KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING

October 19-20, 2005
Shilo Inn
Klamath Falls, Oregon

FINAL MINUTES

Membership:

California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry	Dave Bitts
California Department of Fish and Game	Neil Manji
California In-River Sport Fishing Community	Not represented
Del Norte County	Chuck Blackburn
Hoopa Valley Tribe	Mike Orcutt
Humboldt County	Not represented
Karuk Tribe	Ron Reed
Klamath County	Not represented
Klamath Tribe	Allen Foreman
National Marine Fisheries Service	Irma Lagomarsino
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Keith Wilkinson
Siskiyou County	Marcia Armstrong
Trinity County	Not represented
US Department of Agriculture	Julie Perrochet
US Department of Interior	John Engbring, Chair
Yurok Tribe	Dave Hillemeier

October 19, 2005

Agendum 1. Convene and Opening Remarks

Chairman John Engbring convened the joint meeting between the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force (Task Force) and the Klamath Fisheries Management Council (Klamath Council). He welcomed everyone, and announced that Keith Wilkinson would be serving as Vice Chair for the Task Force meeting.

John Engbring announced that the new Director for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was Dale Hall. He is knowledgeable of many issues in the Klamath Basin and issues pertaining to Endangered Species in the Pacific Northwest, and served as Chair of the Task Force at one point. John Engbring also noted that the Klamath Act sunsets in September of 2006 and that most likely only two Task Force meetings will be scheduled for 2006 (February and June). John Engbring informed the group about the evening field trip to view the new fish ladder at Link River Dam constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Curt Melcher spoke on behalf of the Klamath Fishery Management Council, noting that they had also met the previous day. He noted that the Klamath Council has one additional issue to discuss before adjourning.

Agendum 2. Introductions of Congressional staff in attendance

No Congressional staff in attendance.

Agendum 3. Business

a. Adoption of agenda
The group discussed the order of several draft agenda items. Agendum item 9, Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) update, was moved before Agendum 8, Klamath Irrigation Project operations and Conservation Implementation Plan update. Agendum 7, Klamath River fish monitoring update, was deleted from the agenda, and Agendum 18, General Accounting Office audit report, was moved to replace Agendum 7.

Ron Reed requested that a presentation on microcystis be added to the agenda. It was added as Agendum 18. Marcia Armstrong requested that the discussion on microcystis be limited to fish, and that no discussion of human health implications be discussed. This was agreed to by the group.

Motion by Keith Wilkinson to adopt the agenda as amended.
Seconded by Julie Perrochet.
The motion passed unanimously.

Joint Task Force-Klamath Fishery Management Council Information Session

The following Klamath Council members were present at the joint session: Curt Melcher (Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife), Eric Chavez (National Marine Fisheries Service), Phil Dietrich (U.S. Department of the Interior), Dave Hillemeier (Yurok Tribe), Keith Wilkinson (Ocean Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry), Mike Orcutt (Hoopa Valley Tribe), Jim Harp (Pacific Fishery Management Council), and Neil Manji (California Department of Fish and Game).

Agendum 4. Klamath River Fish Health Assessment Team

Catherine Carter (California Water Quality Control Board) and Sarah Borok (California Department of Fish and Game) reported on behalf of the Klamath River Fish Health Assessment Team (KFHAT). They presented the roles and organizational structure of the KFHAT. They emphasized that KFHAT is not a policy group, and that their role is to provide a coordinated field response to fish die-offs and collect information. It was pointed out that there is no dedicated funding for the group and that participating agencies picked-up the costs individually. A copy of the Emergency Response plan was included in the meeting packets (see Agendum 4 handout). The group has established a phone network to ensure that all necessary agencies and people are contacted if a fish die-off occurs. They have also established a color-coded warning system based on continuous monitoring of river conditions. There is an internal website for those interested in Klamath fish health: **http://ncncr-isb.dfg.ca.gov/kfp/DesktopDefault.aspx**

Catherine Carter said it is KFHAT's role to provide timely information to managers, not to develop criteria to trigger management actions. She said that in order for KFHAT to identify potential indicators for impending fish die-offs, funding dedicated to that research would have to become available.

Mike Orcutt asked if the Task Force could get similar information for the river upstream of Iron Gate Dam. Catherine Carter noted that an entire plan exists for the Upper Basin. Sara Borok noted that the

Bureau of Reclamation is responsible for the plan above Iron Gate Dam and Rich Piaskowski was the contact for that plan.

Agendum 5. Klamath Fishery Management Council update and Pacific Fishery Management Council review of Klamath River Fall Chinook Conservation Goal

Curt Melcher reviewed Klamath Council activities from the meeting held the previous day. He said that the Klamath Council was reviewing the current effort by the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) to examine the fall Chinook conservation goal for Klamath River fall Chinook salmon in the Fisheries Management Plan (FMP). Curt stated that the debate is currently swirling around the stock recruitment analysis, which is being updated using the most recent data available. Curt Melcher said that the PFMC's Salmon Technical Team (STT) recently conducted a reanalysis of the data, incorporating new data obtained since the original analysis was done. He noted that the STT analysis used three models that produced diverse results in potential escapement goals, and that the Klamath Council's Technical Advisory Team had reviewed the report. Curt noted that the PFMC had delayed any decisions on initiating an FMP amendment process to address the conservation goal until the Klamath Council met this month. He said that the Klamath Council was preparing a response to the PFMC regarding proposed changes to the conservation goal. Jim Harp said that if the amendment process begins, it will most likely be in early 2007, and would not affect the 2006 fishing season.

Curt Melcher noted that the Klamath Council, through its Technical Advisory team, is working on acquiring baseline information for a spring Chinook Management Plan. He noted that measures are in place for the fall run Chinook, but more analysis is necessary for the spring run. The Hoopa Valley Tribe is taking the lead in developing the base data.

Agendum 6. Public Comment

No public comment.

Agendum 7. General Accounting Office Report

John Engbring summarized the origin and results of the General Accounting Office (GAO) audit. He said there was a request by several congressional members for an audit, which is a service provided to Congress to review how budgets are spent and managed. John Engbring said that it did not seem unusual that an Act like the Klamath Act would be audited, particularly when the Act is about to sunset. The purpose of the audit was not to judge the effectiveness of the restoration program. The auditors read the Klamath Act very literally when determining whether activities have been properly carried out.

John Engbring said the report found that from 1988 to 2005, just over $17 million was appropriated and about $10 million more was obtained from additional federal and non-federal contributions. Over 350 restoration projects were completed between 1988 and 2005. One thing the auditors focused on was the requirement for a 50-50 match from non-federal sources for restoration projects. In the earlier stages, there were a number of programs funded where the 50-50 match was not tracked.

The Five Recommendations from the audit were as follows:

1. Project agreements should distinguish between cash and non-cash contributions from project participants.

2. Project agreements should state how much of the spending provided by state and local government participants originated specifically from federal and non-federal resources.
3. Procedures for reviewing and validating contributor-supplied information for in-kind services and cash contributions were needed.
4. Restoration Program funds requested and received throughout the appropriations process should be tracked by specifically identifying funds to be used in the Klamath Basin.
5. Expenditures of Klamath restoration Program funds should be tracked through the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) Federal Financial System by assigning them a specific project code.

The group discussed the likelihood of continuation of the Task Force, based on the GAO's recommendations for moving forward. John Engbring commented that the Task Force accomplishments report should detail the restoration projects and accomplishments to further discussions pertaining to the future of restoration in the basin after the Klamath Act sunsets.

John Engbring acknowledged the excellent work completed by the Yreka Fish and Wildlife Service Office before and during this effort.

Agendum 8. Fish Disease Status

Dave Hillemeier briefly summarized disease monitoring that took place this spring by the Fish and Wildlife Service and various other cooperators, primarily looking for the presence of disease in juveniles (*C. shasta and Parvacapsola*), monitoring the incidence of infection spatially and temporally, as well as monitoring water samples for *C. shasta* spores. He said the general indication was that higher levels of *C. shasta* were found prior to higher flows and that two weeks after those flows, the prevalence of *C. shasta* declined.

Dave Bitts requested that the group add this as a discussion topic to the February agenda and invite Scott Foott and the Arcata Fish and Wildlife Service Office to attend. John Engbring stated that disease in juvenile fish is a huge issue and the Task Force should maximize opportunities to understand ways to manage disease.

Gary Curtis stated that the Fish and Wildlife Service is funding four to six additional disease studies right now. He said that he would talk to Nick Hetrick of the Arcata office about those studies and the effort with the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) to coordinate disease research and a management program to cover diseases appropriately in the future. Mike Orcutt said that funding for disease work should be a higher priority within the agencies.

Agendum 9. Joint Oregon/California Klamath River TMDL update

David Leland, California North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB), and Steve Kirk, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ), thanked the Task Force and Klamath Council for the opportunity to update them on the TMDL issue. It was noted that the Klamath River TMDL is a bi-state TMDL involving both California and Oregon. They discussed funding for the process and that due to shifts in funds within California, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 9 will conduct the Lost River TMDL instead of the state Regional Board. It was noted that either ODEQ or EPA Region 10 will be working on this TMDL on the Oregon side. They reviewed sediment and temperature TMDLs and the associated issues.

David Leland then presented an overview and preliminary results from the TMDL efforts for the Shasta River and the Klamath River. David Leland said for the Shasta River, one conclusion from the temperature analysis was that fish habitat could be substantially improved with improved riparian shade in tributary streams. He noted that the intent is for the TMDL implementation to build on existing restoration efforts, reflect the work already being done, and integrate activities with the work already completed in the watershed.

David Leland said that water quality modeling work is underway on the mainstem Klamath River. He noted that the PacifiCorp relicensing process is using an enhanced model, currently under peer review, which will be completed soon and then applied to the scenarios. They will run the scenario of dam removal to address impacts to water quality and may look at altered flow regimes.

The group then discussed the overall TMDL process. They also discussed a variety of enforcement authorities in place should a TMDL prove ineffective as a voluntary measure. The contact information for David Leland and Steve Kirk can be found at: **http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast** or **http://waterquality.deq.state.or.us/wq.**

Agendum 10. Status of Klamath Irrigation Project continuing operations, Conservation Implementation Plan, and Natural Flow Study

Cecil Lesley, Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), provided an update to the Task Force on behalf of Reclamation. Although the season began with low inflows and a low potential for runoff, the rainfall in April and May allowed for nearly average flows down the river. This provided water for the irrigation project use and to meet Biological Opinion requirements for suckers and coho salmon. This is still a below-average year for fall and winter deliveries.

The Arcata Fish and Wildlife office has requested that Reclamation look at the potential for reduced flows for a period of time in the winter to increase supplies in Upper Klamath Lake, which would increase supplies for spring flows. Since the fish are spawning currently it cannot be done, but Reclamation will look into doing so in November and storing water for the spring. Ideally, if Reclamation can deliver higher flows in spring they may have a beneficial effect on rates of *C. shasta* infection downstream. There have not been any agreements yet, but Reclamation is continuing to discuss this opportunity.

John Engbring asked whether pilot studies should begin to try different flow schedules in order to learn more about the river. He said that sort of information could help us develop a flow schedule to improve the numbers of salmon or reduce disease in the river.

Cecil Lesley then discussed the ongoing study entitled: " Natural Flow of the Upper Klamath River". He said that there were inconsistencies noted in that study after the last technical group meeting, and hydrologists have been looking for better information to deal with the identified problems. Once a satisfactory document is produced it will be sent to the National Academy of Sciences for review. A final draft document will be distributed but the only review will be conducted by the National Academy of Sciences.

Jenny Hoblit, Bureau of Reclamation, provided an update on the Conservation Implementation Program (CIP). They are currently working on the third draft of CIP comments from May and anticipate completion in December 2005. Jenny Hoblit encouraged participants to continue commenting on the draft. The final document will be completed at a meeting of interested parties, to be held in January or February 2006. Many projects have been funded by Reclamation this year, including stream gages, coho

movement, sucker habitat enhancement, spawning habitat enhancement, and many others. Mike Orcutt asked how much money is available in Reclamation appropriations for the CIP. Jenny Hoblit responded that although there is not a 2006 budget yet, she has heard that $2.5 million will be available.

Agendum 11. Business

a. Adoption of June 2005 minutes

This Agendum was delayed until October 20th meeting to provide time for members to review.

b. Brief review of June 2005 meeting actions and general correspondence

Gary Curtis reviewed the handouts, which included a list of projects funded by the Task Force, the Charter renewal submitted by staff, draft meeting minutes from the June meeting in Yreka, the fiscal year 2005 program highlights report, and various informational handouts.

Gary Curtis reviewed the assignments from the last meeting. The staff has contacted Klamath County regarding representation on the Task Force, but they have not provided an appointment. Two Task Force members had agreed to draft a letter to the Secretary regarding the disease problem in the Klamath river, which has not yet happened. Dave Bitts noted that Marcia Armstrong and Glen Spain will submit the letter as a consent document through the Task Force once it is written. John Engbring added that since disease is still a big issue, a letter would be very helpful.

Continuing his review of assignments, Gary Curtis noted that the staff was assigned to produce two reports, one a review of the status of anadromous fisheries in the basin and the other regarding issues affecting the mainstem Klamath River. Staff is working with Klamath National Forest biologists to create an inter-agency agreement for reports in outline form. This will be discussed in February. Finally, a staff draft of the accomplishments report will be reviewed tomorrow.

John Engbring referred to the handout on the recent Ninth Circuit decision dealing with the lawsuit on the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Biological Opinion (see informational handout). The case has been remanded back to Judge Armstrong for injunctive relief. Irma Lagomarsino added that injunctive relief could mean many things, and that Judge Armstrong could hold hearings with the parties to determine what sort of injunctive relief might happen.

Marcia Armstrong asked about the Upper Mid-Klamath subbasin planning project. Ron Reed stated that not much additional work has been done. However, there is a transparent process where open communication is a priority, and more will be done once funding becomes available. Darla Eastman added that the Fish and Wildlife Service is drafting the agreement now, including the scope of work. John Engbring said that the Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office has not yet received its Fiscal year 2006 funds.

Agendum 12. Updates and Announcements

a. Status of 2005 Klamath River anadromous fisheries

Sarah Borok, California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), provided a preliminary report on the fishery in 2005, noting that CDFG is still gathering data and the data have not been reviewed. Of particular note, the Salmon River season was the worst on record since the 1980s. The overall feeling is that Klamath salmon are more abundant than last year, the Trinity River is similar to last year. Neil

Manji added that the Scott River seems to be pretty low and does not appear to be a heavy run. Sara Borok said that Chinook arriving at Iron Gate Hatchery appear to have fewer eggs per female than in previous years, possibly due to mycrocystis levels in the river. Gary Curtis said that it is only speculation at this point is that there is a potential affect of the algae on fecundity, and that no studies have shown such a link. Neil Manji responded that there has been no documentation that the algae affects the number of eggs produced by the fish and that Iron Gate has additional problems including soft shell egg disease, so it makes sense to take extra eggs.

Dave Hillemeier explained that the Yurok fishery still has about 800 fish left in their quota. Originally there were concerns that with the small quota the Tribe would catch all the fish immediately and not balance out both stocks, so partial closures per week were implemented. They anticipated that a toxic algae bloom would have a substantial effect on fishing effort because everyone is concerned about the quality of the fish

b. Update on State of California coho salmon recovery process

Neil Manji had no new information to report on the coho recovery process. Phil Detrich noted that the Scott and Shasta Resource Conservation Districts (RCD) are working on the incidental take permitting process and have secured letters of intent from many farmers and ranchers in the Scott and Shasta valleys to sign on to the permit. Kerry Mauro from the Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District added that they have received a draft permit from CDFG that is currently under review. Neil Manji added that although Tribes and other entities will not have an opportunity to comment on the incidental take process, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process will allow for public review.

c. Update on NOAA recovery planning process

Irma Lagomarsino provided an update on National Marine Service, Fisheries Technical Recovery Team (TRT) meeting held the previous day in Ashland, Oregon. The focus of the meeting was to identify independent populations within Evolutionary Significant Units (ESUs) and determine whether they are independent or semi-independent in order to focus on recovery efforts. The TRT is nearly ready to release maps and narratives.

Irma Lagomarsino noted that the TRT is also looking at Oregon coastal coho recovery planning, which was originally planned to be a sequential process of recovery planning and threats assessment. She said that process has taken so long that NOAA's Southwest Region is discussing how to better facilitate recovery planning. Irma Lagomarsino said that NOAA Fisheries' Biennial Report to Congress on recovery planning is now available and includes steps towards identifying a threats assessment based on individual populations. This will help us identify what is inhibiting population recovery efforts. This document will be used as a springboard for Phase 2.

Dave Hillemeier asked what the relationship of the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) listing is to the incidental take permit process. Irma Lagomarsino explained that the two are not linked, and that NOAA is trying to harmonize the NEPA and CEQA processes and is considering joint scoping meetings to gather public input. She said that a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) would be the way to address this under the Federal listing. These are costly documents to prepare, and Resource Conservation Districts do not generally have enough funding to complete them. Mike Orcutt asked if the recent evaluation of whether or not to list the Southern Oregon Northern California Coho (SONCC) ESU included hatchery populations in the analysis. Irma Lagomarsino said yes, there are three hatchery populations of coho in the ESU, providing an overall increase in ESU abundance, but the ESU is still threatened.

Mike Orcutt asked whether the proposed ESA legislation now being considered by Congress regarding habitat and incentives for landowners with endangered species on their property would have an opportunity for public comment. John Engbring noted that this proposed amendment has passed through the House and will need to be approved by the Senate. He added that while there is usually a chance for public comment, it passed so quickly through the House that there was not much of an opportunity for it.

Dave Bitts asked whether there is sufficient staffing to handle recovery for coho as well as other listed salmonids, such as coastal fall Chinook. Irma Lagomarsino said that collaboration between several NOAA Fisheries offices is helping with the coastal fall Chinook work.

d. Update on hydro relicensing

Phil Detrich provided a brief review on the Klamath Hydroelectric Project relicensing process. PacifiCorp's license expires in March 2006, and the Final License Application was filed in March 2005. The agencies have commented and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) has submitted requests for additional information from PacifiCorp. The next milestone will occur in November when FERC will issue a notice that the National Environment Policy Act (NEPA) process will begin. Agencies will then submit their preliminary terms and conditions to FERC. There will be another substantial round of comments in January, assuming the process stays on schedule. As the process will not likely be completed prior to license expiration, it is likely that FERC will issue PacifiCorp an annual license.

The Settlement discussions are still ongoing but are covered by a confidentiality agreement so the material is not public. Cory Scott from PacifiCorp noted that PacifiCorp has requested a 60-day extension on FERC's additional information request for a fish reintroduction adaptive management plan. There has been no indication from FERC whether this request will be accepted.

Agendum 13. Public Comment

Petey Brucker from the Salmon River Restoration Council announced that his organization has been promoting a document produced by the Task Force on understanding harvest allocations. He encouraged all offices to take a copy as an educational tool.

Agendum 14. Presentation of Nathaniel S. Bingham Memorial Awards

John Engbring stated that Task Force awards are a great way to recognize people who are working hard in the basin.

John Engbring presented the Nathaniel S. Bingham Award for an organization to the Shasta Valley RCD Resource Conservation District for demonstrating a sustained commitment to the Shasta Valley. John noted that RCD staff have participated with the incidental take permitting process, worked closely with CDFG for juvenile trapping coordination, and has been involved with many restoration efforts including the removal of diversion dams on the Shasta River. Kerry Mauro and Adriane Garayalde accepted the award for the RCD.

The individual award was presented to Earl Crosby with the Karuk Tribe. Earle has led the Karuk Tribe Watershed Restoration Center to accomplish several road decommissioning projects which prevented, thousands of cubic yards of sediment from being deposited in anadromous fish habitat. Ron Reed added that we are very fortunate to have Earl working tirelessly to collect funds for future restoration projects.

John Engbring then presented Task Force Certificates of Appreciation to: Jason Singleton, Siskiyou County Office of Education; Jim Rice, Shasta Valley landowner; Ken Maurer, Scott Valley landowner; Pat O'Connor, Salmon River Restoration Council; Nat Pennington, Salmon River Restoration Council; Sarah Hugdahl, Salmon River Restoration Council; and a posthumous award for Tom Holzem, Salmon River Restoration Council.

Thursday, October 20, 2005

Reconvene and opening remarks

John Engbring opened the meeting and said the group had a good trip to the new fish ladder at Link River Dam the previous evening.

John Engbring asked if there were any comments on the June meeting minutes. Mike Orcutt provided an edit on the TMC Update section of the June minutes.

Motion by Keith Wilkinson to approve the June Task Force meeting minutes as amended.
Seconded by Chuck Blackburn.
Motion passed unanimously.

Agendum 15. Report from Klamath Watershed Coordination Group

a. Klamath Basin Compact Commission and Upper Klamath Basin Working Group

Alice Kilham reported that the science subcommittee of the Upper Klamath Basin Working Group was very successful in helping with restoration in the upper basin. The group is working well together, is very involved, and will continue to help out as long as the goal is restoration. She continued that the website www.onebasin.org will expand and become a good communication tool for the basin. She urged people to look under "Stakeholder Group" on that website to find out what focus groups are being organized. The stakeholder meetings open people's minds, which is what needs to happen in this basin so we can finally come to some integrated plan. The people in this basin have become part of the action by making recommendations and helping with planning processes.

The group then discussed the ongoing series of Chadwick workshops and Alice Kilham discussed her role in the Klamath Compact Commission.

b. Trinity Management Council Update

Mike Orcutt stated that in June the Trinity Management Council (TMC) discussed whether there would be additional flows out of the Trinity River if adverse conditions were present in the Klamath River. At their June meeting the TMC established a group in the spirit of collaboration to meet in July to ask how effective the releases out of the Trinity had been during the previous two years. Lacking sufficient supporting information, the group then asked what the triggers for releases are. Mike Orcutt said that this issue gets back to the real need for coordination between the Klamath and Trinity side to develop a comprehensive approach to water management.

Mike Orcutt said that the TMC met again in September to discuss the allocation of 2006 funding. Items include: active mainstem restoration projects, secured flows in the Trinity for actual restoration sites, and

getting the science program up and running. He noted that the Task Force has $1 million per year and the TMC has $11.3 million per year to work with. The 2006 TMC budget seemed to mostly go toward construction; funding toward monitoring was reduced and this is an issue. Some TMC members agreed that there is inherent tension between funding construction projects versus science projects, and the TMC hasn't quite figured out what the balance is.

Dave Hillemeier pointed out that the TMC is a good model to consider as the Klamath Act expires. It is on an extensive list of councils to stay in place.

Agendum 16. Public Comment

Jacqui Krizo, asked Alice Kilham what was happening with the Klamath Compact Commission and their role in setting power rates. Alice Kilham replied that California representatives were instructed by higher-ups to let the compact language stand on its own. California will not make a recommendation on power rates. They are very involved in studying dam removal and don't want any interference on power rates.

Deb Crisp, Tulelake Growers, asked if these instructions are coming from the Department of Water Resources (DWR) or the Governor's office. Alice Kilham replied that instructions are coming from the Governor's office, DWR, and CDFG. Deb Crisp stated that the refuge would be in grave danger without pumping.

Agendum 17. Accomplishments Report Update

Petey Brucker stated that they have a draft of the accomplishments report for the Task Force to review. He noted that there are a few sections that still need to be completed and the length needs to be reduced. They are looking for feedback on items that are missing or shouldn't be included.

Task Force members suggested a section that addresses how the Task Force has leveraged funding for other projects and accounted for in-kind services or matching funds. Other suggestions include a smaller section that defines the program and vision, and a section highlighting contributions from Task Force members.

The group discussed deadlines for the accomplishments report. John Engbring believes that Congress will take up the issue of reauthorization in the next several months. A final draft should be made available to the Task Force by February with a goal of having a complete and final report by the spring. Petey Brucker stated that they would like to get feedback from the sub-basins within the next month or two. John Engbring asked Task Force members to provide comments to Gary Curtis and Petey Brucker by November 11th. A final draft will be available to Task Force members in mid-January and the Task Force will spend a few hours on the report at the February meeting. Task Force members suggested a possible half day workshop in December to work through the accomplishments report.

Agendum 18. Report from Technical Work Group

Petey Brucker stated that in June the Technical Working Group (TWG) reported on the ranking of the 2006 work plan. All assignments to the TWG are completed except for the mainstem status review. Petey Brucker noted that spring Chinook returns to the Salmon River and the South Fork of the Trinity River are low. He continued that recently, juvenile otolith studies have provided a potential stock identifier for Salmon River fish.

Petey Brucker said that the TWG has worked with the TMC to determine how we can address flow and disease issues in the Klamath and Trinity rivers. The TWG and the TMC need to get together to think about dedicating funding to this effort. Petey noted that the Task Force needs to think about continuing coordination with the Trinity side because it is exciting to see more of the basin working together.

The group then discussed potential new assignments to the TWG. Dave Bitts asked if the TWG can offer suggestions for final assignments. John Engbring asked about the details of the TWG spring Chinook assignment. He added in terms of assignments, traditionally the big TWG assignment was to rank project proposals that are submitted to the Task Force for funding and in theory we won't be doing that this June.

Petey Brucker replied that the TWG assignment dealing with spring Chinook is to work with the Salmon River working group. It is important to have broad representation at the next working session. The TWG is reviewing the limiting factors analysis. In the future, the stock identification needs to be assessed and additional tools need to be identified.

Keith Wilkinson stated that much of the work on Klamath spring Chinook is being done by the Klamath Council's Technical Advisory Team (TAT). The problem seems to be that there are not any or many spring fish runs on the west coast so they are always looking for surrogate populations, which are often comprised of hatchery fish, which makes for a difficult management scenario. Keith noted that there is some cross-membership between the TAT and the TWG.

Neil Manji said that there were enough agencies dealing with issues like spring Chinook runs right now and he suggested the TWG undertake a fish population assessment. Gary Curtis reminded the Task Force that the fishery status report assigned to staff is not meant to be highly analytical, but would provide an overview of fish stocks in the context of this program. The TWG could provide help with the general analysis. It was also suggested that the TWG assist in compiling a list of what is yet to be accomplished for the conclusion of the accomplishments report.

Irma Lagomarsino suggested that the TWG offer to inform Reclamation about possible salmonid restoration projects with the $2.5 million funds available. John Engbring said he could contact Reclamation to offer TWG assistance.

The group discussed the possible need to have a list of recommended projects for 2007 in case the Task Force is reauthorized. They continued to discuss possible assignments for the TWG. It was suggested that the TMC and the TWG work together to examine the dynamics of the Klamath and Trinity rivers. Both groups may want to attend the June Task Force meeting. It was also suggested that the TMC define what Klamath-Trinity coordination would look like so that both groups are on the same page in terms of joint studies and management. A possible agenda item for February is to discuss this coordination further. An initial idea for the TWG to consider is what aspects of coordination are amenable to a technical study. The TWG should try to avoid organizational and political questions and leave those for the Task Force to address.

It was recommended that John Engbring write a letter to the TMC to notify them of the push for coordination between the TWG and the TMC.

Assignment: John Engbring will call Doug Schleusner (TMC) to notify him of the coordination assignment to the TWG.

Agendum 19. Water Quality and Impacts of Toxic Cyanobacteria Blooms in Copco and Iron Gate Reservoirs, 2005

Susan Corum introduced herself as the water quality expert with the Karuk Tribe, Orleans, CA. She has been studying areas in Copco and Iron Gate reservoirs where cyanobacteria blooms are occurring. *Microcystis aeruginosa* is a species of blue green algae that take the shape of flakes, colonies, or oil slick appearances. It prefers slow or still water and concentrations vary by site. It releases a liver toxin called microcystin, which is three times higher in toxicity than an average pesticide. Once symptoms are noticeable, toxicity is already high. Susan Corum discussed some preliminary results from samples taken in 2005 in Iron Gate and Copco Reservoirs.

Marcia Armstrong raised concerns about references to human consumption of toxic fish. She said that the Siskiyou County Public Health Officer should be present for those kinds of discussions. Dave Hillemeier stated that the point of the Klamath Act is to sustain the fisheries resource and part of that includes sustaining tribal health. Marcia Armstrong would have liked to have known that the issue was going to be raised ahead of time because the Public Health Officer disagrees with this information and questions whether there are medical problems associated with this issue.

Susan Corum continued that algae concentration levels from many samples taken near the end of September were the highest in 2005. The entire reservoir was a green color. Winds and temperatures break up the blooms. There is concern about toxins in the river affecting fish because when cells die they release their toxins, which could be released to salmon downriver.

Marcia Armstrong asked how the assumption can be made that the blooms are moving downstream and not occurring independently. Susan Corum said that the assumption is that they are growing in the reservoir because habitat is not available for the algae to grow in the river. She noted that the blooms are not present above the reservoirs showing that the reservoirs are clearly growing algae. She said the data show that the algae are making it all the way down to the estuary. A report will be put out as soon as the follow-up work is complete.

Ron Reed commented that the tribe is trying to take a proactive role in figuring out the cause of this issue and the potential effects on fish populations and on Tribal members. He noted that he did not ask Susan Corum to come here to add fuel to the fire, but rather to bring attention to the issue.

Marcia Armstrong referenced two letters from the Public Health Officer regarding sampling protocols and other issues he has with the ongoing studies. He isn't finding the science behind the conclusions that are drawn, and is concerned that people are jumping to conclusions. Susan Corum stated that the study uses methods approved by the NCRWQCB, and would like to have a meeting with the County to discuss.

Agendum 20. Public Comment

No public comment.

Agendum 21 . Recap and Summary of Assignments and Motions

The next Task Force meeting is on February 8-9, 2006, in Brookings, Oregon. The next Task Force meeting will be June 21-22, 2006 in Yreka, California. Gary Curtis added that the February dates were selected because the Charter expires the following week. The charter has been submitted for renewal and

will hopefully be authorized by the Secretary of the Interior before the meeting in February. John Engbring asked for June agenda item ideas. A joint meeting with TMC was suggested for June. Marcia Armstrong suggested having the Hatfield Working Group at the meeting with the TMC in June. John Engbring will check with the TMC and the Hatfield Working Group.

Dave Hillemeier suggested adding time at the February meeting to discuss potential data gaps if the Klamath Act is not reauthorized. He also suggested setting aside time for a status report of the ESA process for coho salmon. Neil Manji suggested a follow-up discuss on blue green algae in February. Gary Curtis reviewed potential agenda items for February and June 2006, and assignments from this meeting. Staff will work with the Chair to determine the structure of the remaining Task Force meetings.

John Engbring recognized the Yreka office USFWS staff for all the work they do to coordinate these meetings.

Adjourn

Attachment 1

FINAL AGENDA
Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force
October 19, 2005
Shilo Inn
Klamath Falls, Oregon

October 19, 2005

9:00 AM 1. Convene and opening remarks. John Engbring, Chair; Keith Wilkinson, Vice Chair. Vice Chair for next meeting is Keith Wilkinson

9:15 2. Introductions of Congressional staff in attendance

9:20 3. Business
a. Adoption of agenda

Joint Task Force-Klamath Fishery Management Council Information Session

9:30 4. Klamath River Fish Health Assessment Team (Catherine Carter and Sarah Borok)

10:00 5. Klamath Fishery Management Council update and Pacific Fishery Management Council review of Klamath River Fall Chinook Conservation Goal (Curt Melcher)

10:30 6. Public Comment

10:45 Break

11:00 7. General Accounting Office Report

8. Fish Disease Status (Dave Hilliemeier)

11:30 9. Joint Oregon/California Klamath River TMDL update (David Leland and Steve Kirk)

12:15 LUNCH

1:30 10. Status of Klamath Irrigation Project continuing operations, Conservation Implementation Plan, and Natural Flow Study (Cecil Lesley and Jenny Hoblit)

2:15 11. Business
a) Adoption of June 2005 meeting minutes
b) Brief review of June 2005 meeting actions and general correspondence (Gary Curtis)

2:30 12. Updates and Announcements
a. Status of 2005 Klamath River anadromous fisheries (Sarah Borok)
b. Update on State of California coho recovery process (Neil Manji)
c. Update on NOAA recovery planning process (Irma Lagomarsino)
d. Update on hydro relicensing (Phil Detrich)

3:00	Break
3:15	13. Public Comment
3:50	14. Presentation of Nathaniel S. Bingham Memorial Awards (John Engbring)
4:00	**Recess**
4:30-6:00	Field Trip to Link River Dam fish ladder
6:30-?	Social Hour – Join us at Sergio's Dos, 4650 S. 6th St. Klamath Falls

Reconvene - October 20, 2005

8:00 AM	Reconvene and opening remarks
8:15	15. Report from Klamath Watershed Coordination Group a. Klamath Basin Compact Commission and Upper Klamath Basin Working Group (Alice Kilham) b. Trinity Management Council Update (Mike Orcutt)
8:45	16. Public Comment
9:00	17. Accomplishments report update (Gary Curtis and Petey Brucker)
9:20	18. Report from Technical Work Group (Petey Brucker)
10:15	Break
10:30	19. Water Quality and Impacts of Toxic Cyanobacteria Blooms in Copco and Iron Gate Reservoirs, 2005 (Susan Corum)
11:15	20. Public Comment
11:30	21. Recap and Summary of Assignments and Motions (John Engbring) Next meetings are: February 2006 in Crescent City; June 2006 in Yreka
12:00 PM	Adjourn

Attachment 2

LIST OF HANDOUTS
Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force
October 19, 2005
Shilo Inn
Klamath Falls, Oregon

Agendum 4	Klamath River Basin Fish Kill Response Plan, by the Klamath Fish Health Assessment Team (KFHAT), dated August 2005.
Agendum 7	Report to Congressional Requesters entitled, "Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Restoration Program Limited Assurance Regarding the Federal Funding Requirements", from the United States Government Accountability Office, dated September 2005.
Agendum 10	List of Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force Fiscal Year 2006 Funded Projects.
Agendum 10	Federal Advisory Committee Charter for the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force submitted for renewal in September, 2005.
Agendum 10	Draft Meeting Minutes for the June 2005 Task Force Meeting.
Agendum 10	Fiscal Year 2005 Program Highlights Report.
Agendum 16	Draft Task Force Accomplishments Report.
Informational	Letter to Tam Doduc, State Water Resources Control Board from David Herfindahl, M.D., Public Health Director, regarding microcystin toxin in Copco and Iron Gate Lakes, dated October 7, 2005.
Informational	Letter to William Ngai, M.D., M.P.H., Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment from David Herfindahl, M.D., Public Health Director, regarding a water sample from Copco Lake for microcystin toxin, dated October 7, 2005.
Informational	Herald and News article entitled, "Salmon Test in Upper Klamath Lake a Major Step, dated October 17, 2005.
Informational	Herald and News article entitled, "Salmon to Return to Klamath", dated October 16, 2005.
Informational	United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Attachment 3

MOTIONS AND ASSIGNMENTS
Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force
October 19, 2005
Shilo Inn
Klamath Falls, Oregon

Motions:

Agendum 3.a

Motion by Keith Wilkinson to adopt the agenda as amended.
Seconded by Julie Perrochet.
The motion passed unanimously.

Agendum 11

Motion by Keith Wilkinson to approve the June Task Force meeting minutes as amended.
Seconded by Chuck Blackburn.
Motion passed unanimously.

Assignments:

1) Staff and TWG Chair to complete draft Accomplishments report for review prior to the February meeting, and hold a December meeting to allow interested Task Force Members to provide input.

2) John Engbring will check on DOI process for Accomplishments Report approval.

3) John Engbring will talk to the Trinity Management Council regarding a joint meeting in June, 2006.

Technical Work Group:

1) Provide technical assistance to staff and on preparation of Fishery Status report.

2) Develop prioritized list of key limiting factors affecting salmon populations in the basin to inform future work. Summary of this to be added to the Accomplishments Report forward vision section.

3) Develop list of technical aspects suitable for coordination between the Trinity Management Council and the Task Force.

Attachment 4

LIST OF ATTENDEES
Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force
October 19, 2005
Shilo Inn
Klamath Falls, Oregon

The following individuals attended the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force meeting in Klamath Falls, Oregon, on the dates indicated:

October 19, 2005

Name	Organization
Steve Kirk	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Theresa Wright	Resource Conservation District
Sara Borok	California Department of Fish and Game
Anita Ward	Upper Klamath Basin Working Group
James R. Ottoma	Farmer
Dan Bennetts	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Petey Brucker	Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force Technical Work Group
Jim McCarthy	
Katharine Carter	North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
David Leland	North Coast regional Water Quality Control Board
Cliff Fox	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Jacqui Krizo	
Earl Danosky	Tulelake Irrigation District
Desma Williams	Yurok Tribal Fisheries Program
Kerry Mauro	Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District
Adriane Garayalde	Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District
Justin Ly	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Cory Scott	PacifiCorp
Cindy Williams	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Ron Costello	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Alice Kilham	
Cecil Lesley	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Chuck Korson	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Curt Mullis	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service-Klamath Falls
Sue Mattenberger	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service-Klamath Falls
Jennie M. Hoblit	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

October 20, 2005

Name	Organization
Susan Corum	Karuk Tribe
Deb Crisp	Tulelake Growers
Anita Ward	Upper Klamath Basin Working Group