

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Klamath Field Office  
1312 Fairlane Road  
Yreka, CA 96909

Tel. 916/842-5763

March 30, 1989

TO: Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force  
FROM: Ron Iverson, Recording Secretary  
SUBJECT: Draft minutes of the Task Force meeting held 20-21 March 1989

Attached for your review are minutes of the subject meeting held in Yreka, California. I have followed each motion passed, assignment made, or other decision point with a line of asterisks.

Attachments

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING HELD 20-21 MARCH 1989

IN YREKA, CALIFORNIA

The meeting was convened at 1 p.m. by vice-chair Nat Bingham, with a quorum present (see attendance roster, Attachment 1). The meeting agenda (Attachment 2) was approved without change. The following corrections were made to the minutes of the meeting of 9-10 February 1989:

o Page 4, Report on Bogus Creek egg-taking program, fifth paragraph: The phrase: ... "CDFG decided against" ... should be replaced with ... "CDFG staff recommended against" ...

o Page 5, Public comment, first paragraph summarizing remarks of Tom Stokely: replace ... the Bureau of Reclamation plans to sell over 120,000 acre-feet additional Trinity water... and drop flows to pre-Andrus levels" with: ... "the Bureau of Reclamation intends to reduce Trinity River instream flows to 120,500 AF/yr".

Election of officers Nat said that, while the Task Force operating procedures call for him to succeed Wally Steucke as chair, he would prefer this be done by election. Bill Shake was elected chairperson by consensus, with a comment that the chair should normally be held by an agency representative. Nat was re-elected vice-chairperson.

1989 budget

Discussion of the Hoopa Tribe's request to increase funding of the Pine Creek project led to discussion of a projected deficit in the FY1989 Restoration Program budget. A "high" estimate of Program costs by Klamath Field Office - made on March 20 - was \$1,137,800, compared with appropriations of \$1 million. Highlights of the deficit discussion included:

o Discussion of \$105,000 retained by the Portland office of Fish and Wildlife Service. These costs were not included in the budget approved by the Task Force in June 1988. Included are an 8% overhead charge (\$80,000) and \$25,000 to compensate the Service for funds advanced to the Restoration Program for startup in late FY1988. Shake explained that the overhead rate is below what is usually assessed, and that projected deficits in other programs will make it difficult for the Service to absorb this cost.

o Discussion of other contributors to the projected FY1989 deficit, including:

- oo \$11,000 increase proposed for Pine Creek project
- oo Projected overrun in Klamath Field Office budget of \$25-30,000
- oo Proposed increase in planning contract of \$50,000, in order to obligate the whole long-range planning fund in FY1989
- o Possibility of funding the Pine Creek project from State funds was raised

o The Washington D.C. level of the Service has provided no clarification as to whether FY1989 funds are "no-year" i.e. can be carried over to the next fiscal year if unspent. It appears that FY1989 funds will not carry over and so should be completely obligated...anything not obligated will be lost.

Following actions were taken to correct the projected FY1989 deficit:

o FWS Regional Office will give up the \$25,000 advance made in FY1988 and the 8% overhead assessment, with the provisos that overhead will be assessed in future fiscal years, and that any savings in FY1989 should be provided to the Regional Office to reduce their projected deficit.  
 \*\*\*\*\*

o All planning funds should be budgeted in FY1989, to get the plan done as soon as possible.  
 \*\*\*\*\*

o Given that work statements for diversion screen construction and maintenance are not yet in hand, Projects 4.32 and 4.33 should be deleted from the Federally-funded work plan for FY1989. Screens already constructed at Yreka will be funded from other sources.  
 \*\*\*\*\*

o Funding for the Pine Creek project will be increased to \$31,000, on the understanding that cooperation will be sought from the Regional Water Quality Control Board in conducting the project.  
 \*\*\*\*\*

A revised Federal Work Plan for FY1989, incorporating these changes, is display in Attachment 3.

Report of the technical work group on a programmatic budget for FY1990

Ronnie Pierce summarized the report (Attachment 4). The work group identified \$275,000 in uncommitted Federal funds in FY1990.

Assuming the worst case - no nonFederal funds - the work group proposed to divide this sum about equally between habitat management and artificial propagation. If matching nonFederal funds become available, the work group proposed to spend about \$300,000 of the noncommitted Federal funds to get additional information, and to divide the remainder between habitat management and artificial propagation.

The work group drafted a work plan for new work commencing in FY1990, and a letter inviting proposals for such work (Attachment 2 to Attachment 4). Comments on the work group report included the following:

- o Concerned about the share of Federal funding that is going into things other than fish production or habitat improvement.

- o If California matching funds come through, they will go mostly to construction/production projects. Funds in the State pipeline for FY88-89 Klamath projects total about \$300,000.

- o (Shake): regarding ways to involve socioeconomic groups identified in the Klamath Act, we can and will seek sole-source contracting authority. This could be granted administratively, within current regulations, or legislatively by amending the Klamath Act.

- o Responding to the possibility of new sources of funding for operations of the Klamath Fishery Management Council, the Task Force asked that Klamath Field Office estimate the annual cost of running KFMC.

\*\*\*\*\*

- o The Task Force asked for a detailed explanation of the planned increase in administrative cost from FY1989 to FY1990

\*\*\*\*\*

- o Responding to a question on whether funds can be moved between budget categories once the FY1990 programmatic budget is submitted to FWS-Washington, Shake said there will be flexibility, if justification is provided.

- o Staff of Fish and Wildlife Service and Forest Service were asked to summarize 1990 activities planned for ongoing information-gathering projects. Their comments included the following:

Craig Tuss, FWS (Projects 2.22, 2.43): In 1988, the technical work group identified natural chinook stocks of the lower Klamath as important targets for information-gathering. In 1988-89, Arcata FAO began to estimate spawning escapements, juvenile standing crops, and habitat features for some of these

stocks. Of 15 tributaries examined, six had sufficient spawning to justify trapping to estimate juvenile production, and an additional six had sufficient habitat to warrant further interest, even though little spawning was observed. A second year of field study will allow further focussing on potentially productive tributaries, while dropping unproductive ones. Expected products include:

- oo Recommendations for habitat rehabilitation
- oo Long-term monitoring of index streams will indicate trends in numbers of spawners

(Projects 2.23, 2.44): Blue Creek is the largest lower Klamath tributary...allegedly supported 5-50,000 fall chinook spawners in the 1950s. Arcata FAO is conducting a four-year field effort evaluating spawning and juvenile rearing in Blue Creek...over one spawning cycle. Expected products:

- oo Recommendations for habitat restoration
- oo Feasibility of using Blue Creek as an egg source for other streams, or artificial propagation projects

(Project 2.51): This project involves monitoring of juvenile salmonid outmigration in the lower Klamath River, using traps...a joint venture with the Trinity Restoration Program, which is trapping juveniles in the lower Trinity. This should continue several years as a monitoring action. Products: contribute to determining the relationship between spawning escapements and smolt production, particularly the big spawning escapements of recent years.

Jack West, USFS (Projects 2.31 and 2.41): These are conducted as one field project on 125 stream-miles. Field crews investigate salmon and steelhead spawning, noting spawner use of different habitats, run timing, and size and spacing of redds. In summer, juvenile habitats and standing crops are estimated for the same streams. Products:

- oo Estimates of productive capacity of streams, and identification of limiting factors for productivity
- oo Prescriptions for instream restoration

Jack estimated that habitat assessment of any given stream reach should be repeated every five or so years. In the near future, he proposes to shift spawning assessment effort away from the lower Shasta because of poor visibility and water quality hazardous to instream workers...and because Shasta racks provide an escapement estimate for chinook salmon.

USFS will do 120 stream-miles of habitat typing/standing crop estimates with in-house funds in FY1989, with an eventual total of 700 miles. Jack argued that such field assessment should precede any major investments in habitat restoration. Jack would like to use Klamath Program funds for assessment of larger streams, USFS funds for smaller streams that are more directly impacted by forest management.

Comments on Jack's presentation:

o Q: Will your results be available to writers of the long-range plan?

A: We report results quarterly

o Q: Why no work in the upper Scott River basin?

A: Haven't gotten to it yet...are working up the Scott...next field work will be in Scott Valley

o Q: Will you make steelhead escapement estimates every year?

A: We have just entered the steelhead spawning season. We will estimate escapement where possible, eliminate field effort in reaches where estimation is impractical because of high flow and/or turbidity

o Q: You have requested level funding into FY1990, yet you are proposing major changes in tasks. Will you submit a revised work statement?

A: Yes. I recommend the spawning assessments continue in FY1990...but the 125 stream-miles of habitat assessment will have been completed, so a new piece of habitat assessment work might be considered a new project proposal, to compete with others for FY1990 funding.

Discussion of the work group report continued on March 21. Nat Bingham proposed the report be accepted with a shift of \$150,000 from the information-gathering line to habitat management and artificial propagation under the "full-budget", 100% matching assumption. Comments on the motion included:

o Task Force is responsible to insure that its recommendations for action are well-informed

o There is plenty of data on salmonid restoration...information is not a limiting factor

o The new evaluation biologist position planned for Klamath Field Office should be counted as an information-gathering expense

o Each habitat or fish-rearing project should have before/after evaluation built in

o The programmatic budget for FY1990 is a sort of menu or general indication of the direction the Task Force would like the Restoration Program to take...it should be considered flexible.

Nat's motion passed by consensus

\*\*\*\*\*

Discussion turned to the draft letter soliciting proposals (Attachment B to Attachment 4). Comments on the letter included:

o Given the small amount of funds available for new information-gathering projects, maybe we shouldn't ask for proposals in this category. (Consensus was to leave this category of work in the letter)

o The project proposal format should include a place for proposers to identify funds from other sources...and projects with matching or other Federal funds should be favored for Restoration Program funding.

o The letter should say that project proposals should include a description of evaluation procedures

o The solicitation letter, as presently drafted, is not sufficient for competitive procurement from the private or nonprofit sector. We would need to advertise detailed work statements to satisfy Federal procurement requirements

o Most private-sector contracts will be funded by California. The Federal letter inviting proposals should focus on agencies and tribes as potential cooperators.

o The deadline for proposal submission to CDFG has been moved up to April 25. The Federal deadline should be the same.

o USFS priorities for fish and wildlife, as displayed in the Federal Register, should be attached to the solicitation letter

The draft solicitation letter, with changes as noted above, was approved by consensus. Klamath Field Office was requested to distribute the letter as soon as possible

\*\*\*\*\*

Task Force consideration of Trinity County letter.

Howard Myrick said the key point of their letter (distributed as an attachment to the agenda for this meeting) is that the twelve-

year Trinity River flow study is supposed to identify instream flow needs, but the Bureau seems to be planning to reduce flows to 120,500 AF/year. The County's letter will be formally presented to the Bureau next week at a public meeting in Redding. It was noted the Hoopa Tribe has taken a similar position on marketing of Trinity water.

Discussion followed as to whether the Task Force should get involved in such issues...or perhaps let the Klamath Fishery Management Council take the lead. It was agreed the Task Force should take a position, and the best means to do so would be to endorse the pending Klamath Council letter commenting on the water marketing EISSs.

Myrick explained that Trinity River flows of 340,000 AF/year are needed to fully test the instream flow hypothesis, but three of the five years of the flow study have been too dry to achieve this...and 1988-89 appears to be another water-short year. On account of recent precipitation, the Bureau has redesignated this water year as "dry" rather than "critically dry", thus making an additional 70,000 AF available to the Trinity.

The letter drafted by Bill Yeates for the Klamath Fishery Management Council, containing comments on the draft water marketing EISSs, was distributed March 21. The Task Force endorsed the letter with the following changes: indicate Task Force concurrence in the letter; and update references to 1988-89 as a "critically dry" year. Klamath Field Office was requested to insure the letter got out by the April 2 deadline for comments.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Report on status of State process for soliciting proposals

Mel Odemar reported that proposals for fishery restoration work in FY1989-90 are due in Sacramento April 25. The process is about as was described at the last Task Force meeting. About \$5 million will be available statewide, from several funding sources. Funding of restoration work in Klamath River basin will eventually be guided by the long-range plan, but until then will be decided project-by-project.

Mitch Farro commented that the State uses an unrealistic rationale for ranking pond rearing proposals.

#### Role of the technical work group

Following discussion of this topic by the Task Force in executive session, comments including the following were provided, for the record, by the chairman:

o The work group has never been formally established, but consensus of the Task Force is that this should be done.

o Mission of the work group will be to provide technical expertise as needed by the Task Force...to provide information needed for decisionmaking.

o Klamath Field Office project leader will be work group spokesperson.

o Work group need not reach consensus on every issue...a minority report is acceptable

o The above guidance will apply to the work group in review of FY1990 project proposals, which is the next major work group assignment. Review of proposals should include validating the proposal cost estimates.

o Members of the work group are identified as: Mitch Farro, Don Devol, Mike Parton, Sue Masten, Roger Wallcott, Tom Stokely, Paul Hubbell, Mike Orcutt, Ronnie Pierce, Jerry Earnes, Jack West, Del Robinson, Mike Bryan, and Keith Wilkinson...each representing a Task Force agency, tribe, or constituent group. Any changes in work group membership should be identified as soon as possible. Representatives of other agencies may be included in the work group on an as-needed basis.

o Leaf Hillman and Bob Rice will draft a statement of roles and responsibilities for the work group...to be presented at the next Task Force meeting after discussion with work group members.

\*\*\*\*\*

Restoration Program staffing

Discussion of this topic in executive session led to the following conclusions:

o The Task Force wishes to continue to review planned staffing changes in Klamath Field Office.

o Staffing plan for KFO will be provided to the Task Force for discussion at the July meeting

\*\*\*\*\*

o CDFG will likewise identify any Restoration Program staffing to the Task Force.

Other old business

Rod McInnis asked for clarification on the proposed change in Goal 2 which the mission/goals committee is being asked to

consider. Mel Odemar said a change in that goal was suggested by CDFG staff, to better define and constrain the role of artificial propagation in furthering the purposes of the Restoration Program. Nat Bingham said his constituents were concerned that artificial propagation not be unreasonably constrained as a tool of stock restoration. It was left that the goals committee would consider the issue and report recommendations at the July Task Force meeting.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Report on 1989 management of Klamath chinook harvest

Nat Bingham reported that the issue of chinook harvest allocation between ocean and inriver Klamath harvesters remains unresolved, both for the 1989 season and for the longer term. Klamath Fishery Management Council will meet once more, concurrently with Pacific Fishery Management Council, to try to reach agreement on a 1989 allocation prior to the PFMC decision on 1989 salmon regulations.

#### Comments:

o Q: Any word on the PFMC Framework Plan Amendment, substituting harvest rate management for a spawning escapement goal for Klamath fall chinook?

A: (McInnis): Amendment was signed last week by the Secretary of Commerce.

o Q: Would PFMC automatically accept the recommendation of the KFMC?

A: (Bingham): Not necessarily, but they would probably welcome KFMC decisiveness, since this would shift the political heat.

#### Big Springs field trip

Nat explained the field trip would be followed by a meeting for those interested in examining possibilities for an enhancement propagation facility in the Shasta drainage. The Salmon Stamp Committee is taking the lead in organizing, and possibly in funding, such a facility. SSC is looking for interested local groups such as educators, angler organizations, resource conservation districts...would like a local operator...similar to Mitch Farro's operation on Little River.

Objectives of such a project would be to increase return of chinook spawners to the Shasta to speed restoration of the natural stock, and to stimulate local interest in fish restoration. Procedure could involve transporting adult fish to an egg-taking site, or transporting eggs taken at Shasta rack.

Comments:

o Question as to how this proposal serves the restoration of natural stocks

o Note that this project is not the same as the hatchery once proposed for the Shasta...this would be on a much smaller scale.

o Q: Production statistics?

A: Expect a 250,000 - smolt release from an egg take of 300-400,000.

o Concerned that the troll industry is pitching this proposal now, in advance of submission of other proposals

o Q: Rearing environment in the Shasta is not good...what release size is planned?

A: This is just a concept...we don't have a detailed proposal. We are thinking of rearing to at least smolt size.

Other new business

Mike Orcutt asked that the Hoopa Tribe be included in the technical review committee for long-range planning proposals. Bill Shake will propose this to the FWS Contracting Officer.  
\*\*\*\*\*

Discussion of next meeting

Next meeting is tentatively scheduled for 6-7 July, in Requa. Agenda items will include an update on the financial state of the FY1989 work plan. A subsequent meeting will be held approximately 9-10 November 1989, in Brookings. Agenda items will include an update on progress of the long-range plan. Assuming KFMC will be meeting at that time, we should try for back-to-back meetings.  
\*\*\*\*\*

Public comment

o (Jim Denny) In replacing Phil Schafer as sport angling representative on the Task Force, Klamath River resort owners should be considered...they have been adversely affected by declining steelhead fishing. Task Force would also be helped by addition of a representative for farmers...since it will be most difficult to get more water for fish if organized agriculture is opposed.

Meeting adjourned.

ATTACHMENT 1

KLAMTH FISHERIES TASK FORCE

Attendance Roster, March 20 and 21, 1989 meeting.

Task Force Members

Nat Bingham	California Commercial salmon fishing industry
Don DeVol	Del Norte County
Leaf Hillman	Karuk Tribe
Howard Myrick	Trinity County
Rod McInnis	National Marine Fisheries Service
Mel Odemar	CDFG
Mike Orcutt	Hoopa Tribe
Ronnie Pierce	Humboldt County
Bob Rice	Department of Agriculture
Bill Shake	Department of Interior
Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife

Not in attendance: Susan Masten (Yurok Tribe)  
Phil Schafer (In-River sport fishing community)

Others Attending

Jim Denny  
Sari Sommarstrom  
Doug Denton  
Kim Rushton  
Bill Kier  
Andy Kier  
Mike Bryan  
Terry Brown  
Arnold Whitridge  
Jim Cook  
Patrick Darner  
Ron Dotson  
Don Bradley  
Scott Downie  
Tricia Whitehouse  
Del Robinson  
Mitch Farro  
Jack West

ATTACHMENT 2

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE

AGENDA

FOR A MEETING TO BE HELD IN YREKA, CALIFORNIA

20-21 MARCH 1989

20 March 1989

- 1:00 p.m. Call to order, correction and approval of minutes and agenda
- 1:15 Election of chairperson
- 1:45 Task Force action on Pine Creek proposal of Hoopa Tribe
- 2:00 Task Force consideration of Trinity County letter
- 2:45 Break
- 3:00 Report of the technical work group on a proposed programmatic budget for Federal Fiscal Year 1990 and State Fiscal Year 1989-90 (work group spokesperson to be designated)
- 4:00 Adjourn

21 March 1989

- 8:00 Task Force consideration of work group report
- 9:30 Break
- 9:45 Report on status of State process for soliciting proposals (Odemar)
- 10:00 Other old business
- 10:30 Report on 1989 management of Klamath chinook harvest (Bingham)
- 11:00 Briefing on field trip to Big Springs (Bingham)
- 11:15 Other new business
- 11:30 Public comment
- 12:00 Discussion of next meeting
- 12:30 Adjourn

Note: a field trip is scheduled Tuesday afternoon to the Big Springs area, to view sites for chinook propagation proposed by the Salmon Stamp Committee

FEDERALLY-FUNDED WORK PLAN AND  
BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1989  
KLAMATH BASIN FISHERY RESTORATION  
FILE A:89WRKPLN.FRM

TASK	SUBTASK	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	IMPLEM_BY	CONTINUE IN FY1990?
** (0)ADMINISTER PROGRAM (0)ADMINISTER PROGRAM		(0.1)OPERATE KLAMATH FIELD OFFICE	175000	USFWS	YES
** Subtotal **			175000		
** (1) PLAN PROGRAM (1) PLAN PROGRAM		(1.1) PLAN AND ENV. ASSESSMENT	155500	CONTRACT	NO
** Subtotal **			155500		
** (2) GET INFORMATION (2) GET INFORMATION	(2.1) OCEAN HARVEST INFO	(2.12) TAGGING NEEDS FOR TIME/AREA MANAGEMENT	36400	CONTRACT	NO
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.2) CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT	(2.21) ESTIMATE FALL CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT	41700	CDFG	NO
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.2) CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT	(2.22) FALL CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT, LOWER KLAMATH	24000	USFWS	YES
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.2) CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT	(2.23) FALL CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT, BLUE CREEK	43800	USFWS	YES
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.2) CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT	(2.25) HYDROACOUSTIC WEIR, SALMON RIVER	21500	CDFG	NO
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.3) STEELHEAD ESCAPMNT	(2.31) STEELHEAD ESCAPEMENT, SELECTED TRIBS	73400	USFS	YES
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.4) PRODUCTIVECAPACITY	(2.41) HABITAT TYPE, STANDING CROP, 125 MI.STREAM	75000	USFS	YES
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.4) PRODUCTIVECAPACITY	(2.42) TYPE HABITAT, PLAN REHAB, PINE CREEK	31000	HVBC	NO
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.4) PRODUCTIVECAPACITY	(2.43) JUVENILE PRODUCTION, LOWER KLAMATH TRIBS	0	USFWS	YES
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.4) PRODUCTIVECAPACITY	(2.44) HABITAT AVAILABLE FOR FALL CHINOOK, BLUE CR	0	USFWS	YES
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.5) DOWNSTRM MIGRANTS	(2.51) TRAP OUTMIGRANTS, LOWER KLAMATH RIVER	27200	USFWS	YES

FEDERALLY-FUNDED WORK PLAN AND  
BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1989  
KLAMATH BASIN FISHERY RESTORATION  
FILE A:89WRKPLN.FRM

TASK	SUBTASK	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	IMPLEM_BY	CONTINUE IN FY1990?
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.6) INSTREAM FLOWS	(2.61) ANALYZE RECORDS, FEASIBILITY OF AUGMENT.	36000	CAL-DWR	NO
** Subtotal **			410000		
** (3) EDUCATE					
(3) EDUCATE		(3.1) EDUCATION PROJECT	69000	CONTRACT	YES
(3) EDUCATE		(3.2) PUBLIC INFORMATION/INTERPRETATION	40000	USFWS	YES
** Subtotal **			109000		
** (4) MANAGE HABITAT					
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.1) CONTROL SEDIMENT	(4.14) SEDIMENT BUDGET, SCOTT SUBBASIN	50000	SISK RCD	NO
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.1) CONTROL SEDIMENT	(4.15) CONTROL BANK EROSION, YREKA CREEK	10000	YREKA	?
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.2) INSTREAM HABITAT	(4.25) EVALUATE EXISTING HABITAT IMPROVEMENTS	0	USFS	YES
** Subtotal **			60000		
** (5) ARTIF. PROPAGATION					
(5) ARTIF. PROPAGATION	(5.1) EVALUATE	(5.11) EVALUATE PRESMOLT CHINOOK RELEASE, IGSPH	56700	CDFG	NO
(5) ARTIF. PROPAGATION	(5.1) EVALUATE	(5.12) EVALUATE POND REARING OF FALL CHINOOK	26600	CDFG	NO
** Subtotal **			83300		
*** Total ***			992800		

ATTACHMENT 4

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Klamath Field Office  
1312 Fairlane Road  
Yreka, CA 96097

Tel. 916/842-5763

March 17, 1989

FROM: Ron Iverson  
TO: Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force  
SUBJECT: Proposed programmatic budget for Fiscal Year 1990, Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Fishery Restoration Program

The technical work group of the Task Force met on 15-16 March in Eureka, to carry out four tasks assigned by the Task Force on February 10. Results of the work group effort are reported below, organized by task:

Task 1. Quantify "committed" Federal funds The following were identified as Restoration Program activities that will continue from FY1989 into FY1990:

- o Program administration, consisting of \$80,000 overhead and \$225,000 for operation of Klamath Field Office, totalling \$305,000.
- o Program planning, for which \$50,000 is identified for Fiscal Year in the planning
- o Continuing field studies being conducted by the Fish and Wildlife Service, with FY1990 costs estimated at \$102,000; and Forest Service field studies estimated to cost \$149,000, for a subtotal of \$251,000.
- o The education/public information project, estimated to cost \$109,000 in FY1990.

Task 2. Schedule remaining Federal funds into broad restoration categories The work group decided to recommend a budget covering the entire potential FY1990 funding of \$2 million, Federal and non-Federal. This is displayed in the "Full Budget" column of Attachment 1. Rationale for the "Full Budget" is: administration, planning, and education are considered committed items in the dollar amounts identified under Task 1 above. Getting information i.e. studies and monitoring, is maintained at the FY1989 level of \$450,000. The "manage habitat" category of the budget is maintained at the level recommended by the Task Force for FY1989, and the remainder of the \$2 million is identified for artificial propagation.

Task 3. Define special areas of concern which could be contracted by private restoration groups The work group identified objectives and areas of concern for the FY1990 work plan. These are displayed in an attachment to a draft letter requesting proposals (Attachment 2). The work group felt that most areas of concern under the "get information", "educate", "manage habitat", and "artificial propagation" objectives could conceivably be carried out by

private groups, and such groups have done a considerable portion of the fishery restoration work funded in Klamath Basin by the State of California. The work group is concerned that the more stringent Federal procurement regulations may allow private - sector contracting only where a detailed work statement can be prepared and advertised by the Fish and Wildlife Service. The work group requests guidance from the Task Force as to whether the additional task of work statement preparation should be undertaken.

\*\*\*\*\*

Task 4. Develop a backup budget for Federal funds should State funding not be available The "Low Budget" column of Attachment 1 is the recommended allocation of Federal funds if State funds are lacking in FY1990. Rationale for the "Low Budget" numbers is: administration, planning, ongoing field studies, and the education/information project are considered committed funds (see Task 1 above), and the remainder of the Federal \$1 million is divided between managing habitat and artificial propagation.

Attachments

cc Grover  
    Technical work group

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM  
PROGRAMMATIC BUDGET FOR FY1990  
PROPOSED BY TECHNICAL WORK GROUP  
MARCH 1989

CATEGORY	LOW BUDGET	FULL BUDGET
0 ADMINISTER PROGRAM	305	305
PLAN PROGRAM	50	50
GET INFORMATION	251	450
EDUCATE	109	109
MANAGE HABITAT	140	800
ARTIFICIAL PROPAGATION	145	286
	0	0
*** Total ***	1000	2000

ATTACHMENT 2

**DRAFT**

wp a: rfpltr

March 16, 1989

To interested parties:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service invites proposals for actions to restore anadromous fish stocks of the Klamath River basin, California. Proposals accepted for support will be funded during Federal Fiscal Year 1990 (1 October 1989-30 September 1990), subject to appropriation of funds by Congress.

The fishery restoration work will be part of the Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Fishery Restoration Program, a 20-year program authorized by Congress in 1986. The Klamath Restoration Program is administered by the Service, with guidance provided by the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force, an advisory committee made up of representatives of fishery agencies, tribes, and interest groups. The Task Force has approved an interim work plan for Fiscal Year 1990. Proposals are invited for work directed toward achieving the plan objectives, which are summarized in Attachment A to this letter. Proposals must be received at the Klamath Field Office by 1 May 1989 in order to be considered.

→ CORR-11  
April 25

The "Klamath River basin" is defined here to mean the anadromous fish habitats of the basin, excluding the Trinity River basin. The Trinity basin is excluded here because fish restoration in

that basin is funded through a separate restoration program funded by the Bureau of Reclamation.

The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) also has authority to fund fishery restoration work. Their letter of February xx (Attachment B) invites proposals for work in Klamath Basin, and in other streams of the State. If you have submitted proposals for work in the Klamath River basin in response to the CDFG letter, you need not submit a second proposal to the Service for the same project. All proposals for Klamath work, whether responding to the State letter or this letter, will be grouped together for ranking and approval for funding.

Suggested format for proposals is displayed in Attachment C.

Submit proposals to:

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
1312 Fairlane Road  
Yreka, California 96097

Materials submitted become the property of the Service and will not be returned.

ATTACHMENT A

PLAN OBJECTIVES TOWARD WHICH PROPOSALS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED

- o Species priorities: Anadromous stocks are listed below in descending order of priority

- Highest priority: fall-run chinook salmon
  - steelhead trout
  - spring-run chinook salmon
  - coho salmon

- Lower priority: other anadromous fish stocks

- o Get information
  - o Information on spawning escapement
  - o Information on productive capacity of stream habitats
    - oo Factors contributing to overwinter survival of juvenile fish
    - oo Estimate smolt outmigration from cold and warm-  
t  
winger streams...tie to spawning escapement and standing crop estimates
  - o Information on the outmigrant stage
    - oo Information on survival and rearing in Klamath River and estuary
  - o Information on life history
    - oo Estimate survival and growth, by juvenile life stage, for selected tributaries

- o Inform the public about anadromous fish and actions required to restore them

- o Manage habitat

- o Improve instream flow and temperature conditions
- o Manage sediments in streams
- o Modify barriers to fish passage
- o Screen diversions
- o Restore stream habitats
- o Get information on water quality
- o Evaluate effectiveness of habitat management measures

- o Artificially propagate fish

- o Rear fish

- o For enhancement of natural runs
- o To reduce hatchery impacts on wild fish  
(example: increase period of rearing from  
presmolt release to smolt or yearling  
release)

- o Assess quality and health of cultured fish and/or wild stocks
- o Evaluate effectiveness of rearing programs
- o Maintain genetic resource of anadromous stocks;  
minimize hatchery/wild fish interaction

ATTACHMENT 3

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE

TECHNICAL WORK GROUP

ATTENDANCE

MEETING OF 15-16 MARCH 1989

EUREKA, CA

NAME	REPRESENTING
Jerry Barnes	Department of Agriculture
Mike Parton	Karuk Tribe
Del Robinson	Interior Department
Ronnie Pierce	Humboldt County
Jack West	Department of Agriculture
Mitch Farro	Ocean salmon fishing industry
Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Mike Orcutt	Hoopla Tribe
Ron Iverson	facilitator

A: KATF-15C