



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

IN REPLY REFER TO:

Klamath River Fish and Wildlife Office
P. O. Box 1006
Yreka, CA 96097-1006
(916) 842-5763
FAX (916) 842-4517

December 5, 1996

Memorandum

TO: Klamath Fishery Task Force and Technical Work Group Members

FROM: Project Leader, Klamath River Fish and Wildlife Office, Yreka, California

SUBJECT: Minutes of the Klamath Task Force meeting October 10-11, 1996

Attached are the draft minutes from the subject meeting in Brookings, OR. Please review these draft minutes and get back to us with your comments (preferably in writing) by January 6, 1997.

Ronald A. Iverson
Project Leader

Attachment (1)

cc: Alice Kilham, Klamath Compact Commission
Martha Pagel, Oregon Dept. of Water Resources
Roger K. Paterson, Chairman, Trinity Task Force
Kelly Duncan, HSU
Bruce Halstead, CCFWO
Steve Lewis, ERO
H. Paul Friesema, Northwestern University
Dr. Lee Lamb, USGS
Frank Shrier, PPL
Carl Werkus, BOR
Mark Beuttner, BOR
Jerry Barnes, USFS

Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force Meeting
October 10-11, 1996
Brookings, Oregon
Draft Minutes

October 10, 1996

Agendum Item #1. Convene meeting.

At 8:00AM the meeting was convened by Chairman Nat Bingham. Ron Iverson was the Department of Interior (DOI) representative. Don Russell, the new Klamath County representative, was seated. A quorum was present (Attachment 1).

Agendum Item #2. Business

A. Adoption of agenda.

Bingham: I would like to suggest a change to the agenda (Attachment 2). We will move item #4 to follow #8 with #14 following #4. With that change, are there any other additions or changes to today's agenda that any of the members would like to offer?

****Motion**** (Wilkinson): I move that we adopt the amended agenda.

****Motion seconded**** (Bingham):

****Motion passes****

B. Adoption of minutes from the June 1995, April 1996, and June 1996 meetings.

Bingham: That will bring us to the minutes from the last three meetings. I want to thank staff for the excellent job in preparing and compiling this, a rather complete and detailed summary of what happened at the meetings. Do any of the members have changes or comments relative to the minutes?

****Motion**** (Wilkinson): Seeing no offers of amendments, I would move that we adopt the minutes of all three minutes represented in this document.

****Second**** (Bingham): Moved and seconded to adopt the minutes from June 1995, April 1996 and June 1996.

Dutra: I will not block the adoption but I certainly want it understood that I think that it is inexcusable to not have minutes out in a much faster fashion than has occurred. I will not object to the minutes.

Bingham: Your concern is certainly noted. I believe staff heard it and hopefully, we will get them done more expeditiously in the future. With that concern expressed, do I hear objection to the adoption of the minutes? Hearing no objection, the minutes are adopted.

****Motion passes****

Iverson: Over the years we have kind of gone back and forth on the nature of minutes that have been produced; trying to have a product that is most usable. The recent several sets of minutes have been very lengthy and we are proposing to revise our product to have a more summary version of the minutes in the future backed up by a more nearly verbatim version for those who are interested. So I throw that out as a proposal from the Yreka Office. If anybody has any comments pro or con I would be interested to hear them.

Bingham: I have served on some bodies where that was routinely done where a summary of action and just discussion was one version that was available and then a very complete and detailed version was available to back it up. Any comments from Task Force (TF) members on what you would like the staff to do?

Wilkinson: I appreciate the attempt of Dr. Iverson and his staff to try to help on that and would support that. I think TF members need to carefully review the minutes when they are mailed and respond with any significant amendments or changes in the time indicated.

C. Brief review of last meeting/general correspondence.

Hamilton: (Provided an update and review of correspondence.) (See Handouts A - C, Attachment 3).

D. California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) request for approval of nonfederal match.

Rode: This is a request that we make each year for projects that are funded outside of TF funding by other funding sources such as the Salmon Stamp and Prop 70 and Wildlife Conservation Board funding for projects within the Klamath Basin that are applicable to the Recovery Program. The handout here does not include the projects, just a cover letter. I do have a copy of the listed projects (see Handout B).

Bingham: These projects are then presented for TF approval for a nonfederal match. Would any TF member at this point like to offer a motion to move the forward for approval as a match or would you prefer to wait until we actually have copies available to look at? I will entertain a motion now if anyone is ready.

****Motion**** (Wilkinson): I so move.

****Second**** (Bingham). Moved and seconded that these projects just identified by the CDFG be identified for a nonfederal match. Do I hear objection?

Franklin (for Orcutt): I am wondering of the Technical Work Group (TWG) has already had a look at these and if so, where we might get some information on what their feel of the value might be. Were these submitted to the TWG?

Rode: Normally, these projects are co-submitted to the TWG for evaluation, of course because of the Request for Proposals (RFP) revisions that we made this year, these projects were defacto funded by these other sources first. They didn't get a chance to be, I don't believe, considered by the TWG and I would just like to remind you that the funding sources for these projects also have review groups similar to the TWG.

Bingham: I have in fact served on the committee that approved these projects and they do go through extensive technical review by the CDFG technical people before they even get to the Proposition 70 Committee for approval and in a sense, the fact that they haven't been reviewed by our TWG is an artifact of the process. Our process has changed this year and I would offer that it is hard to get match dollars and we shouldn't look too hard on this one at this time.

Franklin: I would be most comfortable if I could take a look before we try to have a vote.

Orcutt (taking over from Franklin): In my absence when Robert Franklin was sitting in and informed what was going on there. There were a couple of things that in the past have been somewhat controversial, one of them being the screen shop and the other, I think was some work in the Scott River, some rip rap work and I guess the way we have ultimately resolved it is the fact that, we are pretty well aware of the State's problems in meeting the matches. I guess the ultimate bottom line is that they would probably fund it, it just wouldn't go against ever increasing deficit that the State does have in meeting the match with the program I would assume the work would go ahead anyway and ultimately probably never meet the Federal match anyway so with that, we would if nothing else, abstain from the vote on that.

Bingham: I would say that it is true, these items will be funded since they have in fact already been approved by other funding entities. Are there any other members who would care to comment on that at this point?

Orcutt: The State. How close they are to coming to the match?

Bingham: Perhaps that is something that will come out as part of the mid term review process. In fact, I did specifically hear mention of that. I think the fact of the matter is that we all know intuitively that we are far behind on making the State match requirement.

Pace (from audience): In the July 8th, 1996 letter from CDFG, it refers to proposal #99. That would be the TF 96-HR-20 that was reported as funded but not funded? For clarification, I just wanted to know what project that was?

Rode: In the initial letter is the Scott River streambank protection on the Tozier Ranch. It was removed because it was not funded through State proposition monies or other such monies, Prop 70, salmon-stamp money. It was funded by the Cantara Bill Grant. Did I understand you as saying that all other types of funding could qualify as a match?

Iverson: Yes.

Rode: I would like to recommend that Project #99, referenced in the July 18, 1996 letter, then be considered also as a match.

Bingham: I think probably what is needed here is a quick reference to the enabling act but my understanding is that basically the requirement is for nonFederal. There is no strict limitation regarding the source of the nonFederal dollars.

Bulfinch: That is correct and in fact it didn't even have to be dollars, it had to be something that you could put a dollar value on such as volunteer hours. CDFG is administering the Cantara funds where it applies to restoration but they don't originate them. The Scott Coordinated Resource Management Planners (CRMP) really should write a letter offering it as a match; they are the ones that actually spent it.

Rode: Could I make a suggestion that Kent and I look into this in more detail and we leave this request as is for the \$180-some thousand that we originally requested for a match but put off until the next meeting the issue of this one particular project that would be CDFG item 99 and look in to more detail, into how we have been doing on the match and what other types of activities would qualify. Does that sound good?

****Motion withdrawn****

Iverson: It might help to quote from the Act. This is a section of the Klamath Act that deals with cost sharing. It says "50% of the cost of the development and implementation of the program must be provided by one or more nonfederal sources on a basis considered by the Secretary to be timely and appropriate for purposes of this subsection, the term nonfederal source includes a state or local government, any private entity and any individual." So it seems to me, it covers every nonfederal source.

Bingham: Just to supplement that, I was involved with the drafting of the original legislation and we were specifically looking to approach it in a different manner than it had been approached on the Trinity River Act where the requirement in the original Trinity Act was to actually send the matched dollars to the U.S. Treasury. That turned out to be very onerous in many ways and severely crippled restoration efforts in northern California because the State agencies were tapping every source they could get to send those dollars back to D.C. in order to have them come back through the Trinity Restoration Act doubled and we wanted to get out from under that. I am pleased to see that rather onerous requirement was amended in the Trinity reauthorization. Now it looks a lot more like what we have over here on this side but we still have the requirement to be met. Half way through the program, really behooves us to start an accounting procedure. Unless I hear further discussion, lets move forward.

Rode: After listening to what Ron just read, the thought comes to mind, when did the transition occur that that original interpretation then came to mean 50% match by CDFG? Because, we are the only ones that report a match and somehow the burden has been placed on our shoulders to cover all nonfederal source matches. I can quickly think of a lot of other agencies in the State and participating agency from Oregon and a lot of other sources where that money

could come from. We don't mind coordinating that, that is not to say we wouldn't do that. I will continue with Kent on this and I can think of a lot of other places where we could bring up some dollars.

Bingham: Call the question. Is there opposition to the motion to approve these items for nonfederal match as presented by the CDFG? Hearing no objection, so ordered.

****Motion**** To accept the state projects.

****Second****

****Motion passes****

Assignment: Rode will look into what matches can be rung up.

Agendum Item #3. Brief status lake levels, flows, and forecast by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) (Jim Bryant)

Carl Werkus presented (see Handout D).

Fletcher: Part of the KPOP process is to develop some analytical tools and those tools will be relied upon by the TWG and some of the different agencies developing instream flow needs and we just like to stress the need that the BOR participate in those discussions. That would help create a link between the KPOP process and the TF process.

Werkus: I appreciate that and we will react to that.

Rode: As I look at this last graph, I notice that the starting point in October doesn't appear to have much relativity to where water levels wind up at the end of the water year in September. We have got quite a variation there and the reason that was presented to us back in August for considering reduced flows at Iron Gate was to increase the carryover capacity or level of upper Klamath Lake to insure that there be more water there next year. A major point that we brought up was that the system spills in an uncontrollable fashion above Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) minimums most years, I think it is 90+% of the time. It didn't make much sense not knowing what the water year would be to try to save additional water in the fall.

Werkus: That did become central to the discussions that the risk was a one in ten year risk and based on that, we didn't explore the biological effects much further because the risk wasn't considered big enough.

Dutra: We had huge releases during last winter. Would it have been possible to have stored more back at that point in time, ensuring in effect against the hot dry summer which is what occurred?

Werkus: No, there is no more reservoir capacity. Actually those uncontrolled releases come in the spring and you hit capacity of the reservoir; there is a flood control component that controls somewhat the elevation of the lake as you come into the runoff season but then you reach a limit, when you have no more storage capacity.

Russell: It's been 36 years on the project for me; the other aspect of this is that once you have reached maximum elevation on the lake of about 4,370, you begin to jeopardize integrity of the existing dikes on private and public lands. You begin to get into a scenario where if you received a large amount of runoff, then there is a limit as to how much we could put down the system safely for the public because we can't put an unlimited amount down Link River through Elwana and on out over Snow Goose and Keno. If that were to breach Lake Elwana, which it could, it would go right downtown. So it is really a difficult balancing act sometimes.

Barnes: In the package that was given to the TF, there is a letter from Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund noting wide variations in releases and the potential effect on fisheries, fishes downstream of IGD and some of the daily fluctuations were as much as going from 5,500 down to 2500. That is a tremendous difference. Do you know why those wide fluctuations occurred?

Werkus: I cannot say with certainty, but based on experience in other places, I would guess that is actually an inflow fluctuation that is controlled by natural runoff and they are just passing inflow.

Barnes: They characterize it as releases rather than spill.

Werkus: That would be the question that would need to be answered.

Barnes: It may be something that the TWG would want to note and be looking at.

Bingham: It may have to do with the fact that Iron Gate doesn't store very much water.

Frank Shrier (from audience): Once you reach 1700 cfs, we loose control of Iron Gate Projects so anything over that is spill.

Miller: What are you looking at in house this year for storagability within the project and within the Tule Lake Refuge? I particularly would like to know how much water is being stored in the Tule Lake Refuge over the year. I know that you guys are doing some type of a storage study--can you kind of enlighten us where are you with that?

Werkus: We have actually undertaken a water supply initiative. We are looking at every possible potential for increasing the available of water supplies in the Klamath basin. Anything that is out there including the possibility that there are times when we could bring water from the Lost River side of the system. We will look at project storage, ground water, off stream storage, there are a number of potentials out there. We have got some study managers lined up and are putting together a plan of study and we will really try to look at a comprehensive package.

Miller: Have you found any new storage capacity within the system that exists or within the Tule Lake Refuge being able to hold water earlier on?

Werkus: We haven't made it far enough for me to know what options are available right now.

Miller: Are you beginning to monitor your water quality that you are putting back into the system and what is actually in that water we are bringing back to the Klamath River system?

Werkus: My understanding is that there are some serious water quality problems and we are doing some monitoring. I don't know the full extent of it yet but we do have water quality stations both in the Lost River and the on the Klamath River side collecting data. We are participating with the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) in water quality initiatives for the river. That is a serious concern to us and we will participate in any efforts to try to improve that water quality.

Fletcher: Earlier you said you met your targets when you look at the lake and agriculture needs and downstream. I would beg to differ slightly that the targets weren't met, like some of the lake levels. I only point this out because this was one of the wettest years we have had for a long time and there still wasn't enough water to go around to meet everybody's full need. Things aren't going to get easier, I think they are going to get a little bit tougher especially when we look at '97. I think what Alice is trying to do is going to be beneficial. It will get people together and get some dialogue out there but we still got some tough issues ahead and not enough water is the bottom line.

Werkus: I appreciate that Troy; that is one of the things I learned very early on after I got here.

Orcutt: I looked at this graph on that page and it is like 1.3... that is roughly feet difference between projected and actual. What is the amount of volume that it relates to?

Werkus: That is about 91,000 acre feet roughly.

Orcutt: What is thought to be the major cause at present?

Werkus: Two things. One is that snowpack flashed and ran off very quickly and so we ended up with uncontrolled releases, water that couldn't be stored in the system because it came all at once. Then right behind that, the weather turned hot, inflows dropped very low and agricultural demands were high. So it is really a combination of those two factors.

Agendum Item # 4. Update on Klamath Basin ecosystem restoration issues before Congress (Doerr)

Doerr: Defazio's office has been involved with fisheries issues. He supports the watershed approach. He will be on the same committees as in the past and supports the efforts of the Senator.

Wilkinson: NMFS has tentative plans for the coho listing and the steelhead listing, I would like to hear your comments in reference to Governor Kitzaber's plan from the standpoint.

Doerr: Basically what we have done is had Jeff Stiers (who is the Congressman's natural resource person in Washington D.C., and is also our legislative director) working with the Kitzaber staff on this issue from the beginning. I think it all hinges at this point on whether the environmental community sues. If we don't get some time to fill in the holes so that it is not a challengeable plan, then I think we end up in court and there is a possibility they will get a listing on the coho. The steelhead, to be honest with you, I don't know where it stands.

Orcutt: Did you say there is no discussion regarding flow or water quality?

Doerr: No, what I said was that the Congressman is concerned with water quality and flow because it does impact the whole system. I think that has been proven on the Trinity if you look at the water flows that were released there. The Congressman was very successful in going to BOR and getting more water for the Trinity system when that was a negative impact to the fisheries. Obviously you have a storage problem from what I am hearing from the previous gentleman. You have quick melts, no storage, high water usage from ag. That is an issue that is going to have to be addressed as well.

Orcutt: What role has Defazio played in some of the other discussions in terms of water quality and quantity such as Klamath Basin?

Doerr: I can't answer that specifically because on the water quality issues for the upper Klamath, I have not been involved with them directly. Jeff has, and I'd be happy to have him call you and talk to you directly about that if you would like. My responsibility is the coastal and ocean impacts. Jeff has been dealing with the upper Klamath as far as the dams and water quality upstream.

Wilkinson: I would just like to point out, that Congressman DeFazio was very supportive when you got the CVP adjustment. So Congressman DeFazio did step forward and support that.

Doerr: Do not hesitate to call us.

Agendum Item #14. Report from the Klamath Compact Commission and Hatfield Working Group (Alice Kilham)

Kilham: I am pleased to announce we have authorization for this Hatfield legislation. It certainly came out of the fire at the last minute. It is not appropriated yet. I would like to go through the legislation. (Handout E)

Bingham: I have a question in regard to the coordination element under subsection 3c. Could you just enlighten us just a little bit as to (especially under C2) how you see that provision working out on a practical basis?

Kilham: It is a little bit cumbersome. I would say that you already have two members of the TF on the working group, Jud Ellinwood and Craig Bienz. I am saying that perhaps we need to coordinate the best we can. Obviously, the

Compact doesn't have too much problem, there are only three of us and I am on two of them. The Trinity, that seems to me maybe a little more difficult logistically but I was hoping that the people that represented these groups would be willing to work with me through E-mail, through a Web Page, through telephone conversations, through any way we can to make it an open dialogue in which we pass information back and forth. I do think it is very important that we give reports at each others meetings. For instance, at the committee last night, we discussed once again the \$200k that we gave to you last year for the downstream flow (which I say, you're welcome every time I see Mr. Hall). He never really asked us for it but we like to consider that we gave that to you. So now we understand that possibly you would want that again. So I think the feeling is that it is probably very much needed and we appreciate that it is needed but that we would also appreciate someone asking. Craig did give us a breakdown of how the money was spent last year. We would like to have someone come to say this is what we need this for and talk about it so we can have a feel that we are part of it. And, we should probably share our projects with you a little more openly and try to get your input on them, get your reactions to them. I feel a great deal is happening all at once. Oregon is beginning to interact with California on a number of levels. I think that is one of the things that Compact can bring to this is the three governments working together for one solution. I think that a few of us need to sit down, talk a little bit about this, and come up maybe with a plan. I have a feeling the Secretary isn't really interested in formulating it. I think he probably would rather have us formulate it and it just needs to be something that we can agree upon that will work for us.

Russell: I am curious here. Within that framework, is there any likelihood that the Compact itself could receive additional monies? In the past, I think you functioned on legal costs and small office; is there any expectations that the Compact itself could be funded to a greater degree to do work?

Kilham: So far we are sort of trying to piggyback on everybody else and maybe there is enough money that way. I hate to get into another appropriation for another group. We get along so far with cooperating with the BOR on water supply plan. They are contributing in that way to us. In time, the Compact will need more money but it might be up to the States to come up with some of the money at this point because the States are the ones that really have dropped out of any kind of participation in the Compact until this year. We are very fortunate that the States have decided to use the Compact as a forum.

Bulfinch: There is only one thing that is a little jurisdictional here; the representative of ocean commercial fishing industry and a California environmental representative and/or recreational fishing representative. When a vacancy occurs, to be appointing representatives from California to represent California appointed by the Governor of Oregon--it sounds a little politically awkward.

Kilham: It is for restoration in the upper basin.

Bulfinch: I am not talking about the propriety of this, I am talking about stepping on the toes of the Governor of California.

Kilham: I don't know, he might be glad to be rid of that responsibility.

Bingham: I think this is perhaps an issue that can be worked out among all the various representatives.

Wilkinson: Going back to when this organization was formed, there was apparently political oversight in the formation of the Council in representative groups. There was in fact a representative of California commercial fishery and California ocean recreational fishery appointed to the Allocation Work Group. For Oregon, there was only one person selected. That was myself, and I had the opportunity to wear two hats to represent both. I have done that for a good many years now and I think rather equitably. So that was how it was dealt with then. I would be very interested in serving that same role in this new venture.

Rode: I want to follow up recognizing that the Hatfield was an initiative that was originated in Oregon. I still feel that a sizable portion of the upper basin exists in California and I don't see any representation from either Modoc or Siskiyou Counties or from any California State Agency and I think you will be the worse for that. I think that kind of participation would complete the picture.

Kilham: It does say "represented by groups including", so possibly we could look at how we might expand that.

Wilkinson: Touching on just what Mike said, if I understood you correctly, Alice, you said that in your ag representation, you had people from Modoc County as well as Klamath County.

Kilham: We have Tule Lake Refuge's federal representative, Tom Stewart.

Fletcher: Did I hear you right, you are going to give us \$200k for flow studies?

Kilham: I said "probably if you would like to come and be nice and ask".

Agendum Item #5. Status of NMFS determinations to list Steelhead and Coho Salmon (Bybee)

Bybee: In your packet under agendum 5, you have a notice of a schedule of public hearings for the steelhead listing. I will be referring to that. Also in the handouts there is a federal register notice. (Handouts F - J)

Barnes: Can you have an HCP before you have a recovery plan?

Bybee: Yes. The recovery plan will be a separate rule through the ESA process. They can coincide but it is our intention to develop it separately. It has also been experienced that it takes a great deal of time to put together a recovery plan whereas HCP's can be on the road running.

Wilkinson: A lot of what is going on particularly on the coho side has been anxiously awaiting prescriptions from NMFS because there are a lot of activities in some of the south coast areas and the HCP's would be of tremendous significance to us there. How much consultation will there be with the various STEP watershed groups that are very actively involved in coho and steelhead rehabilitation? Will these groups get credit for some ongoing projects providing they can answer the biological needs of the resource? Or I guess the most important question from the standpoint of the private property owner, are they going to get delivered a blanket prescription, irrespective of what work they have accomplished to date?

Bybee: I really don't know the answer to that, Keith. I can assure you though if they do have restoration actions on their property, they would be considered in the HCP process. Any good work out there that is aimed at restoring this fishery or any segment of it, is certainly going to have a role to play.

Orcutt: Would the recovery plan address specifically things like marking of hatchery production? I ask that question because we have been in various discussions with the State of California regarding marking of steelhead at Trinity River Hatchery.

Bybee: Absolutely. We are still talking steelhead right, Mike? (Yes.) If it makes up a major segment of that ESU, it will certainly be addressed in the recovery plan. What we need to keep in mind is that the recovery plan is not a NMFS only effort; academia, states, tribes, everyone will be on that Recovery Team to basically set the scope for what will be in there.

Bulfinch: The CDFG has a steelhead restoration recovery plan. Will your restoration plan include that or be in a position to modify the plan or some combination of the two?

Bybee: I suspect it will either be appended or annexed right to the recovery plan or it will certainly be part of it. There is no question about that.

Russell: I am just curious, Jim, you mentioned earlier that the urban impact on the steelhead. Could you elaborate a little bit on that?

Bybee: You will find most of the urban impacts or at least the most obvious impacts, more in the southern ESUs.

Russell: Can you explain the Klamath Mountain Province for me? I am trying to understand the boundaries and so forth of that, as far as steelhead are concerned.

Bybee: The Klamath Mountain Province was petitioned as an ESU several years ago. When we were in the process of making a determination on whether or not to accept it as a candidate for listing, we also got a petition for steelhead coast wide and as we launched in to that process, it only made good sense to incorporate the Klamath Province Assessment into the whole Statewide assessment.

Russell: I am curious. I am trying to understand the influence of Iron Gate Dam (IGD) from there up as it relates to steelhead. When we talk about steelhead, are we talking about putting them through IGD?

Bybee: Right now, there are no plans to put it through IGD, but who knows, it might show up in the recovery plan, but that is not something that NMFS is posturing right now, nor do I think CDFG is. Do you have any comment on that, Mike?

Rode: I am not aware of any such strategy.

Fletcher: The influences of flow releases below IGD on steelhead populations are an important and critical component of any recovery plan from our perspective. Are there going to be additional genetic type studies?

Bybee: I suspect there will be, Troy. We have already acknowledged the difference between the two races, the summer and the winter run. We are building our genetic staff up and collecting what information we do have so that we can present it to the Recovery Team.

Fletcher: Any type of recommendation will be specific to summer or fall run?

Bybee: Makes sense to me.

Wilkinson: Are there in HCP's any efforts or intent to conduct cumulative impact studies? Point being that at least from the area that I am familiar with that there is a strong concern that for coho and steelhead that we might have cumulative impacts represented by thermal barriers or nonpoint pollution barriers in the estuaries that are preventing migrations certainly of juveniles out and possibly of adults back. So I guess my question is, will cumulative impact studies be part of this whole plan?

Bybee: Yes, it will be essential as we take watershed approaches to this recovery as well as an ecosystem approach.

Wilkinson: Comment. I think I can sum up local opinions about this process and everyone would like to join with seeking the extension at this point.

Barnes: There was a meeting about 1 year ago here in Brookings of the TF and there was a rancher from the Scott Valley who reported that in the early part of this century, coho were extremely abundant in the upper Scott Valley. I don't know when it was the last time we ever saw a coho in the upper Scott Valley in recent times.

Bingham: Relative to the HCP process, where you are working with a large land owner, say industrial forest land owner on the development of an HCP, can you describe for me what level of public involvement there would be in terms of reviewing that before it was approved?

Bybee: NMFS is the federal agency that is still new to the HCP process. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) are veterans and we are going to be allaying ourselves with FWS a great deal. It is my understanding that there is full public disclosure on any HCP. Each plan has been determined subject to National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) where if it is of substantial significant effect, an EIS may be written for it. The smaller HCP's may get a finding of no significant impact status. Either way, they are certainly exposed for public review and within the traditional parameters of NEPA. As far as public involvement, that certainly is going to be encouraged, especially with the larger ones. The comment

was made earlier on steelhead regarding whether we are going to look at cumulative impacts. It seems natural to look at cumulative impacts. To do this, you have to get beyond the interests of real estate boundary lines.

Bingham: The concern that I am hearing is that these will be behind closed doors type deals that get cut between landowners that can afford to employ consultants to prepare plans for them and that the conservation community is going to be left outside.

Miller: Relating to both the steelhead and the coho, do you have an idea of what type of analysis is going to be done? Is it going to be an EA, a full blown EIS, has NMFS decided on just what they are doing?

Bybee: It will depend on the HCP. If one is done for the State of California, it will obviously be a significant plan with full exposure to an EIS. It is premature to make any determination because there may be a multitude of HCP's that we will be reviewing. It could and probably should be both of those.

Orcutt: The handout is dated July of 1995. Is there anything more up to date and what is the more specific schedule?

Bybee: No, that schedule is being determined.

Iverson: We have been talking quite a bit about HCP's and it might be of interest to the group that the FWS and NMFS are going to reorganize somewhat in order to implement a higher level of HCP planning in generally speaking northern California, the Forest Plan area of California, and the coho area of California. We understand there will be a habitat conservation planning team collocated with our office in Yreka, and that will include some NMFS biologists.

Bingham: Will that team be working directly with you in your office?

Iverson: That remains to be seen. We expect to see Phil Detrich who has a long experience in HCP work heading up that group. I am not sure how we are going to work with them other than sharing facilities and administrative support.

Public Comment:

Lucie LaBonte (Chair of the South Coast Coordinating Watershed Council): I have been working with Governor Kitzhaber's office the past few days because we are very concerned about what is going on down in California in the process. As you well know, there have been some set backs. Jim Martin, the salmon advisor to the Governor, did go down to Eureka last week and I accompanied him down to that meeting to find out exactly what the situation was with the local governments. We have hundreds of volunteers working in Oregon through our watershed council process. It was made very clear to me over the past few days speaking to both Ken Bierly who is the Governor's water enhancement board person and Jim Martin, that the concern is not really whether to list or not to list, the concern is for the fish. That is why Oregon has been working diligently on their plan because no matter what happens, we want a good plan in place so we can continue our restoration and enhancement efforts. The Governor's people have made it real clear to me that they do want a six month extension, mostly because of where this process is. The draft of the plan has been written. Right now it is out to all the different people working in the State of Oregon, from timber people to environmental people to ranchers and all the different people are going to be writing comments on this. The idea is to take all those comments and to write them into the draft and that we have all the players on board so we can move forward. I understand extension can only be granted once. We feel the extension will help the fish and the process.

Wilkinson: Would it be fair to characterize your watershed's activities and your understanding of other watersheds' activities as targeted more toward site specific remedies than blanket prescriptions?

LaBonte: Yes, I appreciate that, that is where you are going to, too. You are lucky. The Klamath is covered; you already have an up and running Restoration TF.

Bybee: What your program is doing through the grassroots is the only way to make this thing work and we have got to expand this into other areas of California. You mentioned Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA). I have always

thought that maybe CZMA might have a role in some of those watershed plans even though they don't currently. Are you cranking in your local coastal plans into this process?

LaBonte: What I said was the Port of Brookings Harbor is working with local ports and keeping them informed. We don't have local plan but we have comprehensive plan.

Barnes: You asked for six month extension, were you referring to the coho listing? Could you expand on the draft plan you said was out? Is it a watershed plan, is this an overall recovery plan that the State was working on, what is it?

LaBonte: The six month extension is what the State of Oregon will be asking on October 25th when the listing does go before the court so they can complete their plan. All our watershed councils also have plans of what needs to be done in their watersheds and all those plans have been incorporated into the Governor's salmon initiative. That is the overall plan that the State of Oregon has been working on. It is very difficult because our ESU is shared and NMFS will not split it, so that means that our governments really need to be working together as much as possible. If the governments aren't going to work together, then we have to get the people to work together and the grassroots watershed councils.

Agendum Item #6. Update on status of flow studies (Bienz)

[Iverson summarized funding which came into the Klamath River Flow Study from non-TF, USFWS sources. (Handout K)]

Bienz: I will talk about the various studies ongoing at this time. This list may not be complete, there are a couple others of which I have heard. This is a huge effort of coordination and cooperation. (Handout L) The geomorphology issue has just been identified in the last year as a very significant element and needed to be funded here. The habitat suitability curve development funded by the FWS has been subcontracted to the CDFG to develop habitat suitability curves. These curves would allow us to understand the biological requirements in the stream of the fish in those locations. These curves need to be either amended and basically developed for this fish species of concern as we go ahead with these flow studies at this time. Physical Habitat Simulation (PHABSIM) relationship is basically a computer modeling exercise that brings together hydrology and the biological requirements of the fish. That is being done right now cooperatively by the National Biological Service (NBS; whose real name now is U.S. Geological Service) and the FWS. Information on other studies is provided in the handouts (including Handout M).

Fletcher: Is there an institutional analysis that was done that was part of the Instream Flow IFIM determination process? I haven't seen it, but it is a key part of the flow study effort. How has this group utilized that institutional analysis if it has been made public? I know that a key component to any type of instream flow determination is to involve all the users and to make sure everybody has bought in on the process from the very beginning. There are a couple of different efforts out there right now. There are a lot of different agencies and I am trying to link this into the current KPOP process. Certainly the BOR is proceeding with developing some analytical tools or some models that will be part of this thing but, there still seems to be some loose ends out there. I would like to stress the need for us to grab the BOR and bring them into this process because I don't know if they are participating in your TWG meetings to a very large degree. Certainly, everybody needs to be in on the vote.

Bienz: In developing the instream flow study, the first step and kind of the feedback loop is through this institutional analysis model. It is the ability to scope the questions that are being asked of the investigation; how you would design the studies so the pieces come together. That work was identified two years ago as being a very important part of the total instream flow study. Off my memory, Dr. Lamb was the principal investigator for that component and he did come to a few of the TF meetings to report back. I personally have never seen a copy of his results. I don't remember the time line for deliverables.

Iverson: Lee Lamb attended the April 1996 meeting and there was a discussion of the institutional analysis which was distributed to the TF. There were some questions that Dr. Lamb answered and some things that he said he would follow up on, but the onus was left on the TF as to what use you want to make of that institutional analysis. That has been resolved yet.

Fletcher: I would like to see some type of write up on that institution analysis and then I would like to start to have some discussion amongst ourselves about how we apply some of the points in that analysis. After all, if we are going to have somebody do the work, let's utilize it.

Bingham: Based on that comment, could we schedule some future agenda time for that matter?

Rode: Wouldn't it be appropriate that we all formally review the institutional analysis and make comments in regards to its completeness and accuracy? I just glanced through it and my impression of their interpretation of the CDFG's role was sorely lacking. I am looking for some direction on whether or not we should all review that and see how our specific roles are portrayed, interpreted and then take it from there.

Bingham: The analysis was provided to all of the TF members and I would certainly concur with what Mr. Rode has just said. I felt that for the ocean commercial fishery sector, the analysis was somewhat inadequate. Do we want to move ahead and take responsibility as individual TF members to provide the kind of comment in detail that would be necessary to really flesh it out or do you want to just let it drop?

Iverson: I would volunteer that if folks have comments on the version of the institutional analysis that you were given to review, if you would provide them to us in Yreka, we could make sure that they get to Dr. Lamb. The USGS folks are going to attend the February '97 TF meeting and maybe one of the items of work they could take on at that time, would be to respond to those comments or at least be ready to discuss the institutional analysis.

Bingham: Ron, would you like to suggest a time by which you would like to get those?

Iverson: By the end of the year.

Bienz: In response to the second part of your question, Troy, I would think the concern you were addressing was with the BOR and the Klamath Project Plan. We have moved to the point of selecting the MODSIM model (Handout N). At the February TF meeting, Marshal will be able to be here and speak specifically about what the status of that is and will probably have some information back at that time about some of his preliminary work. The BOR is doing a study similar to what the TF is doing and what we are trying to suggest to the TF is that there is a need to share this information back and forth. We need to prevent any duplication.

Barnes: Can you expand on the development of the habitat suitability curves? Who in the CDFG is responsible for doing it and do you know what data base they are looking at regarding the literature for all species anadromous fish? As you are well aware, the Trinity has the benefit of having a 12 year in-depth investigation of and actually making habitat suitability curves related to specific investigations in the river. Is it going to be specific to the Klamath River or is it going to have to be a literature search?

Hamilton: The curves for coho and steelhead are to be specific to the Klamath. For chinook salmon, they are going to look into whether the ones in the Trinity are transferable or not. Bill Snyder is the contact in the CDFG.

Franklin: I thought Gary Smith was doing the transferability stuff? Whoever's name was on that.

Rode: Bill Snyder is the lead. Whether he gets Gary Smith to help him or not, I am not aware of but he is the one whose name is on the contract.

Franklin: Why would transferability coho and steelhead curves would be investigated. Why aren't they looking to see if that is transferable, too?

Bienz: I am hearing that original curves will be generated for those two species. We have got the curves for each of those species.....

Franklin: Were they indeed developed down in the Trinity for those two species?

Bienz: Yes.

Hamilton: We coordinated with the TWG on this, there were a number of people on that conference call. The agreement was that the curves should be developed for the Klamath for coho and steelhead; that is consistent with FWS policy for doing flow studies. For chinook, because the amount of work that was done on the Trinity, and the similarities in the two stocks, it was decided that the first thing we would look at is whether curves are transferable or not for chinook. If indeed they are not transferable, then we will go back and develop curves for the Klamath.

Franklin: Craig, whether or not these projects are funded by the TF, is there a requirement for annual progress reports? Is that true of the cooperative projects that are not funded by the TF?

Hamilton: All these ones that come through our office are required to provide quarterly reports.

Bienz: We are working also with NBS now on temperature issues. There were some temperature suitability curves. They were developed I think on the Trinity and we are looking at those as an independent set of curves also for the Klamath side. There is some concern whether in fact, these fish have a different temperature preference. So that is another thing that the TWG is considering right now.

Agendum Item #7. Report on the September 16, 1996 Five Chairs meeting (Iverson)

(Iverson summarizes the Five Chairs meeting held September 16th in Sacramento.)

Fletcher: There is a real need to coordinate. It is important that people from different groups attend other groups, but we need to go further than that. We need to have our working groups talk to each other so we can identify priorities and bring those priorities into line with each other. If you look at some of the monitoring needs in the basin, there needs to be a clear identification of what those needs are (i.e., harvest monitoring). We even have a need for those issues to be discussed between the TF and the Klamath Fisheries Management Council (KFMC); to be clarified and fleshed out. There is also a need that the Trinity River TF be brought in.

Bingham: So Dale identified data collection as a very high priority need for coordination probably more at a technical level than at this policy level. I agree with that, I have seen that as a problem for a number of years, and yet as ocean managers, we know we need to have a unified data package to work with.

Wilkinson: At least in the last two budget cycles and presumably again in this one, we are going to have a lack of TWG support for the information things that the Council needs so I have been very hopeful that the Five Chairs meeting would attempt to address that.

Orcutt: I know in participating in the KFMC as well as the Trinity and the Klamath TF, there are issues that are interchangeable and there are potential solutions that various harvesting sectors could benefit from. We just heard about it at the meeting, the funding discrepancy and the data that wouldn't be collected by the State of California. It is certainly a concern of ours. We observed a similar situation on the Trinity last year. Now what I am nearing is the FWS just came up with funds to do that. I would like to find out what sources that the FWS used to fund that project. I would point out that within the Klamath basin, that the Tribes should be a part of this. We are making that move on the Trinity to be a part of the monitoring; we are co-managers over there.

Miller: A point of clarification, the involvement by the tribes is through the Klamath Intertribal Fish and Water Commission not the Klamath Tribes Fish and Water Commission. That consists of all four of the tribes within the basin that are connected to the water system. The Klamath, the Karuk, the Yurok and the Hoopa.

Bingham: Ron, it sounds like several members have spoken to the need to begin to figure out a coordination mechanism. Do you have any thoughts on how we could move forward in that direction?

Iverson: On the question that Mike raised regarding the emergency need for monitoring funds, the amount of funding provided was \$53k. That is the amount that was identified by Mike Rode as the need in the handout that he provided at the Five Chairs meeting. We can make copies of that available during this meeting if desired. I will say that many pots were dipped into at the end of the fiscal year. It is really too complex to go into detail but there were probably 4-5 bottoms of barrels which were scraped to come up with that money at the end of FY96. The need was identified as an emergency need with the threat of the fall chinook megatable not being completed in 1996. Providing these funds to the CDFG does not imply anything about who ought to be doing the monitoring in future years or whether one or another entity would properly be involved and funded in these activities. It was Dale Hall's decision and his way of meeting an emergency need that all the 5 Chairs agreed needed to be addressed.

Nat, in response to your question, I think you have raised an excellent point as to how coordination ought to proceed. Troy has an eloquent option that he could offer and maybe you could start with that.

Fletcher: One of the things we offer to do is be that coordinator now. So we need to develop a working paper and shop it around and let people see what we are talking about. I think after we do that, people will see that it is not as threatening as it may appear and that we don't have an interest in influencing issues as far as a coordinator is involved.

Bingham: Troy, you are offering to develop a draft paper of an outline of what a coordination would be and suggesting that it could go around to everybody for incorporation of their comments. I think maybe we can just leave it there as a work assignment.

Agendum Item #8. A review of the Long Range Plan (LRP) (Sari Sommarstrom)

(Sari Sommarstrom reviewed the development of the LRP.)

Hamilton: We are about to undertake a five year evaluation called for in the LRP. How do you envision using this assessment? How will that information be incorporated in the plan?

Sommarstrom: The intent was to do that adaptive management to get that arrow back in there and see are we doing what we said we would do and what needs to be corrected. Does the plan need to be amended, does it need to be completely changed, are whole sections missing? The five year evaluation is really important in a 20 year program and the intent is a flexible plan. You need to see what you can do now to make sure you are getting to your goals.

Bingham: I can remember the consultant, Bill Kier saying many times that it was his hope that this would be a living plan and that is why it is a three ring binder; it was our intent that we would change it to meet what we learned as we went along.

Iverson: Sari, are you aware of any restoration plan (whether anadromous restoration plan or something similar in other watersheds) where you have an evaluation of the program successfully carried out. It seemed like back when the plan was written, there really wasn't any prototype to go by. I wonder if that has changed.

Sommarstrom: Yes, there has been a lot of planning in the last five or six years on major basin efforts. Probably one of the models that has been working effectively from a very macro level down to micro is the Timber, Fish and Wildlife (TFW) process in the State of Washington where it was a statewide strategy, not simply a watershed strategy. They have developed protocols and they have got watershed councils all the way down to the watershed council level. They have been trying to actively do that feedback with adaptive management.

On that Coastal Salmon Initiative that California and Oregon have been struggling with on this proposed listing of coho and steelhead, I have been looking at trying to find successful watershed (at the local watershed level) plans to use as references. The Klamath Basin is ahead of the game. This six year effort is showing that the level of organization and the information available and the quality of the restoration efforts are reflecting that long term effort. The other groups are two to three years at least behind the Klamath basin, when you look at least through California. I can't say for all of Oregon.

Agendum Item #9. Report on 5-year program review and RFP development (Wilkinson)

(Wilkinson summarizes RFP which went out. [Handout O])

Dutra: What efforts or guarantees do we have to get the Office of the Inspector General to provide the financial stuff so that it is available at the same time as the rest of the report?

Iverson: Last fiscal year, Region I of the FWS asked the DOI Inspector General to put this item on their task list for FY97. We found out Friday of last week that we didn't make the cut and they won't be doing this. I have looked into one or two other options for assessing the financial questions that are asked in the evaluation here. One would be to have our Regional Office, Office of Finance address these issues and they told me that they will consider doing that. I think they would have to have some more specifics as to when the various products would be expected and also what it is that would be expected of them. I think that is a real possibility. We also took a little cursory look at going out to an accounting firm if what is desired is an accounting type of audit, financial audit. The price range we have gotten on that is somewhere from about \$10,000 to \$80,000. That could consume a good part of the money that is identified.

Another possibility would be that our office really can pretty much come up with this material without any outside help and then it could be reviewed by the TF or a subcommittee. I would say the most promising is to have it done in house, either in Yreka or Portland.

Fletcher: Just looking at the tasks that are identified. I would hope that Harvest Management could be taken out of it and be rightfully looked at in the KFMC forum.

Wilkinson: I personally think that is a critical component for an objective view of its contribution towards the whole restoration program and I would hope that no one is offended by it or any toes are stepped on. It is the Committee's perspective that we need that independent review and we need to know right up front whether the allocation perspective is being a contribution to the restoration of the Klamath basin or is not.

Orcutt: I would just kind of echo some of that. Monitoring, that is what we should be looking at, not getting into this whole finger pointing because it never really gets us any where. We have had those discussions and we have had presentations throughout the years and to my knowledge, the issue still surfaces occasionally.

Rode: I am having a hard time understanding how we can separate out the activities of the KFMC from this TF since they are both authorized under the Act. I would like to take the approach of looking at everything, being very candid with ourselves, analyzing everything. Not having any sacred cows that we are trying to protect. This is what this whole review is about and rather than taking personal offense on task item 9.1, why not make it more inclusive? I think we ought to look at the monitoring of success for salmon harvest management for inriver sports fishermen for the ocean fisheries. Those questions do exist, there is skepticism that things are being done adequately and I would recommend that we exam all of them.

Fletcher: All I am asking is that the KFMC is part of this program. The KFMC has dealt with these issues on a number of occasions and it has properly been before the KFMC in that forum. There is no need to drag clearly KFMC issues into our forum just like we don't ask the KFMC program review to go into the restoration side of things.

Wilkinson: I will just speak for the RFP committee. They were speaking generically. There was no attempt to point to any harvest perspective. I will stand by it as it is worded here that we need independent review and/or to make recommendations on the monitoring success of salmon harvest management.

Bingham: What I am hearing is that at least two members of the TF are not comfortable with these tasks. I am going to suggest that, to see that Keith, you and Troy hammer out language before the next TF meeting.

Dutra: I cannot accept the alternative that it would be to done in-house.

Wilkinson: We might spend nearly all of the money allocation for a financial audit. That is kind of like spending your last two dollars to buy a purse. I don't think that it is appropriate. I would certainly like to have the opportunity to keep them separate at this point and try to look for alternatives within the government that could provide this service at no cost.

Dutra: I think the the intent of this was to determine how was the money spent as far as administration and overhead versus on the ground projects versus other efforts.

Wilkinson: In conversations with the staff and Dr. Iverson, it is indicated to me that this Restoration program undergoes some periodic financial review

Iverson: That is what I was suggesting when I mentioned our finance office in Portland. They make periodic reviews of various programs. They haven't been down to see us for about six years so it really would be timely for them to come down. This task list, does this encompass the financial questions that are of interest to the TF?

Bingham: Clancy is shaking his head.

Iverson: Okay, then I guess it remains for someone to identify what those tasks are because what is in here now, I believe we can readily generate and have reviewed by our finance office in Portland. If there is something more, then I guess we need to know what that is.

Bingham: I am going to make the same assignment I did with Troy. I am going to ask Clancy to detail those issues and get them to Keith and then we will be able to look at them. We have got two assignments now.

Miller: It is only appropriate that this body know what has happened over the last five years with all of its financial assets that have been bestowed upon it. I think that it would be appropriate for the TF to make sure we get an independent auditor in here so that we can review what is going on.

Wilkinson: I hear your comments very clearly, and that brings up the question that I think we are going to have to wrestle with; who that might be? If we go to an independent private consultant or consulting firm what would be the cost of that compared to the money that we have to spend on this whole project?

Russell: I guess I would always be concerned if we are spending a dollar to save a nickel. We need to know where we are at in regards to administrative costs on projects. I would like to see that, too.

Hamilton: One clarification. This is not a draft. This RFP has gone out. That was the direction at the last TF meeting. Get it out. That is not to say that we cannot change any kind of tasks once we select the contractors.

Bingham: Before we get another round of comment, maybe your suggestion is the solution to the problem that just got identified. The desires of the TF may need to be incorporated into the contract language.

Fletcher: That is what I wanted to stress. I would not go along with anything that would be like the language I just talked about. I actually drafted some addition language that if we could deal with it a little bit later.

Wilkinson: I wanted to remind the TF, and we on the committee have said this before, this whole thing is to be considered a negotiated progress. So all these concerns that are being expressed here can be addressed in the future as proposers come in droves, or singly or not at all at that time. These issues that Troy is concerned about and Elwood's issues and Mike's, could all be looked at, reviewed, blended, dismissed, whatever we are going to do with them.

Bingham: Keith, I really want to thank you for the efforts of the committee. This is a very good product. I would certainly commend the committee and thank them for their efforts.

Miller: I would like some clarity on what we are going to do before we close these issues that were just raised. Are we going to take that information and incorporate it into this statement of work or are we going to look at it in the future. There are two kind of different compelling statements there that I am wondering where we are going.

Bingham: These concerns will be incorporated into the contract that is negotiated with the proponent that is selected to perform the task.

Iverson: Let's not get too excited about having no more chances to have a say in what this cooperater is going to do. I want to suggest the logistical path that our contracting folks think is most reasonable way for this to proceed, see if you think it allays the fears that are being expressed here. I talked with our individual in contracting who specializes in the kind of work that the TF is involved with, which in Federal parlance is called assistance. In other words, we are buying a product here that is of interest, not just to the Federal Government but to everybody around the table and to a lot of other people. The procuring of this midterm evaluation falls within the realm of assistance rather than in the realm of Federal contracting. That means can be handled in the same way that our other restoration projects are handled. The proposals can come in, they can be reviewed by a subcommittee of the TF, then brought to the TF and discussed in public forum like this one, and the TF can develop a recommendation as to which proposal you want to select. You can make recommendations as to the changes that you would like to see negotiated in that proposal. All the opportunity that you would need to be involved in formulating the scope of work here and selecting the cooperater who will be doing this work.

Wilkinson: As the Chair of the subcommittee, I would, as I did last meeting, like to extend the invitation to any of the TF members to participate in that process. We are going to have to wait until we accumulate some proposals. When they begin to come in then the subcommittee will meet to review and these concerns can be addressed.

Public Comment:

Pace (Scott River CRMP and Klamath Forest Alliance): We are just beginning to look at the evaluation of projects. I have been around this process as most of you know from the beginning. It strikes me that we are not going to have an impact evaluation. We don't have the data to do an impact evaluation so you are doing a kind of a process evaluation. I would strongly reinforce something that Clancy said earlier, that to do this kind of thing, you need somebody that has a fresh view, not any of those of us that have been involved in this, either as consultants, contractors, combatants, three c's. In fact, I am sort of skeptical that we are going to get a project that is worth \$90,000 out of this. I think that we could bring in from some other regions in a five day review, a set of researchers and practitioners to look at this project and it would cost a lot less. We would get a lot better product out of it. I am making one recommendation to look strongly at people who are from outside in all ways and, two, that the TF as a whole think about whether you are going to get something for your \$90k that is just going to gather dust on the shelf or that is going to be a useful product.

****Motion**** (Miller): We send out a proposal for an independent auditor to come in and conduct an audit over the program's finances.

****Second**** (Dutra)

Discussion:

Bingham: Is the intent of the motion to look into whether the dollars were actually spent or to evaluate whether they met the goals of the program or not?

Miller: The intent of the motion is to get some information to the TF membership that will allow us to make competent decisions on what is happening with the funds that are available to us. That is just to have an itemized accounting of what dollars we received, what dollars were expended in each line item and what dollars were carried over. After we have that basic information, then I think we go to part two.

Wilkinson: I would oppose that because that is a whole other cost to the TF that is not budgeted at this moment.

Miller: That cost is either going to come one way or another. If we have an independent auditor come in, the books are okay, everything is okay, I think that gives us a fresh new start in this next five years and that is what we need.

Dutra: If we could get the numbers that Ron is saying that his staff can provide showing how the money was spent, how much money was left over, then maybe adding another objective #11 to your proposal to take that data, scrutinize it, review it and comment on it, I would feel satisfied. It would be a review by an outside firm and you have several other items in here which are financial (objective 3 and objective 6). Does that satisfy the motion maker?

Miller: I can agree with that if the evaluation is done by an independent body; the one that is doing the five year program evaluation. We need to get the fresh look.

Bingham: What I have just heard is that there is friendly amendment to the motion being offered by the maker of the second which should be that the actual numbers, break out of the numbers of the dollars spent would be developed internally by FWS and then that the evaluation of how the money was spent would be part of the tasks of the consultant that is hired to do the five year report.

****Motion amended****: Dollar amounts spent be developed internally, then evaluated by the cooperator selected.

Miller: I understand that and I could agree to that but I want to make something specifically clear. We have asked for full disclosure of all the little funds, those line items, the initial amounts, the expended amounts, the carry over amounts, the left over monies, whatever we have; we need to have all of it. Not just portions of it, no excuses. I know that an auditing firm would give us that.

Wilkinson: I would like to respond to a comment that Elwood made and I remind the TF again that we are entering to this as a negotiated process so that any of these questions can be answered or clarified when we actually get into discussion with proposers as to their independence. Now on the financial aspect of it, I am pleased to find that there is not objection to the FWS providing a disposition of funds which should be available throughout our RFP process historically. There might have to be some clarification of excess funds from one year or whatever took place that is a matter of concern. It is my belief that it is not going to be very startling to anyone. I would not like to see the process held up or belabored any more because as the staff indicates, it is in the market. We have tried in the objectives we have laid out to address the implications of all of these financial things to the whole program. I do not see need for motion, but if the motion remains, I would support the amendment.

****Motion passes****

Agendum Item #10. Report from the Technical Work Group on the development of the Fiscal Year 1997 work plan (Craig Bienz)

Bienz: I would like to follow the excellent documentation provided by staff. What the TF has done in the last year is change the process by which we have gone through to rank the proposals. The recommendation at the bottom of that first page, provided a breakdown of Category 1, Category 2, and Category 3 and the amounts of money that you would have in each of those three categories. Just for background: Category 1 is education, habitat protection and restoration, construction and artificial propagation. As we make our recommendations to you on our ranking, you will have a budget amount that has been pre-approved by the budget committee. Category 2 is support projects like the CRMPs and things like that. Category 3 are all other projects. So research and monitoring and things like that get brought into that 3rd category. That would bring me to the page that has the rankings on it. (Handout P)

Iverson: The guidance from Chairman Hall is that the number we should start with today is \$920k. That is the number at the top of the table before you take out the set asides and so forth. \$920k is the appropriated amount we should work for. I kind of ran through this and my personal estimate of the amount available if you start with the \$920k and then if you go through the set asides that are identified and if you take into account that there are not unfunded projects carried over, I come out with an available amount to fund this table of around \$387k or \$388k.

Rode: That means you have got to recalculate how much is available for each category then.

Bingham: The real question is if the \$410 is actually \$388k then that is something we need to be mindful of. That is what you are saying, Ron. It may not make a real significant difference ultimately in what is approved and what isn't but it would affect how we make our decisions.

Rode: It is \$194k for Category 1 if it is 50% and then \$97k for Categories 2 and 3.

Bienz: In Category 1, the first three projects in Category 1 which would take you through FR03, that would total \$176. Category 2, I would have it coming down through PC04 and again my math shows \$89,006, then Category 3, FP11 would be at \$29,656 would give us a total there of \$83,632 rounding it off the whole dollar. That also falls within the \$97k available in that category.

Agendum Item #11: TF Discussion

Barnes: I would like to raise a large red flag about the inherent capabilities of the system to really rank projects. If we take the first three projects in Category 1, you really have two projects there. The Camp Creek and the Red Cap Creek are one project for \$143k so you would be allocating 2/3rd or almost all, 75% of your Category 1 projects to a single project in the mid Klamath to small tributaries. Which points up that it maybe a very long session today.

Bingham: My understanding is that the result of your process was a randomized evaluation of every project on a stand alone basis, is that correct?

Bienz: That is correct.

Fletcher: We have \$38,681 left over if you trust my math.

Bingham: Good enough for government work. The logical next step would be a two step process. Essentially to adopt the categories as provided to us by the TWG and then decide what to do about the overages.

Bienz: If we were to follow with the recommendations of the Budget Committee, it was the second page of this addendum agendum 10, there is a Rule D that the Budget Committee recommended in May 23rd of 1996. The second paragraph is where the Budget Committee proposed the way to deal with any excess. Following that protocol, Category 3 has the next highest ranked proposal and that would be the FP-08 which received a score of 76. (Note letter from California Coastal Fish and Wildlife Office [CCFWO] to BOR; Handout Q.) The score of Category 1 was 72.82 and Category 2 was 68. So the next highest ranked proposal would be in Category 3. That total amount of money exceeds what you have available but following on in that same paragraph, it says that if the dollar line runs out mid project, the proposer will have to accept on this basis. Basically, you would go back and see if they would be able to do that for a lesser amount. (Handout R)

Fletcher: I would have a question. I think this same project, funding requests have been made to the BOR. Carl, you can make this a lot easier on us if you would agree to fund it fully.

Werkus: It would be maybe easier for both of us if we knew that it was being proposed in a couple places. I have a little concern with that.

Iverson: Regarding the set asides that are sort of upstream of this table, we have \$90k set aside for mid point evaluation and just a few minutes ago, we added another task to that evaluation. You really might want to think about increasing that \$90k in order to add the financial review task which could be considerable because you are asking somebody to professionally scrutinize nine years and close to \$9 million worth of very detailed expenditures.

Agendum Item #12: Public Comment:

Peter Brucker (Salmon River Restoration Council): I have a question under ranking in our proposal which is PC07, it is in Category 2. It says the cost to the KRP would be \$31,375. When it came to the matching funds, where it said there would be zero matching funds. We identified that although there would be no hard cash matching funds, that there was a \$30,400 in kind service amount that we put there for people who would be volunteering their time to do watershed restoration activities. We are concerned that our outcome was altered a little bit here.

Bienz: I will have to go back to the documents to see why that in-kind service wasn't accounted for and I will have to report back in a few minutes.

Pace (Klamath Forest Alliance for the Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Fishery Restoration Program [KFA]): We need a concerted effort of all parties to get a half decent appropriation for the Klamath River. I think that we should join together politically and go to Senator Feinstein who is on the Appropriations Committee to make sure that she gets done what Hatfield just got done in the upper basin. (\$5 million for restoration in next year's budget.) I work in that process of appropriations so I hope that will come up a little later. Feinstein and Defazio, I think we can deliver them and we could get that money; it is an equity issue at this point with the other river segments. It is the opinion of my organization, that we are wasting a lot of money on needless duplication. We have two independently run USFWS offices. That is a continuing problem that is part of the longer range context of the problem that we face in addition to the appropriation.

Last year, we came to this meeting and the recommendations looked like the Scott River CRMP, that I am part of, had written them. It was imbalanced, in favor of the Scott River and I was very proud, proudest I have ever been of this TF in the way they fixed that and got some equity going in terms of the different areas. I am very confident that after some late night meetings, you will probably come out tomorrow morning with something that has some equity to it. It will be different from what we are looking at right now because this is not going to fly. This year, it seems weighted towards the midKlamath and I think there are some very good things in there. I see the strategy that is adopted in the LRP to work through sub basin groups is being implemented and proposed in all the sub basins now with the planning grants there. The \$25k for the lower and mid; they are basically akin to the CRMP efforts on the Scott, Shasta and so now we have got all five of the areas below the dams that have planning processes, assessment processes, ongoing planning processes and strategic planning processes that will result in better projects. It is a step forward that the other parts of the basin are taking on that kind of assessment. It is hard for me to accept as an objective scientific process something that takes essentially five programs that are proposing the same thing, the CRMPs, but yet they ranked differently. We have to have that sub basin process in each of the areas. The TF should remain committed to it. Therefore, I would ask you to consider taking the total that is available, roughly \$100k (you have got five sub basin efforts), and support each of them equally with \$20k.

Regarding the mid course review, I think you could spend any amount of money on it and you might get a good one and you might get something that is not useful at all, depending upon what happens between now and when you execute a contract. The nonfinancial part of it could be done for about \$40-50k. I would suggest capping the whole thing at \$50k using \$10k for an audit type thing and saving money there. I think you can spend a lot of money writing reports if you want to but there are more important things to do including the assessments.

Jim Villeponteaux (Salmon River Restoration Council): I wanted to talk about the Little North Fork fire or shaded fuel break. It is HP05. We have been working with the United States Forest Service (USFS) and have Jobs in the Woods money to do shaded fuel breaks and fuels reduction in other areas on private property. We see this as very important; upper slope fuels reduction is going to reduce the sediments in the long run. We have identified that fire is the number one threat on the Salmon. This one is a unique proposal because we are on Federal property and we would be working with the USFS tied in with us. It is a good opportunity to draw attention to the need there.

Alice Kilham: Elwood asked me to bring up the fact that the Hatfield Committee has just created a Hatfield Foundation and we don't have any money yet but our \$million if we get it each year from the Hatfield legislation has to be fully

matched. What we are hoping to do with this foundation is to come up with private funds that will provide matching monies which we would be able to provide to any worthy project that came along.

Bingham: Always good to know about the possibility of other dollars. Certainly would endorse a comment that was made by Mr. Pace about all joining together to get \$5million a year instead of \$1million. I said that I think six years ago and have tried saying it every year until I got tired of it.

Agendum Item #13. Action: TF decision on final FY1997 work plan

Iverson: Craig, I have a question about one of the proposals that seems to fall within the higher rankings and that is PC01. Could you just summarize what is the gist of that proposal?

Bienz: PC01 was a proposal submitted by Humboldt State University (HSU). TWG asked the TF last year to provide us with support staff from HSU that would provide the GIS service that Clancy was talking about earlier. They also take TWG minutes. We had asked that the TF set aside \$50k that we would be able to continue to do work like that. In the meantime, HSU submitted this proposal to be in the ranking process. It would be our recommendation that it not be in the ranking process, because we have already come to you saying, do it this other way. In other words, give us the \$50k to continue to have that support and that has been supported in the past by the TF.

Dutra: It almost sounds like administration. That is almost staff functions and should be considered part of the administration of this operation rather than proposed projects.

Bienz: I think Clancy is absolutely right. What we are asking for is more support staff. The pitch here would be that Ron's shop used to receive a lot more money than it does at this point. To provide the TWG with the support that it needs to coordinate among and between all the different studies that are ongoing and to continue to provide the clarification that is necessary through a support staff role, we have asked that that be available for the TWG and to actually help the TF in understanding these very complicated issues.

Orcutt: On the two monitoring proposals that are FP11 and FP08, is that the total cost of it or is that some guess at partial funding?

Halstead: That is the total cost of the project.

Orcutt: The letter was sent for BOR (Handout Q). There has been no response to date on any level of funding from them on these projects?

Bienz: That is correct.

Rode: Craig, as I hear you say that HSU project is already funded and authorized or would be authorized in this year's budget, right? Is this the same as the position that was formerly known as the Rob Beachler position?

Bienz: The HSU proposal was somewhat different in that it included ARCview training and things like this that really weren't part of the TWG and TF specific recommendation that we made back earlier. So they are somewhat the same and they are somewhat different. What we wanted to do was hold our opportunity for the \$50k to come back to you later on with a scope of work specifically telling you what we would do with that \$50k.

Wilkinson: If you recall, each of the last two years, I suggested that the monitoring needs/information items that were critical to the operation of the Council be taken out of that realm. Was there or has there been any discussion on that line? Apparently even though there was agreement, each of the last two years that this needed to be done, even with the subsequent Chairs meeting and other passage of time, we haven't got that done and we are right back to the same situation (with FP08, FP10, and FP11).

Regarding the mid course review, I think you could spend any amount of money on it and you might get a good one and you might get something that is not useful at all, depending upon what happens between now and when you execute a contract. The nonfinancial part of it could be done for about \$40-50k. I would suggest capping the whole thing at \$50k using \$10k for an audit type thing and saving money there. I think you can spend a lot of money writing reports if you want to but there are more important things to do including the assessments.

Jim Villeponteaux (Salmon River Restoration Council): I wanted to talk about the Little North Fork fire or shaded fuel break. It is HP05. We have been working with the United States Forest Service (USFS) and have Jobs in the Woods money to do shaded fuel breaks and fuels reduction in other areas on private property. We see this as very important; upper slope fuels reduction is going to reduce the sediments in the long run. We have identified that fire is the number one threat on the Salmon. This one is a unique proposal because we are on Federal property and we would be working with the USFS tied in with us. It is a good opportunity to draw attention to the need there.

Alice Kilham: Elwood asked me to bring up the fact that the Hatfield Committee has just created a Hatfield Foundation and we don't have any money yet but our \$million if we get it each year from the Hatfield legislation has to be fully matched. What we are hoping to do with this foundation is to come up with private funds that will provide matching monies which we would be able to provide to any worthy project that came along.

Bingham: Always good to know about the possibility of other dollars. Certainly would endorse a comment that was made by Mr. Pace about all joining together to get \$5million a year instead of \$1million. I said that I think six years ago and have tried saying it every year until I got tired of it.

Agendum Item #13. Action: TF decision on final FY1997 work plan

Iverson: Craig, I have a question about one of the proposals that seems to fall within the higher rankings and that is PC01. Could you just summarize what is the gist of that proposal?

Bienz: PC01 was a proposal submitted by Humboldt State University (HSU). TWG asked the TF last year to provide us with support staff from HSU that would provide the GIS service that Clancy was talking about earlier. They also take TWG minutes. We had asked that the TF set aside \$50k that we would be able to continue to do work like that. In the meantime, HSU submitted this proposal to be in the ranking process. It would be our recommendation that it not be in the ranking process, because we have already come to you saying, do it this other way. In other words, give us the \$50k to continue to have that support and that has been supported in the past by the TF.

Dutra: It almost sounds like administration. That is almost staff functions and should be considered part of the administration of this operation rather than proposed projects.

Bienz: I think Clancy is absolutely right. What we are asking for is more support staff. The pitch here would be that Ron's shop used to receive a lot more money than it does at this point. To provide the TWG with the support that it needs to coordinate among and between all the different studies that are ongoing and to continue to provide the clarification that is necessary through a support staff role, we have asked that that be available for the TWG and to actually help the TF in understanding these very complicated issues.

Orcutt: On the two monitoring proposals that are FP11 and FP08, is that the total cost of it or is that some guess at partial funding?

Halstead: That is the total cost of the project.

Orcutt: The letter was sent for BOR (Handout Q, again). There has been no response to date on any level of funding from them on these projects?

Fletcher: I think the real question here is, are we going to follow what the process the TF adopted or are we not? If we aren't, let's talk about the new guidelines we are going to develop.

Dutra: We need to fund the five programs that are probably more critical this year with the potential listing of the coho and steelhead. They have to rank very high.

Bingham: Clancy, could you identify which five?

Dutra: Start with PC03, 06, 04, 05, 07.

Bingham: A clarifying question, did I understand you to say that you would not support the work plan as presented? In other words, if it were offered as a motion, you would vote no, did I hear you say that?

Dutra: If we do not do something towards funding those five CRMP/planning processes.

Miller: Could you clarify for me in section two which ones you said were going to be funded with the funding that we have available?

Bienz: Following the criteria that was established of \$97k for Category 2, it goes down through PC04.

Miller: That is over 50% of those projects that he is concerned with. I am not going to vote for a process that doesn't stick with what we already agreed upon by motion.

****Motion**** (Dutra) Move to adjourn

****No second****

****Motion fails****

CAUCUS

****Motion**** (Dutra): I am going to move that we fund FR04, HR01, and FR03 which I believe totals to \$176,682 and some pennies and we fund PC03, PC06, PC04 which adds to \$89,006. We fund PC01, FP09, HP02, FP11, which adds to \$83,632. The second point of my motion is that we fund \$25k to PC05 and PC07 and that we remove Item 3 from the previous setaside (\$50k) which I understand has been covered by two of the projects that I proposed in my motion.

****Second**** (Bingham)

Discussion on motion

Call for the question

Orcutt: Is the \$50k at #3 for the coordinator in fact a surplus or not?

Bingham: My understanding of the action that is in the motion is that Earmark Item 3 is deleted.

Dutra: As I understood that Item 3 is really covered by a couple of these PCS that are listed in my motion so instead of double funding that, I am just taking one away.

Orcutt: How does that fit into the motion recommendation of the BC?

Bingham: In a sense what we are doing here is we are saying yes we are funding a coordinator as is recommended in earmark Item 3, but we are specifying which one it is by funding these other two projects so it really doesn't violate the spirit of that, it is funding for coordinators located in the mid Klamath sub basin.

****Motion amended**** (Rode): Make an amendment to this motion to state that the left over amount which is about \$38,681 be allocated to FP08 which is monitoring Klamath River juvenile salmonid spring time emigration and that our Chairperson, Mr. Dale Hall make a further request of the BOR to see if they would pick up the difference.

****Second accepts**** (Bingham)

Bingham: We still have one objector to the main motion.

Orcutt: My heartburn is about some of the other dollars that affect this budget. As a representative of the Tribe I don't have a lot of input. My big concern there is that these proposals weren't even rated and it has an indirect impact.

Halstead: The \$53k came about as a result of what Mike Rode presented either at the TF or the Five Chairs meeting, that work wasn't going to get done by the CDFG. Last year was a screwy year for the FWS. We had two furloughs, we had at least 11 different budget scenarios that we went through. We did not get a final budget until we were well into the second half of the fiscal year. We pinched every penny we had and then well into the second half of the fiscal year, we got a full budget. We ended up with some money at the end of the year. Mike, through the CDFG, came up with a legitimate reason to spend \$53k. FWS had it and that is where we put it. We don't anticipate that this year. For the first time in 21 years, the FWS has a budget on October the first and it is not fat.

Werkus: There has been considerable discussion about this funding of the juvenile monitoring. I can assure you we will make every effort to fund this program because I think it is very important.

Rode: I would just like to say a few more things about the \$53k of CDFG funding to perhaps allay some of Mike's fears or concerns for this being an unfair process. This is an ongoing project that we have been conducting for 19 years. It is funded through Anadromous Fish Act monies which are separate from the pool of money that the TF gets every year for project support. So we are just lucky if you want to call it that the FWS had a pool of emergency money; it might seem as though it got preferential treatment or didn't go through the process everything else went through but we have never received funding from the TF for that before.

Orcutt: This very same thing happened on the Trinity and it is something that we don't want to repeat. In fact as joint co-managers, we are then competing with Fish and Game in certain instances for the same money. We don't know exactly how much money is there and I think that is my big question mark.

Bingham: I think all of this points back to the discussion we had about coordination and the need for it. So, Mike, am I hearing you saying then that although you are not completely comfortable, you may be ready not to stand in the way of the motion? There is always abstinence.

Orcutt: I realize also that in the past on other issues during the budgeting proposal process that we had the Assistant Regional Director sitting at the table who had much more discretion and much more latitude. I guess I am feeling a little bit uncomfortable in getting some assurances that we will be dealt with in an equal manner in the future. I am still weighing how to vote on this and certainly I don't want to be a hindrance to the process but there also is an issue there that we may have to proceed on individually with the FWS and/or BOR. I am willing to go for it, but we have the concern that our project, the Pine Creek Stocks of Concern Monitoring, is a monitoring effort that involves a substantial amount of matching money. There are considerable amounts of dollars that don't show in the matching, including tribal dollars generated from timber revenues put towards watershed stabilization in that basin. I would also point out that this watershed is managed as a priority on the same level as ones right directly in the valley, while in fact, Pine Creek drains below the Reservation and the Hoopa Valley Tribe doesn't even have access to these fish. It is doing the tribes part in terms of restoration for the entire basin. As a landowner in that watershed, the adherence to no-cut buffers to protect that watershed, has resulted in a considerable amount of money that is being foregone. I would reiterate that this is a small amount of money, \$20k for monitoring, when there are substantial other dollars, both tribal and Federal through the Option 9 process that are being put into this watershed and for the benefit of the entire Klamath basin by the Tribe.

Bingham: I think I heard you correctly, Mike, that we have consensus?

Orcutt: I'll abstain.

****Motion passes****

Bingham: I appreciate that very much. We now have a work plan for FY97. I would like to congratulate and thank the TF for that effort. It was a real exercise in consensus building and how it works. I think we are ready for another motion relative to the last issue before we call it a day.

****Motion**** (Fletcher) That we direct staff to come up with a policy for addressing some of the concerns that Mike Orcutt raised that if there are shortfalls by agencies, tribes or individuals, whoever they may be for needed critical work, that it be brought to the attention of the Chair or this TF by a set procedure.

****Second****

Discussion

Orcutt: A real discrepancy that needs to be filled there is that the State is not really represented at that forum.

****Motion amended**** (Wilkinson): I would like to offer a friendly amendment to Troy's motion and that is to include the long term information needs that are constantly a hang up here, too.

****Motion tabled**** [This motion was tabled with the follow-up in Agendum Item 15.5 regarding clarification. It was considered to be an assignment to staff from the Chair.]

PUBLIC COMMENT (continued)

David Zepponi: I was wondering as a suggestion, if we could get a tabulation of who voted on the work plan and who they represented and what their votes were for each project? Is that possible?

Bingham: You are referring to the technical work group's effort?

Zepponi: That is right, the TWG's record.

Bienz: It is a secret balloting process.

Zepponi: What about the public meetings laws? Doesn't that have to be public information?

Miller: I used to sit on the TF and I think that is a good process to use. One of the concerns I would have at giving out an individual's decisions on one project, is not having the public go in and beat him up because of what they decided on. I don't think that serves any purpose.

Bingham: I would like to add one other comment to that and that is that under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the actual action just occurred before you. The action was just taken here by this body in open public session.

October 11, 1996

Agendum Item #15. Progress Report on TWG recommendations on subbasin planning and annual spending priorities (Bienz) (Handout S)

Questions:

Iverson: Soon after the LRP was developed, there was a struggle with how to write an implementing plan for the LRP to put it into practice and the TF got some assistance from a professional planner with NMFS and looked at a lot of

different options. What was decided on, I thought, was that the action planning would be left up to local watershed groups and since then, I think at least one group, the Scott Valley CRMP has developed a fish restoration plan and a water management plan, water conservation plan, so how does that square with your proposal here?

Bienz: What we are speaking about here with this strategic plan is a little bit different in that we think that the TWG and the TF could bring another level of science and objectivity to the entire basin and therefore speak to the entire basin's goals and how those would be accomplished within each subbasin as it is. We are trying to bring it to a more objective standard for the whole basin.

Bingham: Building on Ron's question then, the specific focus of the subbasin plans that the TWG is developing would be on development of RFP's for the projects that we fund?

Bienz: I think the major intent of the subbasin plans, is to give ourselves an objective standard to measure ourselves against in the project selection process. The science itself of what we need to do in those hasn't been spelled out in front of everyone. So that when we send out on RFP then the proposals then that come in would be specific to what we have identified as the problem we are trying to address.

Iverson: You mentioned the strategic plan that is discussed in this agenda 10 handout and Sari Sommarstrom yesterday had a question about that. How does that relate to the LRP? Is it an update of the LRP or is some other level of planning?

Bienz: The strategic basin plan is basically all of the subbasin plans.

Dutra: We cannot if we are going to be successful turn off groups in Scott Valley, Shasta Valley, Salmon River. My first gut feeling, is that the TWG will become the dictator that is going to tell Scott Valley CRMP what they should have been working on. These groups throughout the basin need help, need support, need funding, need technical support, but I think as a generality, they have been able to tell us what is needed in their valley. French Creek certainly didn't start at this table.

Bienz: I appreciate your statement because you represent in many technical ways the best sub basin that we have with the Scott. We really are trying to be sensitive to the actions, the projects that are ongoing and to help them where appropriate. There are different levels of understanding that exist in each subbasin. Our purpose is to really bring together the grassroots with a different level of science and in fact perhaps some different goals.

Miller: I think this is a strategy that has been long waiting to come forward not only by members of the TF but also by members in each subbasin that have been trying to get what the gist of what the TF wants so that when they prepare their proposals, they can prepare them to meet some objective. We have had countless people come in here from the subbasins wondering why their project didn't get funded. This gives us an opportunity to say here is what our TWG sees as the problem in your basin and here are the elements that need to be dealt with.

Public Comment

Felice Pace (KFA): Are we going to be asked to do more paper work or to plan in a different kind of way?

Bienz: I don't think we are going to ask for more paperwork. What we are really trying to do is say that the Scott Valley CRMP should continue to do everything that it is doing but we wanted to be able to bring alongside of that the measurable goals that we feel from the science side are necessary. It is possible that everything you are doing is what should be done. All we need to do is say that is right and then we can bring that back to the TF and say, the Scott Valley CRMP is doing everything it should be doing but it still needs \$100k.

Rode: Rumors get started and I am sure this is going to get out and there is a potential for certain individuals to get somewhat hysterical about this. I would like to somehow get the information out to CRMPs ahead of time and then follow that up immediately by giving a presentation. I would strongly suggest that Craig be the presenter. Craig has

done a heck of a job. I think he is the person to lead us forth in this new look at things. I think we are at a transition point right now and we are hopefully going to go on to bigger and better things and a more coalesced direct approach to resolving some of the problems in the basin.

Bienz: I appreciate that very much but it really is the TWG and staff. We are all working together really closely right now. The dedication I think that you send to those TWG meetings and the ability of people to just hang in there is getting us through. Especially John, he is probably the objective person that watches us struggle through that. We have had to beat out some hard issues here in the last year and so I appreciate your support.

Orcutt: Get the word out so there is no misinformation or misconstruing of the intent.

Bingham: Thank you for the clarity of that presentation.

Agendum Item #15.5 - ADD-ON AGENDA ITEM: Adopt programmatic priorities for the FY 98 process.

Iverson: We are in the initial step of the annual budget development for FY98. As background, recall that in FY96, Chairman Hall charged the TWG and budget committee to identify projects that would contribute to a Klamath River flow study and he was able to use that information as argument for getting pretty extensive matching funds from other DOI sources. In FY97, as far as I can tell, that step was not gone through. This year, FY97, Dale Hall wants to be able again to go back and get some matching funds from DOI sources to keep momentum going on the flow study. In our office in Yreka, we will probably have to be preparing some arguments and briefing material that show how this FY97 program does contribute to the flow study. Looking at FY98, that is the issue at hand.

****Motion**** (Iverson): I move that priorities for funding in FY98 include 1): Completion of the five year program evaluation, and 2): The Klamath Basin instream flow study.

****Second**** (Miller)

Discussion

Dutra: Are we going to dollarize those?

Bingham: If you look on page 7 of TWG report, the revisions of the RFP process under annual budget development, we are at a point of taking Step A which doesn't call for dollar amounts, it calls for the setting priorities. The next step is that Budget Committee meets.

Hillman: By taking that action on the motion that is on the floor, Step A would be complete for FY98?

Bingham: If some other member of the TF wished to add to those priorities, certainly the floor would be open, the motion could be amended or another motion could be made.

Rode: One other unresolved issue is the funding of what we have been calling the Harvest Management Activities and I know that you asked Jerry Barnes, I believe, and Craig to get together to define exactly what those items are. Where could we work that into the process, to take them out of the RFP process and perhaps fund them up-front?

Bingham: I do not see how we are going to accomplish that today. I would suggest that matter go over to the budget committee for resolution.

Orcutt: I might suggest that the Trinity Coordinating Committee subgroup, monitoring subgroup, is chaired by a member of my staff, George Kautsky who is also on the TAT. He can kind of walk you through what they went through over on the Trinity and give you some starting points.

Orcutt: We funded up to \$90k for the mid program review for '97. This motion I assume anticipates additional funding for that effort in '98?

Iverson: The intent of the motion is that whatever additional funding might be needed, that that be a spending priority for FY98 to complete the mid term evaluation.

Hillman: I am going to object to the motion based on the second item, the mid program review. We are talking about a commitment of \$90k in this fiscal year has already been made to the mid program review. If additional dollars are necessary in the next fiscal year to complete the mid program review, I am wondering why it wasn't anticipated up front and included in this fiscal year to accomplish the objectives of that review. I simply cannot support it on the grounds of commitment of additional dollars in future fiscal years for that review.

Dutra: At every step of the road, I have voted against the flow study other than when the acting Chairman did not give us a chance to vote and ruled we would have a flow study. I will not block the process today, I don't want to spend all afternoon here but I will announce right now that at the best, I will abstain on that issue.

Bingham: At this point, we have no motion so you can go ahead and just let the process go forward with on priorities set or some member can again try for a motion to give us some guidance as to how the budget committee should proceed.

****Motion defeated****

****Motion**** (Iverson): Priorities for funding in FY98 will include the Klamath basin instream flow study.

****Second**** (Wilkinson)

Discussion

****Motion passes**** (Dutra Abstains) (Handout T)

Bingham: Then as a bit of housekeeping, we should set a date for the Budget Committee to meet.

[BC meeting is Wednesday, the 4th of December in Yreka.]

Orcutt: I guess we got some issues right up front like the RFP and some of the recommendations there but do we need to have guidance or should we just bring whatever issue to the table that we would like to at that time?

Bingham: Certainly at this time, if people want to go on record with guidance, I think we can get it on to the minutes and it would be there for the committee to consider or we can bring it to the table. I am open to either approach.

Orcutt: There are at least two things that I was including when I was talking yesterday. First, surplus funds, not TF but other sources that may be available; second, what role the TF may or may not play in projects that are not funded with their dollars. Those are two things that I would like to certainly look at that time.

Bingham: We will have that on the agenda.

Wilkinson: As Chair of the mid program review committee, we will be investigating other efforts at completing this fiscal portion of it hopefully at no cost. We failed apparently on the Inspector General but we feel that there might be other alternatives, there did not seem to be objection to just bringing up to date the normal fiscal process that the agency goes through. We do not know what proposers are going to come in with. The money amount was suggested by the Chairman as realistic and reasonable and so that is why that showed up. I hope that relieves some thinking on the situation.

Agendum Item #16. Upper Basin Amendment (UBA) (Wilkinson)

Wilkinson: In the most recent minutes that we acted on yesterday, the indication to me is that the Chair maybe running out of patience on this amendment. However, I believe that there has been much progress in understanding of issues as a result of this amendment and in my view it deserves to survive.

Bulfinch: It is a situation of trust in both directions rather than a matters of substantive issues. At the last meeting, the objections to the thing were based purely upon attempts to substantiate such a position and didn't refer to any disagreement with any of the issues. I invite you to Item four of the preamble which definitely states "the amendment is not intended as a comprehensive ecosystem restoration plan. Other efforts focused on basin wide ecosystem restoration are underway by other Federal, State, Tribal, local and private entities. This amendment is intended to supplement, not supplant these efforts." So we have a charge in there that promises that it would not override anything in it, including the Hatfield Act Working Group. We have correctly invited to the table the representatives of the upper basin who have been seated at the TF's discretion. Without the UBA, they do not have the Congressional authority. Now I am not proposing they be unseated. However, if the TF is going to abstain from interference in upper basin projects, they should give the courtesy of not vetoing things that are peculiar and important to the lower basin activity. So I think the best way to dispose of the problem is simply to accept it as it is amended and I so move.

****Motion**** (Bulfinch): Adopt the UBA

****Second**** (Miller)

Agendum Item #17: Discussion

Miller: We are looking for passage of this amendment and we hope that if it does fail at this table, that the TF would compel itself to stipulate to the objectors to put their objections in writing. It is a hindering block right now for communication for the tribes and it is really a point of whether we can work together or not. We want this amendment passed so that we can bring everything to the table and we can talk about the issues that need to be talked about. I know that a committee met last night and they were discussing from the Compact Commission. I went and listened to a little bit and there were people there trying to talk about coordination. I sat there, I felt like here we go again. We have gone all the way through this process and the UBA isn't even accepted. Now, we are starting a new process and we are trying to get more people to the table and we haven't even taken care of the first process yet in building trust that needs to be built. That is part of the reason of the tribes are not wanting to step into that arena yet, let's take care of the initial business first and then we will get to the secondary business afterwards.

Dutra: I have spent a lot of time on this amendment and people who support me have spent three times that amount of time. I certainly appreciate the time that others have spent, Keith, Elwood, and a lot of others. But where we stand today and I will go on talking about some other things is, the UBA is dead on arrival. Let's not throw the baby out with the water, let's table the issue until there is stability in Klamath County and somebody here who is elected by the people. I am recommending that we table the issue until the second meeting in 1997.

Bingham: This brings up a procedural issue about rules of consensus because under Robert's Rules of Order and majority rule parliamentary procedure when a motion is defeated only the prevailing side may reintroduce the action and reconsider it. I would like to ask staff to research the issue of whether a motion may come back under rules of consensus or unanimous consent. I don't expect an answer right now. But I am hearing a pretty clear signal here that it is not your intent that the UBA die, but merely that it be considered at the next meeting, am I correct in that?

Dutra: The second meeting in 1997.

Bingham: We will be reconvening in Yreka on the 20th of February.

Russell: I do have concerns about at least the intent to reintroduce this to the TF once it has been voted on. I would want to know that. That is not necessarily my understanding of how this TF works.

Bingham: That is why I have asked for a research and a report back at the next meeting on that. My understanding is that the rules are a little bit different with unanimous consent because otherwise, one party alone could prevent something from ever being heard again. My understanding is that under Rules of Consensus, any member of this TF may bring an action back if it is denied but again, that is why I am asking for the point of order to be researched for us.

****Motion withdrawn****

****Motion**** (Bulfinch): New motion that a decision on the UBA be deferred until the February 20th meeting.

Hillman: I appreciate the action to prevent a wrongful death here. The TF has minutes from three TF meetings, June 4 & 5, April 23-24 and June 10-21. Just a quick glance through each of them and you will find an agenda item where the UBA is brought up. While I appreciate the concerns expressed by Clancy and certainly understand the uncomfortable position that Klamath County representative might have at this time, I want to call people's attention to not only the period of time that this issue has been before the TF but before the subcommittee. Folks have spent a great deal of time, effort and energy in trying to reach consensus. At every turn, that objection has been raised. I am not sure when the elections happen in Klamath County or when they seat their commissioners, but I think formal contact from the Chairman of the TF to Klamath County and the new commissioners once they are seated is needed to address that body and provide some background information on the subject. Hopefully it will cause some sort of action on the part of Klamath County to occur, one way or another so we don't find ourselves in the same situation that we do today in February.

Russell: I appreciate the work that has been done on the amendment and I appreciate the support from the other end of the table from Clancy and it is accurate. Klamath County is not in disarray, we are in the process of selecting new commissioners. That is a political situation. I cannot speak to their intentions in the future and I will not. But I will as a citizen and as a person under directive, support that government in Klamath County because I believe very much in the sovereignty of the states as I believe in the sovereignty of the State of California, a neighbor. So I am going to support the issues that protect me as a citizen and the people of my State and County, and I will not vote for the amendment. I will not put my commissioners in that position. I want to counsel them if I am going to do that and I am also going to support the State's rights. I am always going to be an advocate of the rights of the States to govern themselves and their resources.

Rode: We have had quite a bit of discussion about the implications of whether or not the UBA is adopted or rejected. I recall when we first started discussing whether or not we would have UB representation, that it would be contingent upon the adoption of an UBA. So I suggest that staff research whether the sponsoring legislation that appointed the two representatives from the upper basin is contingent on that plan passage. If it is, that it be recognized in the next vote in February that voting against adoption would also remove those two seats. [Section 4 of the Klamath River Basin Fishery Resources Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 460 ss-3) was amended (Item J) to include representation for Klamath County and the Klamath Tribe, "at such time as the program is expanded to include portions of the Klamath River upstream from IGD."]

****Motion** Reinstated** (Adopt the UBA)

Bulfinch: I reinstated for parliamentary purposes. My second motion was premature until the first one was accepted and it wasn't seconded anyway so according to Robert's Rules of Order, the first one is still on the table.

Agendum Item #18: Public Comment

Pace (Klamath Forest Alliance): It seems more than five years that the TF has been deliberating an UBA. It seems like an eternity to me, not just five years. For the record, a more complete review of what has transpired is in order. The TF recognized early on in developing the LRP that we could not achieve the goals of the legislation and the mandate of the legislation without addressing quantity and quality issues as they come to California from upstream. The principle that we have to address issues on a total basin level has now been reaffirmed in a number of other processes. The irrigators' staff person wrote large parts of this amendment. I haven't read the new amendment, but I would probably object to it

for being too mealy mouthed so we have all had to compromise. If we are not going to work together then we are going to work apart.

Agendum Item #19. TF decision and assignments related to an UBA

Russell: I would like to point out that one of the conflicts here that needs to be dealt with is that we are still dealing with a Congressional document in the State of Oregon called the Klamath River Compact. Sooner or later, that document has to be dealt with because it is a Congressional document. I think that some of the intentions of the UBA run amuck with that document. Sooner or later, that will have to be looked at. That is a document that is important to us and it is a shared interstate agreement between those basins up there involving Siskiyou, Modoc, and Klamath Counties. We are always going to focus on that document that guides the management and waters of the peoples of that region under Oregon and California's consent as it is was ratified.

Hillman: If the problem is conflict with the Klamath Compact, then I would ask that Klamath County to please point where those conflicts exist and let's deal with them. That is how we have worked through this process. Wherever there have been objections, wherever there have been conflicts that people have identified, real and perceived, they have been dealt with. I have asked in the past the Klamath County representative to identify specifically the problems. There has been meeting, after meeting, after meeting to address problems that haven't been put on the table. Right up front the first thing that you read in the UBA, is that "it doesn't supplant, it supplements." As it has been pointed out, the Klamath Compact is a Congressional document so certainly there is no legal recourse even if there were conflicts with the UBA. This is an advisory body to the Secretary and we have a charge. There is no way the UBA or any of its provisions would in anyway supersede what is in the Klamath Compact.

****AMEND Motion****(Miller): Make a due pass on the UBA but if it fails, it would be brought up again at the February meeting.

****Amendment Accepted**** (Bulfinch)

Dutra: How can you have a motion that says if it fails, something else happens? I think they have to stand as separate motions.

Bingham: I think you are probably correct about that. The whole issue I think here is that with consensus, parliamentary procedure is quite different in some respects from what we are mostly used to from serving on boards that have majority rules, Robert's Rules of Order. The thing that we are all concerned about here is that we be given another opportunity for consideration of this and that the action that we are going to take now doesn't preclude it at the next meeting.

Dutra: I am under the impression that if we defeat it today, it could only be brought back up either by the Siskiyou County representative or the Klamath County representative.

Bingham: What I am saying is I think that impression is incorrect but I am going to have to ask staff during the interval to research it.

Bulfinch: The simplest way to handle the intent of everybody including Clancy would be for my second to concur with withdrawal and introduce a new motion to defer until the next meeting. That would be politically correct and protocol conforming.

Miller: I concur.

****Motion Withdrawn****

Miller: I would like to note for the record for that, the last time we made the motion, the motion failed and then I asked Chairman Hall at that time if it was appropriate for us to bring this agenda item up at the next meeting and he said the item will be on the agenda for the next meeting.

Bingham: I recollect that is how it went, too so I presume we can follow that same path again.

Public Comment:

Martha Pagel, Director of Water Resources Department for State of Oregon, Oregon Commission member on the Klamath Compact Commission: It was not my intention obviously to speak to you today for good reason. I have not been involved in your discussions. But from comments/questions that have been raised about what is the role of the State of Oregon and the Klamath Compact and from the difficulty that you are obviously having in figuring out where to go or what stage you are in, it seems to me that it would be useful if the State perspective could be brought forward a little more clearly. We could work with the new County Government, when Klamath County officials are in place; to clarify issues relating to the Compact and other issues from a state perspective. I would offer to you that as "a" representative of the State of Oregon, that I am willing to do that and very happy to take on that role. Sorry that we haven't been part of it more directly before now.

Bingham: So you would be prepared then to offer us some assistance at the next meeting?

Pagel: Yes. Between now and the next meeting, we would be happy to offer some assistance, whatever we can and would be available if you choose to take this up at the next meeting.

Bingham: Would that offer also include the Tribes?

Pagel: Absolutely.

Dutra: I am willing to have it show in the minutes that I would have opposed the proposed motion to pass the UBA today.

Russell: I would vote no on the UBA.

Bingham: Kent, for the record, would all other members have voted yes?

Wilkinson: Yes
Hillman: Karuk Tribe would concur with the motion.
Rode: Yes.
Orcutt: Yes.
Bingham: Yes.
Miller: Yes.
Iverson: Yes.
Bybee: Yes.
Barnes: Yes.
Bulfinch: Yes.

Bingham: Let the record show that this was merely an indication of where everybody would have voted on the motion. I'm off the hook, we are now ready for a new motion.

****Motion**** (Bulfinch): I move that a proposal to accept the UBA be scheduled for the February 20, 1997 meeting.

****Second**** Dutra

****Motion passes****

Bingham: I apologize if there has been lack of clarity from the Chair. I will work with staff on Robert's Rules of Order and maybe we can have a memo out to everybody to help us in the future.

Agendum Item #20: Recap of meeting assignments and action items (Hamilton). Identification of agendum items for the next meeting in Yreka on February 20-21, 1997; Set the date and location for the meeting after next.

Hamilton: Action items are 1) Wilkinson and Fletcher hammer out language regarding how the 5-year review will address Harvest Management; 2) that Dutra and Wilkinson work together to work out the details of what they want to see in the financial accounting of the RFP; 3) the assignment to me is going that once the responses come in to incorporate those changes of Dutra and Wilkinson before any kind of agreements are signed; 4) an assignment is Mike Rode will look at a more comprehensive review of nonfederal matches; 5) another assignment is the staff come up with guidelines to handle excess funds as per Mike Orcutt; 6) the UBA; 7) a decision on the NBS institutional analysis; 8) awards for merit; 9) Troy Fletcher will 'shop around' working paper on the concept of Yurok Tribe becoming Klamath/Trinity Coordinator; 10) (as per the Five Chairs meeting) more coordination between the advisory committees and commissions, specifically an updated report on the Trinity flow issue; 11) the Interior Appropriations Report it as a information item and it was implied that there would be reporting at each others meetings; and 12) include subbasin planning items on the agenda for the February TF meeting.

Iverson: An action item would be the appointment of two TF coordinators with the upper basin working group [Action item/Assignment 13]. As I recall, the appointments of that kind are made by the Chair. If other people are interested in being considered by the Chair, we could take your names and pass them along to Dale.

Bingham: That might be a better approach than trying to deal with it in the last 15 minutes of this meeting.

Rode: I would be interested since the State of California isn't represented on the group.

Kilham: Keith could represent the Oregon Game and Fisheries.

Wilkinson: That would be my intent, to seek that position but in the interim, I would accept this liaison between the TF.

Dutra: Assuming that Keith winds up representing the Oregon fisheries, I am sure that Siskiyou County would be interested in representing on the Hatfield.

Bingham: Okay, that is noted too, then. We will leave that the Chairman to work that on through.

Dutra: I would like to make a statement. I think Felice made the comment there and for those of you do not know, I was defeated in re-election bid so therefore, I will not be on the board after January. I have certainly enjoyed my association with this whole group, the TF, the TWG, the staff and the public members that seem to be the same ones that are here all the time. This will be my last meeting. Since we have set up the budget meeting in December, I will still be a Supervisor then, I may join and see what I can add but I probably won't see a lot of you there so I would like to say goodbye now. I would like to say keep up the good work. We have got to work for more funding. I think also, you as a TF have to improve the monitoring on how we have spent the money and how you spend the money in the future. I could use a lot more words to describe my relationship with each of you in the projects but I will just say thanks for the opportunity. You have all taught me a lot and I have enjoyed it.

Bingham: On behalf of the TF, I would like to thank you very much for your participation and support and the perspective you brought to the process. It has been a real pleasure to work with you, Clancy. I think the only piece of business that leaves for us will be the selection of a date for our next meeting.

****Motion to Adjourn**** (Bulfinch)

****Second**** (Bingham)

Meeting Adjourned

[Meeting after next will be June 19-20, 1997 in Eureka]

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING
October 10-11, 1996
Brookings, OR

Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force Members Present:

Kent Bulfinch	California In-River Sport Fishing Community
Jim Bybee	National Marine Fisheries Service
Clancy Dutra	Siskiyou County
Elwood Miller	Klamath Tribe
Ron Iverson	U. S. Department of the Interior
Leaf Hillman	Karuk Tribe (2nd day)
Elwood Miller	Klamath Tribe
Jerry Barnes	U.S. Forest Service
Mike Orcutt	Hoopla Indian Tribe
Michael Rode	California Department of Fish and Game
Nat Bingham	California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Don Russell	Klamath County
Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Troy Fletcher	Yurok Tribe

Attendees:

Steve Lewis	Ecosystem Restoration Office/USFWS
Lucie LaBonte	Port of Brookings Harbor
Jim Bybee	National Marine Fisheries Service
Gary Dowd	CICRR
Enver Bozgoz	
Craig Bienz	TWG
Frank Shrier	Pacific Power and Light
Todd Kepple	Herald & News
Carol Davis	Commercial Fisher
Robert Franklin	HVT
James Wroble	HVT
David Zepponi	SECF
Jim Waldvogel	KRTF-TW6
Bill Bennett	CAL/DWR-KRCC
Bruce Halstead	FWS
Jim S. Welter	P.O.B./H. OSCF
Andy Martin	The Pilot
Alice Kilham	Klamath Compact Commission
John Wilson	Oregon Troll
Alex Reup	Oregon Troll
Jana Doerr	Congressman DeFazio's office
Karl Wirkus	USBR
Sari Sommarstrom	Sommarstrom & Assoc
Felice Pace	KFA
Jim Villeponteaux	SRRC
Kelly Duncan	HSU

FINAL AGENDA FOR THE KLAMATH TASK FORCE MEETING
BROOKINGS, OREGON
October 10-11, 1996

October 10

- 8:00 AM 1. Convene. Opening remarks. Nat Bingham will serve as Chair. Welcome to Don Russell, new Klamath County representative.
- 8:15 2. Business
- A. Adoption of agenda
 - B. Adoption of minutes from the June 1995, April 1996, and June 1996 meetings.
 - C. Brief review of last meeting/general correspondence
 - D. CDFG request for approval of non federal match (Handout)
- 9:15 3. Brief status lake levels, flows, and forecast by U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Jim Bryant)
- 9:30 4. Update on Klamath Basin ecosystem restoration issues before Congress (Doerr)
- 10:00 5. Status of NMFS determinations to list Steelhead and Coho Salmon (Bybee)
- 10:20 6. Update on status of flow studies (Bienz)
- 10:40 7. Report on the September 16, 1996 Five Chairs meeting (Iverson)
- 11:30 8. A review of the Long Range Plan (Sari Sommarstrom)
- 12:00 LUNCH
- 1:00 9. Report on 5-year program review and RFP development (Wilkinson)
- 1:30 10. Report from the Technical Work Group on the development of the Fiscal Year 1997 work plan (Craig Bienz)
- 2:00 11. TF discussion
- 2:30 12. Public comment on the work plan recommendation
- 3:00 13. Action: TF decision on final FY1997 work plan
- 4:30 14. Report from the Klamath Compact Commission and Hatfield Working Group (Alice Kilham)
- 5:00 Recess [Klamath Compact Commission will meet in the same room on the evening of October 10, 7-9PM]

October 11

- 8:00 AM Reconvene
- 8:15 15. Progress Report on TWG recommendations on subbasin planning and annual spending priorities (Bienz)
- 9:00 16. Upper Basin Amendment (Wilkinson)
- 9:30 17. TF Discussion
- 10:00 18. Public comment
- 10:30 PM 19. TF decision and assignments related to Upper Basin Amendment
- 11:30 PM 20. Recap of meeting assignments and action items (Hamilton).
Identification of agendum items for the next meeting in Yreka on February 20-21, 1997; Set the date and location for the meeting after next.
- 12:00 PM Adjourn

ATTACHMENT 3

TASK FORCE MEETING HANDOUTS

October 10-11, 1996

Brookings, OR

AGENDUM 2 HANDOUT A	CDFG letter to Iverson dated June 20, 1996
AGENDUM 2 HANDOUT B	CDFG revised list of 1995/96 Klamath River Basin fishery restoration projects funded by the State of California dated July 8, 1996
AGENDUM 3 HANDOUT C	KFA letter to Iverson dated June 25, 1996
AGENDUM 3 HANDOUT D	BOR Klamath Project Water Update
AGENDUM 14 HANDOUT E	Conference Report on H.R. 3610, Dept. of Defense Appropriations Act, 1997
AGENDUM 5 HANDOUT F	Notice for Hearings on Steelhead Listing (dated September 16, 1996)
AGENDUM 5 HANDOUT G	NMFS - West Coast Steelhead Briefing Package
AGENDUM 5 HANDOUT H	NMFS - West Coast Steelhead Fact Sheet
AGENDUM 5 HANDOUT I	NMFS - Federal Register Notice dated August 9, 1996
AGENDUM 5 HANDOUT J	NMFS - Press Release dated July 19, 1995
AGENDUM 6 HANDOUT K	Flow Study Funding Provided from FWS Accounts, FY 1996, memo from R. Iverson dated October 9, 1996
AGENDUM 6 HANDOUT L	Flow Study Efforts in the Klamath Basin, memo from C. Bienz, TWG, dated October 9, 1996
AGENDUM 6 HANDOUT M	BOR draft report "General Biology of Anadromous Salmonids Affected by the Klamath Reclamation Project"
AGENDUM 6 HANDOUT N	Update on Development of Water Quantity Model by Dr. Marshall Flug
AGENDUM 9 HANDOUT O	RFP for the 5-Year Program Evaluation for the Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Restoration Program dated October 8, 1996
AGENDUM 10 HANDOUT P	FY97 restoration project proposals as ranked by the Technical Work Group
AGENDUM 10 HANDOUT Q	CCFWO letter to Area Manager, BOR dated August 27, 1996
AGENDUM 10 HANDOUT R	Revised RFP process adopted at the April 23-24, 1996 meeting and additional actions/information
AGENDUM 15 HANDOUT S	Technical Work Group Subbasin Planning Progress Report dated October 11, 1996
AGENDUM 10 HANDOUT T	FY97 Klamath River Fishery Restoration Program Federal Work Plan, FY97

Informational Handouts:

HANDOUT U Letter from the Klamath Tribes to the U.S. Secretary of the Interior, dated September 12, 1996

HANDOUT V Sierra Club Legal Defense letter to BOR dated June 10, 1996

HANDOUT W Water Watch letter to Pagel dated June 7, 1996

HANDOUT X Letter from Hall to BOR regarding Tennant Method and Trihey Report dated June 21, 1996

HANDOUT Y Article in the *Cascadia Times* dated August, 1996

HANDOUT Z Letter from Willis Evans, Evans Environmental Consultants dated Sept. 13, 1996

HANDOUT AA *Capital Press* Article on Scott Restoration dated September 20, 1996

HANDOUT BB Notification of National Watershed Award to French Creek Watershed Advisory Group dated September 16, 1996

HANDOUT CC Agenda for Klamath Compact meeting

HANDOUT DD CDFG press release dated September 21, 1996

HANDOUT EE *Times Standard* article dated July 10, 1996

*HANDOUT FF CDFG Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California (available at TF meeting)

*HANDOUT GG Nature Conservancy Newsletter, Fall 1996 (available at TF meeting)

*Provided separately