the development of a CRMP.
2. Expedite the processing of Corps permits as necessary for the construction of habitat improvement facilities in waters of the United States under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.
3. Seek CRMP input into project or management decisions effecting the Shasta River Basin.

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

1. Provide input to the development of a CRMP .
2. Assist in the development and implementation, as USFWS funding and manpower allows, of monitoring studies to evaluate the effects of habitat improvement projects on aquatic and terrestrial resources.
3. Provide public outreach program assistance by facilitating public meetings and planning sessions
4. Seek CRMP input into project or management decisions effecting the Shasta River Basin.

U.S. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

1. Provide input to the development of a CRMP.
2. Provide results of previous studies on the Shasta River.
3. Conduct or participate in additional studies, when feasible.
4. Seek resources for projects.
5. Participate in follow-up studies to monitor the effect of habitat improvement projects on aquatic and terrestrial resources.
6. Seek CRMP input into project or management decisions effecting the Shasta River Basin.

KLAMATH RIVER TASK FORCE

1. Provide input to the development of a CRMP.
2. Seek CRMP input into project or management decisions effecting the Shasta River Basin.

GREAT NORTHERN CORPORATION

1. Provide input to the development of a CRMP.
2. Formulate proposals for projects.
3. Seek funding for projects.
4. Coordinate the design and implementation of projects.
5. Administer contracts for projects, including construction, bonding, insurance, and documentation.
6. Acquire all necessary permits for habitat improvement projects.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

- A. Each and every provision of this Memorandum of Agreement is subject to all applicable Federal and State laws and regulations.
- B. Nothing in this Memorandum of Agreement shall be construed as obligating any party to the expenditure of funds in excess of available appropriations.
- C. Parties shall not be required to provide any information that they consider to be proprietary.
- D. Any amendment hereto of to the plans agreed to hereunder, shall be in writing, may be proposed by any party, and shall become effective upon approval by all parties to the specific plan.
- E. Any party may propose the termination of this agreement by providing 60 days written notice to the other parties. Such termination shall become effective upon mutual agreement by all parties.
- F. Any party may withdraw from this agreement by providing written notice to all the other parties of the intent to withdraw 60 days in advance of the effective withdrawal date. The withdrawal of one or more parties does not alter the effectiveness of this agreement for the remaining parties.
- G. Parties may be added to this agreement by their signature hereunder indicating their commitment to the objectives of the Memorandum of Agreement and agreement with the General Provisions.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto, by their respective
duly authorized officials, have executed this agreement as
of the _____ day of _____, 19____.

Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District

By _____

Shasta River Water Users Association

By _____

Montague Irrigation District

By _____

Grenada Irrigation District

By _____

Siskiyou County

By _____

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

By _____

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

By _____

U.S. Bureau of Land Management

By _____

Klamath River Task Force

By _____

Great Northern Corporation

By _____
Executive Director

DRAFT

Dear Secretary Lujan,

The purpose of this letter is to bring your attention to a severe problem in implementing the Klamath River Basin Act (PL 99-552). This \$20 million fishery restoration program created the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force (Task Force), and directed the U.S. Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the Task Force in creation and implementation of a 20-year program. Presently, Klamath River salmonid populations are at an all-time low, resulting in the loss of commercial, sport, and native american fisheries. The estimated loss to the local economy is over \$50 million for 1992.

Seven years of below average precipitation have resulted in drought conditions within the Klamath River Basin. Flows in the Klamath River below Iron Gate Dam are now inadequate for implementation of the Klamath Act. From June 1 to July 31, 710 cubic feet per second (cfs) at Iron Gate Dam is recognized by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) as the minimum allowable flow necessary to protect existing salmonid populations in the river below that point. The Bureau of Reclamation proposes to reduce flows at Keno to 100 cfs, with total disregard of the impact to flows at Iron Gate Dam. This action could translate into flows of less than 300 cfs at that point.

Recent letters sent to the Bureau of Reclamation by the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force (dated March 12), California Department of Fish Game (March 23), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (May 18), Karuk Tribe of California (June 14), and Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (June 15) point out problems resulting from reduced flows and request corrective action in this matter. To date, the Bureau of Reclamation has released 12,000 acre-feet to assist in natural and hatchery salmonid outmigration, but flows now occurring are compromising smolt survival. Over 4 million chinook fingerlings were recently released at the Iron Gate Hatchery. The potential now exists to lose a significant portion of the 1992 year class. The Task Force finds this unacceptable.

We propose that you direct the Bureau of Reclamation to deliver, at a minimum, the flows at Iron Gate Dam required under FERC license Number 2082, as follows:

<u>Period</u>	<u>FLOW</u>
June 1 - July 31	710 cfs
August 1 - August 31	1,000 cfs
September 1 - April 30	1,300 cfs
May 1 - May 31	1,000 cfs

Further, we have identified in our long-range fishery restoration plan that the above flows are necessary to fulfill our mandate as stated in the Klamath River Basin Act. Your response to this request is needed immediately.

Sincerely,

William F. Shake
Chairman

cc AFS -- (Executive Secretary)
California State Water Resource Control Board -- (Executive Secretary)
Cal-Trout -- (Executive Secretary)
CDFG -- Boyd Gibbons
CDFG -- Conservation Education Program
CDFG -- John Hayes
CDFG -- Dennis Maria
CSSTRF -- Jud Ellinwood
Federation of Fly Fishers -- (Executive Secretary)
Klamath Tribe -- (Chairman)
ODFW -- Jim Martin
ODFW -- John Fortune
ODFW -- Don McIsaac
NMFS -- (Acting Regional Director)
PCFFA -- Zeke Grader
Trout Unlimited -- (Executive Secretary)
United Anglers -- (Executive Secretary)
USBOR -- Roger Patterson
USBOR -- Don Treasure
USFWS -- Marvin Plenart
USFWS -- Wayne White

Memorandum

TO: Task Force Members

FROM: Keith Wilkinson

SUBJECT: Recommendation for an amendment process.

As requested by the chair I am offering an amendment process, (schedule) for our long term plan. The schedule recommendation is, the amendment process will open October, 1995, through January 1, 1996 and opened thereafter in 5 year cycles. To address a concern about the cycle length, I would like to suggest that would be addressed by directing the chairperson be empowered to respond to an emergency or other immediate concern, by opening the amendment process prior to the adopted schedule.

I would like to offer this schedule for your consideration.

Keith Wilkinson

IFD
Rizma

Memorandum

To : Mr. Tim Farley, Acting Chief
Inland Fisheries Division

Date : June 3, 1992

From : Department of Fish and Game - Region 1

Subject : Chinook Smolt Plant at Iron Gate Fish Hatchery, Siskiyou County

As you are well aware, conditions on the upper Klamath River have caused some concerns about the upcoming fall chinook smolt plant from Iron Gate Fish Hatchery. This is a followup to your May 21 letter regarding the releases.

On June 2, three live cages were placed at three locations in the upper river downstream from the hatchery outfall. Fish were placed in the cages at approximately 2 p.m. and were checked at 0700 on June 3. There was no loss of fish at all. Dissolved oxygen (DO) samples were also taken at a site approximately two miles below the hatchery. The findings were:

June 2 @ 2000 hours	8.1 ppm
June 2 @ 2300 hours	7.0 ppm
June 3 @ 0600 hours	7.3 ppm.

During that period, the pH reading ranged from 8.45 to 5.96. The river temperature at the hatchery is 63°F and the water in the hatchery has been warmed to 55°F. It appears that overall conditions are about as good as they are likely to get.

After discussions with Mr. Paul Hubbell, we propose to implement the following plan. (Fish sizes are those on June 1, 1992; they are used for reference only and will be larger at the time of release). This plan will be used if there is no significant observed fish loss. If a significant loss occurs, fish releases will cease and other alternatives will be considered. Observations will be made after each release.

June 2 Live cage fish and hold overnight. Take DO and pH readings through the night.

If conditions are suitable, releases will start. All releases will be made at dusk.

June 3	Plant 50,000 fish at 64/pound.
June 4	Plant 300,000 fish at 64/pound.
June 5	Plant 300,000 fish at 64/pound.

Mr. Tim Farley
Page Two
June 3, 1992

June 6 Plant 350,000 fish at 78/pound.
June 7 Plant 350,000 fish at 78/pound (AND ALL the CWT fish).
June 8 Plant 350,000 fish at 94/pound.
June 9 Plant 350,000 fish at 94/pound.
June 10 Plant 350,000 fish at 107/pound.
June 11 Plant 350,000 fish at 107/pound.
June 13 Plant 905,000 fish at 138/pound.
June 14 Plant 905,000 fish at 150/pound.

Messrs. Bill Chesney and Mitch Silva will assist Iron Gate Fish Hatchery personnel with visual observations for possible fish loss. Mr. Dennis Maria will maintain two fish traps to monitor and confirm the downstream movement of the planted fish.

As you can see, we are making every effort to release this year class without any major problem.

My staff feels that marking next year's chinook smolts with more than one group of coded wire tags would allow more flexibility at the time of release.

If you have any questions, please contact Messrs. John Hayes or Bob Corn at ATSS 442-2364 and 442-2369, respectively.

for John M. Hayes
Banky E. Curtis
Regional Manager

Approved: ^{Original signed by} Paul M. Hubbell *for*
Mr. Tim Farley, Acting Chief

Date: 6/8/92

cc: Mr. John Hayes
Mr. Bob Corn
Mr. Curt Hiser
Mr. Paul Hubbell
Mr. Jim Hopelain
Mr. Forrest Reynolds
Mr. Ken Hashagen
Mr. Paul Wertz

Attachment

Memorandum

Robert Corn
Fisheries Management Supervisor - Hatcheries
Region I

Date: June 3, 1992

From: Department of Fish and Game - Iron Gate Salmon & Steelhead Hatchery

Subject: Preparations for Fingerling King Salmon Release

Fish Survival Test of King Salmon Fingerling

Tuesday, June 2, 1992

Three 'live cars' were placed in the Klamath River:

- #1 at the gauging station on the hatchery grounds;
- #2 at the 'Fish Hook' restaurant approximately 1.5 miles downstream from the hatchery;
- #3 at the 'R' Ranch approximately 2.3 miles downstream from the hatchery.

#1 and 2 were installed and the fish introduced between 2:00 and 3:30 PM on June 2nd. Approximately 150 fish were placed in #1 and 50 fish in #2. No visible evidence of stress was seen. #3 was installed and approximately 50 fish introduced at 8:00 PM. No sign of stress was seen. The Klamath River temperature was 65°F. The hatchery water temperature was 55°F.

All three live cars were checked between 5:00 and 7:00 AM on Wednesday, June 3rd. No loss had occurred in any live car and no sign of stress was noted. All fish were very active. The Klamath River temperature at 6:00 AM was 62.5°F.

Water Conditions Testing

Dissolved oxygen, temperature and pH readings were taken from 8:45 PM June 2nd to 6:00 AM June 3rd in the Klamath River at the 'R' Ranch approximately 2.3 miles below Iron Gate Hatchery.

<u>Time</u>	<u>Temperature</u>	<u>pH</u>	<u>Dissolved oxygen</u>
June 2, 1992			
8:45 PM	18°C (65°F)	8.45	8.1
9:25 PM	18°C		7.7
10:00 PM	18°C		7.3
11:00 PM	18°C		7.0
June 3, 1992			
1:00 AM	17.75°C (64°F)		7.1
3:00 AM	17°C (62.5°F)		7.1
5:00 AM	17°C		7.1
6:00 AM	17°C	5.96	7.3

Curtis A. Hiser

Curtis A. Hiser
Fish Hatchery Manager II

CAH/mar

cc: John Hayes

John Hayes

SUBJECT 1991 Chinook Salmon Production

TRINITY HATCHERY

Spring Chinook A. 210188 smolts were released on June 5

All were tagged.

B. 376,500 will be held for the yearling program for release in Nov. None are tagged as yet.

Fall Chinook (A) Planned release of June 22 of 576,000 smolts, of these 205,000 are tagged.

(B) 936,000 will be held for the yearling program for release in November, none are tagged as yet.

Iron Gate information is attached.

Bob.

Bob Corn
Hatchery Supervisor

Memorandum

To : Robert Corn
 Fisheries Management Supervisor, Hatcheries
 Region 1

Date : June 12, 1992

From : Department of Fish and Game - Iron Gate Salmon & Steelhead Hatchery

Subject: Projected Production of Iron Gate Hatchery 1991 King Salmon

King Salmon - 91 smolts planted ----- 3,570,012

King Salmon - 91 held for release as yearling in fall 1992

Iron Gate Hatchery -----	1,005,000	
Fall Creek Hatchery -----	200,000	
Klamath River Rearing Ponds ----	160,713	
	<u>1,365,713</u>	<u>1,365,713</u>
Total -----		4,935,725

King Salmon - 91 total eggs taken ----- 6,599,391

King Salmon - 91

Projected percentage of eggs taken to fish planted -- 74.8%

Curtis A. Hiser

Curtis A. Hiser
 Fish Hatchery Manager II

CAH/mar
 cc: John Hayes

Memorandum

John Hayes
 Fisheries Management Supervisor
 Region I

Date June 12, 1992

From : Department of Fish and Game - Iron Gate Salmon & Steelhead Hatchery

Subject: Iron Gate Hatchery Smolt Plants 1992

	<u>Number released</u>	<u>Size</u>	<u>Hatchery pond temperature</u>		<u>Klamath River at Iron Gate Hatchery temperature</u>	
			<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>
June 3	50,000	56/lb	58.8	54.9	68.4	64.8
June 4	119,500	56/lb	58.5	54.7	68.7	64.4
June 5	119,500	56/lb	58.1	54.3	68.2	64.4
June 6	304,650	73/lb	59.0	54.9	68.4	64.4
June 7	304,650	73/lb	59.0	55.4	68.7	64.4
	191,242	80/lb (tagged)				
June 8	229,625	91/lb				
June 9	229,625	91/lb	58.3	54.7	67.8	64.8
June 10	230,310	93/lb	56.7	54.1	66.6	62.8
June 11	230,310	93/lb	57.0	55.2	66.0	64.2
June 13	780,300	95/lb				
June 14	780,300	95/lb				
	<u>3,570,012</u>					

Klamath River flow at Iron Gate Hatchery on June 11, 1992 - 536.7 CFS

Curtis Hiser
 Curtis Hiser
 Fish Hatchery Manager II

CAH/mar
 cc: Bob Corn

CALIFORNIA
SALMON, STEELHEAD, AND TROUT
RESTORATION FEDERATION

P.O. Box 4260 • Arcata, California 95521 • (707) 444-8903

May 25, 1992

Mr. Boyd Gibbons, Director
California Department of Fish and Game
1416 Ninth St., 12th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Gibbons:

Our organization represents more than 1500 men and women professionally involved in restoring California's salmonid fisheries.

We are writing to you on behalf of the following organizations endorsing this letter:

**United Anglers
California Trout
Trout Unlimited
Salmon Unlimited
Northern California Guides and Sportsmens Association
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations
Salmon Troller's Marketing Association
Golden Gate Fishermen's Association**

These organizations and the Federation believe that the Department must implement a program of marking all salmon and steelhead trout propagated at state hatcheries, and require all salmon and steelhead propagated at cooperative rearing projects to be similarly marked. There are serious and compelling reasons for implementing this program immediately.

Marking all hatchery-produced salmon could allow the state's ocean and inland salmon fishery to selectively harvest only hatchery fish. Targeting hatchery fish for ocean and inland harvest would provide greater fishing opportunities in areas affected by Klamath Management Zone regulations. Conversely, the impact of the ocean harvest on escapement of Klamath wild stock¹ spawners would be reduced to a minimal level. Greater survival of wild spawners entering the Trinity and

Sacramento Rivers would also result from a selective harvest of hatchery fish.

Marking all hatchery-produced salmon will allow researchers to distinguish between naturally-produced fish and hatchery-produced fish, both juveniles and adults, from the moment artificially propagated fish are planted in a stream. Critical information must be developed on a basin-wide scale about interactions between hatchery and wild juvenile fish, smolt migratory behavior, and smolt survival rates. Instituting a total marking policy would enhance the capability of fishery biologists to quantify the escapement of naturally-produced adults. Biologists could determine the magnitude of interbreeding between hatchery and wild adults and describe the distribution and origin of hatchery-produced adult spawners.

Fisheries professionals and conservation organizations believe that current salmon and steelhead management policies fail to address issues involving the conservation of the genetic variability of wild stocks. Studies of several Pacific Coast salmon populations attribute the decline of wild stocks to a loss of genetic vigor as a result of ongoing interbreeding with hatchery-produced spawners.

One doesn't have to look hard to find an example of biological damage resulting from not understanding the interaction of wild and artificially produced fish. In the 1980's, the Oregon coho and chinook salmon fisheries collapsed at a time when hatchery production was at an all time high. Many investigators speculate that the large numbers of hatchery smolts planted during those peak production years simply overwhelmed the capacity of stream, estuarine and ocean environments to support that number of fish. Biologists studying the Klamath-Trinity river system's anadromous fish populations are becoming increasingly concerned that a similar pattern is establishing itself in the Klamath-Trinity system. They have good reasons to be concerned.

Several authoritative studies have shown that hatchery-produced smolts compete directly with naturally produced juveniles for limited supplies of food and space. Competition among hatchery smolts and with wild fish can result in poor survival of both wild and hatchery fish.

1. Self sustaining runs of fish separate in time or space from hatchery stocks.

Predation of larger hatchery-produced smolts on smaller wild wild juveniles is well documented. Another concern of biologists is the transmission of disease from infected hatchery fish to wild fish.

Not only are displaced and malnourished wild fish more susceptible to infection by disease, they are also more easily captured by natural predators and less able to tolerate elevated water temperatures associated with drought flow conditions.

Released from hatcheries into streams with sub-normal flows, smolts have been observed to migrate slowly and often stay in the stream for prolonged periods. This behavior extends and magnifies the impact they have on aquatic communities. Water diversions and drought conditions have combined to reduce flows in the Klamath, Trinity and Sacramento Rivers over the past several years. If smolts released from hatcheries on these rivers were marked, their interaction with wild juvenile salmon and steelhead could be described and monitored.

The Department urgently needs to collect this kind of information. The Department should be monitoring the impact of individual hatcheries on wild stocks, and making adjustments in hatchery objectives and procedures to minimize deleterious impacts revealed by monitoring programs. We believe these management actions must be taken in order for the Department to comply with provisions of the Salmon, Steelhead Trout and Anadromous Fisheries Program Act of 1988.

The Act, created when SB 2261 was enacted, requires the Department of Fish and Game to establish a comprehensive program (2261 Program) for the protection and restoration of the state's salmon and steelhead trout. A goal for the program is doubling the natural production of salmon and steelhead by the year 2000, by protecting and restoring their habitat.

In regard to artificial propagation, the Act finds, "Artificially produced salmon and steelhead trout stocks are now at or near the maximum percentage they should occupy in the mix of natural and artificial production for the state. Where both artificial and natural means of increasing salmon and steelhead are possible, preference shall be given to natural production."

The Act also requires the Department to provide the legislature with a report (completed in 1989) specifying the initial elements of the 2261 Program. One of the elements

is artificial production. The report declares that the Department's goal "is to make [existing hatchery] operations as productive as possible while not adversely affecting naturally reproducing populations. Increased fish rearing will not be permitted where it would have adverse impacts on wild populations [emphasis added]."

Four years have elapsed since the 2261 Program's inception, and the state's salmon and steelhead populations continue to decline. The Department must ascertain whether their efforts to increase natural production are not being undermined by hatchery management practices. The information needed to make this assessment cannot be acquired without being able to distinguish a hatchery fish from a naturally-produced fish. Biologists must be provided with the capability to make this distinction.

Opponents of this proposal will say marking would be too costly. We say that is the cost of doing business. Implementation should be a top priority that is accommodated by adjustments in the hatchery system budget. Costs could be offset by cuts in production, and reallocation of hatchery funding and manpower. For example, hatchery personnel could be either temporarily or permanently assigned to marking crews that moved from hatchery to hatchery on a demand basis. These crews could be augmented by CCC crews or displaced fishermen working under contract to the state.

Opponents will argue the policy is impractical (although it is being done elsewhere) and would be technically too difficult to successfully implement. We believe that the program can work, and solutions can be found for the technical glitches one would normally expect to experience when a large scale program like this is initiated.

Idaho already is marking all hatchery fish, and Oregon and Washington are also considering instituting similar programs. On a coastwide scale, adoption of a standardized marking system by California, Oregon, and Washington would undoubtedly be embraced by the PFMC, NMFS and other management agencies grappling with salmon harvest management and species listed as threatened or endangered.

In order to develop a marking system that is both effective and efficient, and to bring it on line as rapidly as possible, we believe the Department should have access to the best advice the scientific community can offer. For that reason, we propose the formation of an advisory panel composed of expert fish culturists and biologists recommended by the Cal-Neva Chapter of the American Fisheries

Society, as well as Department and public representatives.

The panel's mission would be to review current knowledge, summarize their findings, and recommend: (1) a preferred marking method and techniques, (2) a method for evaluating the utility and efficacy of the procedure, and (3) a procedure for field testing, evaluating, and improving the program. The panel would, we suggest, report to and coordinate its efforts with the Department's Hatchery Coordinator and 2261 Program Leader.

To sum up, we believe the benefits of instituting a policy of marking all hatchery-produced salmon and steelhead would include:

- (1) Optimizing the ocean harvest of salmon,
- (2) Reducing the harvest of wild stocks,
- (3) Developing information that is integral to devising best fisheries management strategies, and
- (4) Reducing the impacts of hatchery fish on wild stocks.

We ask that you discuss the merits of our request with your Hatchery Coordinator, Ken Hashagen, and the 2261 Program Leader, Forrest Reynolds, and set up a meeting with representatives of the endorsing groups so that we can discuss the matter further at your convenience.

We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Jud Ellinwood
Executive Secretary

cc: Senator Barry Keene
Senator Dan McCorquodale
Senator Henry Mello
Assemblyman Dominic Cortese
Assemblyman Dan Hauser
Tim Farley, CDFG
Ken Hashagen, CDFG
Forrest Reynolds, CDFG

A. Petrovich Jr., CDFG
Terry Mills, CDF&G
Larry Six, Executive Director
PFMC
Guy Thornburg, Executive Director
Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission
Larry Week, President
AFS-Cal Neva Chapter
Earl Carpenter, Chairman
California Advisory Committee on
Salmon and Steelhead Trout
Ron Iverson, Klamath River Basin
Fisheries Restoration Program
Chuck Lane, Trinity River Restoration
Program

Oregon

June 3, 1992



DEPARTMENT OF
FISH AND
WILDLIFE

OFFICE OF THE
DIRECTOR

Mr. William F. Shake
Assistant Regional Director
USFWS - Fishery Resources
1002 NE Holladay Street
Portland, OR 97232-4181

Dear Mr. Shake:

The unfortunately restrictive 1992 ocean salmon fisheries recently adopted by the Pacific Fishery Management Council in waters affected by Klamath River chinook concerns has caused us to reflect on possible factors that we may be able to influence to avoid a similar situation in the future. Considering the long life cycle of chinook salmon, it is unlikely that anything under human control will substantially improve the status of those Klamath River chinook that will determine 1993 fisheries--these fish left the Klamath River in 1990 and 1991 and final abundance will be determined by marine environmental conditions. However, we do have the opportunity to positively change some of the factors that affect future brood year production of Klamath River chinook salmon. One of those opportunities is hatchery management practices within the Klamath River basin.

Our representatives on the Klamath Fishery Management Council (KFMC) and Klamath River Task Force (KRTF) have discussed the effect of hatchery practices at Iron Gate Hatchery and Trinity Hatchery on total chinook production of natural and hatchery populations. Their review of recent information suggests that hatchery practices may have a substantial impact on the survival of natural populations and that slight changes in hatchery practices could substantially improve the survival of hatchery populations. While this review suggested that some obstacles exist to making these



2501 SW First Avenue
PO Box 59
Portland, OR 97207
(503) 229-5406
FAX (503) 229-6134

Mr. William F. Shake
June 3, 1992
Page 2

changes, it appears that some of these obstacles can be hurdled in the short term to accomplish positive change. We would like to suggest a joint meeting of a small group of selected individuals to examine pertinent information and make recommendations for changes implementable in the next few years that can yield benefits for at least the next decade. While some would call for long-term studies prior to action, we feel that studies and evaluations may still proceed during the next decade to fine-tune a comprehensive long-term hatchery program for the Klamath River basin.

We propose that a policy and technical representative from CFG, ODFW, the Klamath River tribes, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service meet in the near future. This group would focus on the hatchery practices data that received preliminary reviews by the KFMC and KRTF, as well as the mitigation agreement documents for Iron Gate and Trinity Hatcheries.

The group would make recommendations to the KFMC, KRTF, CFG and perhaps U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and Pacific Power & Light for changes that could occur in 1993. Should you agree, please contact Dr. D. O. McIsaac of my staff to facilitate logistics of such a meeting. He can be reached at 503-229-5410, Ext. 398.

Sincerely,



Randy Fisher
Director

dmw

c J. Martin
Bohn
Wilkerson
Kaiser
DeHart
Berry
Hankin - HSU
McIsaac

WP

This identical letter was sent to this list of people:

Mr. Boyd Gibbons, CDFG
Mr. Bill Shake, UFWA
Mr. Richard Haberman, Yukon Indian Tribe
Mr. Dale Risling, Chrmn., Hoopa Indian Tribe

The KMZ Fishery Coalition is concerned with mitigation releases impact on natural production, fish released at 90 to 70lb will not be detectable as hatchery fish as adults.

We feel as many as possible be reared for fall release to reduce competition with the natural production below both T.R. + S.G. hatchery - also look at the possibility of marking all hatchery fish in the future to know hatchery percentage in the system.

Thanks

Jim S. Walter
for KMZ fishery

JUN 24 1992

WDDM.000

OUTLINE OF PRESENTATION TO KLAMATH RIVER TASK FORCE

JUNE 17, 1992

1. Description of the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Pl (Basin Plan).
2. Description of the Basin Plan amendment process.
3. Issue of amending the Basin Plan to address temperature problems in the Klamath River.

1. THE BASIN PLAN

The Basin Plan provides the framework for the Regional Board's regulation of water quality. The basin planning process is set forth in the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. The Basin Plan was first written in 1975. It has been amended several times since then.

The Basin Plan contains five sections. Section 1, the Introduction, contains a description of the Region, a hydrologic map of the Region, and a description of current water quality problems in the Region. Section 2 consists of a listing of the Beneficial Uses of the waters of the Region. Section 3, contains water quality objectives

for bacteria, dissolved oxygen, temperature, conductance, and other water quality parameters which are needed to maintain the beneficial water uses described in Section 2. Section 4 is the Implementation section, which is the meat of the plan. That section contains the Action Plans and Policies which address various water quality problems in the Region. Section 5 describes the basic framework for surveillance and monitoring in the Region.

2. AMENDMENT OF THE BASIN PLAN

The federal Clean Water Act and the statewide Porter-Cologne Act require a continuing review of the Basin Plans. The object of the review is to determine, through public input, the need for changes to update the plan with changes in technology, and to address new water quality issues as they arise. The Basin Plan of the North Coast Region last underwent a formal review in 1988. We are due to begin another review of the Basin Plan this Fall, beginning in September.

To begin the process of a Basin Plan review, the Regional Board requests in a public notice which is published in the newspapers throughout the North Coast Region and sent to all those who are on the Regional Board mailing list to provide input regarding the water quality needs of the Region and suggestions for Basin Plan amendment. In addition, Regional Board staff will prepare its evaluation of the Basin Plan and its recommendations for changes. Judging from the past, a range of requests to amend the Basin Plan will be received. We begin the Basin Plan review process in September. Regional Board staff will then prepare a report which will describe and prioritize the requests for Basin Plan amendment. Along with this

prioritization, the staff will estimate the staff time needed to complete each amendment. The staff report will be available to the public, and will be discussed at a public hearing to allow public input.

3. AMENDMENT OF THE BASIN PLAN TO ADDRESS THE TEMPERATURE PROBLEMS IN THE KLAMATH RIVER

This is best illustrated by the Regional Board's recent experiences which resulted in amendment of the Basin Plan to include a site-specific temperature objective for the 39-mile stretch of the Trinity River which extends from Lewiston Dam to the North Fork of the Trinity River. In petitioning the Regional Board to amend the Basin Plan, fisheries experts and the County of Trinity argued that the Trinity River was different from the other waterways in the Region, and therefore was deserving of a specific temperature objective. They made the contention that the general temperature objective which applies to all of the waters of the North Coast Region was not protecting the Trinity River. They requested an amendment of the temperature objective to protect the declining populations of salmon and steelhead which have occurred since the construction of the Trinity River Division of the Central Valley Project in 1963.

After no less than six public meeting and approximately three years in time, the Regional Board adopted a temperature objective that was a minimum requirement to protect the fisheries.

Describe the specific temperature objective for the Trinity

River. Reference the March 26, 1992 Staff Report in support of site-specific temperature objective. The Regional Board adopted the amendment in May 1991. The State Water Resources later approved the amendment, after it seriously considered the potential impacts of the amendment on the rest of the State - the State Board needed to address and separate the water rights issues from water quality issues, which was not an easy task.

Because Trinity River flows are controlled, to a large extent, by releases from Lewiston Dam, the Regional Board adopted, in addition to the specific temperature objective, an Interim Action Plan for the Trinity River. The Action Plan describes the management of releases, operated by the Bureau of Reclamation, that it is a collaborative effort of a number of interests and agencies including Trinity and Humboldt Counties, the Department of Water Resources, the Hoopa Valley Indian Tribe, the Department of Fish and Game, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the State Water Resources Control Board, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The Action Plan also states that the releases, to the extent controllable, need to meet the objective. The "extent controllable" is determined by the collaborative effort of the involved agencies.

Close in time to the the Regional Board's action, the Secretary of the Interior authorized flows in the Trinity River to increase to provide fisheries fisheries protection. Therefore, what actually occurred in the Trinity River last year was a combination of increased flows "fish friendly" temperatures.

The USFWS monitors the Trinity River with continuous temperature measuring devices. Throughout the compliance period, the USFWS notified the Regional Board weekly of the temperature measurements taken. Throughout the 1991 period for monitoring, the temperatures were exceeded, for a short time, on two days only.

The bad news is, however, that fish counts conducted by the Department of Fish and Game (DFG) show numbers of spring run chinook salmon to be the lowest on record since 1977, and the numbers of fall run chinook to be the third lowest since 1977. Steelhead numbers were at an all-time low. The DFG did observe, however, a positive phenomenon in the Trinity River during the last spawning season, which they attribute not only to the increased flows but to the compliance to the temperatures - that is the spreading of nesting areas throughout a much longer stretch in the Trinity River. Historically, since the construction of Lewiston Dam in 1963, approximately 40 - 50 % of the spawners have utilized a two-mile reach of the river immediately below the dam to nest and spawn - this is a limited space for the spawners, and cause for competition for nesting space. In 1991, however, DFG observed increased numbers of nests, or redds, and a wider distribution over the span of the 39 miles extending from Lewiston Dam to the N. F. Trinity River. The DFG is hopeful that production will improve because of this spreading of the nests. Along with this, the DFG observed last fall the lowest pre-spawning mortality rates in history.

As for planning for the upcoming summer and fall 1992, the BOR headed operations group is currently at the drawing board. Each year, after the rainy season and prior to summer, the BOR prepares its operations plan which is determined by running various scenarios of releases of available water through its temperature model. The most recent preliminary forecast available to me indicates that there will be compliance to the temperature objective in the Trinity River this year.

The operational plan of the Bureau of Reclamation calls for providing enough flow through Lewiston Lake to keep the temperatures down in July, then to draw down Whiskeytown Lake in August to meet needs in the Central Valley. Expected levels in Lewiston and Trinity Lakes are expected to be slightly higher than in 1991. Over and above this, BOR plans to construct a temperature curtain at the fish hatchery at Lewiston - this will be completed by mid-July or August. In addition, \$800,000 in federal drought relief funds have been approved to construct a second curtain upstream, in the narrows of Lewiston Reservoir, to get to the cold waters at the bottom - estimated completion date for this curtain is September 1st. These measurements may allow an increased interbasin transfer of an estimated 100,000 AF to the Sacramento Valley, with no adverse impact on the Trinity. Also, the fish hatchery, having undergone an upgrading of its facility, expects increased production this year.

The agencies involved are looking to the long-term. They have concluded that temperature control structure at Whiskeytown is needed. Without that device, waters from the Trinity are heated approximately 11° when stored at Whiskeytown, and serve no use for cooling to the Sacramento. Also, a bill for the construction of a temperature control device at Shasta Dam is currently in the House.

The above summarizes the Basin Plan amendment process experienced in the Trinity River last year. I hope it will give you a basis for comparison for your needs on the Klamath River. I would like to emphasize that during the Trinity River Basin Plan amendment process, the Regional Board relied heavily on fisheries experts and the information that they provided - we couldn't have done it without them. Similarly, for request that may come from you, we will be looking for specifics, for technical information that supports the request. For example, what are the temperature requirements of the Klamath River fishery? Is there data to back that up? And finally, can and how can those needs be met?

As a final point, the Regional Board needs to see that the Basin Plan is as accurate as possible. If the existing temperature objective, or any other objective in the Basin Plan does not meet the needs of the Klamath River, we need to know it, and then we will have a sound basis for recommending a change in the Basin Plan.