

MEETING OF THE
KLAMATH FISHERIES TASK FORCE
EUREKA, CALIFORNIA JUNE 17-19, 1991
MINUTES FOR THE RECORD

Meeting called to order at 1:14 p.m. by Chairman Shake, with a quorum present (see roster, Attachment 1a). Absent: Barbara Holder and Don DeVol.

What about Kunitz Co?

Adoption of agenda

(Odemar): I suggest that we postpone the discussion on operational planning until tomorrow morning.

**** Motion ****

(Wilkinson): I move to accept the agenda (Attachment 1b).
Seconded.

**** Motion carried ****

Adoption of minutes

Discussion of minutes from the March 11 meeting in Millbrae, CA.

Q: Can US Forest Service (USFS) funds be used as a match? The notes seem to be inconsistent on pages 4 and 6 (Sumner).

A: (Iverson): 319h funds from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) cannot be matched with federal funding, because 319h funds are federal. Federal dollars cannot be used to match federal dollars. For example, the SWRCB approved Kier's proposal, so if a match can be found, the grant will be provided. The match Kier proposes to use is legitimate. The issue of USFS qualifying for Wallop-Breaux funds will be discussed more tomorrow.

Q: Where will money come from to repair USFS roads if their road budget is cut (Sumner)?

(Shake): We will address these issues later in the day when the USFS representative arrives. Add these to the bottom of the agenda prior to the public comment period.

**** Motion ****

(Wilkinson): I move to approve the March 11, 1991 minutes from the Millbrae meeting.

(Odemar): Second.

**** Motion carried. ****

Report on status of work plans for FY89-91

- o Non-Federal work plan (Odemar)

At the February meeting Michael Bird presented the state's workplan. Today, I will provide an update on that workplan based on Mike's reports (see Attachment 2).

Kier Associates' report on the effectiveness of instream structures found that the structures were not as effective as hoped for. The state has completed reports on in-stream structures, but they lack the evaluation component present in federal reports.

o Federal work plan (Alcorn)

FY89:

Alcorn:

- o Most of the agreements for FY89 are closed (Attachment 3).
- o The outstanding agreements include DWR and CDFG. The left over money from CDFG work (\$60,000) will be used for the same type of work (tagging Iron Gate Hatchery chinook) in following FY's.

**** Motion ****

Wilkinson: I move that the TF provide flexibility of funds from one fiscal year to the next.

Discussion:

- o This money has been obligated out of the FY89 funds, if it is not spent, it is lost to the project. Remaining money can be spent in the next fiscal year for a similar project.
- o If we don't use the money on a similar project, then we don't get to spend it. The scope of work cannot change but the geographical area can.

**** Wilkinson:** Amend the motion. The TWG should develop criteria to flag and account for carry-over of remaining money. If there is money left over after the end-dates of the agreements, then we should get guidance on what to do with it.

**** Motion carried. ****

Discussion:

A related issue is that the Act calls for carry-over of funds. \$21 million over 20 years is supposed to be available until expended. A mistake in FWS, has kept this money from remaining available.

Shake: This is an action item that should be revisited. Perhaps we could go to DC to get the procedure for carrying-over funds set in place along with the Act. We could use the projects from FY89 as examples, and we need to be able to be flexible.

**** Action Item ****

o Federal work plan (Alcorn) continued

FY89 page 2: We have good news - as a result of the sediment budget and the French Ck sediment study (4.14), the Calif State Board of Forestry will use

the French Ck area as a model study area for mixed ownership and Coordinated Resource Management Planning (CRMP's).

FY90 (Attachment 4)

Page 1: The water quality study on the Shasta River shows that high water temperatures are the limiting factor to fish production. There are also problems with elevated levels of un-ionized ammonia. The state will use these studies as a springboard for further studies. So, this is an example of restoration program money going farther than originally planned.

FY91 (Attachment 5)

Funding for the curriculum development project (E-3), was deferred until FY92 at the March TF meeting. Ron Iverson recommended that we defer this funding because the need for FY91 funds was expected to be greater than the money available. We have now found that there is adequate money available to fund this project out of FY91 funds.

**** We accept the two reports. ****

Introduction of guest.

Bruce Halstead introduces Chuck Metzler who is Congressman Riggs Representative from Riggs' Eureka office.

Break

Update on Klamath and Trinity flows

Don Paff, Bureau of Reclamation:

- o The drought is still with us. The peak time for reservoirs to fill is right now. From now on the water levels will lower.
- o The revised release schedule calls for 800 cfs to be released at Iron Gate Dam during June. 250 cfs will be the minimum flow from Keno dam. The Secretary's decision calls for 290,000 acre-feet to be released to the Trinity.
- o The release schedules to contractors have not changed. The late season rains caused us to go from a disastrous year to a bad year. This will be the 7th driest year of record for Southern Oregon and all of California. The carryover storage in the reservoirs will be down to the amount that the reservoirs held in 1977, which means this is the second lowest reservoir storage in history. Next year will hopefully be a recovery year.
- o A Central Valley Project Operation Criterion Plan (CVPOCP) is being put together. This will help to address many issues from many agencies. Next year, we could be in really tough shape if we do not get rain this winter. We are telling contractors that they will get zero deliveries. Hopefully, we will get at least normal rainfall next year.

Q: What are the plans in case we don't get rain?

A: The reservoirs will be empty. It has got to rain in order to provide water to contractors. The statistical forecast needs to come true.

Q: As I drove on Highway 5, I was surprised to see so many new rice fields growing in the Central Valley. I am concerned about seeing hundreds of acre-feet of water being used to grow rice. Why are new rice fields being planted?

A: The new fields are not in addition to existing fields. 20,000 acres are out of production. There are less acres of land under irrigation now than there were five years ago. 2.6 acre-feet of water is not that much water to grow rice. Cotton is the crop that uses more water than rice.

Q: Is this information written up anywhere?

A: No, but I could write up a summary of the Klamath and Trinity systems and provide it to the Task Force, via the Klamath River Fisheries Resource Office (KRFRO). We are still in for a tough year next year. We need to plan that water is in short supply. The CVPOCP is being developed under Section 7 to protect the Bald Eagle and winter chinook. Agencies are currently reviewing this plan.

Q: Can I (Mike Orcutt) be more involved in the process to review the plan? I feel that the tribe should be involved in this process because the Hoopa Tribe was integral in securing the increased flows.

A: Yes.

Q: Since we are unable to affect the amount of precipitation we receive, yet global warming seems to be at the heart of the problem, is the Bureau of Reclamation looking at ways of decreasing the carbon dioxide input to the atmosphere?

A: We are looking into what the effects of CO2 are, but we are not planning on setting regulations for the amount of output.

Kirk Rogers, Bureau of Reclamation:

- o The Trinity River is looking better than ever this year. Fish are returning to the river in great condition.

Bill Shake thanked Don and Kirk for attending, and invited them back to attend future meetings.

Task Force discussion of the upper basin plan amendment.

Iverson:

- o The draft amendment to the long-range plan was delivered by Kier Associates last winter. The draft was provided to the TF in January 1991.
- o In February, we proposed a schedule for incorporating comments into this document. The original schedule is now obsolete because of delays. For example, ODFW and the Hoopa Tribe have not yet provided comments. Therefore we have not completed the first step. After the first step is completed, we will send this amendment out for a public comment period. Public comments will be incorporated for Task Force review. This process will take 8 months from the Task Force commenting on the draft plan to arriving at a final amendment.

Discussion:

(Keith Wilkinson): The due date for agency comments was extended to April 15, 1991. I hate to see this review process delayed even more. Could we accept agency comments during the public review process? Agencies could still identify their comments as agency comments.

Craig Bienz, Klamath Tribe (Oregon): The Klamath Tribe is involved with a lot of water quality issues. The tribe is waiting to see how they can contribute to the Klamath Restoration Program. Currently, the tribe is concerned with finding out what their role is in the Task Force process. We have not made formal comments on the upper basin plan yet. There is some question as to what our role is -- We would like to be involved before the amendment gets finalized.

- o We could form a smaller group to look at the comments, provide suggestions to revise the amendment. This same group will decide on recommendations for the public involvement process. The group could consist of Keith Wilkinson and Mike Orcutt.
- o We will send a letter to the Tribe asking them to participate in the plans for the upper basin.
- o We should set a termination date for public comment and advertise this in the Federal Register. Dates will be decided on later. (Shake suggests that he and Keith Wilkinson meet with ODFW to set dates.)

**** Action Item ****

- o The procedure for dealing with comments would be similar to the procedure for the full long-range plan. Agency comments would be brought to the next TF meeting.

Update on the status of the KFMC long-range plan.

Whitehouse:

- o 46 comments were received on the draft plan (21 written, 25 oral). These comments have been categorized, organized, then reviewed by the ad hoc subcommittee.
- o The ad hoc subcommittee's recommendations for revisions will be provided to the council at their meeting next week.

Discussion:

- o We need to establish when the plan will be open for amendments.
- o We need to insure that issues for the TF get routed to the TF or the proper place for action.

Since Barbara Holder is not here yet, we will defer the questions relating to the USFS until later.

Public Comment Period

Jim Cook, Great Northern Corporation

- 1) On behalf of the Shasta CRMP, we would like to extend an invitation to the Task Force to be part of the CRMP process. Doug Alcorn and Dick

Sumner have been at meetings, but we do not yet have an official Klamath River Task Force representative.

** Hearing no objections, Dick Sumner will be the Task Force representative for the Shasta CRMP.

** Action Item. **

2) re: publishing annual reports

We, at Great Northern Corporation (GNC) feel that it may be difficult for the public to access final reports for the Klamath Restoration Program by using the Fish and Wildlife Reference Service (FWRS). We would like to volunteer to keep a copy of the reports at our office in a 3-ring binder for the public to access.

(Iverson): We normally make enough copies of final reports for Task Force members. We could make one more copy, give it to GNC, then they could distribute it locally.

Discussion:

Q: Is GNC making a gratis offer to do this for the life of the program?

A: Yes.

Q: Are final copies of the reports available to the public right now within the basin?

A: The current final report distribution system calls for final reports being mailed to the public libraries in each county.

Q: How is your organization planning to let the public know about this process?

A: The Fish and Wildlife Service currently mails a letter to all interested people twice yearly letting them know that final reports are available: 1) at public libraries, or 2) they can receive their own copy by calling the 800 number for the Fish and Wildlife Reference Service. This letter could also reference GNC as a report repository.

- o GNC cannot publish government reports for-profit.
- o Long-range Plan Policy 7.7.f calls for setting up an information transfer service. GNC is volunteering to supplement the current process, and this could be good. Psychologically, it sounds good to have the reports available locally.

(Shake): I'll assume that there is no major opposition to this idea. A motion will not be carried because this action is supplemental.

Report on the benefits and detriments of Threatened or Endangered Species listing of Klamath River stocks:

Shake: Listing a species as threatened or endangered can occur in two ways. On one hand, an interested group can petition the FWS to list a particular species as threatened or endangered. The agency then has 90 days to consider the petition. Once a petition is accepted, a notice of acceptance is published. After data is reviewed, the agency makes a draft decision to list the species as threatened or endangered, or not to list. Economics are not

taken into consideration. Public comments are collected, then a final decision is made. Decisions are made on a case by case basis.

If the FWS deems a species as threatened, there is more flexibility in the management of stocks. Federal agencies that may disrupt the threatened species need to go through a Section 7 process. If a fish species in the Klamath is listed, then we would need to consult with NMFS before trying to do any restoration work.

"Anadromous Salmonids on the Decline" is an article in the March-April issue of Fisheries that I would recommend reading.

Discussion:

- o If one species is listed, then it will radically affect how we manage other species. For example, winter run chinook in the Sacramento River survive on Trinity River water. Once a species is listed, it reduces the flexibility of management (McInnis).
- o Q: Have there been any petitions received by National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) for protecting Klamath Stocks?
A: No.
- o The state has received petitions for protecting fish from the South Fork of the Trinity.
- o Recent news in a press release from NMFS states that the Snake River spring and chinook salmon are now listed as threatened (Attachment 6).
- o Q: Would you comment on Idaho DFG's position to eliminate sockeye in order to manage for chinook?
A: Elimination of sockeye is being used as a management tool to protect chinook species. This action would severely impact harvest flexibility. We need to recognize that low fish numbers are a result of a number of factors. Overharvest is definitely a concern, but other reasons should also be recognized (dams, downstream passage, etc).
- o Listing a species may finally give an agency the hammer it needs to get restoration work, or other changes, done.
- o This is the first year that the state has put a weir in the Trinity to count the returns of spring chinook and steelhead. This kind of information is definitely needed and will prove quite useful for the potential upcoming situations regarding listing.
- o Q: Is there a mean level that we can come to that we can all survive? I am looking at the cover of Fisheries where logging, farming, and fishing are all represented.
A: Yes. We can achieve a balance using mechanisms to modify the activities that are currently underway. There are ways to reach compromises and protect species while still using our resources. Agencies are carefully researching each potential species from a strictly biological perspective. This prevents invalid proposals from getting on the list. The world does not stop because a species is listed. Compromises can be found.

Wallop-Breaux funding (Shake)

- o There was a question at the February meeting to find out if the USFS could share in receiving Wallop-Breaux funding.
- o Wallop-Breaux funding is \$160 million per year administered by the FWS to each state. USFS cannot use.
- o Some items of interest pertaining to Wallop-Breaux funding include:
 - o Reverted funds can be used by the FWS for research.
 - o An administrative fund is established that cannot use more than 4% of the total. Any money remaining in this fund is allocated to multi agency jurisdictions with wide-appeal for sportfishing.
 - o An amendment would be needed for agencies such as the USFS or tribes to be able to receive the money. The law comes up for re-authorization next year.

Hillman: The Native American Fish and Wildlife Society has drafted proposed language for an amendment to the Wallop-Breaux funding act. This amendment would allow tribal participation.

June 18, 1991

Klamath River subbasin stock identification

Iverson: The joint consistency committee called for nominating a panel to study the Klamath River subbasin stock identification issue.

Discussion:

- o There should be a specific list of what constitutes the discrete stocks within the basin. We need a panel of people who have both academic and hands-on field experience.
- o Both academicians and agency people should be on this panel. A mixture of people worked out well for a similar panel on the Columbia River.
- o The council is concerned about the validity of the stocks listed in the TF plan. They think that the problems of managing weak stocks could be magnified if the stocks aren't correctly identified.
- o People with a genetics background could set the tone of what should be looked at. Later, some of the other folks could review what has been produced.

Specific people to serve on this panel might include: Barnhart (USFWS Co-op unit), Halstead (USFWS-Coastal Calif. Fisheries Resources Office (CCFRO)), Hubbell (CDFG), Orcutt (Hoopa Valley Fisheries), Des Laurier (USFS), Maahs (commercial fishing), Reisenblechler (USFWS-Seattle Lab), a representative from NMFS, a representative from AFS, and a representative from ODFW.

- We need to clearly describe what we want this panel to do
- o examine the list of stocks that we identified in the plan
 - o validate that list in terms of being distinct stocks
 - o put some sideboards on the list with the objective of consolidation rather than expansion (with allowances for special situations).
 - o review all available information and identify data gaps.

We also need to decide if we are going to cover this group's expenses and if we are going to provide staff support to help administer this panel. This would be a temporary panel.

**** Action ****

Iverson will write a letter to the appropriate folks.

Report from the Education subcommittee

The Education subcommittee met June 17 and discussed the following items: curriculum development, a video on Yurok fisheries and programs underway for public communication and education through the Yreka office.

Orcutt: I sat in on the meeting, I'd like to become formally involved.

Wilkinson: I'd recommend the chairman appoint him. He's expressed his interest, and is working in tribal education as well.

**** Action Item ****

The subcommittee report was made in 2 parts: Keith Wilkinson reported on school education and the proposed video, then Tricia Whitehouse reported on the programs underway for public communication.

Wilkinson:

- o The FY90 contract for curriculum development for grades 4-6 was reviewed by the committee. Dianne Higgins, contractor, was present at the meeting to answer questions.
- o The curriculum development program is valuable to the restoration program. The education subcommittee believes education is the best investment of our restoration dollar. We're in the process of completing the 2nd year of curriculum development. Next year we'll do the 9-12. There is a Summer Institute scheduled for a week this summer similar to the one scheduled for last year. Summer Institute is an opportunity for teachers to get out and get some experience in salmon fisheries of the Klamath River basin. We heard the report on this at the December meeting. Overall, I'm pleased with what's happened in the education category. We believe it's valuable.
- o Diane Higgins has provided copies of the education curriculum from her contract for interested members of the Task Force to have.
- o In the 4 county restoration program area, we have a potential to reach 6,000 4-6 graders, 4,000 7-8 graders, or a K-12 total of 38,000 students.
- o The Klamath River Educational Program (KREP) has socioeconomic benefits even outside of the KR basin. The four counties should be inclusive, not just the part of the counties within the Klamath River basin. The upper basin should also be included.
- oo Another issue that the subcommittee discussed was the Yurok video. The three questions that are unsettled are: 1) why would the video need to go

out for competitive bid instead of cooperative agreement? 2) Why did the FY91 Request for Proposals (RFP) call for videos? and, 3) If the project for video production goes to bid, what will the budget be set at?

Discussion:

Iverson: The FY92 RFP was written to be consistent with plan policies, which call for video production. I don't think we understood what the constraints on video production would be until we began to look into this type of work as a result of the recommendation to produce a video focusing on Yurok fishing activities in December. We provided information to Task Force members about video production in a memo, after researching the process with specialists in our Portland regional office. Also, all USFWS employees were given a memo recently regarding constraints of video production. Contractor selection is carried out at a level higher than our office.

Whitehouse: The issue seems to be a matter of determining how much time we want to spend on gaining approval for video production. We could produce other communication media that wouldn't require the extensive review effort involved in video production.

Bingham: It was my motion that spoke for authorizing the Yurok fisheries video. My concern is that my motion also spoke for equal consideration for a troll industry (or other subject) video. The troll video came out on the bottom in the ranking process, the Yurok video proposal came out on top. Why did this happen? My consideration now, to be consistent with my motion, is to make the two videos equal. The FY92 workplan has the Yurok video ranked at the top because the KRFR0 was instructed to put it there. It had previously ranked lower. I recommend that the other video be considered equally.

I had also asked that this body have final edit of any video that is produced.

Wilkinson: Another concern came up at the subcommittee meeting, there's a long delay for development of a video. Part of the purpose of the education program is to be quick and accessible to educators.

Shake: Ron is right that we have constraints, but it's not impossible. If we recognize that video authorization is a lengthy process, and recognize that the Washington Office (WO) may edit what we produce, then we could still do it as long as the WO agrees on the content.

Pierce: Is it a legal fact that video proposals must go out for competitive bid, when you have the opportunity to enter into a cooperative agreement with a non-profit organization?

Iverson: We've been informed that we must go out to bid, because the decision to produce a video is made at a higher level.

Pierce: Why does this higher level contracting decision apply to videos and not other projects?

Iverson: We don't know why. If we want to have a video represent USFWS, it has to meet criteria for content, quality, etc. Someone controls that in WO.

Pierce: Does this apply to other communication media items?

Shake: All have various constraints, depending on audience. All have various levels of review.

Pierce: I'm not questioning the review process, just whether it has to go out to competitive bid.

Shake: We can discuss this with others in the USFWS. Other videos have been produced under contract, but the selection of the contractor was made at the WO. The field offices don't have the opportunity to select video producers.

Pierce: If the video does have to go out to competitive bid, the price in the budget will be different. You will not find anyone else that can do this video for \$15,000. The Yuroks are donating the equipment, etc. If the education committee needs to review it and further review is necessary, the price will also be increased, because the original proposal was budgeted for specific film and editing time. The price could escalate to \$50,000 if we need to go out to bid, and \$100,000 if the troller video is also included.

Bingham: As far as I'm concerned, I don't mind if both proposals are dropped to the bottom of the ranked workplan.

Farro: We're back here to the same spot as we were last year. We now have two groups that want their stories told, I think we will soon have other groups requesting the same type of coverage. We must make the decision here whether we want to fund this type of propaganda for all other fishing groups. I thought we dealt with this in the past. First, we need to make the decision on how the TF will expend funds.

Shake: Nat, if we go through a competitive process and NCIDC is the low bidder, would they be acceptable to you?

Bingham: They would have to be selected by the same selection criteria that the Technical Work Group uses for other projects. Technically, they would be judged on their technical ability and equipment. So, my answer is a qualified "yes".

Shake: Do we have consensus on a video?

A: Yes.

Farro: A video by itself is useless. We need an adequate way to advertise and distribute the video. These marketing steps can be costly and time consuming.

Wilkinson: The video should be incorporated into educational curriculum.

Shake: I suggest that we table the video proposals this year. The education subcommittee can scope out the entire video content, process etc., and report back to the Task Force for next year's budget. Part of what the committee will research is the requirement to have a competitively bid contract for the video.

Sumner: Video production should be a group effort. The sport fishing community wants to be included and restoration activities could be shown.

**** Motion ****

Bingham: I move that the 2 video proposals be taken out of '92 budget. The subject of video production should be given to the education subcommittee. (The Task Force education subcommittee consists of Bingham, Wilkinson, Holder, Orcutt, and Pierce).

Orcutt: The topics of restoration efforts and sportfishing should also be included in the motion for a video.

Lara: Pulling a proposal that ranked at 99 will set a precedent to pull other highly ranked proposals from the workplan. This video proposal was supposed to be looked at for additional funding last year, now it is being looked at for funding this year, why is this being done?

Shake: Nat made a motion in February's meeting to include equal consideration for future videos. Now, we have a motion to leave all videos until next year, until after the education subcommittee researches the content and process for funding. We have consensus that a single video covering many user groups would be better than a video on just one user group.

Pierce: The USFWS indicated that the tribal video would have to go out to competitive bid. If so, there is a possibility that NCIDC would remove the proposal from the process.

Grover: Whether or not we need to go for competitive bid, we still must get approval from the Department of Interior. The education subcommittee will first need to develop content, objectives, etc.

Orcutt: Does the USFWS administer congressional money, or is this USFWS money for the Act?

Shake: The money for the restoration program is USFWS appropriated money.

Grover: USFWS has been charged to implement this program by the Secretary of Interior.

**** Motion ****

Bingham: I make a motion that we pull both videos from the FY92 budget, refer them to the education subcommittee to develop a video addressing fishing and restoration programs in the basin, and come back to the Task Force for final approval. The proposed video will be submitted to USFWS for their bidding process. The proposal will come from the education subcommittee to the Task Force to be reviewed and rated.

Discussion

Shake: This motion captures my suggestion of the subcommittee scoping out the video process and determining the content, length of running time, topic, etc. for the video. After we hear back from the subcommittee, we will decide whether or not to fund.

This video would have a lot of power in education. If we need to postpone it for a year to get a better product, I think it's the logical way to proceed.

Break

Shake: Do we have any objections to the motion on the table?

Lara: Yes, I object to the motion.

**** Motion ****

Lara: I'd make a motion to leave the Yurok video in the FY92 workplan. Motion seconded.

Bingham: I'll vote no to the motion, because there has not been equal consideration for the troller video, which was part of my original motion.

Shake: As an alternative, we could go back to Nat's motion and include development of a plan of work for the education subcommittee. They'd consider the concept to develop a video.

**** Motion ****

Shake: I suggest a similar motion to Nat's, but with a clear statement that includes work proposed by NCIDC in the plan of work. Seconded.

Lara: I object to this motion. We've got to have the legal opinion on the Yurok video. I think we should table this until 2:00 p.m. when we can get some answers to the contractual procedures.

Shake: The legal question of contractual procedures has been assigned to the education subcommittee. Does that help your concern?

Lara: No. But I'll abstain from voting on the motion.

Shake: Roll call: all "yes", with two abstentions. Hearing no objections, we'll give the assignment to the subcommittee.

**** Motion carried ****

Education Subcommittee Report (continued)

Wilkinson:

One of the questions was the parameters or scope of the education program. Is it the 4 counties, or the Klamath River basin? I believe it should be the 4 counties. We need clarification as to the scope of the range.

Shake: I agree with you, the contract should include the 4 county area.

Q: Diane, is the video tape library called for in your contract accessible to the public?

A: Yes.

Whitehouse:

The rest of the Education and Communication Program is continuing. I'm administering contracts with Kidder Creek Outdoor School, Chico State University (survey), Paula Yoon (transportable display) and Dianne Higgins (7-8th grade curriculum).

- o Kidder Creek Outdoor School: On May 15, the cooperater received the signed agreement. The development of outdoor field activities is beginning.
- o The Survey Research Center at Chico State University has developed the questions and analytical program for the survey. The questions for school age children have been pre-tested. We're prepared to send the questionnaire to OMB for approval. The goals and objectives for the survey were developed by KRFRRO in conjunction with the Survey Research Center.
- o The transportable display is being developed. This transportable display was funded last year as an informational display for restoration activities. Paula Yoon, contractor, reported to the education subcommittee that the display will provide an overview of the basin and the restoration program with information on the enabling legislation, an aerial photo of the entire basin, information on the long range plan, information and photographs on habitat protection/restoration, and fish protection/restoration. It will be smaller than the display that was built for the Humboldt County Fishing Industry so that it can fit in the government vehicle. It will be built in such a way that it can be left unattended in public places. The draft outline for this display has been sent, by the contractor, to all of you for comments.

Hillman: I'm concerned about the review process for this display.

- o will there be some type of USFWS review?
- o When USFWS review is completed, will the Task Force get to review the display?

A: KRFRRO will be reviewing the contract throughout the display's development. The Education subcommittee will look at the general plans and see mock-ups along the way. This transportable display's content will be within our control, so we will not need WO review.

Hillman: If the display does not need WO review, I suggest that the Task Force get final review.

Shake: I suggest that as the processes for development of educational and communication materials moves along, the education subcommittee, which represents us, will review material. I assume that if there are issues that are controversial, the committee will bring them back to the Task Force for a policy recommendation. If items are not an issue, I would hope that they proceed, to move forward with it, rather than wait for the Task Force to look at it as a whole. I have confidence in that committee doing its job.

Orcutt: I think we should have a clear procedure. In the past, assumptions have caused problems. I suggest that the subcommittee be updated at each step of the way.

Shake: I agree. Tricia, will you continue regular communications about the communication and education contracts/agreements with the education subcommittee?

Whitehouse: Yes.

The other items I'm involved with include the KFMC long-range plan. We've had 5 public meetings, and lots of press coverage before, during, and after meetings. I've been organizing the public and agency comments for review by the Management Council at their meeting next week.

The Task Force's Long-Range Plan has been mailed to the printer in Portland. We should have copies available by late July. Getting the plan ready for printing took a lot of work and staff time at the KRFRO.

The Newsletter was approved in February by WO office. Members of the Task Force and Management Council are now reviewing it. I'll collect their comments and make necessary changes. We hope to get this newsletter mailed to the public soon. It'll be a good way for people to keep up to date without having to read the minutes. The newsletter will be printed quarterly.

I've been giving the slide presentation on the Klamath Restoration Program to community groups such as Yreka Community School, and Mt. Shasta Audobon Society. Other groups continue to request and schedule presentations.

The brochure has been forwarded to the regional office and is awaiting printing.

Scopes of works for the communication and education program were written based on the Long-Range Plan. These scopes of work went through the ranking process with the Technical Work Group and are on the proposed workplan.

The USFWS Reference Service has been receiving final reports from us several at a time. Interested parties are notified once the reports are entered into the referencing database.

This report summarizes all the activities occurring within the Public Communication and Education Program at this time.

Discussion:

Q: When is the TF going to have a look at the brochure (Hillman)?

A: The education subcommittee reviewed the brochure at their December meeting. The Task Force will get a look at it when it comes out in August. Would you like to be on the education subcommittee?

Hillman: No.

Q: Is the newsletter approval that you've received from the WO on the format or content?

A: Format and content were reviewed. Now that the format has been approved, we will maintain it. Content was reviewed to ensure that the subject matter was within FWS standards. We will provide the WO with a report after a few issues have been published. They will keep an eye on it for the first few issues, although we will not need each issue formally reviewed by the WO.

3 year action plan proposal

Iverson:

The biggest cost factor in this proposal for a 3 year action plan (Attachment 7) would be for additional travel and meetings for the TWG. We figure it costs about \$3,000 per 3 day meeting. This proposal would lay out an action plan similar to the one for the Trinity Restoration Program.

Action planning is consistent with the long-range plan. The policies in the plan need to be prioritized and organized into a, for example, 3-year action plan. First, we would need to identify and characterize implementing actions (i.e., what, who, where, when, how much and limiting factors). Secondly, we would prioritize each long range policy, or, actions leading to each policy. Thirdly, we need to identify a timeframe to get the high priority items done first.

A question that arises with a proposal like this is: What kind of public involvement do we need to develop an action plan? This plan for the Klamath may require detailed NEPA compliance with opportunities for public involvement.

The proposed schedule calls for a 7-month period during which action planning would occur. The work would be done in-house by FWS staff and TWG members.

The cost estimate in this proposal has a wide confidence interval.

Every group involved needs to come up with a long-term plan and share these all around. Then, every member group could sign a MOU or MOA saying what they intend to do to carry out the 3 year action plan. This is compatible with the long-term planning process. Whether these MOU's would have a legal force if signators did not carry out their part of the agreement does not seem reasonable.

Discussion:

- o Odemar: I feel very strongly that we need to get into more of an action planning mode. The restoration process really needs to have a clear and specific "information needs plan" that identifies the agencies that need to do work, and how they would be funded. We need to identify multi-year projects and clearly head off with a road map of where we are going with our restoration work. I would like to find out ahead of time which agencies are doing what.
- o Bingham: Does the chairman of the TWG have any comments on this process.
- o Franklin: This is one of several assignments that we (the TWG) will be working on. At the beginning of the TWG meeting, we discussed how best to get the most important work done. We need to really know which are the most important areas and the best methods of getting things done. The Trinity's plan isn't necessarily a cure-all, we are still having problems now. For example, the money for Grass Valley dam could have been used to purchase the watershed instead of having one expensive band-aid.

The TWG is willing to do this. The problem is with having the TWG members free up enough time, it is becoming a half-time job as it is.

- o Odegar: Referring to the marked up workplan. We need an "information needs survey". The nominal group technique, used by Mackett, is an excellent technique for helping us determine who can do what, and how much it costs. If we do nothing else, I suggest that we develop an information needs survey.
- o Hillman: Action planning seems like a good direction to get into. The long-term MOU's and agreements between agencies and tribes should be pursued.

Shake: It sounds like we need long-term action planning. Now we need to decide how we will go about this.

- o Odegar: My concerns are more basic than where we are going on a long-term policy. The Pine Cr example is a logical progression of work, but we could get so bogged down by the immensity of the problem before us that it may not work. I felt uneasy from the very beginning, when we were developing a policy plan. How does a group such as this make policy level changes. There are things that we, as a group, are doing every year, that we are not sure we should be doing.
- o Shake: Doesn't this process do this? Wouldn't the information gathering be one of the products that is delivered?
- o Odegar: Perhaps. We need to identify particular watersheds that have problems and prioritize work in those areas.
- o Bingham: Clearly, \$1,000,000 / year is not enough. How do we take our large vision of what we want to get done in the Klamath Basin and narrow it down to something that can be done within budget?
- o Farro: Staff developed some Scope of Works to be put into the ranking process. Their efforts were based on plan policies but were not well received. Maybe in the future the Scope of Works produced by staff will be better understood. The TWG is already busy, it is hard to ask them to give more of their time.
- o Sumner: I can envision that this thing could swell up and get as large as the original plan, although I would like to see the work done. I would like to recommend that we keep it as simple as we can.
- o Barnes: Agency commitment is essential for 20-30 work days. Before we go ahead on this, we need to get the agencies to commit.

Other comments

Bill Mendenhall, DWR: We already have the tools to do this type of planning. IFIM is a powerful tool that could help. Many times it is misunderstood.

Pat Higgins: As we get more and more detailed, the TWG is forced to check with local groups to coordinate efforts.

Bob Rohde, ERA: We have satellite shots that will identify all the current projects that have been done to date. These can be used as a management tool to envision what needs to be done. This would give a clear overview of the basin with background information that will help the TF decide and focus on priorities. Our work will provide recommendations on work that needs to be done. I would like to give you an update on what we have produced to date.

Iverson: I don't think this Scope of Work (PA-1) is appropriate for deciding how to spend \$1 million/year. This action plan needs to incorporate all the little pieces that many groups are working on.

Odemar: CDFG is getting more into GIS. We have a committee identifying what we need.

Pierce: Didn't we hear Mackett say that his system for using nominal group technique is now portable? If so, this might be a good program to use.

Odemar: I have been involved in 2 separate processes that Mackett has facilitated. They were both successful. I suggest that we consider using this technique. I imagine it will be much easier than when we went through the process with the council. The product would be a large chart with the information needs identified.

Once the chart is set up, it will help to easily identify gaps that need action. For example, if we see that CDFG should do something, but they can't, we could find out which other agency would take the responsibility.?

Sumner: We need direction. Once priorities are set, the work should be set up and done.

Shake: I agree with you, but perhaps we could use the same system with several categories.

Iverson: The trouble is that a lot of these policies are things that should have been done for the last 20 years. We should use the sophisticated planning techniques that Mel suggests.

Wilkinson: We should discuss our needs with Mackett. Maybe he can help.

Pierce: The first day of the process could be to sort the action items into short term and long term.

After listening to the discussion and looking at Ron's proposal, I suggest that we incorporate the nominal group technique and incorporate both a short and long priority list into one action plan. We would have 2 items: 1 longer term list, and 1 nuts and bolts list.

Gathering information, raising fish, and habitat restoration are 3 areas that are nuts and bolts. There is a basic necessity to do these things.

**** Motion ****

Shake: I make a motion that we use this proposal with the understanding that we use Dave Mackett's skills (as available) and look for both a short term and long term policy breakdown in a draft 3 year action plan.

We will need a single purpose meeting to start on this process. The meeting will be open to all TF and TWG members.

Hearing no objections, let's go ahead and do this.

**** Action Item ****

LUNCH

Report of the TWG

Franklin: We met in Hoopa on June 4, 5. We used the same criteria as last year. The TWG did not assign bonus points. The scores from each member were averaged onto the workplan before you. Some issues that the TWG struggled with were the ability of proponents to be present to answer questions, and time frame restrictions for reviewing proposals.

Three specific proposals that need to be highlighted include:

A) Fall Creek Hatchery: The contribution of fish from Fall Creek hatchery is very high, but funding remains an issue. Prop 70 cannot fund operation and maintenance of any form, i.e. the money is not available to feed fish.

The mitigation goal for number of adults that reach Iron Gate may not be violated by taking some of the fish that would have otherwise been raised at the hatchery, raising them at Fall Creek and producing a higher quality fish. There may not be impediments to doing this type of work.

Q: If Fall Creek hatchery could provide fish as a mitigation goal, then why can't Pacific Power and Light pay for running the hatchery?

A: At this point they have not agreed to partially fund this. We would need to sit down with PP&L to find out what the costs would be.

Last year, fish were released prior to being yearlings at Iron Gate, this was due to a hiring freeze. This is the first time that Fall Ck is being considered to raise fish other than excess eggs. This could be 180,000 yearlings raised at Fall Ck as mitigation rather than surplus egg raising.

B) The Horse Ck diversion is a substantial barrier to fish migration that remains from year to year. This impediment to fish passage hasn't been significant enough to get taken care of through the 1603 process. The TWG does not want to buy a diversion, so they asked the TWG to ask the TF to write a letter to CDFG. CDFG has an agreement with the landowner.

Bingham: The 1603 permit says that fish migration can occur after the first high water washes the material out. Supposedly, this satisfies the migration barrier problem. This means that there are 2 problems: fish migration and fill-dirt/materials in the stream.

Farro: I suggest that a letter be sent to a local law enforcement captain with a copy to Banky Curtis on this matter.

Franklin: Bird felt that this could be effectively taken care of by following the appropriate routes in CDFG.

Odemar: I could take this concern up through the routes in CDFG.

Shake: Ron will work with Bob to prepare a draft.

C) IFIM proposals from DWR: HP-9 and HP-10

A likely source of funding for such studies might exist through BIA.

Robinson: BIA has responded to the tribes requests, we have started to collect information to keep water in the main stem river, and we are collecting info. The TF can still collect more info if they want.

Mendenhall: We propose to investigate the amount of water that is needed in the Scott River. We are also willing to seek further funding from other sources.

Report from the Budget Committee

Bingham: The budget committee met on Thursday, June 6. They first awarded either 10 (clearly employing targeted groups), 5 (possible employment of targeted groups) and 0 (not employing targeted groups). The ranked list was then budgeted. The two budget levels projected reflect the range of possibilities (Attachment 8). The budget levels were determined by trying to get the same levels of ranking scores across the categories. "Low" budget is a scenario based on the expectation that the Program Administration costs come from the \$1 million. \$737,000 in projects is proposed. The "high" budget assumes that the Regional Office will pick up the costs of operating the Klamath River Fisheries Resource Office (KRFRO).

Odemar: In a couple of the categories, there are several proposals that may be funded by the state. We still do not know how much the state will be funding. I am confident that the state will be picking up some of the costs.

Orcutt: Why is the high and low budget line in the same place in some categories?

Odemar: We tried to reach a level that fit at an obvious break in the rankings. The lines were based purely on the numeric ranking of the proposals.

Description of state and federal funds available

Odemar: There are 4 sources of money available to us for restoration.

1) Prop 19 Wildlife Conservation Board funding only goes to public agencies.

2) Prop 99 is from the tax on tobacco products. The actual amount available out of \$650,000 will be determined after legislation sets the budget. Funding is for habitat restoration, not fish production.

3) Prop 70 is the bond act for salmon and steelhead restoration. This money is granted through the Calif. Advisory Committee on Salmon and Steelhead Trout.

4) Salmon stamp money is for chinook or coho. CDFG has no control over this money (Nat serves on this committee). The committee pays for some education work, and some rearing projects (e.g., Horse Lentil Ck).

Prop 70 and Salmon Stamp recommendations will be made later this week.

At the beginning of each year CDFG requests proposals. Evaluation of proposals is immediately made. No studies are funded.

So the proposals that are noted as being submitted to CDFG on the workplan are in the state process.

Many funding sources are stating that say fish enhancement cannot be done unless habitat restoration is also done.

Discussion:

Pierce:

- o There are still some sticky situations regarding some of the rearing proposals. In the past many of these were funded with CDFG funds. Now, these can't be funded with Prop 99 money because they are not tied with restoration,
- o Because prop 70 will not fund projects for operations or maintenance. Therefore these proposals cannot be funded. This might be a chance to completely change the funding for these projects.

Q: What's the deal with steelhead programs not being able to be funded by the state?

A: Odemar: I don't know anything about that. The issue of rescuing fish that may later be superimposed on others still exists.

Q: How does the budget apply the process you described to the projects on page 11?

A: It doesn't. We ran out of time to make recommendations on this category. The whole question of who pays for program administration needs to be settled.

Hillman: This category should be inclusive of the entire budget for running the Yreka office.

Bingham: We are interested in seeing how much the council costs. How much travel costs, etc. Next year we would like to get this information along with everything else.

Grover: As recently as last week, we saw that the \$1 million for the Klamath River Fishery Restoration Program was in the President's budget. So far, the Klamath is still in. The one item that did not go anywhere this year is the Congressional add-on for the costs for Program Administration.

The Federal Advisory Committee Act requires that the TF and MC memberships are renewed every 2 years. This act also lays out our responsibilities to recommend projects and coordinate groups. The TF and MC act in an advisory

capacity to the FWS, although, unless there is sufficient justification to act otherwise, FWS will take the TF recommendation as a package. The ultimate decision for funding is made by the DOI.

Funding Procedures

Introduction: Mike Bowen from USFWS contracting is with us today. Mike Bowen is the designated contracting officer for the Klamath Fishery Restoration Program.

Bowen:

- o Earlier this year, I asked Ron to develop procedures that would smoothly run these proposals through the funding process.
- o We have a whole different set of guidelines for the different entities that we deal with. I am concerned how we can do everything possible to insure that we have a record of impartiality in choosing which proposals are funded. One comment that needs to be addressed is that project proponents supported their proposals. People that were doing the evaluation should not have any interest in the results (personal or economic).
- o I tried to bring in the step of an in-house evaluation team to establish impartiality. The final decision has to be made (required by law) by an in-house technical review group (FWS). It is illegal to have an advisory committee make these decisions.
- o I have concerns: protection of the group, (we need to look clean), protection of the process.

Discussion

Franklin: There seemed to be confusion within the TWG over the criteria to be used to rank proposals. Many members felt that the criteria should have been published with the request for proposals so that the proposers could have seen what they were going to be judged on.

Q: Can state funded program's be considered a state match?

A: The determination would need to be made by the service after hearing input from the Task Force. We are publishing a rule of what contributes in-kind contributions, etc.

Q: Hillman: If the FWS has the final word, then I need clarification. Who is the service that will be making the final recommendations?

A: Bowen: Procedurally, after the work plan is agreed upon, the contracting delegate (Shake) signs the agreement. In the future, I recommend that the TWG and an internal panel both review the proposals at the same time.

Shake: When the TWG meets to review the proposals, FWS representation should also be available, i.e. an internal technical review panel. This throws out the first step as a separate step. The final result would be the same.

Q: Could we get some advice on how to deal with the conflict of interest issue?

A: It is very difficult to give the appearance of not having conflict of interest. For this group, there is not sufficient expertise to make decisions on contracts without using the people involved.

Bowen:

- o If the government decides to do something in-house then it is done. If the government decides to go outside, then they contract out to a neutral party.
- o The statute rules over any other rules. Because PL99-552 does not specifically name who the money is to go to, then the TF consults and recommends. Ultimately, the decision is made by FWS. When it is federal money, it is spent by federal employees.

Shake: Here's an example-- the PFMC makes their recommendation to the Secretary of Commerce. Usually the Secretary takes the PFMC's recommendation. If he doesn't, he better have a very good reason.

Hillman: I agree in concept. But, I don't like finding out that some projects were not accepted prior to understanding why they weren't accepted.

Shake: I apologize. We have amended our error and we have a new suggested process that would take care of this. The new process would insure that there were 3-4 federal people on the initial review committee.

Q: Where do Indian Tribes fit in?

A: They are treated as state or local governments.

Bingham: I think this proposed idea is a good one.

Break

Public Comment

Public Comment #1) Dan Ferrera CCC, Del Norte County

The proposals that are listed on page 9 (Attachment 8) should have been listed as 5 separate proposals. Tarup Creek, Bluff Creek, Red Cap Creek etc. These are not the second generation of proposals that the CDFG requested. These proposals were to go with proposals from USFS. HR-27 has multiple streams in it. The 2nd generation proposals broke this into 24 projects of which 5 should have come to the TWG.

It would be helpful to us if we could get feedback on what we didn't do that was needed in order to write better proposals next year. This is the third year that we have submitted proposals and haven't been funded. We need to have feedback in order to improve.

Odemar: Last year, we received a very expensive proposal that did not provide a clear explanation of what the money would go toward. Later, that proposal was re-submitted to CDFG for about \$50,000 and funded.

Bingham: The technical work group (TWG) or budget subcommittee could look into providing feedback to proposers.

Franklin: I am concerned about the potential workload this feedback would present. 100 proposals this year, perhaps 300 proposals next year.

Q: How do we maintain confidentiality?

A: We only need to go through this process with the proposers who request it. You could go through the criteria with the proposer.

Shake: Ron Iverson will get you in touch with the correct person to get feedback on your proposals.

Public Comment #2) Dianne Higgins:

I am concerned about the low ranking that the curriculum development Scope of Work received. Last year, the curriculum development proposal that I'd written received a very high ranking, later I wrote a proposal and received funding. I would have submitted a proposal if I could have known this Scope of Work would have ranked so low.

Discussion

Q: How would you feel about using your program as an umbrella to hold some of the smaller projects that are related?

A: Fine. It is specifically stated in my contract that I encourage teachers to apply for funding. If I served an umbrella function for these smaller proposals, then I feel I would be fulfilling this need.

Hillman: I attended the first day's discussion at the TWG, and I feel that there is some confusion or frustration in regards to the overall direction of the education program. The confusion is created by the variety of proposals that are received and what the role is of the Public Communications position at the office. I have expressed my feelings before that our education component is running in a lot of different directions and I feel that no one knows who is doing what.

Wilkinson: As I said earlier this morning, many students are being reached with a measurable amount of educational materials on salmon and steelhead. From my perspective, we now need to set aside money now for programs, such as videos, down the road.

Iverson: It is likely that there is enough money remaining in the FY91 budget to fund at least \$50,000 worth of 9-12 curriculum development.

Public Comment #3) Pat Higgins

The proposal I submitted is to share information about riparian restoration with farmers and ranchers in the Yreka area. This would also help to inform people who wish to be volunteers. I don't understand why this was ranked so low, when it has so many benefits. This money would have covered the admission costs so farmers could have attended free of admission.

Discussion

Sumner: On June 13 the Shasta Valley Coordinated Resource Management Plan (CRMP) had a meeting and decided to do this workshop on its own.

Q: Farro: Why do we move things around in the workplan after the TWG spent a lot of time ranking the projects in it?

A: We shouldn't. If they are below the line, then they are below the line. We can accept comments from the proposers regarding their proposals.

Public Comment #4) Ronnie Pierce

I do not have a proposal, I have a one-time request from the local tribes and rancherias. The Native American Fish and Wildlife Society has chosen Eureka

as its location for a mid-Pacific Regional conference. We will be requesting funds from other agencies. I would like to ask for a one-time contribution of \$1,000. The conference is scheduled for October 22, 23, 24. This Society is affiliated with the National Fish and Wildlife Society, so tribal speakers will be brought into the area.

Thackeray: I don't think this conference is related to fish restoration.

Pierce/Orcutt: This type of activity is called for in the long-range plan and the Act.

Whitehouse: In fiscal year 1990 the California Salmon, Steelhead and Trout Restoration Federation Conference (CSSTRF) received \$1,500 from the Task Force for its conference on fish and habitat restoration.

Public Comment #5) Bill Mendenhall

First, I would like to congratulate the TWG for running a smooth ship. It would be a real help to proposers/us to be able to see the Action Plan in April. Also, I would like to see an engineer represented on the TF.

More on the education category funding levels

Iverson: Every month, we update our projection of remaining funds for the year. Right now we are \$40,000 in the black. I would estimate that we should end up with \$50,000.

Q: Why was an Education item the one item that was deferred from FY91 to FY92?

A: At the March meeting, we asked to defer one project because we saw our whole budget running into the red. Now we have more confidence that we will have money available.

Odemar: This is an ongoing program. I propose that ongoing programs are continued even though they fall below the line. It makes no sense to drop out a continuing project. Couldn't we at least fund it out of FY91, then fund the balance out of FY92?

Iverson: I believe we can fund the whole curriculum out of 91 funds.

Bowen: We shouldn't be requesting proposals, then sending them out for competitive bid. Now we are in the position of going out competitively for an extension to a contract that we could have just added on as an amendment. We could write a sole-source justification, the amount could be negotiated. Then the statement of work could be revised.

Once the curriculum is developed and in use, then there could be some continuation of funding for support.

Q: Who is it that really determines if you could go into Siskiyou Co Schools for example, and teach a subject that may be controversial? (Thackeray)

A: The teacher has the responsibility to balance the subject matter in the classroom. (Higgins)

Q: Would it be appropriate that all this material be presented to the Supervisor of Siskiyou County Schools? (Thackeray)

A; I have been working with Brian Swagerty at the Siskiyou County Office of Education who is the county's science coordinator. I do not see a reason to get further review. (Higgins)

Thackeray: Last night, I saw an advertisement that said not to burn fossil fuels because it is adding to the greenhouse effect. I'm worried that we are bending the minds of young people too much.

Orcutt: We are trying to get the environmental education materials out there so that kids are informed to make their own decisions.

The 4-6 grade curriculum is available for Task Force members to have a copy.

**** Motion ****

Amend the existing contract to use \$50,000, out of FY91 funds, to begin to develop the curriculum for grades 9-12.

Discussion

Orcutt: The same 91 funds could be used to fund the video.

Shake: We made a policy decision this morning to have 1 video, that not only covered Yurok interests, but was more encompassing of the entire restoration program. The Education subcommittee could develop the scope of work/plan for communication efforts.

Lara: I'm not going to say anything, but if I did say anything, I would say that you just did things (moving funding around) that were just opposite to what you said could happen.

Shake: We are re-funding what we already decided to do last June.

Hearing no objection, we will go ahead and direct KRFRO staff to complete a contract amendment.

**** Action ****

Q: On proposal E-12, who owns the computer if it is bought for the school? (Sumner)

A: The government owns it, but after the agreement is over a decision can be made to give the computer to the school (Bowen).

Notes on Federal funding processes

Q: If a video was produced for the public benefit by a non-profit organization, would that video project have to go out for competitive bid?

A: (Bowen): the government attempts to "compete" any project that is over \$25,000. There are different "levels of burden" so even if it is \$15,000 it is may be expected to go out competitively.

There is a way to sole-source a project because of a certain amount of expertise. Although, the guidance is to "compete" it wherever we can.

Meeting adjourned.

June 19, 1991

Shake: Yesterday when we adjourned I asked you to consider:

- 1) the funding levels between the categories in the marked up work plan and
- 2) Mel's concern that we had put some on-going projects below the line.

Let's start by looking at the split between the categories.

Discussion:

- o The Education funding level is below what it should be.
- o The Habitat Protection Category is important and should have more money in it. Habitat Protection (the dirt flinging type of work) should be done before other types of projects are funded.
- o FP-11 and FP-12 are both studies on green sturgeon. Could these studies be coordinated to prevent overhanding? A: Yes, hopefully. One study looks at early life history, one tags adults. The TWG realized that there may be some overlap and therefore some possible budget reductions.
- o Shake: At least for now the mix seems appropriate.
- o Bingham: Note that the Program Administration category hasn't been addressed. I would have liked to have seen the break-down of where the \$405,000 is going. I don't think we should just take all those activities for granted.
- o Sumner: The Program Administration Category is now \$431,000 based on the \$26,000 that we added yesterday.
- o Shake: We received a letter from Trout Unlimited. They made an error in the budgets for their proposals. Their costs should be reduced by 20%.
- o Alcorn: Proposals from Trout Unlimited (HR-1,2,3) are on page 9 of the workplan. All these proposals ranked at the very bottom of the list.
- o Sumner: The water supply in Humbug Ck is a good water source that supports a lot of fish. This work has been turned down twice, in the future we should pay attention to it.

Iverson: The breakdown of the \$405k needed for Program Administration includes the following estimations for FY92:

\$200,000 for 5 staff positions,
\$4,000 for training,
\$55,000 for travel,
\$30,000 for operations (utilities, vehicles, printing etc),
\$9,000 for space rental,
\$19,000 for supplies (rental of conference rooms, federal register notices),
\$8,000 for capitalized property (software, office furniture), and
\$80,000 for Regional Office overhead (8%).

Orcutt: What is the breakdown of the cost for KFMC functions?

Iverson: The KFMC is a very expensive outfit. We estimate that costs will be in the neighborhood of \$80,000 - \$90,000 (this does not include KRFRO staff time). The budget I just showed you estimates only \$24,000 for their travel

this year (last year it was \$41,000). Every year has been more expensive than the previous year for federal advisory committee support.

Shake: There are a number of items in the workplan that have been submitted to CDFG. Hopefully the \$170,000 that we are over will be covered by CDFG funding. At the next meeting, we may be able to add a few more projects to fill in any extra money that becomes available.

Orcutt: We want to request that tribal representatives sit in with federal and state representatives when they meet to talk about budgeting. The tribes have money available too, and maybe they could contribute.

Odemar: Certainly, we will involve anyone who desires in the discussions.

Shake: Now, let's go through the workplan category by category.

Workplan Category: Education

Wilkinson: Delete E-3 and E-12 and insert E-6 (at 17,500). This will assume that Dianne Higgins could give part of her budget to the teachers for E-3 and E-12. Approximately \$50,000 of '91 money will be used, \$17,000 will come out of '92.

\$15,000 becomes available because the Yurok video will not be funded.

Total with revisions \$23,690.

Some of the workshops could be really valuable. For example, the conference on DG in the Scott River could be very beneficial to the restoration program.

Thackeray: I hope we don't sit here today and haggle over everything below the line.

Q: Why didn't the NAFWS conference go through the formal proposal process?

A: Because CSSTRF used this method (of presenting the information verbally before the Task Force) a few years ago.

Bowen: We don't want to bring proposals-for-funding up in this discussion. They should be considered separately.

Shake: We will postpone discussion of funding this conference.

Thackeray: Let's set guidelines not to consider minor requests for funding in the future.

Wilkinson: I feel that these minor requests for funding will occur throughout the year, and should be considered at a funding meeting.

Farro: I don't think we should fund administrative costs for conference organizers.

Proposal E-13:

Thackeray: I have some problems with item 4 in the proposal, regarding distrust of agencies. It seems to me that these people want to wear the badge. I have some problems with these people acting as a police force.

Q: Is this conclusion that you've reached an assumption, or is it from reading their proposal? (Hillman)

A: My concern comes from reading their proposal. I believe that they can do some work among their own people, but I don't like the idea of them acting as a police force.

Orcutt: I imagine that this is a situation where there is a very large area to cover and only one warden. Poaching is a problem, I think it is critical to have people watching people and providing educational opportunities.

Sumner: I think George's concern is having poachers watching poachers.

Wilkinson: I want to speak in favor of dropping E-13, we should tread very softly in regards to poaching prevention. In the Oregon program, this type of activity is successful. The strategy should be for The TF to write a letter to CDFG, and ask for their support.

Odemar: This is the most remote corner of the state and we are not adequately staffed to provide enough coverage for this area.

Hillman: In regards to the two approaches taken by these 2 separate approaches: the strong-arm approach of FP-10, or the grassroots approach of E-13. People that are familiar with that area will tell you that game wardens (FP-10) can not get at the heart of the problem for several reasons. The stocks in that area are critical. People are unaware of the problems and concerns of fish in that area. The proposal does not call for arresting people, it calls for educating people. The local folks in this proposal can do a good job educating other local folks.

Bingham: I would like to speak in defense of this proposal as well. I heard the discussions at the TWG and I understand now the local person's perspective that the fish they see in the pools may represent 1/4 of the run in the basin and that run is endangered. One person attending one meeting can get the message about the critical nature of stocks out to many others and can be really helpful. If this program can turn one poacher around, it will be worth it.

Odemar: The people that are doing this educational program may actually be part of the problem. The department does not support this proposal.

Orcutt: This is a small amount of money for a good cause.

Vote:

For deleting from the workplan-- Wilkinson, Thackeray, Sumner, Odemar.
Keep in workplan-- Orcutt, Farro, Bingham, Shake, Hillman, McInnis.

** Proposal E-13 is funded under the current workplan until a consensus takes it out.

We have a set of recommendations from both the TWG and the budget committee and we don't take projects out unless there is a consensus for doing so.

Odemar: We need to contact the Klamath Forest Alliance (KFA) and make sure that their actions do not exclude the agencies that have authority in the area.

Thackeray: We need to let the agency know that we will be working with them.

Robinson: I was present at the TWG meeting where this proposal was discussed. Would it be helpful to hear further information from a TWG representative?

A: No.

Workplan Category: Fish Protection

Proposal FP-14:

Sumner: My representative on the TWG brought up the fact that some of this information is already available.

Proposal FP-11 and FP-3:

**** Motion ****

Lara: These projects should be coordinated to eliminate overlap.

Farro: This is the first time that green sturgeon have been brought up. Is this the direction that we want to be headed?

Orcutt: Research on green sturgeon, a species of critical concern to the tribes, shows that there is a real lack of information on health and life history of this species. There is no management plan for green sturgeon.

Odemar: I feel very uncomfortable about going ahead into new areas of information gathering. I would not support getting into new information gathering on green sturgeon until later. I am not sure that these studies will gather information in the right order. Ongoing research programs should not be dropped unless there is information leading to it. Proposals FP-2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, and 15 are supported. I do not support FP-3, 8, 11, or 14.

Orcutt: The TWG discussed and justified the reasons for including work on green sturgeon.

Lara: I support the work on green sturgeon. I think we should fund the work then discuss the specific tasks that should be done.

Shake: The Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC) is developing a white sturgeon management plan for the coast. Tom Kisanuki (USFWS - CCFRO, Arcata) is heading this group. Perhaps we should put a technical group together to draft a proposal and write a plan for funding projects for green sturgeon (Mike would chair). Work would progress after that, probably next year.

I support Mel's recommendation for dropping out 3 projects, then moving up 3 others.

Hillman: How long can we wait to collect information? Is there a way to keep the money available to develop a coordinated effort for this year?

Shake: We should wait until after the PSMFC group makes a recommendation.

Orcutt: Could we have this work on the green sturgeon considered for state funding?

Odemar: There are no state funds available for this type of work. It could go into the funding process for next year. This is a brand new effort, let's make sure we are doing it properly. I don't see where there will be any critical time lost if we wait until fy93.

McInnis: One of the driving forces in giving extra scrutiny to these proposals is because there are some ongoing projects that are below the cut-off line.

Bingham: When the TWG ranked these proposals, they had no idea where the lines were going to fall. Perhaps this was a mistake. It appears that we may have a stock of fish that is in real trouble, but we don't have enough information to make a decision.

Farro: We should deal with this issue of ongoing projects in a better way. We should hear reports on these projects prior to making funding decisions.

Orcutt: Coordination is key to the success of many of these projects.

Odemar: Commitment to funding research really can't be done on a yearly basis. If we are going to spend any money for research, we should first have our informational needs survey complete. This is a problem with the system that we need to correct. Green sturgeon need research.

Break

Reconvene

Proposal FP-6:

Seining juvenile salmonids from the lower Klamath is a highly variable information source. This work was part of the 5 year program that was desired by the KFMC and TF in past years. I understand the processes of the budget and TWG committees, but we need a process to grandfather these types of projects.

Orcutt: What do these studies provide? Migration timing, species identification, composition? And, was there any consideration regarding how many times these fish are being handled and what the effects of this multiple handling are? On the Trinity River side, the fish are handled extensively, which could be detrimental to their well-being.

Franklin: At the TWG meeting, there was discussion on the issue of repeatedly handling fish. I don't recall whether the discussion of prior funding occurred. There was consensus in the TWG that these types of monitoring projects had diminishing returns and value as they went on. For this reason, these types of projects may have been rated lower.

Pierce: These are ongoing studies (FP-6 and FP-2). This work (FP-6) is part of the long-term monitoring program the USFWS put in place. Survival rates are correlated with ocean stock abundances as a methodology, as opposed to the jack count methodology.

Orcutt: I'd like to announce that the National Ecological Research Center in Colorado is trying to make a fish production model using data already collected, related to outmigrant data and IFIM on the Trinity River system. Their work will model outmigrant production past Junction City. If we want to see further studies like this, then we should support collection of data.

Odemar: After discussion with Mike Orcutt, I feel I can support the green sturgeon proposal by HVTC, and would encourage dropping out USFWS-CCFRO's proposal on sturgeon, because the tribe has the best people to work with the local tribal fishermen. Paul Hubbell (CDFG) tells me his group is collecting similar data that FP-6 (USFWS) is gathering. Maybe this is the time to coordinate activities.

Orcutt: HVTC offers to take the lead and involve concerned parties in this research. Blue Cr. is the most important lower KR tributary. We can support these, but I suggest that we not continue funding proposals based on critical budgeting needs of CDFG.

Shake: Is there Salmon Stamp money available?

Bingham: I wouldn't be able to commit any money right now. The industry has said that they are not willing to commit funding to the Klamath River basin until harvest issues are settled.

**** Motion ****

Odemar: I suggest that we include FP-5, 11, 7, 1 year of 12 (\$17,000), and FP-15, 2, and 16. This action would delete FP-3, and 8, giving us a total of \$182,407 for the category.

I also agree with Mike that to fund maintenance of screens because of budget crunches and critical necessities, is not the way to fund projects.

Orcutt: I suggest putting FP-15 into the appropriate category, which would be category HR.

Farro: We are renewing some projects, without seeing the validity of the expenditure.

Shake: We don't have enough information yet, because we have not yet studied a full brood year.

FP-8

Q: Why is this proposal ranked so high?

A: Franklin: the problem that this proposal addresses is differentiating juveniles. We don't know if the juveniles of different species utilize different habitats or outmigrant timing. This proposal addresses the problem of identifying juveniles in the river.

Odemar: We don't want to get into the area of funding research that includes methods that may not work.

Orcutt: This information would be valuable.

Franklin: They describe this as prototype research. Matching funds account for approximately \$38,000.

**** Motion ****

Delete FP-3. Leave FP-2 and FP-16 on the table for discussion.

Hearing no objection, these changes will be made.

**** Action item ****

Discussion:

Other projects will stay below the line.

In the future, we need to do a better job of deciding what we get locked into. Just because we agree with something one year doesn't mean that we should automatically fund it every year.

**** Motion ****

Fund FP-12 as a 3 year study (\$49,000 total for 3 years), with the understanding that \$25,000 would be funded again next year.

Discussion

Q: Mike, can we do this?

A: We could do this in 2 ways: 1) we could lock in the total amount of funding (\$49,000) with the understanding that 1 task per year would be completed for the next three years, or 2) we could re-evaluate the project yearly.

Farro: I have a concern with cost-effectiveness. Groups that were awarded 10 points may have proposals that show up better than they were ranked based on their cost effectiveness.

Orcutt: Was there a concern about the cost-effectiveness of our projects? You will not find cheaper work done anywhere.

Hearing no objection, the motion passes.

**** Action item ****

Proposal FP-8

**** Motion ****

Remove FP-8 from the funded list.

Discussion

Bingham: There seems to be a lot of bang-for-the-buck in this proposal. It appears that this lab would do most of the work with the result of gaining some really solid information. I understand that the state wants to stick with their method of GSI, but this method may be better down the line and it is much needed information on a critical watershed. This would help identify information that we need. I support this proposal and I don't want it removed from the workplan.

Sumner: Even though the idea is worthy, the costs may be more expensive than identified.

Odemar: Before developing a tool, we need to identify the types of information that is needed. I am not convinced that the inability to differentiate between spring and fall chinook is that big of a problem. I don't like the process that we are using to develop a research tool.

Bingham: It looks to me like they are developing a tool that is already proven.

Orcutt: Species differentiation is a problem on the Trinity. It is definitely a needed tool.

Shake: We are talking about doing this on the Salmon River, where every fish on the river is a fish of concern.

Franklin: The information will be collected using spawned out adults and 200 sacrificed juveniles.

Consensus was not reached, so the proposal stays in the workplan.

Workplan Category: Fish Restoration

Proposal FR-6

McInnis: We have money identified for the mid-Klamath, but we don't know if we have eggs.

Odemar: In some cases, this program (offsite rearing of IGH stocks) is contrary to the policies in the long-range plan.

Hillman: The Camp Creek element of this project is supported by local native stocks from Camp Creek. I strongly support this element of the program.

Odemar: We certainly should support the Camp Ck element. But this may be the appropriate time to get out of raising surplus stocks.

Hillman: Since you are familiar with the mid-Klamath Program, maybe you can provide guidance to move this program more into using locally adapted stocks.

Odemar: Yes, I suggest weaning this program into using locally adapted stocks.

Hillman: Trapping efforts on Red Cap Creek were initiated last year, and this program could be easily adapted to use stocks from that creek as well.

Q: When you take fish from separate streams to rear them, do you return them to the respective streams when the young are released?

A: In the past this wasn't a problem, because the fish were from Iron Gate. Now native stocks are caught, reared and released at Camp Ck. The other

element is the rearing ponds which raise IGH stocks. A percentage of the hatchery releases are marked. Camp Ck has marked the entire release.

Shake: We should mark all the native fish so we can evaluate returns. The Snake River stocks are being utilized in a similar manner, and there are a lot of concerns.

Jerry Barnes: 70,000 Iron Gate Hatchery fish have been raised yearly at Red Cap Creek for the past 5 years. Bluff Ck only had 60 fish return last year. We are trying to restore a naturally spawning population. We hope a naturally reproducing stock will re-establish itself.

Orcutt: I have a question about the Orleans Rod and Gun Club rearing fish at Perch Ck? Where are they released?

Hillman: The stocks are released back into the location where they were trapped. This is a real grassroots operation.

The proposals include decision points to cut-off funding if eggs are not available. If that occurs, the funding will be modified.

Proposal FR-5

This proposal is for rearing fish on the Salmon River using an abandoned Salmon Stamp facility. If we support this group, they may provide a good option as a location for us to raise spring chinook.

Proposal FR-2

Is this \$25,000 to capture 60 fish?

Pierce: Yes. FR-2 goes with FR-9.

Franklin: The TWG recognized that this proposal was an expensive item. This proposal is "pricey" when viewed in comparison with other projects.

Orcutt: We also capture fish with gillnets and we find it is a very expensive item.

Farro: I am pretty familiar with the costs involved in trapping and rearing fish because I have been involved with a lot of projects like these. I still see these proposals (FR-2 and FR-9) as asking for a lot of money. The proposal right below FR-9 shows a lot of volunteer effort (FR-1, Orleans Rod and Gun Club).

Shake: We want to move away from rearing fish until we have good habitats for these fish to return to.

Bingham: I think it is appropriate that we are spending a large part of our budget on fish rearing. It addresses the immediate problem of needing fish out there now.

Farro: I am still concerned that these are some pretty expensive rearing programs. Other folks around the state may complain about the cost-effectiveness of these projects, this isn't a level playing field.

Proposal FR-1

Sumner: My constituency would also like to see FR-1 raised above the line.

Mc Innis: Could they do FR-1 without doing FR-4?

Hillman: Yes, and they have been for years. This looks at the long term goals and objectives for raising local stocks. A major component of this is providing better facilities for dealing with weather conditions. Currently, the blue plastic tarps to keep the sun off and temperatures down aren't as effective as a roof would be. A roof would also prevent snow and rain from clogging the feeders.

**** Motion ****

Add FR-1 into the workplan by raising it above the line.

**** Action ****

Hearing no objections, let's raise FR-1 above the line.

Workplan Category: Habitat Protection

Proposal HP-4

Q: Why does this proposal have a zero cost? Aren't there matching costs involved? Don't we know what the in-kind costs would be?

A: The match is drawn from stream watch and restoration projects. The participation of local people would be considered as a match. This is called for in the long-range plan. Debra Caldon, consultant with Kier Associates, submitted this to EPA and SWRCB. These agencies will help fund the project. Basically, there is a 60:40 requirement for a "soft match". Many different kinds of things can be factored in: personnel costs (non-federal), volunteer value (per hour), facilities etc. It doesn't need to be activities that are strictly in the Klamath Plan.

Q: Odegar: Does the grant go to Kier Associates or the Task Force?

A: The grant goes to FWS who would disperse the funds.

The SWRCB could provide the state money (this project has already competed against other western states and has succeeded in gaining funding for water quality studies).

Caldon: Federal agencies want to make sure that there is a local level of funding for projects that are being paid for with federal dollars.

Franklin: Members of the TWG recognized that the proposal called for support from volunteer groups that had not yet been invited to participate. The TWG questioned the validity of counting volunteer availability prior to asking volunteers for their support.

Wilkinson: The KRFR0 would have to set up a process to quantify the efforts of volunteers.

Kier: Many things that are going to be done in the basin will qualify as services-in-kind. This doesn't mean new commitments, this is just quantifying the effort (addresses Bob's concern about being volunteered without asking groups first).

Franklin: I am still troubled that there are specific tasks laid out here (e.g., aquatic insect identification) that are not going to be done by volunteers.

Wilkinson: I hope that volunteers are correctly trained to help out. The Oregon program has 6,000-10,000 people involved.

Shake: What is the actual grant amount that we would get from EPA?

Kier: \$102,000. The total of \$175,000 identified in the proposal includes the value of the soft match. Then we pay USGS \$30,000 back.

Bowen: Has anyone talked to the finance center about their overhead costs?
Caldon: I believe 10% overhead is included.

**** Motion ****

Include HR-4 in the workplan.

MCInnis: What is the effect of not moving this proposal into the workplan?

Caldon: We are at the point right now, that the money will go back into the coffer and fund another type of work.

Lara: Can you summarize what this proposal would do?

Kier: The plan says that there needs to be a consistent way of keeping information on water quality and habitat inventory available over the years. This program would provide a GIS system for the Klamath River. \$30,000 would go to USGS to adapt their files for the Klamath Restoration Program. The information for each reach of the Klamath Basin could be carefully entered (# of spawners, amount of juvenile rearing habitat etc). After a few years, we would have information available that would point out areas where we need to get more information. The whole thrust of this thing is to have a system that would be maintained over the life of the program.

Odemar: We are funding a \$36,800 GIS feasibility study right now. Would this be a duplication?

No, because the USGS reach file and the GIS reach file cover different areas (upslope vs stream only).

**** Action ****

Hearing no objection, we will move this proposal above the line.

lunch

Workplan Category: Habitat Restoration

Proposal HR-8 and HR-4

**** Motion ****

**** Move HR-8 and HR-4 into the workplan. Seconded.**

Discussion:

HR-4: We should have some administrative guidelines to maintain control of these type of projects and clarify the responsible agencies. KRFRO staff could draft this up.

Q: Who would be the project leader? Ron? Tricia?

A: We would probably write a purchase order.

Bartholomew: These small grants of start-up money can be really helpful in getting community restoration groups started.

Proposal HR-23

McInnis: Is this CRMP proposal for first-year start up costs or will this activity continue?

Sumner: This is money for an overall project for this CRMP. At our last meeting, we discussed some of the needs of the CRMP. In many areas, we need someone to spend a lot of time with the landowners to get their permission to access land.

This is the proposal that Dennis Maria helped us develop.

Q: What does this proposal have to do with HP-11?

A: HP-11 was proposed to CDFG for fencing, supplies etc. Meanwhile, the CRMP got going and submitted a different proposal for funding.

Workplan Category: Program Administration

Proposal PA-3

Iverson: We need to accumulate all the information that is available on the Klamath River and have it available in an easily accessible format. Sari Sommarstrom is doing this type of thing for the Trinity Restoration Program. The project of developing a library would go out for competitive bid.

Shake: We should have the technical information for the Klamath and other restoration information available at a centralized location.

Wilkinson: Technology is changing rapidly and there should be a central updated location for it.

Mendenhall: As contractors, it would have helped us immensely to have a central location for the information that we needed.

**** Action ****

Shake: This proposal could be funded with end-of-year money from the Regional Office.

Proposal PA-2

**** Motion ****

PA-2 should be incorporated into the workplan.

Bartholomew: It sure would be helpful for the audience to be able to hear.

Thackeray: I would suggest including PA-2 with PA-3 for funding with end-of-year funds.

**** Action ****

Proposal PA-2 could be funded with end-of-year money.

Discussion

Farro: I see a lot of the budget disappearing into non-fish projects. It seems like more of these type of projects should be covered by the \$405,000 for Program Administration.

Odemar: I can see where this high overhead comes from. The expense involved in this process is very high. Think about what agencies have spent in the last 3 days just to have people here.

The \$80,000 in the RO budget is 8% of \$1 million. This money pays for Contracting, Denver Finance Center etc.

Discussion over funding procedures

Odemar: I would like to list the proposals and their ranking with the CDFG process. HR-7, 13, 15, 16 rated high. HR-9 did not rate high.

Shake: I suggest that we leave it the way it is, wait until the CDFG process goes through, then revisit a few of the proposals

Bingham: Ron, How do we usually let people know if their proposals have been funded?

I don't know how we will do it this year until after I speak with Bowen. Last year, we distributed the workplan with the lines drawn to all the people on the interested party list.

Orcutt: Some of the structures above the line (e.g., HR-11 and HR-9) could be funded by the state.

Bartholomew: that wasn't an option in the letter we received last week. I don't see coming to any negotiations on 19.

Farro: In the fish restoration category, there were many proposals that had flexible costs due to the availability of eggs. I want to get a better handle on these costs.

Shake: The proposals are based on the full number of eggs being raised at the facilities. If the number of eggs is reduced, then there will be a proportional reduction in the amount of money paid to the contractors.

Farro: Inherent in your statement is a very thorough review by the Contracting Officer, right?

Shake: The process is as follows: 1) we have to trust the folks doing the work to use only the funds necessary and returns funds to the TF, and 2) we have a staff evaluation position (Doug Alcorn) to check on the feasibility of these projects.

Orcutt: Can state money be used?

Odemar: No.

**** Motion ****

Accept the fiscal year 92 workplan as revised today.

Hearing no objections, the motion passes (Attachment 9).

(note: the Klamath Restoration Program workplan has been updated, as of early July, to clarify which proposals are being funded by the state with Prop 70 funds).

**** Action ****

Shake: I would like to compliment the TWG and Budget Subcommittee for their work at resolving issues prior to bringing them to this meeting. I think that this was good work by a lot of people.

Bingham: The conflict of interest problem still remains. We need some strong direction on this issue.

Orcutt: Overall this has been a positive experience, I am glad that the subcommittees did such good work. I still am concerned about a few things: in some cases we are dealing with a lot of red tape and I hope that this can be eliminated, the other thing is that the identification of problem areas is the key thing that we need to look for.

break

Reports on FY90 projects

Brian Cates: The work on Blue Ck was primarily completed by Joe Polos and Sandy Noble. They are unavailable today, so I will report for them.

The objectives of our work on Blue Creek were to: 1) enumerate chinook spawning in this creek, 2) enumerate juvenile outmigrants using coded wire tags (CWT), and 3) complete a habitat inventory.

Blue Creek is special because the fish from this creek are larger than fish elsewhere in the Klamath Basin. Blue Ck has been a challenge to work on because there is a lot of variability in flow levels. Part of our job is working in the creek to find out where the fish are spawning and count the redds. Coho and steelhead are also in the creek. We have found fish up to river kilometer (km) 12.5. We have also tracked fish with a radio tagging

project that captures fish with a gill net (helpful when the water becomes turbid). Internal and external tags can be used. Right now we are mapping out the distribution of these fish, 10% of the tags are found in the Klamath. So apparently, there may be some movement up and down the creek and the river. The Coast Guard has been very good at giving us helicopter time to do surveys at no cost.

We have been running a rotary screw trap. At low stage it is 80-90% efficient, at flood stages, it is not so efficient. Efficiency is determined by sampling with a complete trap and comparing numbers. This helps to give us a total estimation of fish in the creek. Juvenile outmigrants are trapped in April and May. Adults are trapped in October through December. For example, in 1989 we captured 14,000 chinook.

In order to increase the information on this natural stock we try to CWT the fish to determine where they go in the ocean. The first year 10,000 were tagged.

At river km 22 there is a barrier that could be either be a physical barrier or a velocity barrier. We are hoping to look for juveniles above it this year. The juvenile outmigrant estimate for fall chinook was 51,000.

Restoration work in the lower tributaries started in 89. We first did a cursory survey of the lower 24 tributaries. Now we have trimmed the list down to those streams that have year-round water. We make estimates based on the number of juvenile outmigrants and the number of redds.

Hunter Creek contains steelhead and some cutthroat. There are some land use problems in some watersheds, and this has affected the number of fish in the streams. Barriers include logs, boulders, and beaver dams. The Klamath affects access to these streams because it can aggrade the mouths.

Seining project

We have had a project going on for several years now, which is basically a chance to collect information on timing of migrations (hatchery vs wild). We are finding that the estuary is very important for rearing. (Brian showed slides of typical smolts found in the estuary, smolt size variations and the variations in condition of hatchery and wild fish.) Hatchery fish from IGH are smaller and not in as good condition as wild fish.

One concern is that we see spring releases from hatcheries in the upper system, yet we see very little movement of those fish out of the Klamath system until water flows come up. We believe we need to get these fish to outmigrate so there will be less competition with wild stocks.

Wilkinson: What study would you recommend to determine size, quantity, and quality of fish released from IGH?

Cates: Techniques such as marking, or studying production records to fine tune the production techniques, could be used to improve returns and limit impacts to wild fish.

Wilkinson: What strategy should we develop to cut down on interaction of hatchery and wild fish?

Cates: There may not be a lot you can do. Released hatchery fish tend to pull wild fish with them when they migrate downstream. The best thing a hatchery can do is release the fish at the precise moment when the fish are ready to smolt and move downstream.

Wilkinson: That's true, but what about when the river conditions are bad for release, so release occurs earlier to provide good river conditions?

Cates: There's a lot that can and should be done to address these problems.

Odemar: How much of a tie do you have with the natural stocks production program on the Trinity River system?

Cates: We're not always aware of what they're doing, and they're not always aware of what we're doing. This is a problem we need to address.

Alcorn: Have you estimated the seeding rate in Blue Creek?

Cates: We believe it's underseeded.

Orcutt: Is the competition you're talking about in the upper river with chinook or coho?

Cates: Chinook, primarily.

Q: Where do we go from here?

Cates: We feel there is important information to be gained from these studies. We want them to be continued. We are also going to help Scott Foott on his disease survey this year.

Farro: Since we're in year 4 of a 5 year program, I'd like to spend a little time looking at the objectives. How close are we at achieving those objectives?

Cates: Until you get large escapement numbers of adults into the system, we won't have an excellent estimate of what the system can produce. We are trying to look at the types of habitat and estimate the densities that we can expect in each type of habitat.

Farro: Do you have any indication if the broodstock take is affecting your program?

Cates: Right now, no, but in the future we may.

French Ck erosion site inventory

Bob Bartholomew of the Soil Conservation Service will report on this project that was subcontracted through Siskiyou Resource Conservation District.

The goals of this project were to locate the sources of sediment, identify Best Management Practices (BMP's) and identify sources of money to use for restoration activities.

The French Creek watershed is 20,000 acres of which 13,000 are granitic. The study was limited to granitics. We took a snapshot of the watershed, visiting granitic areas. We started doing a sediment budget, but found that setting annual rates of sediment transport would be better addressed in a several year project.

The concerned public was instrumental in getting the restoration work started. The state Board of Forestry is now using this area for further studies on mixed ownership studies of land-use problems.

900 individual sites were identified as actively eroding, these were grouped into reaches. 70 priority sites were identified by the amount of sediment and amount of water moving it. A county road had been contributing massive amounts of sediment, now the County Road Department has fixed the problem.

Several funding sources were identified but they either didn't fit the landowners or the landowners didn't want them. For example, one funding source needs the landowners to be an agricultural producer, others need a 50% match by landowners and many landowners don't want to do this.

The final report should be out by July. It is undergoing peer review.

Shasta River Water Quality Plan - Ouzel Enterprises

Bob Bartholomew reported on this agency's work.

Water quality along the Shasta River was checked at 7 sites plus 1 temperature recording site during the period of April 90-Jan91. Ouzel Enterprises tested for 14 -15 water quality parameters. Temperature and dissolved oxygen are suspected to be limiting. Temperatures reached lethal levels, although the dissolved oxygen levels never went below the lethal level of 5 mg/L.

From May - October there were only 18 days that fell within the 50-60 temperature range for salmonids. The temperature exceeded maximum temperatures for salmonids on 138 days. On 13 of those days the temperatures were greater than 80 degrees. 89.6 degrees F was the highest temperature recorded during this time period.

Dissolved oxygen levels ranged from 4.6 - 18.2 mg/L.

From where I sit, working for SCS, the majority of their recommendations don't sit well with the agricultural community. The reservoir was built by the irrigation district. The CRMP group is looking at riparian shading to help cool water.

Doug Alcorn suggested that techniques to run the water underground, or releasing water after it has cooled overnight could be useful in this situation.

The report for this study is available at the KRFRO.

Is there a USGS gaging station on the Shasta? Is all the water being adjudicated? (unanswered)

Photos from the early 40's showed about the same amount of water being used for irrigation. More fertilizers may be used now.

Q: What changes have occurred since then that have led to the fish numbers declining? The amount or quality of return water, the loss of riparian shading? This used to be the most productive tributary in the Klamath system.

A: There are more sprinklers in the Shasta Valley now. These may take water farther away from the river. The wheel lines are allowing water to be transported farther away, which gives it more chances to warm up.

Q: Did this study take in most of the salmon and steelhead habitat?

A: Yes. The Shasta seems to have water that could be used for rearing, but temperature seems to be limiting its use.

Right below Dwinnell reservoir there is no water in the river bed. Leaks along the irrigation ditch could be fixed with gunite, but the irrigation district needs to secure funds. This could allow 10 cfs to be left in the river for fish. There may be a problem with downstream right holders taking this water, but perhaps this could be addressed.

Storing water in the reservoir allows the irrigation season to be longer.

Sumner: We have not yet considered the different vegetation around the lake. Where there used to be sage around the lake, there are now a lot of homes. The homes and accompanying septic tanks could be a prime source of nutrients.

Status report of Task Force appointments

Task Force members have been appointed for: Del Norte, Siskiyou, Trinity, NMFS, and ODFW.

The Hoopa Valley Tribal Council's appointments for both the Task Force and Management Council are being processed.

California Department of Fish and Game has not yet given their recommendations to the governor.

New Business

- o Wilkinson: We need to develop a process to provide for accountability of proposers and a procedure for quantifying volunteer effort.

**** Action ****

Hearing no objections, Bill Shake asked Ron to report to the Task Force on a process for quantifying volunteer effort at the next meeting.

- o Shake: I appreciated having Mike Bowen present at this meeting. I suggest that the budget committee meet with Mike prior to the next meeting to clear up any modifications on the funding processes.
- o Odemar: We need to have a method of identifying and quantifying the non-federal match. Whose responsibility is it to do this accounting?

Sumner: we need to have a method of evaluation to assess the contribution of in-kind services.

**** Action ****

Shake: Let's ask Ron to research a process for quantifying volunteer effort.

- o Hillman: We postponed the decision regarding sponsoring the conference for NAFWS. Now is the time to address this issue.

Wilkinson: I feel that we should deal with requests of this type at the same meeting as other budget requests, but separate from the proposal process.

Farro: I would like to see something in writing about how it relates to our restoration process and how the money would be used.

Pierce: We will be having the first planning meeting next week. I assume we will have up front expenditures for advertising etc.

McInnis: We are talking about FY92 money. Is there any money available in 91?

Shake: We can probably find \$1,000.

Orcutt: The North American Fish and Wildlife Society is involved with the other local tribes. The conference will be a real eye-opener that covers water issues, NW Indian fish commission issues and sharing what different tribes are doing for restoration.

Pierce: There is no intent to spend this money to pay conference organizers.

Odemar: What bills will be paid for with this?

Pierce: I don't have that information budgeted yet.

Q: Do you have an estimate of total cost for putting this on?

A: No.

This is the first time this has ever been held in Calif. so it is difficult for us to know the total budget required.

**** Motion ****

The Task Force should fund this request.

**** Action ****

Hearing no objections, this request will be funded.

An invitation is extended to everyone to attend.

Next meeting

The next meeting will be in Brookings, Oregon on November 6 and 7.

Public Comment

Franklin: Habitat structures built by CDFG are controversial. People evaluating these structures have varying responses regarding their effectiveness. The only quick fix we have for fish restoration is accessing adequate flows for fish.

Bartholomew: Referred to article in the newsletter Stream Reach. If you think that the Forest Practices Act is not doing a good job, then get hold of the form or newsletter from the State Board of Forestry. A public comment period is now open. Public meetings are being held throughout Calif. Comments due August 1.

**** Action ****

Ron will coordinate a response from the TF on this issue.

Shake thanked TF members for a smooth meeting.

Attendance Roster, June 16-18, 1991 meeting in Eureka, California.

Task Force Members Present

Nat Bingham
Mitch Farro
Leaf Hillman
Walt Lara
Rod McInnis for Fullerton
Mel Odemar
Michael Orcutt
Bill Shake (Chair)
Dick Sumner
George Thackeray
Keith Wilkinson

Representing

California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Humboldt County
Karuk Tribe
Yurok Tribe
National Marine Fisheries Service
California Department of Fish and Game
Hoopa Indian Tribe
U.S. Department of the Interior
California In-River Sport Fishing Community
Siskiyou County
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Others Attending

Chuck Abbott
Doug Alcorn
Bob Bartholomew
Craig Bienz
Michael Bowen
Debra Caldon
Andy Colonna
Jim Cook
Dianne Higgins
Ron Iverson
Bill Kier
Bill Mendenhall
Ronnie Pierce
Gene Schnell
Terry Supahan
Tricia Whitehouse
Paula Yoon

Representing

Yurok Tribe
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. Soil Conservation Service
Klamath Tribe
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
William M. Kier Associates

Great Northern Corporation
Klamath River Educational Program
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
William M. Kier Associates
Department of Water Resources

Karuk Tribe
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Revised 6/11/91

AGENDA

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING
17-19 JUNE 1991
EUREKA, CALIFORNIA

June 17 -- Red Lion Motor Inn, 1929 4th Street, Eureka, CA.

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

1:15 Report on status of work plans for Fiscal Years 1989-91.

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

2:15 Break.

2:45 Reconvene. Task Force discussion of the upper basin plan amendment.

- o Comment on content of the plan amendment.
- o Public involvement process (Meeting content and scheduling).

3:45 Update on the status of the KFMC long-range plan (Bingham).

4:00 Update on Trinity and Klamath River flows (Don Paff, BuRec).

4:30 Public comment period.

5:00 Adjourn.

June 18

- 8:00 am Reconvene. Report on the benefits and detriments of Threatened or Endangered Species listing of Klamath River stocks (Shake).
- 8:30 Task Force discussion to appoint a panel to study the Klamath River subbasin stock identification issue.
- o Panel membership, roles and responsibilities.
 - o Panel membership nominations.
- 9:30 Report from the education subcommittee (Wilkinson).
- 9:45 Break.
- 10:15 Status report on printing/distribution of the long-range plan (Whitehouse).
- 10:30 Report on Wallop-Breaux funds application (Shake).
- 11:00 Three-year action plan proposal presentation (Iverson).
- 11:15 Report of the technical work group and budget committee: recommendations for projects to be included in the FY92 work plan (Chairpersons of the two groups).
- o Summary of procedures used to arrive at recommendations.
 - o Summary of recommended projects proposals.
 - o Rationale for recommended funding allocation among work categories.
- 12:00 Lunch
- 1:00 Reconvene. Subcommittee reports (cont.)
- 2:00 Development of FY92 work plan.
- Description of State and Federal approval and funding processes, and anticipated amounts of funds available (Mel Odemar, Jerry Grover, Mike Bowen).
- 2:45 Break
- 3:00 Reconvene. Task Force discussion of FY92 work plan.
- 4:00 Public comment period (priority given to comments on FY92 work plan recommendations).
- 5:00 Adjourn.

June 19

8:00 am Reconvene. Development of FY92 work plan -- Task Force discussion (continued).

10:00 Break.

10:30 Reconvene. Task Force discussion on FY92 work plan.

12:00 Lunch.

1:00 Reconvene. Task Force recommendations on FY92 work plan.

2:15 Break.

2:30 Reconvene. Reports on completed FY90 projects

- o Blue Creek, lower Klamath River tributaries, outmigrant seining (Polos).
- o French Creek erosion site inventory, Shasta River water quality testing (Bartholomew).

3:30 Status report on Task Force membership appointment (Iverson).

3:45 New business and discussion of next meeting.

4:00 Public comment period.

5:00 Adjourn.

Klamath River Basin 90-91 Stream Enhancement Project Status

Project Title: Kidder Creek Diversion Screen
Proposal Number: 17
Task Force ID #: 017
Amount Requested: \$15,000
Contract Number: (insert WC contract number)
Amount Approved: \$15,000
Tributary To: Scott River
Stream: Kidder Creek
Objective: To screen two existing open agricultural diversion ditches to prevent downstream migrant salmonids from being stranded in fields.
Contractor: DFG
Contact: Ron Dotson
Status: Two screens were installed on Kidder Creek in the spring of 1991.

Project Title: Little North Fork Salmon River Rearing Project
Proposal Number: 202 (funded through Salmon Stamp)
Task Force ID #: 002
Amount Requested: \$18,909
Contract: FG-0094
Amount Approved: \$18,835
Stream: Little North Fork Salmon River
Tributary To: Salmon River
Objective: Rear fall chinook salmon from fry to yearling size.
Contractor: Robert Will
Schedule:
Status: No fish delivered to this rearing project. Contract ends 11/15/91.

Project Title: Fall Creek Rearing Ponds
Proposal Number: 3
Task Force ID #: 003
Amount Requested: \$25,640
Contract Number:
Amount Approved: 0
Stream: Fall Creek
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: Rear chinook salmon to yearlings.
Contractor: Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District
Contact: Bob Bartholomew
Schedule:
Status: Project dropped because no surplus fish at Iron Gate Hatchery.

Project Title: Camp Creek Rearing Pond troughs
Proposal Number: 5 (salmon stamp)
Task Force ID #: 005A
Amount Requested: \$3,350
Contract Number: TBA to Region 1
Amount Approved: \$1,500
Stream: Camp Creek
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: Replace rearing troughs.
Contractor: DFG
Schedule:
Status: Troughs have been replaced.

Project Title: Hammel Creek Chinook Hatching/Rearing Project
Proposal Number: 201 (funded through Salmon Stamp)
Task Force ID #: 005B
Amount Requested: \$14,239
Contract: FG-0048
Amount Approved: \$14,165
Stream: Hammel Creek
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: Rear chinook fry for transfer to Little North Fork.
Contractor: Art Frazier
Schedule:
Status: Contractor received no fish from DFG. Contract ends 12/31/91.

Project Title: Klamath River Yearling Chinook Salmon Rearing Project
Proposal Number: 117
Task Force ID #: 117
Amount Requested: \$93,637
Contract Number: FG-0372
Amount Approved: \$93,637
Stream: Elk, Red Cap, Grider, and Camp Creeks
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: Operate rearing ponds for yearling chinook.
Contractor: Northern California Indian Development Council
Contact: Kim Rushton Region 1 DFG
Schedule:

Project Title: Eagle Ranch Steelhead Trout Rescue Rearing Facility
Proposal Number: 140 (this was alternative # 2 in proposal 140)
Task Force ID #: 140A
Amount Requested: \$16,937
Contract Number: FG-0417
Amount Approved: \$16,937
Stream: Cold Creek
Tributary To: Bogus Creek
Objective: Operate rescue/rearing facility for steelhead.
Contractor: Paul Luckey/Mike Luckey
Contact: Same as above
Schedule:
Status: Closed contract.

Project Title: Eagle Ranch Steelhead Trout Rescue Rearing Facility
Proposal Number: 140 (this was alternative # 1 in proposal 140,
alternative # 2 was accepted)
Task Force ID #: 140B
Amount Requested: \$12466
Contract Number:
Amount Approved: 0
Stream: Cold Creek
Tributary To: Bogus Creek
Objective: Operate rescue/rearing facility for steelhead.
Contractor: Paul Luckey/Mike Luckey
Contact: Same as above
Schedule:
Status: Not funded.

Project Title: Orleans Community Rescues Steelhead Rearing Project
Proposal Number: 170
Task Force ID #: 170
Amount Requested: \$8,851
Contract Number: FG-0416
Amount Approved: \$8,851
Stream: Scott River
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: Operate rescue/rearing facility for steelhead.
Contractor: Orleans Rod and Gun Club
Contact:
Schedule:
Status: Contract closed. Reared approximately 12,000 rescued steelhead to yearlings, and released fish back into the tributaries they were rescued from. Releases were in the last week of March, 1991, and planted by Region 1.

Project Title: Bogus Creek Cattle Exclusion

Proposal Number: 14

Task Force ID #: 014

Amount Requested: \$4,232

Contract Number: TBA to Region 1

Amount Approved: \$4,232

Stream: Bogus Creek

Tributary To: Klamath River

Objective: To exclude cattle from entering the riparian zone along approximately 2000 feet of Bogus Creek.

Contractor: DFG

Contact: Rick Davis

Comment: Prop 70 Committee recommended funding at the level indicated provided that 4000 feet of fencing is built.

Status: During the summer of 1990, approximately 1000 feet of cattle exclusion fence was constructed on Beck property. This fencing was needed to exclude cattle from six of the previously installed spawning weirs (see proposal # 195). Only six weirs of the twelve needed fencing.

Project Title: Pine Creek Watershed Erosion Control & Prevention Project

Proposal Number: 65

Task Force ID #: 065

Amount Requested: \$62,593

Contract Number:

Amount Approved: 0

Stream: Pine Creek

Tributary To: Klamath River

Objective: Control or prevent erosion of sediment into Pine Creek.

Contractor: Hoopa Valley Business Council

Schedule:

Status: This proposal was withdrawn by the proposer.

Project Title: Nordheimer Creek Mouth Modification

Proposal Number: 111

Task Force ID #: 111

Amount Requested: \$7,600

Contract Number: FG-0340

Amount Approved: \$7,600

Stream: Nordheimer Creek

Tributary To: Salmon Creek

Objective: Improve access for chinook salmon into Nordheimer Creek by modifying the mouth of the stream.

Contractor: USFS Klamath National Forest, Happy Camp Ranger District

Contact: Jack West

Status: Conditions at the mouth of Nordheimer Creek have changed and no longer present an access problem for migrating adults. \$2,910 of the encumbered funds will be used to build submerged pool cover structures in the East and South Forks of Salmon River. These structures will provide cover for summer steelhead and spring run chinook adults.

Project Title: Salmon River Seed Collection and Germination
Proposal Number: 112
Task Force ID #: 112
Amount Requested: \$13,957
Contract Number:
Amount Approved: 0
Stream: NF and SF Salmon River
Tributary To: Salmon River
Objective: Collect seeds, grow seedlings.
Contractor: USFS Klamath NF
Contact: Jack West
Schedule:
Status: Not funded by DFG.

Project Title: Summer Steelhead/Spring Chinook Cover Ledges
Proposal Number: 113
Task Force ID #: 113
Amount Requested: \$2,910
Contract Number: FG-0439
Amount Approved: \$2,910
Stream: NF and SF Salmon River
Tributary To: Salmon River
Objective: Provide overhead cover in pools for juvenile and adult
salmon.
Contractor: USFS Klamath NF
Contact: Jack West
Schedule:
Status:

Project Title: Elk Creek Winter Habitat Restoration #1
Proposal Number: 114
Task Force ID #: 114
Amount Requested: \$18,872
Contract Number: FG-0340
Amount Approved: \$13,860
Stream: Elk Creek
Objective: Provide complex winter , spring and summer rearing habitat
for juvenile salmon and steelhead in Elk Creek.
Contractor: USFS Klamath National Forest, Happy Camp ranger District
Contact: Bill Bemis
Schedule: August 1991
Status: Materials have been purchased and stockpiled. Structures
will be installed in August of 1991.

Project Title: Elk Creek Weirs #3
Proposal Number: 115
Task Force ID #: 115
Amount Requested: \$17,330
Contract Number: FG-0340
Amount Approved: \$10,398
Stream: Elk Creek
Objective: Provide spawning and rearing habitat for salmon and steelhead in Elk Creek.
Contractor: USFS Klamath National Forest, Happy Camp Ranger District
Contact: Bill Bemis
Schedule: Late August 1991.
Status: Materials have been purchased and stockpiled. Structures will be installed in August of 1991.

Project Title: Elk Creek Weirs and Boulder/CWD #2
Proposal Number: 116
Task Force ID #: 116
Amount Requested: \$20,505
Contract Number: FG-0340
Amount Approved: \$12,793
Stream: Elk Creek
Objective: Provide spawning and rearing habitat for salmon and steelhead in Elk Creek.
Contractor: USFS Klamath National Forest, Happy Camp Ranger District
Contact: Bill Bemis
Schedule: Late August 1991.
Status: Materials have been purchased and stockpiled. Structures will be installed in August of 1991.

Project Title: Lower Bogus Creek Spawning Weir/Riffle Restoration.
Proposal Number: 195
Task Force ID #: Not on the approved task force funding list
Amount Requested: \$10,120
Contract Number: This is not on the 1990 Klamath list.
Amount Approved: \$10,120
Stream: Bogus Creek
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: Renovate existing boulder weirs from earlier project and replenish salmon spawning gravel.
Contractor: DFG
Contact: Rick Davis
Comment: Project was originally scheduled for funding with FY 89-90 money. Project was not funded until FY 90-91.
Status: Completed in 1990. Constructed 12 boulder spawning weirs and placed gravel behind each weir.

Klamath River Basin 89-90 Stream Enhancement Project Status

Project Title: Tectah Creek Habitat Restoration Project
Proposal Number: 47
Task Force ID #: 047
Amount Requested: \$71,788
Contract Number: FG-0415
Amount Approved: \$50,000
Stream: Tectah Creek
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: Improve rearing habitat for emergent salmonids by placing structures along the margins of the stream. Cover structures will be placed in some pools too.
Contractor: Del Norte Center, California Conservation Corps,
Contact: David Muraki
Schedule: Late Summer 1991
Status: Enhancement sites have been identified. Site plans are being prepared. The CCC crews will spike on site while working on project.

Project Title: Red Cap Creek #3
Proposal Number: 211 (from 1988/89 fiscal year)
Task Force ID #:
Amount Requested: \$76,250
Contract Number: WC-1502
Amount Approved: \$76,250
Stream: Red Cap Creek
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: To increase the quality and quantity of spawning habitat for chinook salmon through the placement of boulder structures in the stream.
Contractor: USFS Six Rivers Forest, Orleans Ranger District
Contact: Jerry Boberg
Schedule: Project will be completed fall of 1991
Status: This project was started last year and will be finished in the fall of 1991. About 40 boulder structures will have been installed in Red Cap Creek through this contract.

Project Title: Bluff Creek #3
Proposal Number: 209 (from 1988/89 fiscal year)
Task Force ID #:
Amount Requested: \$101,200
Contract Number: WC-1503
Amount Approved: \$101,200
Stream: Bluff Creek
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: To increase the quality and quantity of spawning habitat for chinook salmon through the placement of boulder structures in the stream.
Contractor: USFS Six Rivers Forest, Orleans Ranger District
Contact: Jerry Boberg
Schedule: Project will be completed fall of 1991
Status: This project was started last year and will be finished in the fall of 1991. About 38 boulder structures will have been installed in Bluff Creek through this contract.

Project Title: Boise Creek Instream Habitat Enhancement
Proposal Number: 210 (from 1988/89 fiscal year)
Task Force ID #:
Amount Requested: \$29,300
Contract Number: WC-1511
Amount Approved: \$29,300
Stream: Boise Creek
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: To improve the quality and quantity of spawning habitat for salmon and steelhead, as well as enhancing habitat diversity in Boise Creek, through the placement of boulder structures.
Contractor: USFS Six Rivers Forest, Orleans Ranger District
Contact: Jerry Boberg
Schedule: Fall 1991
Status: This project has been held up due to legal problems with a miner. The problem has been resolved and the project will get under way in the fall. It is anticipated that the project will be completed in the late fall of 1991.

Project Title: Camp Creek Instream Habitat Enhancement
Proposal Number: 90 (from 1989/90 fiscal year)
Task Force ID #:
Amount Requested: \$26,030
Contract Number: FG-9365
Amount Approved: \$26,030
Stream: Camp Creek
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: Increase habitat diversity for salmon and steelhead by installing boulder structures.
Contractor: USFS Six Rivers Forest, Orleans Ranger District
Contact: Jerry Boberg
Schedule: Project will be completed fall of 1991
Status: This project was started last year and will be finished in the fall of 1991. About 28 boulder structures will have been installed in Camp Creek through this contract.

Project Title: Shasta River Livestock Exclusion Fencing

Proposal Number: 170 (from 1989/90 fiscal year)

Task Force ID #:

Amount Requested: \$13,365

Contract Number: FG-9332

Amount Approved: \$13,365

Stream: Shasta River, Ordway Ranch

Tributary To: Klamath River

Objective: To exclude livestock from the riparian zone along a section of the Shasta River on the Ordway Ranch.

Contractor: Great Northern Corporation

Contact: Jim Cook

Schedule: Fall 1991

Status: Materials have been purchased, fence line flagged and crews from Deadwood Conservation Camp are installing fence.

Project Title: Bogus Creek , Foster Ranch

Proposal Number: 56 (from 1989/90 fiscal year)

Task Force ID #:

Amount Requested: \$68,932

Contract Number: FG-9381

Amount Approved: \$16,960

Stream: Bogus Creek

Tributary To: Klamath River

Objective: Stream bank stabilization at two sites, fence 400 yards of riparian vegetation and install boulder weirs and clusters to improve habitat in Bogus Creek.

Contractor: Clearwater BioStudies

Contact: Steve Kucas

Schedule: Project will be completed this fall.

Status: A third weir to enhance spawning habitat will be completed this year. 400 yards of stream was fenced. Two vertical bank erosion sites were stabilized last summer. The contract will be completed this summer.

Project Title: Shasta River

Proposal Number: 57 (from 1989/90 fiscal year)

Task Force ID #:

Amount Requested: \$25,185

Contract Number: FG-9381

Amount Approved: \$25,185

Stream: Shasta River

Tributary To: Klamath River

Objective: Stabilize vertical erosion sites on Shasta River.

Contractor: Clearwater BioStudies

Contact: Steve Kucas

Status: This project was completed last summer. The balance of the money saved will be used in Grider Creek, tributary to the Klamath River, to construct a boulder weir. The weir will collect spawning graves for chinook salmon. The Grider Creek portion of this contract will be completed at the end of this summer.

Project Title: Scott River Bank Stabilization and Spawning Habitat Protection

Proposal Number: 9 + 10 (from 1988/89 fiscal year)

Task Force ID #:

Amount Requested: \$113,292 and \$16,266 respectively

Contract Number: WC-1530

Amount Approved: \$66,300

Stream: Scott River

Tributary To: Klamath River

Objective: Install livestock exclusion fencing on the Tobias and Shuck/Troutman ranches and install sediment routing structures to improve spawning habitat.

Contractor: Siskiyou Resources Conservation District

Contact: Bob Bartholomew

Schedule: Fall of 1991

Status: Unstable banks were armored with rip rap and planted with willow slips. The rip rap was constructed with a few large boulders placed in the stream channel next to the finished rip rap to increase pool cover next to the sites. The project sites were also fenced.

The sediment routing portion of the contract was moved upstream near Callahan. This portion of the contract may not be done because of problems in securing a Army Corps of Engineers permit in time to complete the project.

Project Title: Etna Creek Dam Fish Passage

Proposal Number: 63 (from 1989/90 fiscal year)

Task Force ID #:

Amount Requested: \$10,450

Contract Number: FG-9353

Amount Approved: \$10,450

Stream: Etna Creek

Tributary To: Scott River

Objective: Provide access over Etna Creek Dam

Contractor: Siskiyou Resource Conservation District

Contact: Bob Bartholomew

Status: An Alaskan Steep Pass Ladder was installed last fall. A savings in the contract was realized and will be used to add instream cover in some of the pools to improve rearing habitat in Etna Creek.

Project Title: Hunter Creek
Proposal Number: From 1987/88 fiscal year
Task Force ID #: [REDACTED]
Amount Requested: \$
Contract Number: WC-1383
Amount Approved: \$170,039
Stream: Hunter Creek
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: Improve spawning and rearing habitat in Hunter Creek by installing log instream structures. Modify 3 barriers.
Contractor: Del Norte Center, California Conservation Corps
Contact: David Muraki
Schedule: This project began in 1989.
Status: The project is 98% complete. Approximately 200 structures were installed in the stream. The three barriers have been modified. Contract will end 12/31/91.

Project Title: Bluff Creek Instream Habitat Enhancement
Proposal Number: 88 (from 1989/90 fiscal year)
Task Force ID #: [REDACTED]
Amount Requested: \$49,950
Contract Number: FG-9365
Amount Approved: \$49,950
Stream: Bluff Creek
Tributary to: Klamath River
Objective: Increase and improve salmonid nursery and spawning habitat.
Contractor: USFS Six Rivers Forest, Orleans Ranger District
Contact: Jerry Boberg
Schedule:
Status: Completed.

Project Title: Grider Creek Habitat Enhancement Project
Proposal Number: 58 (from 1989/90 fiscal year)
Task Force ID #: [REDACTED]
Amount Requested: \$17,200
Contract Number: FG-9467
Amount Approved: \$17,200
Stream: Grider Creek
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: Protection of rearing pond and bank stabilization.
Contractor: Clearwater BioStudies
Contact: Steve Kucas
Schedule: Summer of 1991
Status: They still need to construct boulder spawning weirs. This will be performed during the 1991 low water period.

FEDERAL WORK PLAN AND
 BUDGET YEAR 1989
 KLAMATH BASIN WETLAND RESTORATION
 files:89wrkpln.dbf,89wrkpln.ndx, 89wp2.frm

** (0)ADMINISTER PROGRAM			
(0)ADMINISTER PROGRAM	(0.1)OPERATE KLAMATH FIELD OFFICE	168760 USFWS	
(0)ADMINISTER PROGRAM	(0.2)REGIONAL OFFICE OVERHEAD	50000 USFWS	
** Subtotal **		218760	
** (1) PLAN PROGRAM			
(1) PLAN PROGRAM	(1.1) PLAN AND ENV. ASSESSMENT	140135 KIER	1,000 copies to be printed by 8/91.
** Subtotal **		140135	
** (2) GET INFORMATION			
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.12) TAGGING NEEDS FOR TIME/AREA MANAGEMENT	36400 HSU	Agreement closed.
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.21) ESTIMATE FALL CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT	41700 CDFG	Final report accepted 4/90. Agreement not closed.
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.22) FALL CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT, LOWER KLAMATH	24000 USFWS	Closed.
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.23) FALL CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT, BLUE CREEK	43800 USFWS	Closed.
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.25) HYDROACOUSTIC WEIR, SALMON RIVER	21500 CDFG	Final report rec'd 4/90. Agreement not closed.
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.31) STEELHEAD ESCAPEMENT, SELECTED TRIBS	73400 USFS	Final billing complete.
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.41) HABITAT TYPE, STANDING CROP, 125 MI.STREAM	75000 USFS	Final billing complete.
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.42) TYPE HABITAT, PLAN REHAB, PINE CREEK	31905 HVBC	Final Report rec'd 3/91. USFWS Ref Svc 6/91.
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.43) JUVENILE PRODUCTION, LOWER KLAMATH TRIBS	0 USFWS	Agreement closed.
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.44) HABITAT AVAILABLE FOR FALL CHINOOK, BLUE CR	0 USFWS	Agreement closed.
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.51) TRAP OUTMIGRANTS, LOWER KLAMATH RIVER	27200 USFWS	Agreement closed.

FEDERALLY-FUNDED WORK PLAN AND
BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1989
KLAMATH BASIN FISHERY RESTORATION
files:89wrkpln.dbf,89wrkpln.ndx, 89wp2.frm

(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.61) ANALYZE RECORDS, FEASIBILITY OF AUGMENT.	36000 CAL-DWR	Draft final report rec'd 3/91, expect final 7/91.
** Subtotal **		410905	
** (3) EDUCATE			
(3) EDUCATE	(3.1) EDUCATION PROJECT	67000 DHIGGINS	Grades 4-6 curriculum rec'd 3/91.
(3) EDUCATE	(3.2) PUBLIC INFORMATION/INTERPRETATION	20000 USFWS	Program complete.
** Subtotal **		87000	
** (4) MANAGE HABITAT			
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.14) SEDIMENT BUDGET, SCOTT SUBBASIN	50000 SISK RCD	Agreement closed.
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.15) CONTROL BANK EROSION, YREKA CREEK	10000 YREKA	Agreement closed.
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.25) EVALUATE EXISTING HABITAT IMPROVEMENTS	0 USFS	Final billing complete.
** Subtotal **		60000	
** (5) ARTIF. PROPAGATION			
(5) ARTIF. PROPAGATION	(5.11) EVALUATE PRESMOLT CHINOOK RELEASE, IGSFH	56600 CDFG	Final report rec'd 4/90. Agreement not closed.
(5) ARTIF. PROPAGATION	(5.12) EVALUATE POND-REARING OF FALL CHINOOK	26600 CDFG	Final report rec'd 4/90. Agreement not closed.
** Subtotal **		83200	
*** Total ***		1000000	

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
 FEDERAL WORK PLAN, FISCAL YEAR 1990
 files: 90fedwp.dbf, catprpsr.ndx,
 90wp2.frm

ATTACHMENT 4

CATEGORY	PROJECT	COOPERATOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	STATUS
** ADMINISTRATION					
ADMINISTRATION	90-0.1	USFWS	OPERATE KLAMATH FIELD OFFICE	240817	
ADMINISTRATION	90-0.2	USFWS	REGIONAL OFFICE OVERHEAD	93000	
** Subtotal **				333817	
** ARTIF. PROPAG.					
ARTIF. PROPAG.	90-5.1	NCIDC	LATE FALL CHINOOK STOCKING, YUROK RESERVATION	109653	Final report rec'd 2/91. USFWS Ref Svc 7/91.
ARTIF. PROPAG.	90-FR/117	NCIDC	REAR CHINOOK IN MID-KLAMATH POND TO YEARLING SIZE	26000	Final report rec'd 2/91. USFWS Ref Svc 7/91.
** Subtotal **				135653	
** EDUCATE					
EDUCATE	90-3.21	CHICO STATE U.	QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY	18265	Questions developed. Survey expected 8/91, after OMP apprv'd
EDUCATE	90-3.1	DIANE HIGGINS	CLASSROOM CURRICULUM, TEACHER TRAINING	68040	Draft curriculum rec'd. Final curriculum expected 6/91.
EDUCATE	90-3.2	USFWS	PUBLIC INFORMATION	39648	Program complete.
** Subtotal **				125953	
** GET INFORMATION					
GET INFORMATION	90 FP-1	KARUK TRIBE OF CALIF	ESTIMATE KARUK SUBSISTENCE HARVEST	15295	Final report rec'd 2/91. USFWS Ref Svc 7/91.
GET INFORMATION	90-2.71	SHASTA VALLEY RCD	SHASTA R. FISHERIES WATER QUALITY PROJECT	24470	Final report rec'd 6/91. USFWS Ref Svc 7/91.
GET INFORMATION	90-2.41	USFS SALMON R RD	SALMON SUBBASIN HABITAT PRODUCTIVITY SURVEY	45247	Field work complete. Final report expected 8/91.
GET INFORMATION	90-2.21	USFS SALMON R RD	SPAWNING GROUND UTILIZATION SURVEYS	81568	Field work complete. Final report expected 8/91.
GET INFORMATION	90-2.52	USFS SIX RIVERS	CAMP CREEK DOWNSTREAM MIGRANT STUDY	14993	Field work underway. Final report expected 2/92.
GET INFORMATION	90-2.23	USFWS	BLUE CREEK STUDIES	53400	Annual report expected 7/91.

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
FEDERAL WORK PLAN, FISCAL YEAR 1990
files: 90fedwp.dbf, catprpsr.ndx,
90wp2.frm

CATEGORY	PROJECT	COOPERATOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST STATUS
GET INFORMATION	90-2.22	USFWS	STUDIES IN SMALL TRIBES, LOWER KLAMATH	24000 Annual report expected 7/91.
GET INFORMATION	90-2.51	USFWS	TRAP OUTMIGRANTS, LOWER KLAMATH RIVER	27200 Annual report expected 7/91.
** Subtotal **				286173
* MANAGE HABITAT				
MANAGE HABITAT	90-2.42	HOOPA VALLEY BC	PINE CR. HABITAT EVALUATION/IMPROVEMENT ASSESS.	31188 Final report expected 8/91.
MANAGE HABITAT	90-4.3	PSMFC	IMPROVE MAINTENANCE OF DIVERSION SCREENS	23911 Agreement Closed.
MANAGE HABITAT	90-4.2	SISKIYOU RCD	SCOTT R. BASIN SEDIMENT STUDY, PHASE II	30768 Final report expected 7/91.
** Subtotal **				85867
* PLAN PROGRAM				
PLAN PROGRAM	90-1.1	KIER ASSOCIATES	AMEND LONG-RANGE PLAN TO INCLUDE UPPER BASIN ISSUE	30149 Draft amendment accepted by T.F. 3/91. Contract still open.
** Subtotal **				30149
*** Total ***				997612

KLAMATH RESTORATION PROGRAM
FEDERAL WORK PLAN, FISCAL YEAR 1991

ATTACHMENT 5

files: 91fedwp.dbf,ndx,frm

PROJECT COOPERATOR NUMBER	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST COMMENT
** CATEGORY: Education			
E-8 U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Basinwide	Public Information Program. Continues ongoing program: presentations, media etc	40000 Ongoing program. Five public meetings held. Slide presentations given to six organizations. Processed comments on RFMC Plan. Mailed eleven press releases.
E-3 USFWS - Contract		Develop education program for school children.	67500 Deferred until FY92 funds become available.
E-1 USFWS - Contract	Kidder Creek	Educational field study of fish requirements and riparian restoration.	2500 Underway. Final report expected 12/91.
E-4 USFWS - Contract		Portable information display for Klamath Fishery Restoration Program.	7500 Underway. Deliverable 12/91.
** Subtotal **			117500
** CATEGORY: Fish Protection			
FP/193 CDFG	Shasta River	Modify and repair Shasta River fish counting facility.	23639 Expect Corps permit 8/91. Project completion estimated 9/91.
FP-1 Karuk Tribe of California	Klamath River, Ishi-Pishi Falls	Estimate, by species, Karuk subsistence harvest.	26514 Underway. Final report expected 12/91.
FP-3 USFWS, FAO Arcata	Lower tributaries to Klamath River	Estimate spawning, juvenile production, habitat.	40500 Underway. Expect final report 3/92.
FP-4 USFWS, FAO Arcata	Blue Creek	Estimate chinook stock status and potential for enhancement.	57400 Underway. Final report expected 3/92.
FP-5 USFWS, FAO Arcata	Klamath River at Big Bar.	Monitor juvenile salmonid emigration.	2750 Underway. Final report expected 3/92.
FP-6 USFWS, FAO Arcata	Lower Klamath River and estuary.	Estimate juvenile fish standing crop and outmigration.	27750 Underway. Final report expected 3/92.
** Subtotal **			178553
** CATEGORY: Fish Restoration			
FR-3 CDFG	Klamath River, several tributaries.	Estimate adult contribution of pond reared salmon.	27600 CWT Tagging complete for Indian, Elk and Bluff Creek ponds. Final report expected 9/91.
FR-1 NCIDC	Klamath River, Yurok reservation	Late run fall chinook accelerated stocking program.	124633 Approximately 44,000 fish on feed in facilities. Agreement budget reduced by \$24,815.

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
FEDERAL WORK PLAN, FISCAL YEAR 1991

files: 91fedwp.dbf,ndx,frm

PROJECT COOPERATOR NUMBER	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST COMMENT
FR-2 NCIDC	Klamath River, Yurok reservation	Late run fall chinook gillnet capture project	22798 Project completed 1/91.
** Subtotal **			175031
** CATEGORY: Habitat Protection			
HP-1 Energy and Resource Advocates	Klamath Basin, Salmon River & west.	Remote sensing and GIS feasibility analysis.	36830 Underway. Final report expected 7/91.
HP-3 HSU/CCFRU	Salmon River	Estimate spawning and rearing habitat for spring chinook and summer steelhead.	10281 Underway. Progress report expected 6/91.
HP-10 Siskiyou RCD	Scott River, Scott Valley portion.	Inventory riparian zone.	7054 Seasonal employee hired, survey work to begin soon. Final report expected 12/91.
HP-7 USFS, Klamath NF	Salmon River, South Fork	Conduct watershed improvement needs inventory (WINI).	18500 Field work begun. Attempting to link upslope erosion processes with impacts to fish habitat. Final report expected 9/91.
HP-9 USFS, Klamath NF	Salmon River Subbasin	Analyze sediment delivery.	38190 Field inventory work ongoing. Developing a database and GIS info. transfer. Final report expected 9/91.
** Subtotal **			110855
** CATEGORY: Habitat Restoration			
HR-15 CDFG	Klamath River, various tributaries.	Provide one work year of diversion screen maintenance.	27589 Underway. Final report expected 2/92.
HR/065 Hoopa Valley Business Council	Pine Creek	Control or prevent erosion of sediment into Pine Creek.	61811 Cooperative agreement not signed by HVTC yet.
HR/112 USFS, Klamath NF	Salmon River, North & South Forks.	Provide native plants to reseed riparian zones.	13957 Seed collection to be done this fall.
** Subtotal **			103357
** CATEGORY: Program Administration			
PA-3 U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service		Operation of Klamath Fishery Resource Office.	262000 Continues ongoing project.
PA-4 U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service		USFWS Regional Office overhead.	80000 Continues ongoing project.
** Subtotal **			342000
*** Total ***			1027296

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE NEWS

Western Regional Center
Seattle, WA 98115



NOAA-SEA-03-91

Contact: Hal Alabaster
(206) 526-6046
Roddy Moscoso
(301) 427-2370

SNAKE SPRING/SUMMER, FALL
CHINOOK ARE THREATENED;
NO LISTING WARRANTED FOR
COLUMBIA COHO

HOLD FOR RELEASE AT 1:00 PM PDT, JUNE 7, 1991

To: Regional Directorate, Region
From: Public Affairs, Region 1
Portland, Oregon

NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) today announced a decision to list Snake River spring and summer chinook salmon as one threatened species under the Endangered Species Act, and an additional Snake River fall run of chinook will also be proposed for threatened status. The Fisheries Service has determined that lower Columbia River coho salmon do not warrant listing under the law. The agency now has up to one year to determine if the proposed listings will become final.

Any final decision on whether to list the fall, as well as spring/summer chinook salmon, must be based solely on the best scientific data available on the status of these populations as required under the ESA. Under the Act, socioeconomic considerations cannot play a part in NOAA's decision whether or not to list.

Before any final decision to list these species, broad public input will be sought to ensure that the administrative and scientific record for any proposal is accurate and complete. Scientific data on the respective populations will be sought from a wide variety of groups and a broad number of scientists.

The law also calls for the preparation of a population recovery plan for each listed species. While socioeconomic considerations cannot figure in NOAA's decision to list, such factors may be considered within any recovery plan.

A year ago NMFS received four petitions from Oregon Trout, a sportfishing group, and other groups to list Snake River fall, spring and summer chinook salmon and lower Columbia River coho salmon. The petitions also requested the designation of critical habitat under the ESA.

The decisions come after an exhaustive, year-long biological review by fisheries experts, and the completion of separate status reviews for Snake River fall chinook salmon, Snake River spring/summer chinook salmon, and lower Columbia River coho salmon.

Snake River spring/summer chinook salmon once numbered in excess of 1.5 million annually during their annual returns but have declined to fewer than an estimated 10,000 fish distributed over the entire Snake River Basin in Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. Fewer than 400 fall chinook salmon returned to the Snake River during each of the last four years.

NMFS has evaluated the status of lower Columbia River coho salmon and decided that biological evidence suggests that listing these fish under the ESA is not warranted now. Lower Columbia River coho are presently comprised of a mixture of fish of various origins, and no evidence was found that there remains a distinct wild population segment of coho salmon in the lower Columbia River.

Public hearings on the listing proposals have been scheduled for July 30, 1991 in Portland, Oregon at the Federal Complex Auditorium, 911 NE 11th Avenue (1st floor rear entrance at corner of 9th Ave. and Holladay); July 31, 1991 in Seattle, Washington at the NOAA Western Administrative Support Center Auditorium in Building #9, 7600 Sand Point Way, NE; August 1, 1991 in Richland, Washington, Richland Federal Building Auditorium, 825 Jadwin Avenue; August 7, 1991 in Boise, Idaho, Boise Interagency Fire Center Auditorium, 3905 Vista Avenue. All hearings are scheduled for 7:30pm to 9:30pm.

Additional information on hearing schedules may be obtained by calling NMFS at (503) 230-5400. The proposed listings allow for a 60-day comment period ending August 7, 1991. Comments may be

addressed to: ~~Endangered Species Coordinator~~
Environmental and Technical Services Division 911
N.E. 11th Avenue, Suite 620
Portland, OR 97232

June 7, 1991

actionpl.an
drafted 4/25/91

STATEMENT OF WORK

PREPARATION OF A THREE-YEAR ACTION PLAN
KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM

I. PROGRAM INFORMATION

Restoration Program Objective 7: Provide adequate and effective administration to successfully implement the Restoration Plan and Program.

Restoration Program Policy 7.10: Ensure a practical and equitable project selection process.

Project Title: Prepare a three-year (FY1993-FY1995) action plan for the Klamath Fishery Restoration Program.

NOTE: THIS WORK IS NOT ENTIRELY FOR OUTSIDE COMPETITION: SOME WOULD BE DONE BY FWS STAFF AND TASK FORCE SUBGROUPS. THE REASON FOR PUTTING THIS SCOPE OF WORK INTO THE PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS IS TO IDENTIFY FY92 PROGRAM FUNDS TO SET ASIDE FOR ACTION PLANNING.

II. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

- A. Identify ways to implement each of the policies of the long range plan for the Klamath Fishery Restoration Program.
- B. Prioritize the implementation of policies.
- C. Organize the high-priority steps for policy implementation into a three-year action plan.

III. TASKS

Task A: Identify and characterize implementing actions.

A.1 -- Identify WHAT should be done to implement the policy, and HOW these actions should be taken; prepare a logical, time-sequenced stepdown plan for getting the policy implemented or, for ongoing policies, for keeping it implemented. Use flow charts, critical path analysis, value engineering, brainwriting, nominal group technique, interpretive structural modeling or other appropriate work planning tools to identify and organize the steps and substeps of implementation.

A.2 -- Identify WHO would be the most likely entities to implement and fund the policy. In some cases, there is a tribe or agency with obvious lead responsibility. In most cases, responsibility is diffuse. If Task Force, work group, or Yreka FWS staff could contribute, so identify. If some tasks, could be competitively funded, explain.

A.3 -- Identify WHERE actions should be concentrated. For some policies, the geographic locus is already defined. For others, some implementing actions should be concentrated in some priority locations. So these should be identified.

A.4 -- Identify WHEN actions should be taken. Some policies will take ongoing, unceasing effort to implement. For others, most actions may be needed in the near term, with a lower level of maintenance effort. Other policies can be assigned pretty specific start and complete -- or abandon -- dates.

A.5 -- Estimate funding and staff time requirements for each action.

A.6 -- Identify factors limiting implementation of the policy. Removal or mitigation of these problems should be a part of the action plan.

Task B: Prioritize each long range policy, or, where appropriate, to actions leading to each policy

B.1 -- Prepare criteria for assigning priority.

B.2 -- Using established criteria, make a preliminary assignment of priority to each policy and action.

B.3 -- Group the highest-priority policies/actions into a preliminary near-term action plan.

B.4 -- Review the preliminary plan for logic and consistency. Adjust as necessary to produce a final draft action plan. Maintain a written record supporting the process and logic of prioritization.

Task C: Organize the actions and priorities identified in Tasks A and B in a draft three-year action plan, with environmental assessment, for implementing the highest-priority actions.

C.1 -- Define the scope of the plan. If it includes all the highest-priority actions identified through Tasks A and B, say that. If some actions are left out of planning -- for example, if an agency asserts that the actions for which it is responsible are exempt from recommendations of the Task Force -- then identify those.

C.2 -- Schedule highest-priority actions in a logical three-year sequence, and display them in tables.

C.3 -- Develop a narrative describing the logic of the action plan.

C.4 -- Draft an environmental assessment, in compliance with Interior Department guidelines for NEPA compliance.

C.5 -- If so indicated by Federal regulations, prepare a draft environmental impact statement.

C.6 -- Develop a procedure for updating the action plan, and evaluating performance.

Task D: Communicate the draft action plan and EA to interested parties, and incorporate comments.

D.1 -- Coordinate with Klamath Task Force: provide review draft and oral presentation; incorporate comments and provide revised draft(s). Get agreement on a procedure for agency/public review.

D.2 -- Coordinate with the Secretary of the Interior

D.3 -- Distribute review drafts of plan and EA or EIS to agencies and public.

D.4 -- Arrange scoping sessions or public comment meetings, as needed.

D.5 -- Receive, compile, and incorporate comments. Coordinate Task Force participation in this.

Task E: Prepare a final action plan and EA or EIS

E.1 -- Arrange final Task Force review. Make final edits.

E.2 -- Print and distribute final documents, with appropriate publicity.

IV. METHODS

It is proposed that the work be done primarily in-house, with some contract support. Tasks A, B, and C would be primarily assigned to the technical work group, with support from the Yreka field office. The work group role is realistic only if Task Force tribes, agencies and groups will contribute resources to make work group members available for an extended task. Expertise in some action areas not well-represented on the work group may be acquired through competitive procurement.

Tasks D and E would involve the field office, work group, and Task Force.

Alternatively, the work could be primarily contracted.

V. SCHEDULE

Tasks A, B, and C: Initiate October 1991, complete December 1991

Task D.1: December 1991

Tasks D.2 and D.3: January 1992

Task D.3 and D.4: February 1992

Task D.5 and E.1: March 1992 (to precede FY93 RFP)

Task E.2: April 1992.

VI. BUDGET ESTIMATE

1. Personnel

Consultant specialists -- 80 hours @ \$30/hour.....\$ 2,400

2. Travel

Consultant travel/per diem..... 1,000

In-house travel: 4 work group meetings @ \$3,000..... 12,000

3. Supplies

Printing and distribution of draft and final plan... 10,000
and EA/EIS

4. Overhead

Consultant overhead -- 50% of direct labor..... 1,200

TOTAL 26,600

KLAMATH FISH RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
** CATEGORY: Education NCIDC	Lower Klamath	Video on Yurok harvest	15000 USFWS	E-17	Previously recommended by Task Force	99
Diane Higgins	Basinwide	Support for teachers of the Klamath River educational program.	1500 USFWS	E- 3	To provide funds for equipment.	83
Shasta Valley RCD	Shasta River Basin	Operating expenses for Shasta Valley CRMP	2090 USFWS	E- 1	To cover administrative costs of newly formed CRMP.	83
Klamath Forest Alliance	Salmon River	Poaching prevention workshop.	1600 USFWS	E-13	Emphasis on protecting spring chinook and summer steelhead on Salmon River, participation by locals.	78
Montague Elementary School Dist.	Little Shasta River	Stream restoration by Montague Elementary School.	4850 USFWS	E-12	Environmental education through hands on participation.	78
Calif. Salmon and Steelhead Rest.	Northern Calif.	10th Annual Conference	2500 USFWS	E-14	Funding request for administrative expenses.	76
<hr/>						
UC Extension-Davis	Klamath River Basin	Conference on decomposed granitic soils: Problems and solutions.	6000 USFWS	E-11	Addresses erosion control policies.	66
Gary Warner	Kidder Creek	Kidder Creek outdoor school	4900 USFWS	E- 4		66
USFWS-KRFRO	Scott and Shasta River Valleys	Inventory and workshop on agricultural water conservation practices.	15900 USFWS	E- 8	Addresses plan policies 2.F.1.a,b,c.	65
Siskiyou RCD	Basinwide	Farmer/commercial fisherman exchange project.	3850 USFWS	E- 2	To foster communication between two primary user groups.	65
USFWS-KRFRO	Basinwide	Curriculum development for grades 9-12.	49000 USFWS	E- 6	To expand existing curricula from grades 4-8 through grade 12.	65
USFWS-KRFRO	Basinwide	Habitat restoration workshop	7800 USFWS	E- 9	To provide restoration technique training.	59
Trout Unlimited, Six Rivers Chapter	Shasta River Basin	Riparian restoration techniques conference.	1500 USFWS	E- 5	Funding for administrative expenses.	53
Lone Eagle & KEET TV	Basinwide	Video: "Klamath Salmon - A View From The Sea"	28500 USFWS	E-16		51

"Low" and "High" Budgets

Σ = 27,540

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
USFWS-KRFRO	Basinwide	Workshops on current timber harvest practices	7800	USFWS E-10	Addresses plan policies 2.A.1.a,c,e,f,g.	51
USFWS-KRFRO	Basinwide	Workshop on proposal preparation and bidding process.	2900	USFWS E- 7		49
Yoon & Associates	Lower Klamth River	Radio Series	1600	USFWS E-15		42
** Subtotal **			157290			
*** Total ***			157290			

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
** CATEGORY: Fish Protection USFWS-CCFRO	Basinwide	Age composition/scale analysis of Klamath fall chinook.	5450 USFWS	FP- 5	To provide the KRTAT with an age composition estimate.	89
Hoopla Valley Tribal Council	Klamath River below Trinity River	Estimate population size and range of green sturgeon.	14058 USFWS	FP-11	Tag and re-capture 100 migrating adult green sturgeon.	88
USFWS- Fish Health Center	Basinwide	Disease Survey of Salmonid Smolts	10105 USFWS	FP- 7	To determine status and smolt quality at Iron Gate hatchery prior to release and after 3 weeks in river, as well as wild smolts captured in the lower Klamath.	82
USFWS-CCFRO	Klamath River at Big Bar	Monitoring of Yearling Salmonid Emigration.	3000 USFWS	FP- 4	Ongoing project.	79
Coastal Resources Research Group	Salmon River	Population Differentiation of Spring and Fall Chinook.	16109 USFWS	FP- 8	Identification through DNA profiling used to distinguish between spring and fall chinook salmon stocks on the Salmon River.	79
USFWS-CCFRO	Klamath River	Biological Data Collection for Green Sturgeon.	38004 USFWS	FP- 3	Attempt to identify primary spawning areas, and collect early life history, age-growth, distribution, and abundance data.	79
Hoopla Valley Tribal Council	Pine Creek	Monitoring outmigrating salmonids.	49128 USFWS	FP-12	Monitoring over a 3-year time period.	79
California Dept. of Fish and Game	Kidder Creek	Irrigation diversion screening	47476 CDFG	FP-15	One screen on Kidder Creek 52 cfs diversion ditch.	78
		"Low" Budget	Σ = 183,330			
USFWS-CCFRO	Blue Creek	Status of Salmon and Steelhead Stocks of Blue Ck.	58729 USFWS	FP- 2	Biological survey and habitat assessment. Ongoing project.	74
Clearwater Biostudies	Scott River	Catalog surface water diversions, Scott River Basin.	46429 CDFG	FP-14	Catalog will be used by CDFG Yreka Screen Shop.	73
Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game	Scott and Shasta Valleys	Temporary help for the Yreka Screen shop.	27589 USFWS	FP-16		73
		"High" Budget	Σ = 316,077			
USFWS-CCFRO	Lower Klamath and Estuary	Juvenile Salmonid Seining Program	35500 USFWS	FP- 6	Ongoing project.	70

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
USFWS-CCFRO	Lower Klamath River tributaries	Monitoring juvenile salmonid outmigration.	52555 USFWS	FP- 1	Terwer, Tectah, Roach, and Hunter Creeks.	67
Klamath N.F.	Salmon, Scott and mid-Klamath tribs	Spawning Ground Utilization Surveys	72280 USFWS	FP- 9	175 miles.	66
Clearwater Biostudies	Shasta River	Catalog of surface water diversions, Shasta River Basin.	38915 CDFG	FP-13	Catalog will be used by CDFG Yreka Screen Shop.	65
Klamath N.F.	Salmon River	Seasonal law-enforcement for fish protection (USFS).	16566 USFWS	FP-10	To alleviate the poaching problem on spring chinook, summer steelh ead on the Salmon River.	57
Calif. Coop. Fishery Research Unit	Klamath River	Study of Life History of American Shad in Klamath River	20268 USFWS	FP-17		43
Biosonics	Klamath River	Hydroacoustic Monitoring	28500 USFWS	FP-18		32
** Subtotal **			580661			

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
** CATEGORY: Fish Restoration						
NCIDC	Fall Creek	Rearing Pond Project	33625 USFWS	FR- 7		85
NCIDC	Lower Klamath River Tributaries	Fish rescue and rearing project.	2750 USFWS	FR- 3	To rescue stranded juvenile salmonids in the lower Klamath River and tributaries.	84
NCIDC	Lower Klamath River	Late run fall chinook gillnet capture.	24970 USFWS	FR- 2	To capture 120,000 late run fall chinook eggs for lower Klamath River late fall chinook rearing program.	82
Orleans Rod and Gun Club	Orleans	Rescued steelhead rearing project	11297 CDFG	FR- 4	Goal is to rear 18,000 to 20,000 steelhead rescued from Scott River system.	79
NCIDC	Mid-Klamath River tributaries	Pond rearing program for mid-Klamath River chinook	101712 CDFG	FR- 6	Ongoing program. Production goal of 120,000 to 240,000 chinook (Indian, Grider, and Elk Creeks).	79
Art Frazier	Hammel Creek	Chinook hatching/rearing project	8074 CDFG	FR- 5	To rear 30,000 yearling Salmon River chinook	77
NCIDC	Lower Klamath River	Accelerated Stocking Program, Late Fall Run Chinook	133058 USFWS	FR- 9		77
<i>"Low" and "High" Budgets</i>			<i>E = 315,486</i>			
Orleans Rod and Gun Club	Orleans	Upgrade fish rearing facility	9550 USFWS	FR- 1	Increase rearing capacity and capability.	71
Paul and Joanne Luckey	Bogus Creek	Eagle Ranch Steelhead Rescue Rearing Facility	18473 CDFG	FR-10	Rear rescued steelhead from Bogus, Cold, and nearby creeks.	53
Commercial Maricultures	Iron Gate Hatchery	Hatchery Assessment	36000 USFWS	FR- 8		28
** Subtotal **			379509			

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
** CATEGORY: Habitat Protection						
Hoop Valley Tribal Council	Pine Creek	Sediment monitoring	38662 USFWS	HP- 1	Phase 4 of the Pine Creek watershed 83 improvement program.	83
			<i>"Low" Budget Σ = 38,662</i>			
Klamath N.F.	Negro/Indian Creek Drainages	Watershed Improvement Needs Inventory (WINI)	16300 USFWS	HP-17	South Fork of the Salmon River.	74
Klamath N.F.	Methodist Creek Drainage	Watershed improvement needs inventory (WINI).	17000 USFWS	HP-16	South Fork of Salmon River.	73
Klamath N.F.	Clear, Rainy, Elk and Dillon Cks.	Coarse woody material survey.	4000 USFWS	HP-13	To establish coarse woody debris restoration standard.	72
Pacific Watershed Associates	Lower Klamath River tributaries	Watershed and stream channel assessment of 5 tributary basins.	44635 USFWS	HP-12		71
<i>"High" Budget</i>			<i>Σ = 120,597</i>			
Klamath N.F.	Wooley Creek	Habitat Condition Study	31300 USFWS	HP-14		68
USFWS-KRFRO	Basinwide	Abandoned mine pollution survey.	24890 USFWS	HP- 2	Competitive bid: Identify pollution sites, evaluate degree of water quality degradation, and facilitate abatement of problem. (Policy 2.B.2.b,g)	62
Klamath N.F.	Oak Flat Creek	Sediment Study	26670 USFWS	HP-15		58
Shasta Valley RCD	Shasta Valley	Shasta River Riparian Inventory	10109 USFWS	HP-11		57
USFWS-KRFRO	Klamath R, Shasta & Scott subbasins	Design instream flow studies.	10785 USFWS	HP- 3	Competitive bid: IFIM study. (Policy 2.F.1.j)	55
Kier Associates	Basinwide	Database of water quality and habitat inventory.	0 USFWS	HP- 4	Incorporates data into national EPA 52 waterbody system database. (Policy 3.2.c.d, Policy 3.13.b and Policy 7.7.b)	
DWR	Scott River	Scott River IFIM study.	319000 USFWS	HP-10	Proposed for 3 years, total \$319,000.	49
DWR	Klamath River Estuary	Water quality and biological assessment.	66345 USFWS	HP- 6	Study proposed for 3 years, total cost \$132,680.	49
DWR	Klamath River	Instream Flow Needs Study, IFIM.	598000 USFWS	HP- 9	Proposed for 3 years, total \$598,000.	44

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
DWR	Lake Shastina	Limnological study.	35300	USFWS HP- 5	Water quality study of Lake Shastina.	43
DWR	Lower Klamath River	Water quality study.	176325	USFWS HP- 8	Proposed for three years, total cost \$176,325.	42
DWR	Shasta and Scott River basins	Assessment of Water Quality of Ag Return Flows.	39244	USFWS HP- 7		41
Research Triangle Institute	Basinwide	Data Management System	73981	USFWS HP-18	Data can be incorporated into the EPA waterbody system database.	38
Contaminant Research Center	Scott/Shasta Rivers	Agriculture effects study	376000	USFWS HP-19		37
Energy Resource Advocates	Upper Klamath River Basin	GIS Feasibility Analysis	35516	USFWS HP-21		30
DWR	Scott River	Sediment Pool Feasibility Study	29100	USFWS HP-20		30
** Subtotal **			1973162			

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
** CATEGORY: Habitat Restoration NCIDC	Tarup Creek	Migration barrier removal.	10192 USFWS	HR-24	Lower Klamath tributary. Remove sediment at mouth of creek.	90
Shasta RCD	Shasta River	Easton bank protection and riparian fencing.	7190 USFWS	HR-17	1400 lineal feet of riparian protection.	89
Shasta RCD	Shasta River	A.D. Banhart Cattle Exclusion Fencing	9698 CDFG	HR-18	Riparian fencing for 4500 lineal feet of 2 stranded electrical fencing.	88
Klamath N.F.	South Fork Salmon River	Overwinter Habitat Enhancement	3432 CDFG	HR-11	Juvenile winter habitat.	84
Siskiyou RCD	Scott River	Streambank protection.	11550 CDFG	HR-20	Work was identified in the FY91 riparian condition survey.	84
Siskiyou RCD	Scott River	Riparian Fencing and Re-vegetation Project.	17556 CDFG	HR-21	Work identified in the FY91 riparian condition survey.	84
Siskiyou RCD	Paradise Hollow, French Ck Drainage	Cattle exclusion fencing.	10340 CDFG	HR-19	Tributary to Scott River.	83
Klamath N.F.	South Fork Salmon River	Plant native riparian vegetation.	11640 CDFG	HR-14	Second stage of the riparian vegetation project.	82
Fruit Growers Supply Company	Cottonwood Creek	Cattle Exclusion Fencing	39456 CDFG	HR-25	Tributary below Iron Gate. 2 miles of 5 strand barb wire riparian fencing.	81
Shasta RCD	Shasta River	Riparian Fencing and Re-vegetation Project.	28886 CDFG	HR-22	2.5 miles of riverbank to be fenced, and planted if needed.	81
Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Shasta River CRMP Field Projects Coordinator	24785 USFWS	HR-23	Coordinate activities of the newly formed Shasta Coordinated Resource Management Program (CRMP).	81
Klamath N.F.	Indian Creek	Winter habitat restoration.	22725 CDFG	HR- 9	Mid-Klamath tributary. Complex large woody debris structures.	77
Klamath N.F.	Indian Creek	Riparian restoration.	8840 CDFG	HR- 8	Mid-Klamath tributary. Summer and winter thermal protection.	74
Klamath N.F.	Salmon River basin	Log structure placement.	11327 CDFG	HR-13	20 structures placed in various	73

"Low" budget

Σ = 197,450

"High" budget

Σ = 217,617

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
					tributaries to the Salmon River.	
USFWS-KRFRO	Basinwide	Adoption of sub-basins.	1000 USFWS	HR- 4	Competitive bid: Provide start up funding for local community groups for restoration at the "grassroots level". (Policy 3.1.d)	69
Six Rivers N.F.	Bluff Creek	Construction of log cover structures.	14615 USFWS	HR-16	12 complex structures placed in the 68 mainstem creek.	68
Six Rivers N.F.	Red Cap Creek	Construction of log cover structures.	15290 USFWS	HR-15	14 structures in the main stem of creek.	67
Klamath N.F.	Salmon River mainstem	Provide boulder cover at Crapo Creek confluence.	6732 CDFG	HR-12	Provide protection for spring chinook.	64
USFWS-KRFRO	Scott River		200000 USFWS	HR- 6	Competitive bid: erosion control. No budget estimate.	61
Klamath N.F.	Grider Creek	Fish Habitat Improvement	20000 CDFG	HR- 7	Habitat improvement by providing juvenile rearing areas.	61
Klamath N.F.	Crawford Creek	Re-construct road adjacent to creek.	48255 CDFG	HR-10	Tributary to S. Fk. Salmon River. Sediment reduction.	60
CCC	Klamath River	Stream habitat restoration.	72088 CDFG	HR-27	Construct and install 50+ instream structures on mid-Klamath tributaries.	53
CCC	Lower Tributaries of Klamath River	Stream Habitat Restoration	81497 USFWS	HR-29		49
Trout Unlimited	Seiad Creek	Construction of habitat modification structures.	50000 USFWS	HR- 3	Mid-Klamath tributary. Project targeting juvenile rearing habitat improvement.	49
Trout Unlimited	Humbug Creek	Migration barrier removal.	78710 USFWS	HR- 1	Mid Klamath tributary.	46
USFWS-KRFRO	Salmon River	Erosion control.	200000 USFWS	HR- 5	Competitive bid: erosion control. No budget estimate.	45
Trout Unlimited	Horse Creek	Juvenile Rearing Structures	50000 USFWS	HR- 2	Mid-Klamath tributary. Instream habitat modification structures.	45
DWR	Scott River	Pilot Project: Modify 3500 feet of	30800 USFWS	HR-30		38

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
		stream channel				
Trout Unlimited	Horse Creek	Migration Barrier Improvement	80796 USFWS	HR-28		36
Hegler	Empire and Lumgrey Creeks	Thermal Rehabilitation Ponds	150675 CDFG	HR-32		24
Hegler	Walker Creek	Thermal Rehabilitation Ponds	49617 USFWS	HR-31		22
** Subtotal **			1367692			

06/11

KLAMATH RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR BIDDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
** CATEGORY: Program Administration USFWS-69	Basinwide	Sound system	7666 USFWS PA-	2	For use at Task Force and KFMC meetings. Cost is rough estimate.	80
USFWS-KRFRO	Yreka, CA.	Technical Library	4250 USFWS PA-	3		78
USFWS-KRFRO	Basinwide	Three year action plan	26600 USFWS PA-	1	Identification, prioritization, and organization of high priority steps for long range plan policy implementation.	71
** Subtotal **			38516			
*** Total ***			4496830			

KLAMATH FISH RESTORATION PROGRAM
RECOMMENDED WORK PLAN, FISCAL YEAR 1992

files: 92krp.dbf,ndx,frm

PROJECT COOPERATOR NUMBER	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST COMMENT
** CATEGORY: Education			
E- 1 Shasta Valley RCD	Shasta River Basin	Operating expenses for Shasta Valley CRMP	2090 To cover administrative costs of newly formed CRMP.
E-13 Klamath Forest Alliance	Salmon River	Poaching prevention workshop.	1600 Emphasis on protecting spring chinook and summer steelhead on Salmon River, participation by locals.
E-14 Calif. Salmon and Steelhead Reat.	Northern Calif.	10th Annual Conference	2500 Funding request for administrative expenses.
E- 6 USFWS-KRFRO	Basinwide	Curriculum development for grades 9-12.	17500 Continue to expand existing curricula from grades 4-8 through grade 12. (In FY91, \$50,000 of funding will be available to continue these projects.) Also provides funding for equipment and materials for teachers with the Klamath River Educational Program.
** Subtotal **			23690
** CATEGORY: Fish Protection			
FP- 5 USFWS-CCFRO	Basinwide	Age composition/scale analysis of Klamath fall chinook.	5450 To provide the KRTAT with an age composition estimate.
FP-11 Hoopa Valley Tribal Council	Klamath River below Trinity River	Estimate population size and range of green sturgeon.	14058 Tag and re-capture 100 migrating adult green sturgeon.
FP- 7 USFWS- Fish Health Center	Basinwide	Disease Survey of Salmonid Smolts	10105 To determine status and smolt quality at Iron Gate hatchery prior to release and after 3 weeks in river, as well as wild smolts captured in the lower Klamath.
FP- 8 Coastal Resources Research Group	Salmon River	Population Differentiation of Spring and Fall Chinook.	16109 Identification through DNA profiling used to distinguish between spring and fall chinook salmon stocks on the Salmon River.
FP- 4 USFWS-CCFRO	Klamath River at Rig Bar	Monitoring of Yearling Salmonid Emigration.	3000 Ongoing project.
FP-12 Hoopa Valley Tribal Council	Pine Creek	Monitoring outmigrating salmonids.	25000 This proposal is for monitoring over a 3-year time period, with the understanding that the total cost will be \$49,000.
FP-15 California Dept. of Fish and Game	Kidder Creek	Irrigation diversion screening	47476 Likely funded by CDFG (7/91). One screen on Kidder Creek 52 cfs diversion ditch.
FP- 2 USFWS-CCFRO	Blue Creek	Status of Salmon and Steelhead Stocks of Blue Ck.	58729 Biological survey and habitat assessment. Ongoing project.

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
RECOMMENDED WORK PLAN, FISCAL YEAR 1992

files: 92krp.dbf,ndx,frm

PROJECT COOPERATOR NUMBER	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST COMMENT
FP-16 Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game	Scott and Shasta Valleys	Temporary help for the Yreka Screen shop.	27589
** Subtotal **			207516
** CATEGORY: Fish Restoration			
FR 7 NCIDC	Fall Creek	Rearing Pond Project	33625
FR- 3 NCIDC	Lower Klamath River Tributaries	Fish rescue and rearing project.	2750 To rescue stranded juvenile salmonids in the lower Klamath River and tributaries.
FR- 2 NCIDC	Lower Klamath River	Late run fall chinook gillnet capture.	24970 To capture 120,000 late run fall chinook eggs for lower Klamath River late fall chinook rearing program.
FR- 6 NCIDC	Mid-Klamath River tributaries	Pond rearing program for mid-Klamath River chinook	101712 Ongoing program. Production goal of 120,000 to 240,000 chinook (Indian, Bluff, Elk Creeks). Camp Creek broodstocks used in these ponds.
FR- 4 Orleans Rod and Gun Club	Orleans	Rescued steelhead rearing project	11297 Goal is to rear 18,000 to 20,000 steelhead rescued from Scott River system.
FR- 5 Art Frazier	Hammel Creek	Chinook hatching/rearing project	8074 To rear 30,000 yearling Salmon River chinook
FR- 9 NCIDC	Lower Klamath River	Accelerated Stocking Program, Late Fall Run Chinook	133058
FR- 1 Orleans Rod and Gun Club	Orleans	Upgrade fish rearing facility	9550 Increase rearing capacity and capability.
** Subtotal **			325036
** CATEGORY: Habitat Protection			
HP- 1 Hoopa Valley Tribal Council	Pine Creek	Sediment monitoring	38662 Phase 4 of the Pine Creek watershed improvement program.
HP- 4 Kier Associates	Basinwide	Database of water quality and habitat inventory.	0 Funded with \$102,000 from the State Water Resources Control Board. Incorporates data into national EPA waterbody system database. (Policy 3.2.c.d, Policy 3.13.b and Policy 7.7.b)
** Subtotal **			38662
** CATEGORY: Habitat Restoration			
HR-24 NCIDC	Tarup Creek	Migration barrier removal.	10192 Lower Klamath tributary. Remove sediment at mouth of creek.

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
RECOMMENDED WORK PLAN, FISCAL YEAR 1992

files: 92krp.dbf,ndx,frm

PROJECT NUMBER	COOPERATOR	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	COMMENT
HR-17	Shasta RCD	Shasta River	Easton bank protection and riparian fencing.	7190	1400 lineal feet of riparian protection.
HR-18	Shasta RCD	Shasta River	A.D. Bannhart Cattle Exclusion Fencing	9698	Likely funded by CDFG (7/91). Riparian fencing for 4300 lineal feet of 2 stranded electrical fencing.
HR-11	Klamath N.F.	South Fork Salmon River	Overwinter Habitat Enhancement	3432	Likely funded by CDFG (7/91). Juvenile winter habitat.
HR-20	Siskiyou RCD	Scott River	Streambank protection.	11550	Likely funded by CDFG (7/91). Work was identified in the FY91 riparian condition survey.
HR-21	Siskiyou RCD	Scott River	Riparian Fencing and Re-vegetation Project.	17556	Likely funded by CDFG (7/91). Work identified in the FY91 riparian condition survey.
HR-19	Siskiyou RCD	Paradise Hollow, French Ck Drainage	Cattle exclusion fencing.	10340	Tributary to Scott River.
HR-14	Klamath N.F.	South Fork Salmon River	Plant native riparian vegetation.	11640	Likely funded by CDFG (7/91). Second stage of the riparian vegetation project.
HR-25	Fruit Growers Supply Company	Cottonwood Creek	Cattle Exclusion Fencing	39456	Likely funded by CDFG (7/91). Tributary below Iron Gate. 2 miles of 5 strand barb wire riparian fencing.
HR-22	Shasta RCD	Shasta River	Riparian Fencing and Re-vegetation Project.	28886	Likely funded by CDFG (7/91). 2.5 miles of riverbank to be fenced, and planted if needed.
HR-23	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Shasta River CRMP Field Projects Coordinator	24785	Coordinate activities of the newly formed Shasta Coordinated Resource Management Program (CRMP).
HR-9	Klamath N.F.	Indian Creek	Winter habitat restoration.	22725	Likely funded by CDFG (7/91). Mid-Klamath tributary. Complex large woody debris structures.
** Subtotal **				197450	
** CATEGORY: Program Administration					
PA-4	USFWS-KRFRO	Basinwide	Program Coordination and Implementation	405000	Includes costs for 5 staff, travel for Task Force and Management Council, building rental, meeting room rental, printing, etc.
PA-1	USFWS-KRFRO	Basinwide	Three year action plan	26800	Identification, prioritization, and organization of high priority steps for long range plan policy implementation.
** Subtotal **				431600	
*** Total ***				1223954	

MEETING OF THE
KLAMATH FISHERIES TASK FORCE
EUREKA, CALIFORNIA JUNE 17-19, 1991
SUMMARY MINUTES

Meeting called to order at 1:14 p.m. by Chairman Shake, with a quorum present (see roster, Attachment 1a). Absent: Barbara Holder and Don DeVol.

Adoption of agenda

(Odemar): I suggest that we postpone the discussion on operational planning until tomorrow morning.

**** Motion **** (Wilkinson): I move to accept the agenda (Attachment 1b).
Seconded.

**** Motion carried ****

Adoption of minutes

Discussion of minutes from the March 11 meeting in Millbrae, CA.

**** Motion **** (Wilkinson): I move to approve the March 11, 1991 minutes from the Millbrae meeting. Seconded.

**** Motion carried. ****

Report on status of work plans for FY89-91

o Non-Federal work plan (Odemar)

At the February meeting Michael Bird presented the state's workplan. Today, I will provide an update on that workplan based on Mike's reports (see Attachment 2).

Kier Associates' report on the effectiveness of instream structures found that the structures were not as effective as hoped for. The state has completed reports on in-stream structures, but they lack the evaluation component present in federal reports.

o Federal work plan (Alcorn)

FY89:

Alcorn:

o Most of the agreements for FY89 are closed (Attachment 3).

o The outstanding agreements include DWR and CDFG. The left over money from CDFG work (\$60,000) will be used for the same type of work (tagging Iron Gate Hatchery chinook) in following FY's.

**** Motion **** Wilkinson: I move that the TF provide flexibility of funds from one fiscal year to the next.

Discussion:

- o This money has been obligated out of the FY89 funds, if it is not spent, it is lost to the project. Remaining money can be spent in the next fiscal year for a similar project.
- o If we don't use the money on a similar project, then we don't get to spend it. The scope of work cannot change but the geographical area can.

** Wilkinson: Amend the motion. The TWG should develop criteria to flag and account for carry-over of remaining money. If there is money left over after the end-dates of the agreements, then we should get guidance on what to do with it.

** Motion carried. **

Discussion:

A related issue is that the Act calls for carry-over of funds. \$21 million over 20 years is supposed to be available until expended. A mistake in FWS, has kept this money from remaining available.

Shake: This is an action item that should be revisited. Perhaps we could go to DC to get the procedure for carrying-over funds set in place along with the Act. We could use the projects from FY89 as examples. We need to be able to be flexible.

** Action Item **

o Federal work plan (Alcorn) continued

FY89 page 2: We have good news - as a result of the sediment budget and the French Ck sediment study (4.14), the Calif State Board of Forestry will use the French Ck area as a model study area for mixed ownership and Coordinated Resource Management Planning (CRMP's).

FY90 (Attachment 4)

Page 1: The water quality study on the Shasta River shows that high water temperatures are the limiting factor to fish production. There are also problems with elevated levels of un-ionized ammonia. The state will use these studies as a springboard for further studies. So, this is an example of restoration program money going farther than originally planned.

FY91 (Attachment 5)

Funding for the curriculum development project (E-3), was deferred until FY92 at the March TF meeting. Ron Iverson recommended that we defer this funding because the need for FY91 funds was expected to be greater than the money available. We have now found that there is adequate money available to fund this project out of FY91 funds.

** We accept the two reports. **

Introduction of guest.

Bruce Halstead introduces Chuck Metzler who is Congressman Riggs Representative from Riggs' Eureka office.

Update on Klamath and Trinity flows

Don Paff, Bureau of Reclamation:

- o The drought is still with us. The peak time for reservoirs to fill is right now. From now on the water levels will lower.
- o The revised release schedule calls for 800 cfs to be released at Iron Gate Dam during June. 250 cfs will be the minimum flow from Keno dam. The Secretary's decision calls for 290,000 acre-feet to be released to the Trinity.
- o The release schedules to contractors have not changed. The late season rains caused us to go from a disastrous year to a bad year. This will be the 7th driest year of record for Southern Oregon and all of California. The carryover storage in the reservoirs will be down to the amount that the reservoirs held in 1977, which means this is the second lowest reservoir storage in history. Next year will hopefully be a recovery year.
- o A Central Valley Project Operation Criterion Plan (CVPOCP) is being put together. This will help to address many issues from many agencies. Next year, we could be in really tough shape if we do not get rain this winter. We are telling contractors that they will get zero deliveries. Hopefully, we will get at least normal rainfall next year.

Q: What are the plans in case we don't get rain?

A: The reservoirs will be empty. It has got to rain in order to provide water to contractors. The statistical forecast needs to come true.

Q: As I drove on Highway 5, I was surprised to see so many new rice fields growing in the Central Valley. I am concerned about seeing hundreds of acre-feet of water being used to grow rice. Why are new rice fields being planted?

A: The new fields are not in addition to existing fields. 20,000 acres are out of production. There are less acres of land under irrigation now than there were five years ago. 2.6 acre-feet of water is not that much water to grow rice. Cotton is the crop that uses more water than rice.

Q: Is this information written up anywhere?

A: No, but I could write up a summary of the Klamath and Trinity systems and provide it to the Task Force, via the Klamath River Fisheries Resource Office (KRFRO). We are still in for a tough year next year. We need to plan that water is in short supply. The CVPOCP is being developed under Section 7 to protect the Bald Eagle and winter chinook. Agencies are currently reviewing this plan.

Q: Can I (Mike Orcutt) be more involved in the process to review the plan? I feel that the tribe should be involved in this process because the Hoopa Tribe was integral in securing the increased flows.

A: Yes.

Q: Since we are unable to affect the amount of precipitation we receive, yet global warming seems to be at the heart of the problem, is the Bureau of Reclamation looking at ways of decreasing the carbon dioxide input to the atmosphere?

A: We are looking into what the effects of CO2 are, but we are not planning on setting regulations for the amount of output.

Kirk Rogers, Bureau of Reclamation:

- o The Trinity River is looking better than ever this year. Fish are returning to the river in great condition.

Bill Shake thanked Don and Kirk for attending, and invited them back to attend future meetings.

Task Force discussion of the upper basin plan amendment.

Iverson:

- o The draft amendment to the long-range plan was delivered by Kier Associates last winter. The draft was provided to the TF in January 1991.
- o In February, we proposed a schedule for incorporating comments into this document. The original schedule is now obsolete because of delays. For example, ODFW and the Hoopa Tribe have not yet provided comments. Therefore we have not completed the first step. After the first step is completed, we will send this amendment out for a public comment period. Public comments will be incorporated for Task Force review. This process will take 8 months from the Task Force commenting on the draft plan to arriving at a final amendment.

Discussion:

- o We could form a smaller group to look at the comments, provide suggestions to revise the amendment. This same group will decide on recommendations for the public involvement process. The group could consist of Keith Wilkinson and Mike Orcutt.
- o We will send a letter to the Tribe asking them to participate in the plans for the upper basin.
- o We should set a termination date for public comment and advertise this in the Federal Register. Dates will be decided on later. (Shake suggests that he and Keith Wilkinson meet with ODFW to set dates.)

**** Action Item ****

- o The procedure for dealing with comments would be similar to the procedure for the full long-range plan. Agency comments would be brought to the next TF meeting.

Update on the status of the KFMC long-range plan.

Whitehouse:

- o 46 comments were received on the draft plan (21 written, 25 oral). These comments have been categorized, organized, then reviewed by the ad hoc subcommittee.
- o The ad hoc subcommittee's recommendations for revisions will be provided to the council at their meeting next week.

Public Comment Period

Jim Cook, Great Northern Corporation

- 1) On behalf of the Shasta CRMP, we would like to extend an invitation to the Task Force to be part of the CRMP process. Doug Alcorn and Dick Sumner have been at meetings, but we do not yet have an official Klamath River Task Force representative.

** Hearing no objections, Dick Sumner will be the Task Force representative for the Shasta CRMP.

** Action Item. **

2) re: publishing annual reports

We, at Great Northern Corporation (GNC) feel that it may be difficult for the public to access final reports for the Klamath Restoration Program by using the Fish and Wildlife Reference Service (FWRS). We would like to volunteer to keep a copy of the reports at our office in a 3-ring binder for the public to access.

(Iverson): We normally make enough copies of final reports for Task Force members. We could make one more copy, give it to GNC, then they could distribute it locally.

Q: Is GNC making a gratis offer to do this for the life of the program? Yes.

Q: Are final copies of the reports available to the public right now within the basin? A: The current final report distribution system calls for final reports being mailed to the public libraries in each county.

Q: How is your organization planning to let the public know about this process? A: The Fish and Wildlife Service currently mails a letter to all interested people twice yearly letting them know that final reports are available: 1) at public libraries, or 2) they can receive their own copy by calling the 800 number for the Fish and Wildlife Reference Service. This letter could also reference GNC as a report repository.

- o GNC cannot publish government reports for-profit.
- o Long-range Plan Policy 7.7.f calls for setting up an information transfer service. GNC is volunteering to supplement the current process, and this could be good. Psychologically, it sounds good to have the reports available locally.

(Shake): I'll assume that there is no major opposition to this idea. A motion will not be carried because this action is supplemental.

Report on the benefits and detriments of Threatened or Endangered Species listing of Klamath River stocks:

Shake: Listing a species as threatened or endangered can occur in two ways. On one hand, an interested group can petition the FWS to list a particular species as threatened or endangered. The agency then has 90 days to consider the petition. Once a petition is accepted, a notice of acceptance is published. After data is reviewed, the agency makes a draft decision to list the species as threatened or endangered, or not to list. Economics are not taken into consideration. Public comments are collected, then a final decision is made. Decisions are made on a case by case basis.

If the FWS deems a species as threatened, there is more flexibility in the management of stocks. Federal agencies that may disrupt the threatened species need to go through a Section 7 process. If a fish species in the

Klamath is listed, then we would need to consult with NMFS before trying to do any restoration work.

"Anadromous Salmonids on the Decline" is an article in the March-April issue of Fisheries that I recommend reading. See also attachment 6.

Wallop-Breaux funding (Shake)

- o There was a question at the February meeting to find out if the USFS could share in receiving Wallop-Breaux funding.
- o Wallop-Breaux funding is \$160 million per year administered by the FWS to each state. USFS cannot use.
- o Some items of interest pertaining to Wallop-Breaux funding include:
 - o Reverted funds can be used by the FWS for research.
 - o An administrative fund is established that cannot use more than 4% of the total. Any money remaining in this fund is allocated to multi agency jurisdictions with wide-appeal for sportfishing.
 - o An amendment would be needed for agencies such as the USFS or tribes to be able to receive the money. The law comes up for re-authorization next year.

Hillman: The Native American Fish and Wildlife Society has drafted proposed language for an amendment to the Wallop-Breaux funding act. This amendment would allow tribal participation.

June 18, 1991

Klamath River subbasin stock identification

Iverson: The joint consistency committee called for nominating a panel to study the Klamath River subbasin stock identification issue.

Discussion:

- o There should be a specific list of what constitutes the discrete stocks within the basin. We need a panel of people who have both academic and hands-on field experience.
- o Both academicians and agency people should be on this panel. A mixture of people worked out well for a similar panel on the Columbia River.
- o The council is concerned about the validity of the stocks listed in the TF plan. They think that the problems of managing weak stocks could be magnified if the stocks aren't correctly identified.
- o People with a genetics background could set the tone of what should be looked at. Later, some of the other folks could review what has been produced.

Specific people to serve on this panel might include: Barnhart (USFWS Co-op unit), Halstead (USFWS-Coastal Calif. Fisheries Resources Office (CCFRO)), Hubbell (CDFG), Orcutt (Hoopa Valley Fisheries), Des Laurier (USFS), Maahs (commercial fishing), Reisenblechler (USFWS-Seattle Lab), a representative from NMFS, a representative from AFS, and a representative from ODFW.

We need to clearly describe what we want this panel to do

- o examine the list of stocks that we identified in the plan
- o validate that list in terms of being distinct stocks

- o put some sideboards on the list with the objective of consolidation rather than expansion (with allowances for special situations).
- o review all available information and identify data gaps.

We also need to decide if we are going to cover this group's expenses and if we are going to provide staff support to help administer this panel. This would be a temporary panel.

**** Action ****

Iverson will write a letter to the appropriate folks.

Report from the Education subcommittee

The Education subcommittee met June 17 and discussed the following items: curriculum development, a video on Yurok fisheries and programs underway for public communication and education through the Yreka office.

Orcutt: I sat in on the meeting, I'd like to become formally involved.

Wilkinson: I'd recommend the chairman appoint him. He's expressed his interest; and is working in tribal education as well.

**** Action Item ****

The subcommittee report was made in 2 parts: Keith Wilkinson reported on school education and the proposed video, then Tricia Whitehouse reported on the programs underway for public communication.

Wilkinson:

- o The FY90 contract for curriculum development for grades 4-6 was reviewed by the committee. Dianne Higgins, contractor, was present at the meeting to answer questions.
- o The curriculum development program is valuable to the restoration program. The education subcommittee believes education is the best investment of our restoration dollar. We're in the process of completing the 2nd year of curriculum development. Next year we'll do the 9-12. There is a Summer Institute scheduled for a week this summer similar to the one scheduled for last year. Summer Institute is an opportunity for teachers to get out and get some experience in salmon fisheries of the Klamath River basin. We heard the report on this at the December meeting. Overall, I'm pleased with what's happened in the education category. We believe it's valuable.
- o Diane Higgins has provided copies of the education curriculum from her contract for interested members of the Task Force to have.
- o In the 4 county restoration program area, we have a potential to reach 6,000 4-6 graders, 4,000 7-8 graders, or a K-12 total of 38,000 students.
- o The Klamath River Educational Program (KREP) has socioeconomic benefits even outside of the KR basin. The four counties should be inclusive, not just the part of the counties within the Klamath River basin. The upper basin should also be included.

oo Another issue that the subcommittee discussed was the Yurok video. The three questions that are unsettled are: 1) why would the video need to go out for competitive bid instead of cooperative agreement? 2) Why did the FY91 Request for Proposals (RFP) call for videos? and, 3) If the project for video production goes to bid, what will the budget be set at?

** Motion ** Bingham: I move that the 2 video proposals be taken out of '92 budget. The subject of video production should be given to the education subcommittee.

(The Task Force education subcommittee consists of Bingham, Wilkinson, Holder, Orcutt, and Pierce).

Shake: Nat made a motion in February's meeting to include equal consideration for future videos. Now, we have a motion to leave all videos until next year, until after the education subcommittee researches the content and process for funding. We have consensus that a single video covering many user groups would be better than a video on just one user group.

** Motion ** Bingham: I make a motion that we pull both videos from the FY92 budget, refer them to the education subcommittee to develop a video addressing fishing and restoration programs in the basin, and come back to the Task Force for final approval. The proposed video will be submitted to USFWS for their bidding process. The proposal will come from the education subcommittee to the Task Force to be reviewed and rated.

Lara: I object to the motion.

** Motion ** Lara: I make a motion to leave the Yurok video in the FY92 workplan. Motion seconded.

Bingham: I'll vote no to the motion, because there has not been equal consideration for the troller video, which was part of my original motion.

Shake: As an alternative, we could go back to Nat's motion and include development of a plan of work for the education subcommittee. They'd consider the concept to develop a video.

** Motion ** Shake: I suggest a similar motion to Nat's, but with a clear statement that includes work proposed by NCIDC in the plan of work. Seconded.

Lara: I object to this motion. We've got to have the legal opinion on the Yurok video. I think we should table this until 2:00 p.m. when we can get some answers to the contractual procedures.

Shake: The legal question of contractual procedures has been assigned to the education subcommittee. Does that help your concern?

Lara: No. But I'll abstain from voting on the motion.

Shake: Roll call: all "yes", with two abstentions.
Hearing no objections, we'll give the assignment to the subcommittee.

**** Motion carried ****

Education Subcommittee Report (continued)

Wilkinson:

One of the questions was the parameters or scope of the education program. Is it the 4 counties, or the Klamath River basin? I believe it should be the 4 counties. We need clarification as to the scope of the range.

Shake: I agree with you, the contract should include the 4 county area.

Q: Diane, is the video tape library called for in your contract accessible to the public? Yes.

Whitehouse:

The rest of the Education and Communication Program is continuing. I'm administering contracts with Kidder Creek Outdoor School, Chico State University (survey), Paula Yoon (transportable display) and Dianne Higgins (7-8th grade curriculum).

- o Kidder Creek Outdoor School: On May 15, the cooperator received the signed agreement. The development of outdoor field activities is beginning.
- o The Survey Research Center at Chico State University has developed the questions and analytical program for the survey. The questions for school age children have been pre-tested. We're prepared to send the questionnaire to OMB for approval. The goals and objectives for the survey were developed by KRFRO in conjunction with the Survey Research Center.
- o The transportable display is being developed. This transportable display was funded last year as an informational display for restoration activities. Paula Yoon, contractor, reported to the education subcommittee that the display will provide an overview of the basin and the restoration program with information on the enabling legislation, an aerial photo of the entire basin, information on the long range plan, information and photographs on habitat protection/restoration, and fish protection/restoration. It will be smaller than the display that was built for the Humboldt County Fishing Industry so that it can fit in the government vehicle. It will be built in such a way that it can be left unattended in public places. The draft outline for this display has been sent, by the contractor, to all of you for comments.

The other items I'm involved with include the KFMC long-range plan. We've had 5 public meetings, and lots of press coverage before, during, and after meetings. I've been organizing the public and agency comments for review by the Management Council at their meeting next week.

The Task Force's Long-Range Plan has been mailed to the printer in Portland. We should have copies available by late July. Getting the plan ready for printing took a lot of work and staff time at the KRFRO.

The newsletter was approved in February by WO office. Members of the Task Force and Management Council are now reviewing it. I'll collect their comments and make necessary changes. We hope to get this newsletter mailed to the public soon. It'll be a good way for people to keep up to date without having to read the minutes. The newsletter will be printed quarterly.

I've been giving the slide presentation on the Klamath Restoration Program to community groups. Other groups continue to request and schedule presentations.

The brochure has been forwarded to the regional office and is awaiting printing.

Scopes of works for the communication and education program were written based on the Long-Range Plan. These scopes of work went through the ranking process with the Technical Work Group and are on the proposed workplan.

The USFWS Reference Service has been receiving final reports from us several at a time. Interested parties are notified once the reports are entered into the referencing database.

This report summarizes all the activities occurring within the Public Communication and Education Program at this time.

3 year action plan proposal

Iverson:

The biggest cost factor in this proposal for a 3 year action plan (Attachment 7) would be for additional travel and meetings for the TWG. We figure it costs about \$3,000 per 3 day meeting. This proposal would lay out an action plan similar to the one for the Trinity Restoration Program.

Action planning is consistent with the long-range plan. The policies in the plan need to be prioritized and organized into a, for example, 3-year action plan. First, we would need to identify and characterize implementing actions (i.e., what, who, where, when, how much and limiting factors). Secondly, we would prioritize each long range policy, or, actions leading to each policy. Thirdly, we need to identify a timeframe to get the high priority items done first.

A question that arises with a proposal like this is: What kind of public involvement do we need to develop an action plan? This plan for the Klamath may require detailed NEPA compliance with opportunities for public involvement.

The proposed schedule calls for a 7-month period during which action planning would occur. The work would be done in-house by FWS staff and TWG members. The cost estimate in this proposal has a wide confidence interval.

Every group involved needs to come up with a long-term plan and share these all around. Then, every member group could sign a MOU or MOA saying what they intend to do to carry out the 3 year action plan. This is compatible with the long-term planning process. Whether these MOU's would have a legal force if signators did not carry out their part of the the agreement does not seem reasonable.

Shake: It sounds like we need long-term action planning. Now we need to decide how we will go about this.

- o Bingham: Clearly, \$1,000,000 / year is not enough . How do we take our large vision of what we want to get done in the Klamath Basin and narrow it down to something that can be done within budget?
- o Farro: Staff developed some Scope of Works to be put into the ranking process. Their efforts were based on plan policies but were not well received. Maybe in the future the Scope of Works produced by staff will be better understood. The TWG is already busy, it is hard to ask them to give more of their time.
- o Sumner: I can envision that this thing could swell up and get as large as the original plan, although I would like to see the work done. I would like to recommend that we keep it as simple as we can.
- o Barnes: Agency commitment is essential for 20-30 work days. Before we go ahead on this, we need to get the agencies to commit.

Other comments

Bill Mendenhall, DWR: We already have the tools to do this type of planning. IFIM is a powerful tool that could help. Many times it is misunderstood.

Pat Higgins: As we get more and more detailed, the TWG is forced to check with local groups to coordinate efforts.

Bob Rohde, ERA: We have satellite shots that will identify all the current projects that have been done to date. These can be used as a management tool to envision what needs to be done. This would give a clear overview of the basin with background information that will help the TF decide and focus on priorities. Our work will provide recommendations on work that needs to be done. I would like to give you an update on what we have produced to date.

Iverson: I don't think this Scope of Work (PA-1) is appropriate for deciding how to spend \$1 million/year. This action plan needs to incorporate all the little pieces that many groups are working on.

Odemar: I have been involved in 2 separate processes that Mackett has facilitated. They were both successful. I suggest that we consider using this technique. I imagine it will be much easier than when we went through the process with the council. The product would be a large chart with the information needs identified.

Once the chart is set up, it will help to easily identify gaps...that need action. For example, if we see that CDFG should do something, but they can't, we could find out which other agency would take the responsibility.?

Iverson: The trouble is that a lot of these policies are things that should have been done for the last 20 years. We should use the sophisticated planning techniques that Mel suggests.

**** Motion **** Shake: I make a motion that we use this proposal with the understanding that we use Dave Mackett's skills (as available) and look for

both a short term and long term policy breakdown in a draft 3 year action plan.

We will need a single purpose meeting to start on this process. The meeting will be open to all TF and TWG members.

Hearing no objections, let's go ahead and do this.

**** Action Item ****

Report of the TWG

Franklin: We met in Hoopa on June 4, 5. We used the same criteria as last year. The TWG did not assign bonus points. The scores from each member were averaged onto the workplan before you. Some issues that the TWG struggled with were the ability of proponents to be present to answer questions, and time frame restrictions for reviewing proposals.

Three specific proposals that need to be highlighted include:

A) Fall Creek Hatchery: The contribution of fish from Fall Creek hatchery is very high, but funding remains an issue. Prop 70 cannot fund operation and maintenance of any form, i.e. the money is not available to feed fish.

The mitigation goal for number of adults that reach Iron Gate may not be violated by taking some of the fish that would have otherwise been raised at the hatchery, raising them at Fall Creek and producing a higher quality fish. There may not be impediments to doing this type of work.

Last year, fish were released prior to being yearlings at Iron Gate, this was due to a hiring freeze. This is the first time that Fall Ck is being considered to raise fish other than excess eggs. This could be 180,000 yearlings raised at Fall Ck as mitigation rather than surplus egg raising.

B) The Horse Ck diversion is a substantial barrier to fish migration that remains from year to year. This impediment to fish passage hasn't been significant enough to get taken care of through the 1603 process. The TWG does not want to buy a diversion, so they asked the TWG to ask the TF to write a letter to CDFG. CDFG has an agreement with the landowner.

Bingham: The 1603 permit says that fish migration can occur after the first high water washes the material out. Supposedly, this satisfies the migration barrier problem. This means that there are 2 problems: fish migration and fill-dirt/materials in the stream.

Farro: I suggest that a letter be sent to a local law enforcement captain with a copy to Banky Curtis on this matter.

Franklin: Bird felt that this could be effectively taken care of by following the appropriate routes in CDFG.

Odemar: I could take this concern up through the routes in CDFG.

Shake: Ron will work with Bob to prepare a draft.

C) IFIM proposals from DWR: HP-9 and HP-10.

A likely source of funding for such studies might exist through BIA.

Robinson: BIA has responded to the tribes requests, we have started to collect information to keep water in the main stem river, and we are collecting info. The TF can still collect more info if they want.

Mendenhall: We propose to investigate the amount of water that is needed in the Scott River. We are also willing to seek further funding from other sources.

Report from the Budget Committee

Bingham: The budget committee met on Thursday, June 6. They first awarded either 10 (clearly employing targeted groups), 5 (possible employment of targeted groups) and 0 (not employing targeted groups). The ranked list was then budgeted. The two budget levels projected reflect the range of possibilities (Attachment 8). The budget levels were determined by trying to get the same levels of ranking scores across the categories. "Low" budget is a scenario based on the expectation that the Program Administration costs come from the \$1 million. \$737,000 in projects is proposed. The "high" budget assumes that the Regional Office will pick up the costs of operating the Klamath River Fisheries Resource Office (KRFRO).

Odemar: In a couple of the categories, there are several proposals that may be funded by the state. We still do not know how much the state will be funding. I am confident that the state will be picking up some of the costs.

Description of state and federal funds available

State

Odemar: There are 4 sources of money available to us for restoration.

- 1) Prop 19 Wildlife Conservation Board funding only goes to public agencies.
- 2) Prop 99 is from the tax on tobacco products. The actual amount available out of \$650,000 will be determined after legislation sets the budget. Funding is for habitat restoration, not fish production.
- 3) Prop 70, is the bond act for salmon and steelhead restoration. This money is granted through the Calif. Advisory Committee on Salmon and Steelhead Trout.
- 4) Salmon stamp money is for chinook or coho. CDFG has no control over this money (Nat serves on this committee). The committee pays for some education work, and some rearing projects (e.g., Horse Lentil Ck).

Prop 70 and Salmon Stamp recommendations will be made later this week.

At the beginning of each year CDFG requests proposals. Evaluation of proposals is immediately made. No studies are funded.

So the proposals that are noted as being submitted to CDFG on the workplan are in the state process.

Many funding sources are stating that say fish enhancement cannot be done unless habitat restoration is also done.

Funding Procedures

Introduction: Mike Bowen from USFWS contracting is with us today. Mike Bowen is the designated contracting officer for the Klamath Fishery Restoration Program.

Bowen:

- o Earlier this year, I asked Ron to develop procedures that would smoothly run these proposals through the funding process.
- o We have a whole different set of guidelines for the different entities that we deal with. I am concerned how we can do everything possible to insure that we have a record of impartiality in choosing which proposals are funded. One comment that needs to be addressed is that project proponents supported their proposals. People that were doing the evaluation should not have any interest in the results (personal or economic).
- o I tried to bring in the step of an in-house evaluation team to establish impartiality. The final decision has to be made (required by law) by an in-house technical review group (FWS). It is illegal to have an advisory committee make these decisions.
- o I have concerns: protection of the group, (we need to look clean), protection of the process.
- o If the government decides to do something in-house then it is done. If the government decides to go outside, then they contract out to a neutral party.
- o The statute rules over any other rules. Because PL99-552 does not specifically name who the money is to go to, then the TF consults and recommends. Ultimately, the decision is made by FWS. When it is federal money, it is spent by federal employees.

Public Comment

Public Comment #1) Dan Ferrera CCC, Del Norte County

The proposals that are listed on page 9 (Attachment 8) should have been listed as 5 separate proposals. Tarup Creek, Bluff Creek, Red Cap Creek etc. These are not the second generation of proposals that the CDFG requested. These proposals were to go with proposals from USFS. HR-27 has multiple streams in it. The 2nd generation proposals broke this into 24 projects of which 5 should have come to the TWG.

It would be helpful to us if we could get feedback on what we didn't do that was needed in order to write better proposals next year. This is the third year that we have submitted proposals and haven't been funded. We need to have feedback in order to improve.

Shake: Ron Iverson will get you in touch with the correct person to get feedback on your proposals.

Public Comment #2) Dianne Higgins:

I am concerned about the low ranking that the curriculum development Scope of Work received. Last year, the curriculum development proposal that I'd written received a very high ranking, later I wrote a proposal and received funding. I would have submitted a proposal if I could have known this Scope of Work would have ranked so low.

Q: How would you feel about using your program as an umbrella to hold some of the smaller projects that are related?

A: Fine. It is specifically stated in my contract that I encourage teachers to apply for funding. If I served an umbrella function for these smaller proposals, then I feel I would be fulfilling this need.

Hillman: I attended the first day's discussion at the TWG, and I feel that there is some confusion or frustration in regards to the overall direction of the education program. The confusion is created by the variety of proposals that are received and what the role is of the Public Communications position at the office. I have expressed my feelings before that our education component is running in a lot of different directions and I feel that no one knows who is doing what.

Wilkinson: As I said earlier this morning, many students are being reached with a measurable amount of educational materials on salmon and steelhead. From my perspective, we now need to set aside money now for programs, such as videos, down the road.

Iverson: It is likely that there is enough money remaining in the FY91 budget to fund at least \$50,000 worth of 9-12 curriculum development.

Public Comment #3) Pat Higgins

The proposal I submitted is to share information about riparian restoration with farmers and ranchers in the Yreka area. This would also help to inform people who wish to be volunteers. I don't understand why this was ranked so low, when it has so many benefits. This money would have covered the admission costs so farmers could have attended free of admission.

Public Comment #4) Ronnie Pierce

I do not have a proposal, I have a one-time request from the local tribes and rancherias. The Native American Fish and Wildlife Society has chosen Eureka as its location for a mid-Pacific Regional conference. We will be requesting funds from other agencies. I would like to ask for a one-time contribution of \$1,000. The conference is scheduled for October 22, 23, 24. This Society is affiliated with the National Fish and Wildlife Society, so tribal speakers will be brought into the area.

Public Comment #5) Bill Mendenhall

First, I would like to congratulate the TWG for running a smooth ship. It would be a real help to proposers/us to be able to see the Action Plan in April. Also, I would like to see an engineer represented on the TF.

More on the education category funding levels

**** Motion **** Amend the existing contract to use \$50,000, out of FY91 funds, to begin to develop the curriculum for grades 9-12.

Shake: We are re-funding what we already decided to do last June. Hearing no objection, we will go ahead and direct KRFRRO staff to complete a contract amendment.

**** Action ****

Notes on Federal funding processes

Q: If a video was produced for the public benefit by a non-profit organization, would that video project have to go out for competitive bid?

A: (Bowen): the government attempts to "compete" any project that is over \$25,000. There are different "levels of burden" so even if it is \$15,000 it is may be expected to go out competitively. There is a way to sole-source a project because of a certain amount of expertise. Although, the guidance is to "compete" it wherever we can.

June 19, 1991

Shake: Yesterday when we adjourned I asked you to consider:

- 1) the funding levels between the categories in the marked up work plan and
- 2) Mel's concern that we had put some on-going projects below the line.

Let's start by looking at the split between the categories.

Discussion:

- o The Education funding level is below what it should be.
- o The Habitat Protection Category is important and should have more money in it. Habitat Protection (the dirt flinging type of work) should be done before other types of projects are funded.
- o FP-11 and FP-12 are both studies on green sturgeon. Could these studies be coordinated to prevent overhandling? A: Yes, hopefully. One study looks at early life history, one tags adults. The TWG realized that there may be some overlap and therefore some possible budget reductions.
- o Shake: At least for now the mix seems appropriate.
- o Shake: We received a letter from Trout Unlimited. They made an error in the budgets for their proposals. Their costs should be reduced by 20%.
- o Alcorn: Proposals from Trout Unlimited (HR-1,2,3) are on page 9 of the workplan. All these proposals ranked at the very bottom of the list.
- o Sumner: The water supply in Humbug Ck is a good water source that supports a lot of fish. This work has been turned down twice, in the future we should pay attention to it.

Iverson: The breakdown of the \$405k needed for Program Administration includes the following estimations for FY92:

\$200,000 for 5 staff positions,
\$4,000 for training,
\$55,000 for travel,
\$30,000 for operations (utilities, vehicles, printing etc),
\$9,000 for space rental,
\$19,000 for supplies (rental of conference rooms, federal register notices),
\$8,000 for capitalized property (software, office furniture), and
\$80,000 for Regional Office overhead (8%).

Orcutt: What is the breakdown of the cost for KFMC functions?

Iverson: The KFMC is a very expensive outfit. We estimate that costs will be in the neighborhood of \$80,000 - \$90,000 (this does not include KRFR staff time). The budget I just showed you estimates only \$24,000 for their travel

this year (last year it was \$41,000). Every year has been more expensive than the previous year for federal advisory committee support.

Shake: There are a number of items in the workplan that have been submitted to CDFG. Hopefully the \$170,000 that we are over will be covered by CDFG funding. At the next meeting, we may be able to add a few more projects to fill in any extra money that becomes available.

Orcutt: We want to request that tribal representatives sit in with federal and state representatives when they meet to talk about budgeting. The tribes have money available too, and maybe they could contribute.

Odemar: Certainly, we will involve anyone who desires in the discussions.

Shake: Now, let's go through the workplan category by category.

Workplan Category: Education

- o Delete E-3 and E-12 and insert E-6 (at 17,500). This will assume that Dianne Higgins could give part of her budget to the teachers for E-3 and E-12. Approximately \$50,000 of '91 money will be used, \$17,000 will come out of '92.
- o \$15,000 becomes available because the Yurok video will not be funded.
- o Some of the workshops could be really valuable. For example, the conference on DG in the Scott River could be very beneficial to the restoration program.
- o I don't think we should fund administrative costs for conference organizers.

Proposal E-13:

This proposal was controversial. Arguments were presented for and against this proposal being funded.

Vote:

For deleting from the workplan-- Wilkinson, Thackeray, Sumner, Odemar.
Keep in workplan-- Orcutt, Farro, Bingham, Shake, Hillman, McInnis.

**** Proposal E-13 is funded under the current workplan until a consensus takes it out.**

We have a set of recommendations from both the TWG and the budget committee and we don't take projects out unless there is a consensus for doing so.

Odemar: We need to contact the Klamath Forest Alliance (KFA) and make sure that their actions do not exclude the agencies that have authority in the area.

Workplan Category: Fish Protection

Proposal FP-11 and FP-3:

Lara: These projects should be coordinated to eliminate overlap.

Proposal FP-6:

**** Motion **** Odemar: I suggest that we include FP-5, 11, 7, 1 year of 12 (\$17,000), and FP-15, 2, and 16. This action would delete FP-3, and 8, giving us a total of \$182,407 for the category.

Orcutt: I suggest putting FP-15 into the appropriate category, which would be category HR.

FP-8

** Motion ** Delete FP-3. Leave FP-2 and FP-16 on the table for discussion.

Hearing no objection, these changes will be made.

** Action item **

** Motion ** Fund FP-12 as a 3 year study (\$49,000 total for 3 years), with the understanding that \$25,000 would be funded again next year.

Hearing no objection, the motion passes.

** Action item **

Proposal FP-8

** Motion ** Remove FP-8 from the funded list.

Consensus was not reached, so the proposal stays in the workplan.

Workplan Category: Fish Restoration

Proposal FR-6

o The proposals include decision points to cut-off funding if eggs are not available. If that occurs, the funding will be modified.

Proposal FR-5

o This proposal is for rearing fish on the Salmon River using an abandoned Salmon Stamp facility. If we support this group, they may provide a good option as a location for us to raise spring chinook.

Proposal FR-2

- o Discussion on this proposal included the following comments:
- o this is \$25,000 to capture 60 fish.
- o FR-2 goes with FR-9.
- o TWG recognized that this proposal was an expensive item.
- o people involved in other projects for trapping and rearing fish thought these proposals (FR-2 and FR-9) are asking for a lot of money.
- o We want to move away from rearing fish until we have good habitats for these fish to return to.
- o Appropriate to spend a large part of our budget on fish rearing.
- o Other folks around the state may complain about the cost-effectiveness of these projects. This isn't a level playing field.

Proposal FR-1

Comments include:

- o Sumner: My constituency would like to see FR-1 raised above the line.
- o Could they do FR-1 without doing FR-4? Yes, and they have been for years.
- o This looks at the long term goals and objectives for raising local stocks. A major component of this is providing better facilities for dealing with weather conditions. Currently, the blue plastic tarps to keep the sun off and temperatures down aren't as effective as a roof would be. A roof would also prevent snow and rain from clogging the feeders.

**** Motion **** Add FR-1 into the workplan by raising it above the line.

**** Action ****

Hearing no objections, let's raise FR-1 above the line.

Workplan Category: Habitat Protection

Proposal HP-4

- o The SWRCB could provide the state money (this project has already competed against other western states and has succeeded in gaining funding for water quality studies.
- o The actual grant amount that we would get from EPA is \$102,000. The total of \$175,000 identified in the proposal includes the value of the soft match. Then we pay USGS \$30,000 back.

**** Motion **** Include HR-4 in the workplan.

The plan says that there needs to be a consistent way of keeping information on water quality and habitat inventory available over the years. This program would provide a GIS system for the Klamath River. \$30,000 would go to USGS to adapt their files for the Klamath Restoration Program. The information for each reach of the Klamath Basin could be carefully entered (# of spawners, amount of juvenile rearing habitat etc). After a few years, we would have information available that would point out areas where we need to get more information. The whole thrust of this thing is to have a system that would be maintained over the life of the program.

**** Action ****

Hearing no objection, we will move this proposal above the line.

Workplan Category: Habitat Restoration

Proposal HR-8 and HR-4

**** Motion **** Move HR-8 and HR-4 into the workplan. Seconded.

Discussion:

HR-4 Comments:

- o We should have some administrative guidelines to maintain control of these type of projects and clarify the responsible agencies. KRFRO staff could draft this up.
- o We would probably write a purchase order.
- o These small grants of start-up money can be really helpful in getting community restoration groups started.

Proposal HR-23

Comments:

- o This is money for an overall CRMP project. In many areas, we need someone to spend a lot of time with the landowners to get their permission to access land.
- o This is the proposal that Dennis Maria helped us develop.
- o HP-11 was proposed to CDFG for fencing, supplies etc. Meanwhile, the CRMP got going and submitted a different proposal for funding.

Workplan Category: Program Administration

Proposal PA-3

Iverson: We need to accumulate all the information that is available on the Klamath River and have it available in an easily accessible format. Sari Sommarstrom is doing this type of thing for the Trinity Restoration Program. The project of developing a library would go out for competitive bid.

Comments:

- o We should have the technical information for the Klamath and other restoration information available at a centralized location.
- o Technology is changing rapidly and there should be a central updated location for it.
- o Mendenhall: As contractors, it would have helped us immensely to have a central location for the information that we needed.

**** Action ****

Shake: This proposal could be funded with end-of-year money from the Regional Office.

Proposal PA-2

**** Motion **** PA-2 should be incorporated into the workplan.

**** Action ****

Proposal PA-2 could be funded with end-of-year money.

Discussion over funding procedures

Discussion:

- o Proposals HR-7, 13, 15, 16 rated high with the CDFG process. Proposals HR-9 did not rate high.
- o Last year, we distributed the Klamath Restoration Program workplan with the lines drawn to all the people on the interested party list.
- o Some of the proposals that are above the line now (e.g., HR-11 and HR-9) could be funded by the state later.

Comments on the flexible costs of proposals due to the availability of eggs:

- o The proposals are based on the full number of eggs being raised at the facilities. If the number of eggs is reduced, then there will be a proportional reduction in the amount of money paid to the contractors.
- o If the number of eggs is reduced then the process is as follows: 1) we have to trust the folks doing the work to use only the funds necessary and returns funds to the TF, and 2) we have an staff evaluation position (Doug Alcorn) to check on the feasibility of these projects.

**** Motion **** Accept the fiscal year 92 workplan as revised today.

Hearing no objections, the motion passes (Attachment 9).

(note: the Klamath Restoration Program workplan has been updated, as of early July, to clarify which proposals are being funded by the state with Prop 70 funds).

**** Action ****

Reports on FY90 projects

Brian Cates: The work on Blue Ck was primarily completed by Joe Polos and Sandy Noble. They are unavailable today, so I will report for them.

The objectives of our work on Blue Creek were to: 1) enumerate chinook spawning in this creek, 2) enumerate juvenile outmigrants using coded wire tags (CWT), and 3) complete a habitat inventory.

Blue Creek is special because the fish from this creek are larger than fish elsewhere in the Klamath Basin. Blue Ck has been a challenge to work on because there is a lot of variability in flow levels. Part of our job is working in the creek to find out where the fish are spawning and count the redds. Coho and steelhead are also in the creek. We have found fish up to river kilometer (km) 12.5. We have also tracked fish with a radio tagging project that captures fish with a gill net (helpful when the water becomes turbid). Internal and external tags can be used. Right now we are mapping out the distribution of these fish, 10% of the tags are found in the Klamath. So apparently, there may be some movement up and down the creek and the river. The Coast Guard has been very good at giving us helicopter time, to do surveys, at no cost.

We have been running a rotary screw trap. At low stage it is 80-90% efficient, at flood stages, it is not so efficient. Efficiency is determined by sampling with a complete trap and comparing numbers. This helps to give us a total estimation of fish in the creek. Juvenile outmigrants are trapped in April and May. Adults are trapped in October through December. For example, in 1989 we captured 14,000 chinook.

In order to increase the information on this natural stock we try to CWT the fish to determine where they go in the ocean. The first year 10,000 were tagged.

At river km 22 there is a barrier that could be either be a physical barrier or a velocity barrier. We are hoping to look for juveniles above it this year. The juvenile outmigrant estimate for fall chinook was 51,000.

Restoration work in the lower tributaries started in 89. We first did a cursory survey of the lower 24 tributaries. Now we have trimmed the list down to those streams that have year-round water. We make estimates based on the number of juvenile outmigrants and the number of redds.

Hunter Creek contains steelhead and some cutthroat. There are some land use problems in some watersheds, and this has affected the number of fish in the streams. Barriers include logs, boulders, and beaver dams. The Klamath affects access to these streams because it can agreed the mouths.

Seining project: We have had a project going on for several years now, which is basically a chance to collect information on timing of migrations (hatchery vs wild). We are finding that the estuary is very important for rearing. (Brian showed slides of typical smolts found in the estuary, smolt size variations and the variations in condition of hatchery and wild fish.) Hatchery fish from IGH are smaller and not in as good condition as wild fish.

One concern is that we see spring releases from hatcheries in the upper system, yet we see very little movement of those fish out of the Klamath system until water flows come up. We believe we need to get these fish to outmigrate so there will be less competition with wild stocks.

Techniques such as marking, or studying production records to fine tune the production techniques, could be used to improve returns and limit impacts to wild fish.

Q: What strategy should we develop to cut down on the interaction of hatchery and wild fish?

Cates: There may not be a lot you can do. Released hatchery fish tend to pull wild fish with them when they migrate downstream. The best thing a hatchery can do is release the fish at the precise moment when the fish are ready to smolt and move downstream.

Q: Have you estimated the seeding rate in Blue Creek? Yes, we believe it's underseeded.

Orcutt: Is the competition you're talking about in the upper river with chinook or coho? Chinook, primarily.

Summary: We feel there is important information to be gained from these studies. We want them to be continued.

French Ck erosion site inventory

Bob Bartholomew of the Soil Conservation Service will report on this project that was subcontracted through Siskiyou Resource Conservation District.

The goals of this project were to locate the sources of sediment, identify Best Management Practices (BMP's) and identify sources of money to use for restoration activities.

The French Creek watershed is 20,000 acres of which 13,000 are granitic. The study was limited to granitics. We took a snapshot of the watershed, visiting granitic areas. We started doing a sediment budget, but found that setting annual rates of sediment transport would be better addressed in a several year project.

The concerned public was instrumental in getting the restoration work started. The state Board of Forestry is now using this area for further studies on mixed ownership studies of land-use problems.

900 individual sites were identified as actively eroding, these were grouped into reaches. 70 priority sites were identified by the amount of sediment and amount of water moving it. A county road had been contributing massive amounts of sediment, now the County Road Department has fixed the problem.

Several funding sources were identified but they either didn't fit the landowners or the landowners didn't want them. For example, one funding source needs the landowners to be an agricultural producer, others need a 50% match by landowners and many landowners don't want to do this.

The final report should be out by July. It is undergoing peer review.

Shasta River Water Quality Plan - Ouzel Enterprises

Bob Bartholomew reported on this agency's work.

Water quality along the Shasta River was checked at 7 sites plus 1 temperature recording site during the period of April 90-Jan91. Ouzel Enterprises tested for 14 -15 water quality parameters. Temperature and dissolved oxygen are suspected to be limiting. Temperatures reached lethal levels, although the dissolved oxygen levels never went below the lethal level of 5 mg/L.

From May - October there were only 18 days that fell within the 50-60 temperature range for salmonids. The temperature exceeded maximum temperatures for salmonids on 138 days. On 13 of those days the temperatures were greater than 80 degrees. 89.6 degrees F was the highest temperature recorded during this time period.

Dissolved oxygen levels ranged from 4.6 - 18.2 mg/L.

From where I sit, working for SCS, the majority of their recommendations don't sit well with the agricultural community. The reservoir was built by the irrigation district. The CRMP group is looking at riparian shading to help cool water.

Doug Alcorn suggested that techniques to run the water underground, or releasing water after it has cooled overnight could be useful in this situation.

Photos from the early 40's showed about the same amount of water being used for irrigation. More fertilizers may be used now.

Q: What changes have occurred since then that have led to the fish numbers declining? The amount or quality of return water, the loss of riparian shading? This used to be the most productive tributary in the Klamath system.

A: There are more sprinklers in the Shasta Valley now. These may take water farther away from the river. The wheel lines are allowing water to be transported farther away, which gives it more chances to warm up.

Q: Did this study take in most of the salmon and steelhead habitat?

A: Yes. The Shasta seems to have water that could be used for rearing, but temperature seems to be limiting its use.

Right below Dwinnell reservoir there is no water in the river bed. Leaks along the irrigation ditch could be fixed with gunite, but the irrigation district needs to secure funds. This could allow 10 cfs to be left in the river for fish. There may be a problem with downstream right holders taking this water, but perhaps this could be addressed. The report for this study is available through the KRFRRO.

Sumner: We have not yet considered the different vegetation around the lake. Where there used to be sage around the lake, there are now a lot of homes. The homes and accompanying septic tanks could be a prime source of nutrients.

Status report of Task Force appointments

Task Force members have been appointed for: Del Norte, Siskiyou, Trinity, NMFS, and ODFW. The Hoopa Valley Tribal Council's appointments for both the Task Force and Management Council are being processed. California Department of Fish and Game has not yet given their recommendations to the governor.

New Business

**** Action ****

Bill Shake asked Ron to report to the Task Force on a process for quantifying volunteer effort at the next meeting.

- o Shake: I appreciated having Mike Bowen present at this meeting. I suggest that the budget committee meet with Mike prior to the next meeting to clear up any modifications on the funding processes.
- o Native American Fish and Wildlife Society Conference:
The Native American Fish and Wildlife Society is involved with the other local tribes. The conference will be a real eye-opener that covers water issues, NW Indian fish commission issues and sharing what different tribes are doing for restoration. This is the first time this has ever been held in Calif. so it is difficult for us to know the total budget required.

**** Motion ****

The Task Force should fund this request for \$1000.

**** Action ****

Hearing no objections, this request will be funded. An invitation is extended to everyone to attend.

Next meeting

The next meeting will be in Brookings, Oregon on November 6 and 7.

Public Comment

Franklin: Habitat structures built by CDFG are controversial. People evaluating these structures have varying responses regarding their effectiveness. The only quick fix we have for fish restoration is accessing adequate flows for fish.

Bartholomew: Referred to article in the newsletter Stream Reach. If you think that the Forest Practices Act is not doing a good job, then get hold of the form or newsletter from the State Board of Forestry. A public comment period is now open. Public meetings are being held throughout Calif. Comments due August 1.

**** Action ****

Ron will coordinate a response from the TF on this issue.

Shake thanked TF members for a smooth meeting.

Attendance Roster, June 16-18, 1991 meeting in Eureka, California.

Task Force Members Present

Nat Bingham
Mitch Farro
Leaf Hillman
Walt Lara
Rod McInnis for Fullerton
Mel Odemar
Michael Orcutt
Bill Shake (Chair)
Dick Sumner
George Thackeray
Keith Wilkinson

Representing

California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Humboldt County
Karuk Tribe
Yurok Tribe
National Marine Fisheries Service
California Department of Fish and Game
Hoopa Indian Tribe
U.S. Department of the Interior
California In-River Sport Fishing Community
Siskiyou County
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Others Attending

Chuck Abbott
Doug Alcorn
Bob Bartholomew
Craig Bienz
Michael Bowen
Debra Caldon
Andy Colonna
Jim Cook
Dianne Higgins
Ron Iverson
Bill Kier
Bill Mendenhall
Ronnie Pierce
Gene Schnell
Terry Supahan
Tricia Whitehouse
Paula Yoon

Representing

Yurok Tribe
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. Soil Conservation Service
Klamath Tribe
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
William M. Kier Associates

Great Northern Corporation
Klamath River Educational Program
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
William M. Kier Associates
Department of Water Resources

Karuk Tribe
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Revised 6/11/91

AGENDA

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING
17-19 JUNE 1991
EUREKA, CALIFORNIA

- June 17 -- Red Lion Motor Inn, 1929 4th Street, Eureka, CA.
- 1:00 pm Call to Order. Correction and approval of minutes and agenda.
- 1:15 Report on status of work plans for Fiscal Years 1989-91.
- o Non-Federal work plan (Odemar).
 - o Federal work plan (Alcorn).
- 2:15 Break.
- 2:45 Reconvene. Task Force discussion of the upper basin plan amendment.
- o Comment on content of the plan amendment.
 - o Public involvement process (Meeting content and scheduling).
- 3:45 Update on the status of the KFMC long-range plan (Bingham).
- 4:00 Update on Trinity and Klamath River flows (Don Paff, BuRec).
- 4:30 Public comment period.
- 5:00 Adjourn.

June 18

- 8:00 am Reconvene. Report on the benefits and detriments of Threatened or Endangered Species listing of Klamath River stocks (Shake).
- 8:30 Task Force discussion to appoint a panel to study the Klamath River subbasin stock identification issue.
- o Panel membership, roles and responsibilities.
 - o Panel membership nominations.
- 9:30 Report from the education subcommittee (Wilkinson).
- 9:45 Break.
- 10:15 Status report on printing/distribution of the long-range plan (Whitehouse).
- 10:30 Report on Wallop-Breaux funds application (Shake).
- 11:00 Three-year action plan proposal presentation (Iverson).
- 11:15 Report of the technical work group and budget committee: recommendations for projects to be included in the FY92 work plan (Chairpersons of the two groups).
- o Summary of procedures used to arrive at recommendations.
 - o Summary of recommended projects proposals.
 - o Rationale for recommended funding allocation among work categories.
- 12:00 Lunch
- 1:00 Reconvene. Subcommittee reports (cont.)
- 2:00 Development of FY92 work plan.
- Description of State and Federal approval and funding processes, and anticipated amounts of funds available (Mel Odemar, Jerry Grover, Mike Bowen).
- 2:45 Break
- 3:00 Reconvene. Task Force discussion of FY92 work plan.
- 4:00 Public comment period (priority given to comments on FY92 work plan recommendations).
- 5:00 Adjourn.

June 19

8:00 am Reconvene. Development of FY92 work plan -- Task Force discussion (continued).

10:00 Break.

10:30 Reconvene. Task Force discussion on FY92 work plan.

12:00 Lunch.

1:00 Reconvene. Task Force recommendations on FY92 work plan.

2:15 Break.

2:30 Reconvene. Reports on completed FY90 projects

- o Blue Creek, lower Klamath River tributaries, outmigrant seining (Polos).
- o French Creek erosion site inventory, Shasta River water quality testing (Bartholomew).

3:30 Status report on Task Force membership appointment (Iverson).

3:45 New business and discussion of next meeting.

4:00 Public comment period.

5:00 Adjourn.

Klamath River Basin 90-91 Stream Enhancement Project Status

Project Title: Kidder Creek Diversion Screen
Proposal Number: 17
Task Force ID #: 017
Amount Requested: \$15,000
Contract Number: (insert WC contract number)
Amount Approved: \$15,000
Tributary To: Scott River
Stream: Kidder Creek
Objective: To screen two existing open agricultural diversion ditches to prevent downstream migrant salmonids from being stranded in fields.
Contractor: DFG
Contact: Ron Dotson
Status: Two screens were installed on Kidder Creek in the spring of 1991.

Project Title: Little North Fork Salmon River Rearing Project
Proposal Number: 202 (funded through Salmon Stamp)
Task Force ID #: 002
Amount Requested: \$18,909
Contract: FG-0094
Amount Approved: \$18,835
Stream: Little North Fork Salmon River
Tributary To: Salmon River
Objective: Rear fall chinook salmon from fry to yearling size.
Contractor: Robert Will
Schedule:
Status: No fish delivered to this rearing project. Contract ends 11/15/91.

Project Title: Fall Creek Rearing Ponds

Proposal Number: 3

Task Force ID #: 003

Amount Requested: \$25,640

Contract Number:

Amount Approved: 0

Stream: Fall Creek

Tributary To: Klamath River

Objective: Rear chinook salmon to yearlings.

Contractor: Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District

Contact: Bob Bartholomew

Schedule:

Status: Project dropped because no surplus fish at Iron Gate Hatchery.

Project Title: Camp Creek Rearing Pond troughs

Proposal Number: 5 (salmon stamp)

Task Force ID #: 005A

Amount Requested: \$3,350

Contract Number: TBA to Region 1

Amount Approved: \$1,500

Stream: Camp Creek

Tributary To: Klamath River

Objective: Replace rearing troughs.

Contractor: DFG

Schedule:

Status: Troughs have been replaced.

Project Title: Hammel Creek Chinook Hatching/Rearing Project

Proposal Number: 201 (funded through Salmon Stamp)

Task Force ID #: 005B

Amount Requested: \$14,239

Contract: FG-0048

Amount Approved: \$14,165

Stream: Hammel Creek

Tributary To: Klamath River

Objective: Rear chinook fry for transfer to Little North Fork.

Contractor: Art Frazier

Schedule:

Status: Contractor received no fish from DFG. Contract ends 12/31/91.

Project Title: Klamath River Yearling Chinook Salmon Rearing Project

Proposal Number: 117

Task Force ID #: 117

Amount Requested: \$93,637

Contract Number: FG-0372

Amount Approved: \$93,637

Stream: Elk, Red Cap, Grider, and Camp Creeks

Tributary To: Klamath River

Objective: Operate rearing ponds for yearling chinook.

Contractor: Northern California Indian Development Council

Contact: Kim Rushton Region 1 DFG

Schedule:

Project Title: Eagle Ranch Steelhead Trout Rescue Rearing Facility
Proposal Number: 140 (this was alternative # 2 in proposal 140)
Task Force ID #: 140A
Amount Requested: \$16,937
Contract Number: FG-0417
Amount Approved: \$16,937
Stream: Cold Creek
Tributary To: Bogus Creek
Objective: Operate rescue/rearing facility for steelhead.
Contractor: Paul Luckey/Mike Luckey
Contact: Same as above
Schedule:
Status: Closed contract.

Project Title: Eagle Ranch Steelhead Trout Rescue Rearing Facility
Proposal Number: 140 (this was alternative # 1 in proposal 140,
alternative # 2 was accepted)
Task Force ID #: 140B
Amount Requested: \$12466
Contract Number:
Amount Approved: 0
Stream: Cold Creek
Tributary To: Bogus Creek
Objective: Operate rescue/rearing facility for steelhead.
Contractor: Paul Luckey/Mike Luckey
Contact: Same as above
Schedule:
Status: Not funded.

Project Title: Orleans Community Rescues Steelhead Rearing Project
Proposal Number: 170
Task Force ID #: 170
Amount Requested: \$8,851
Contract Number: FG-0416
Amount Approved: \$8,851
Stream: Scott River
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: Operate rescue/rearing facility for steelhead.
Contractor: Orleans Rod and Gun Club
Contact:
Schedule:
Status: Contract closed. Reared approximately 12,000 rescued steelhead to yearlings, and released fish back into the tributaries they were rescued from. Releases were in the last week of March, 1991, and planted by Region 1.

Project Title: Bogus Creek Cattle Exclusion
Proposal Number: 14
Task Force ID #: 014
Amount Requested: \$4,232
Contract Number: TBA to Region 1
Amount Approved: \$4,232
Stream: Bogus Creek
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: To exclude cattle from entering the riparian zone along approximately 2000 feet of Bogus Creek.
Contractor: DFG
Contact: Rick Davis
Comment: Prop 70 Committee recommended funding at the level indicated provided that 4000 feet of fencing is built.
Status: During the summer of 1990, approximately 1000 feet of cattle exclusion fence was constructed on Beck property. This fencing was needed to exclude cattle from six of the previously installed spawning weirs (see proposal # 195). Only six weirs of the twelve needed fencing.

Project Title: Pine Creek Watershed Erosion Control & Prevention Project
Proposal Number: 65
Task Force ID #: 065
Amount Requested: \$62,593
Contract Number:
Amount Approved: 0
Stream: Pine Creek
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: Control or prevent erosion of sediment into Pine Creek.
Contractor: Hoopa Valley Business Council
Schedule:
Status: This proposal was withdrawn by the proposer.

Project Title: Nordheimer Creek Mouth Modification
Proposal Number: 111
Task Force ID #: 111
Amount Requested: \$7,600
Contract Number: FG-0340
Amount Approved: \$7,600
Stream: Nordheimer Creek
Tributary To: Salmon Creek
Objective: Improve access for chinook salmon into Nordheimer Creek by modifying the mouth of the stream.
Contractor: USFS Klamath National Forest, Happy Camp Ranger District
Contact: Jack West
Status: Conditions at the mouth of Nordheimer Creek have changed and no longer present an access problem for migrating adults. \$2,910 of the encumbered funds will be used to build submerged pool cover structures in the East and South Forks of Salmon River. These structures will provide cover for summer steelhead and spring run chinook adults.

Project Title: Salmon River Seed Collection and Germination
Proposal Number: 112
Task Force ID #: 112
Amount Requested: \$13,957
Contract Number:
Amount Approved: 0
Stream: NF and SF Salmon River
Tributary To: Salmon River
Objective: Collect seeds, grow seedlings.
Contractor: USFS Klamath NF
Contact: Jack West
Schedule:
Status: Not funded by DFG.

Project Title: Summer Steelhead/Spring Chinook Cover Ledges
Proposal Number: 113
Task Force ID #: 113
Amount Requested: \$2,910
Contract Number: FG-0439
Amount Approved: \$2,910
Stream: NF and SF Salmon River
Tributary To: Salmon River
Objective: Provide overhead cover in pools for juvenile and adult
salmon.
Contractor: USFS Klamath NF
Contact: Jack West
Schedule:
Status:

Project Title: Elk Creek Winter Habitat Restoration #1
Proposal Number: 114
Task Force ID #: 114
Amount Requested: \$18,872
Contract Number: FG-0340
Amount Approved: \$13,860
Stream: Elk Creek
Objective: Provide complex winter, spring and summer rearing habitat
for juvenile salmon and steelhead in Elk Creek.
Contractor: USFS Klamath National Forest, Happy Camp ranger District
Contact: Bill Bemis
Schedule: August 1991
Status: Materials have been purchased and stockpiled. Structures
will be installed in August of 1991.

Project Title: Elk Creek Weirs #3
Proposal Number: 115
Task Force ID #: 115
Amount Requested: \$17,330
Contract Number: FG-0340
Amount Approved: \$10,398
Stream: Elk Creek
Objective: Provide spawning and rearing habitat for salmon and steelhead in Elk Creek.
Contractor: USFS Klamath National Forest, Happy Camp Ranger District
Contact: Bill Bemis
Schedule: Late August 1991.
Status: Materials have been purchased and stockpiled. Structures will be installed in August of 1991.

Project Title: Elk Creek Weirs and Boulder/CWD #2
Proposal Number: 116
Task Force ID #: 116
Amount Requested: \$20,505
Contract Number: FG-0340
Amount Approved: \$12,793
Stream: Elk Creek
Objective: Provide spawning and rearing habitat for salmon and steelhead in Elk Creek.
Contractor: USFS Klamath National Forest, Happy Camp Ranger District
Contact: Bill Bemis
Schedule: Late August 1991.
Status: Materials have been purchased and stockpiled. Structures will be installed in August of 1991.

Project Title: Lower Bogus Creek Spawning Weir/Riffle Restoration.
Proposal Number: 195
Task Force ID #: Not on the approved task force funding list
Amount Requested: \$10,120
Contract Number: This is not on the 1990 Klamath list.
Amount Approved: \$10,120
Stream: Bogus Creek
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: Renovate existing boulder weirs from earlier project and replenish salmon spawning gravel.
Contractor: DFG
Contact: Rick Davis
Comment: Project was originally scheduled for funding with FY 89-90 money. Project was not funded until FY 90-91.
Status: Completed in 1990. Constructed 12 boulder spawning weirs and placed gravel behind each weir.

Klamath River Basin 89-90 Stream Enhancement Project Status

Project Title: Tectah Creek Habitat Restoration Project
Proposal Number: 47
Task Force ID #: 047
Amount Requested: \$71,788
Contract Number: FG-0415
Amount Approved: \$50,000
Stream: Tectah Creek
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: Improve rearing habitat for emergent salmonids by placing structures along the margins of the stream. Cover structures will be placed in some pools too.
Contractor: Del Norte Center, California Conservation Corps,
Contact: David Muraki
Schedule: Late Summer 1991
Status: Enhancement sites have been identified. Site plans are being prepared. The CCC crews will spike on site while working on project.

Project Title: Red Cap Creek #3
Proposal Number: 211 (from 1988/89 fiscal year)
Task Force ID #:
Amount Requested: \$76,250
Contract Number: WC-1502
Amount Approved: \$76,250
Stream: Red Cap Creek
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: To increase the quality and quantity of spawning habitat for chinook salmon through the placement of boulder structures in the stream.
Contractor: USFS Six Rivers Forest, Orleans Ranger District
Contact: Jerry Boberg
Schedule: Project will be completed fall of 1991
Status: This project was started last year and will be finished in the fall of 1991. About 40 boulder structures will have been installed in Red Cap Creek through this contract.

Project Title: Bluff Creek #3
Proposal Number: 209 (from 1988/89 fiscal year)
Task Force ID #:
Amount Requested: \$101,200
Contract Number: WC-1503
Amount Approved: \$101,200
Stream: Bluff Creek
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: To increase the quality and quantity of spawning habitat for chinook salmon through the placement of boulder structures in the stream.
Contractor: USFS Six Rivers Forest, Orleans Ranger District
Contact: Jerry Boberg
Schedule: Project will be completed fall of 1991
Status: This project was started last year and will be finished in the fall of 1991. About 38 boulder structures will have been installed in Bluff Creek through this contract.

Project Title: Boise Creek Instream Habitat Enhancement
Proposal Number: 210 (from 1988/89 fiscal year)
Task Force ID #:
Amount Requested: \$29,300
Contract Number: WC-1511
Amount Approved: \$29,300
Stream: Boise Creek
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: To improve the quality and quantity of spawning habitat for salmon and steelhead, as well as enhancing habitat diversity in Boise Creek, through the placement of boulder structures.
Contractor: USFS Six Rivers Forest, Orleans Ranger District
Contact: Jerry Boberg
Schedule: Fall 1991
Status: This project has been held up due to legal problems with a miner. The problem has been resolved and the project will get under way in the fall. It is anticipated that the project will be completed in the late fall of 1991.

Project Title: Camp Creek Instream Habitat Enhancement
Proposal Number: 90 (from 1989/90 fiscal year)
Task Force ID #:
Amount Requested: \$26,030
Contract Number: FG-9365
Amount Approved: \$26,030
Stream: Camp Creek
Tributary To: Klamath River
Objective: Increase habitat diversity for salmon and steelhead by installing boulder structures.
Contractor: USFS Six Rivers Forest, Orleans Ranger District
Contact: Jerry Boberg
Schedule: Project will be completed fall of 1991
Status: This project was started last year and will be finished in the fall of 1991. About 28 boulder structures will have been installed in Camp Creek through this contract.

Project Title: Shasta River Livestock Exclusion Fencing

Proposal Number: 170 (from 1989/90 fiscal year)

Task Force ID #:

Amount Requested: \$13,365

Contract Number: FG-9332

Amount Approved: \$13,365

Stream: Shasta River, Ordway Ranch

Tributary To: Klamath River

Objective: To exclude livestock from the riparian zone along a section of the Shasta River on the Ordway Ranch.

Contractor: Great Northern Corporation

Contact: Jim Cook

Schedule: Fall 1991

Status: Materials have been purchased, fence line flagged and crews from Deadwood Conservation Camp are installing fence.

Project Title: Bogus Creek , Foster Ranch

Proposal Number: 56 (from 1989/90 fiscal year)

Task Force ID #:

Amount Requested: \$68,932

Contract Number: FG-9381

Amount Approved: \$16,960

Stream: Bogus Creek

Tributary To: Klamath River

Objective: Stream bank stabilization at two sites, fence 400 yards of riparian vegetation and install boulder weirs and clusters to improve habitat in Bogus Creek.

Contractor: Clearwater BioStudies

Contact: Steve Kucas

Schedule: Project will be completed this fall.

Status: A third weir to enhance spawning habitat will be completed this year. 400 yards of stream was fenced. Two vertical bank erosion sites were stabilized last summer. The contract will be completed this summer.

Project Title: Shasta River

Proposal Number: 57 (from 1989/90 fiscal year)

Task Force ID #:

Amount Requested: \$25,185

Contract Number: FG-9381

Amount Approved: \$25,185

Stream: Shasta River

Tributary To: Klamath River

Objective: Stabilize vertical erosion sites on Shasta River.

Contractor: Clearwater BioStudies

Contact: Steve Kucas

Status: This project was completed last summer. The balance of the money saved will be used in Grider Creek, tributary to the Klamath River, to construct a boulder weir. The weir will collect spawning graves for chinook salmon. The Grider Creek portion of this contract will be completed at the end of this summer.

Project Title: Scott River Bank Stabilization and Spawning Habitat Protection

Proposal Number: 9 + 10 (from 1988/89 fiscal year)

Task Force ID #:

Amount Requested: \$113,292 and \$16,266 respectively

Contract Number: WC-1530

Amount Approved: \$66,300

Stream: Scott River

Tributary To: Klamath River

Objective: Install livestock exclusion fencing on the Tobias and Shuck/Troutman ranches and install sediment routing structures to improve spawning habitat.

Contractor: Siskiyou Resources Conservation District

Contact: Bob Bartholomew

Schedule: Fall of 1991

Status: Unstable banks were armored with rip rap and planted with willow slips. The rip rap was constructed with a few large boulders placed in the stream channel next to the finished rip rap to increase pool cover next to the sites. The project sites were also fenced.

The sediment routing portion of the contract was moved upstream near Callahan. This portion of the contract may not be done because of problems in securing a Army Corps of Engineers permit in time to complete the project.

Project Title: Etna Creek Dam Fish Passage

Proposal Number: 63 (from 1989/90 fiscal year)

Task Force ID #:

Amount Requested: \$10,450

Contract Number: FG-9353

Amount Approved: \$10,450

Stream: Etna Creek

Tributary To: Scott River

Objective: Provide access over Etna Creek Dam

Contractor: Siskiyou Resource Conservation District

Contact: Bob Bartholomew

Status: An Alaskan Steep Pass Ladder was installed last fall. A savings in the contract was realized and will be used to add instream cover in some of the pools to improve rearing habitat in Etna Creek.

Project Title: Hunter Creek

Proposal Number: From 1987/88 fiscal year

Task Force ID #:

Amount Requested: \$

Contract Number: WC-1383

Amount Approved: \$170,039

Stream: Hunter Creek

Tributary To: Klamath River

Objective: Improve spawning and rearing habitat in Hunter Creek by installing log instream structures. Modify 3 barriers.

Contractor: Del Norte Center, California Conservation Corps

Contact: David Muraki

Schedule: This project began in 1989.

Status: The project is 98% complete. Approximately 200 structures were installed in the stream. The three barriers have been modified. Contract will end 12/31/91.

Project Title: Bluff Creek Instream Habitat Enhancement

Proposal Number: 88 (from 1989/90 fiscal year)

Task Force ID #:

Amount Requested: \$49,950

Contract Number: FG-9365

Amount Approved: \$49,950

Stream: Bluff Creek

Tributary to: Klamath River

Objective: Increase and improve salmonid nursery and spawning habitat.

Contractor: USFS Six Rivers Forest, Orleans Ranger District

Contact: Jerry Boberg

Schedule:

Status: Completed.

Project Title: Grider Creek Habitat Enhancement Project

Proposal Number: 58 (from 1989/90 fiscal year)

Task Force ID #:

Amount Requested: \$17,200

Contract Number: FG-9467

Amount Approved: \$17,200

Stream: Grider Creek

Tributary To: Klamath River

Objective: Protection of rearing pond and bank stabilization.

Contractor: Clearwater BioStudies

Contact: Steve Kucas

Schedule: Summer of 1991

Status: They still need to construct boulder spawning weirs. This will be performed during the 1991 low water period.

FEDERALLY FUNDED WORK PLAN AND
BUDGET FISCAL YEAR 1989
KLAMATH BASIN FISHERY RESTORATION
files:89wrkpln.dbf,89wrkpln.ndx, 89wp2.frm

ATTACHMENT 3

** (0)ADMINISTER PROGRAM			
(0)ADMINISTER PROGRAM	(0.1)OPERATE KLAMATH FIELD OFFICE	168760 USFWS	
(0)ADMINISTER PROGRAM	(0.2)REGIONAL OFFICE OVERHEAD	50000 USFWS	
** Subtotal **		218760	
** (1) PLAN PROGRAM			
(1) PLAN PROGRAM	(1.1) PLAN AND ENV. ASSESSMENT	140135 KIER	1,000 copies to be printed by 8/91.
** Subtotal **		140135	
** (2) GET INFORMATION			
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.12) TAGGING NEEDS FOR TIME/AREA MANAGEMENT	36400 HSU	Agreement closed.
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.21) ESTIMATE FALL CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT	41700 CDFG	Final report accepted 4/90. Agreement not closed.
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.22) FALL CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT, LOWER KLAMATH	24000 USFWS	Closed.
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.23) FALL CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT, BLUE CREEK	43800 USFWS	Closed.
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.25) HYDROACOUSTIC WEIR, SALMON RIVER	21500 CDFG	Final report rec'd 4/90. Agreement not closed.
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.31) STEELHEAD ESCAPEMENT, SELECTED TRIBS	73400 USFS	Final billing complete.
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.41) HABITAT TYPE, STANDING CROP, 125 MI.STREAM	75000 USFS	Final billing complete.
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.42) TYPE HABITAT, PLAN REHAB, PINE CREEK	31905 HVBC	Final Report rec'd 3/91. USFWS Ref Svc 6/91.
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.43) JUVENILE PRODUCTION, LOWER KLAMATH TRIBS.	0 USFWS	Agreement closed.
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.44) HABITAT AVAILABLE FOR FALL CHINOOK, BLUE CR	0 USFWS	Agreement closed.
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.51) TRAP OUTMIGRANTS, LOWER KLAMATH RIVER	27200 USFWS	Agreement closed.

FEDERALLY-FUNDED WORK PLAN AND
BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1989
KLAMATH BASIN FISHERY RESTORATION
files:89wrkpln.dbf,89wrkpln.ndx, 89wp2.frm

(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.61) ANALYZE RECORDS, FEASIBILITY OF AUGMENT.	36000 CAL-DWR	Draft final report rec'd 3/91, expect final 7/91.
** Subtotal **		410905	
** (3) EDUCATE			
(3) EDUCATE	(3.1) EDUCATION PROJECT	67000 DHIGGINS	Grades 4-6 curriculum rec'd 3/91.
(4) EDUCATE	(3.2) PUBLIC INFORMATION/INTERPRETATION	20000 USFWS	Program complete.
** Subtotal **		87000	
** (4) MANAGE HABITAT			
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.14) SEDIMENT BUDGET, SCOTT SUBBASIN	50000 SISK RCD	Agreement closed.
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.15) CONTROL BANK EROSION, YREKA CREEK	10000 YREKA	Agreement closed.
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.25) EVALUATE EXISTING HABITAT IMPROVEMENTS	0 USFS	Final billing complete.
** Subtotal **		60000	
** (5) ARTIF. PROPAGATION			
(5) ARTIF. PROPAGATION	(5.11) EVALUATE PRESMOLT CHINOOK RELEASE, IGSFH	56600 CDFG	Final report rec'd 4/90. Agreement not closed.
(5) ARTIF. PROPAGATION	(5.12) EVALUATE POND REARING OF FALL CHINOOK	26600 CDFG	Final report rec'd 4/90. Agreement not closed.
** Subtotal **		83200	
*** Total ***		1000000	

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
 FEDERAL WORK PLAN, FISCAL YEAR 1990
 files: 90fedwp.dbf, catprpsr.ndx,
 90wp2.frm

ATTACHMENT 4

CATEGORY	PROJECT	COOPERATOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	STATUS
** ADMINISTRATION					
ADMINISTRATION	90-0.1	USFWS	OPERATE KLAMATH FIELD OFFICE	240817	
ADMINISTRATION	90-0.2	USFWS	REGIONAL OFFICE OVERHEAD	93000	
** Subtotal **				333817	
* ARTIF. PROPAG.					
ARTIF. PROPAG.	90-5.1	NCIDC	LATE FALL CHINOOK STOCKING, YUROK RESERVATION	109653	Final report rec'd 2/91. USFWS Ref Svc 7/91.
ARTIF. PROPAG.	90-FR/117	NCIDC	REAR CHINOOK IN MID-KLAMATH PONDS TO YEARLING SIZE	26000	Final report rec'd 2/91. USFWS Ref Svc 7/91.
** Subtotal **				135653	
** EDUCATE					
EDUCATE	90-3.21	CHICO STATE U.	QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY	18265	Questions developed. Survey expected 8/91, after OMP appr'v'd
EDUCATE	90-3.1	DIANE HIGGINS	CLASSROOM CURRICULUM, TEACHER TRAINING	68040	Draft curriculum rec'd. Final curriculum expected 6/91.
EDUCATE	90-3.2	USFWS	PUBLIC INFORMATION	39648	Program complete.
** Subtotal **				125953	
** GET INFORMATION					
GET INFORMATION	90-FP-1	KARUK TRIBE OF CALIF	ESTIMATE KARUK SUBSISTENCE HARVEST	15295	Final report rec'd 2/91. USFWS Ref Svc 7/91.
GET INFORMATION	90-2.71	SHASTA VALLEY RCD	SHASTA R. FISHERIES WATER QUALITY PROJECT	24470	Final report rec'd 6/91. USFWS Ref Svc 7/91.
GET INFORMATION	90-2.41	USFS SALMON R RD	SALMON SUBBASIN HABITAT PRODUCTIVITY SURVEY	45247	Field work complete. Final report expected 8/91.
GET INFORMATION	90-2.21	USFS SALMON R RD	SPAWNING GROUND UTILIZATION SURVEYS	81568	Field work complete. Final report expected 8/91.
GET INFORMATION	90-2.52	USFS SIX RIVERS	CAMP CREEK DOWNSTREAM MIGRANT STUDY	14993	Field work underway. Final report expected 2/92.
GET INFORMATION	90-2.23	USFWS	BLUE CREEK STUDIES	53400	Annual report expected 7/91.

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
FEDERAL WORK PLAN, FISCAL YEAR 1990
files: 90fedwp.dbf, catprpsr.ndx,
90wp2.frm

CATEGORY	PROJECT	COOPERATOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST STATUS
GET INFORMATION	90-2.22	USFWS	STUDIES IN SMALL TRIBS, LOWER KLAMATH	24000 Annual report expected 7/91.
GET INFORMATION	90-2.51	USFWS	TRAP OUTMIGRANTS, LOWER KLAMATH RIVER	27200 Annual report expected 7/91.
** Subtotal **				286173
* MANAGE HABITAT				
MANAGE HABITAT	90-2.42	HOOPA VALLEY BC	PINE CR. HABITAT EVALUATION/IMPROVEMENT ASSESS.	31188 Final report expected 8/91.
MANAGE HABITAT	90-4.3	PSMFC	IMPROVE MAINTENANCE OF DIVERSION SCREENS	23911 Agreement Closed.
MANAGE HABITAT	90-4.2	SISKIYOU RCD	SCOTT R. BASIN SEDIMENT STUDY, PHASE II	30768 Final report expected 7/91.
** Subtotal **				85867
** PLAN PROGRAM				
PLAN PROGRAM	90-1.1	KIER ASSOCIATES	AMEND LONG-RANGE PLAN TO INCLUDE UPPER BASIN ISSUE	30149 Draft amendment accepted by T.F. 3/91. Contract still open.
** Subtotal **				30149
*** Total ***				997612

KLAMATH RIVER RESTORATION PROGRAM
FEDERAL WORKING PLAN, FISCAL YEAR 1991

ATTACHMENT 5

files: 91fedwp.dbf,ndx,frm

PROJECT COOPERATOR NUMBER	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST COMMENT
** CATEGORY: Education			
E-8	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Basinwide	Public Information Program. Continues ongoing program: presentations, media etc
			40000 Ongoing program. Five public meetings held. Slide presentations given to six organizations. Processed comments on KFMC Plan. Mailed eleven press releases.
E-3	USFWS - Contract		Develop education program for school children.
			67500 Deferred until FY92 funds become available.
E-1	USFWS - Contract	Kidder Creek	Educational field study of fish requirements and riparian restoration.
			2500 Underway. Final report expected 12/91.
E-4	USFWS - Contract		Portable information display for Klamath Fishery Restoration Program.
			7500 Underway. Deliverable 12/91.
** Subtotal **			117500
** CATEGORY: Fish Protection			
FP/193	CDFG	Shasta River	Modify and repair Shasta River fish counting facility.
			23639 Expect Corps permit 8/91. Project completion estimated 9/91.
FP-1	Karuk Tribe of California	Klamath River, Ishi-Pishi Falls	Estimate, by species, Karuk subsistence harvest.
			26514 Underway. Final report expected 12/91.
FP-3	USFWS, FAO Arcata	Lower tributaries to Klamath River	Estimate spawning, juvenile production, habitat.
			40500 Underway. Expect final report 3/92.
FP-4	USFWS, FAO Arcata	Blue Creek	Estimate chinook stock status and potential for enhancement.
			57400 Underway. Final report expected 3/92.
FP-5	USFWS, FAO Arcata	Klamath River at Big Bar.	Monitor juvenile salmonid emigration.
			2750 Underway. Final report expected 3/92.
FP-6	USFWS, FAO Arcata	Lower Klamath River and estuary.	Estimate juvenile fish standing crop and outmigration.
			27750 Underway. Final report expected 3/92.
** Subtotal **			178553
** CATEGORY: Fish Restoration			
FR-3	CDFG	Klamath River, several tributaries.	Estimate adult contribution of pond reared salmon.
			27600 CWT Tagging complete for Indian, Elk and Bluff Creek ponds. Final report expected 9/91.
FR-1	NCIDC	Klamath River, Yurok reservation	Late run fall chinook accelerated stocking program.
			124633 Approximately 44,000 fish on feed in facilities. Agreement budget reduced by \$24,815.

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
FEDERAL WORK PLAN, FISCAL YEAR 1991

files: 91fedwp.dbf,ndx,frm

PROJECT COOPERATOR NUMBER	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST COMMENT
FR-2 NCIDC	Klamath River, Yurok reservation	Late run fall chinook gillnet capture project	22798 Project completed 1/91.
** Subtotal **			175031
** CATEGORY: Habitat Protection			
HP-1 Energy and Resource Advocates	Klamath Basin, Salmon River & west.	Remote sensing and GIS feasibility analysis.	36830 Underway. Final report expected 7/91.
HP-3 HSU/CCFRU	Salmon River	Estimate spawning and rearing habitat for spring chinook and summer steelhead.	10281 Underway. Progress report expected 6/91.
HP-10 Siskiyou RCD	Scott River, Scott Valley	Inventory riparian zone. portion.	7054 Seasonal employee hired, survey work to begin soon. Final report expected 12/91.
HP-7 USFS, Klamath NF	Salmon River, South Fork	Conduct watershed improvement needs inventory (WINI).	18500 Field work begun. Attempting to link upslope erosion processes with impacts to fish habitat. Final report expected 9/91.
HP-9 USFS, Klamath NF	Salmon River Subbasin	Analyze sediment delivery.	38190 Field inventory work ongoing. Developing a database and GIS info. transfer. Final report expected 9/91.
** Subtotal **			110855
** CATEGORY: Habitat Restoration			
HR-15 CDFG	Klamath River, various tributaries.	Provide one work year of diversion screen maintenance.	27589 Underway. Final report expected 2/92.
HR/065 Hoopa Valley Business Council	Pine Creek	Control or prevent erosion of sediment into Pine Creek.	61811 Cooperative agreement not signed by HVTC yet.
HR/112 USFS, Klamath NF	Salmon River, North & South Forks.	Provide native plants to reseed riparian zones.	13957 Seed collection to be done this fall.
** Subtotal **			103357
** CATEGORY: Program Administration			
PA-3 U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service		Operation of Klamath Fishery Resource Office.	262000 Continues ongoing project.
PA-4 U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service		USFWS Regional Office overhead.	80000 Continues ongoing project.
** Subtotal **			342000
*** Total ***			1027296

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
** CATEGORY: Fish Restoration NCIDC	Fall Creek	Rearing Pond Project	33625 USFWS	FR- 7		85
NCIDC	Lower Klamath River Tributaries	Fish rescue and rearing project.	2750 USFWS	FR- 3	To rescue stranded juvenile salmonids in the lower Klamath River and tributaries.	84
NCIDC	Lower Klamath River	Late run fall chinook gillnet capture.	24970 USFWS	FR- 2	To capture 120,000 late run fall chinook eggs for lower Klamath River late fall chinook rearing program.	82
Orleans Rod and Gun Club	Orleans	Rescued steelhead rearing project	11297 CDFG	FR- 4	Goal is to rear 18,000 to 20,000 steelhead rescued from Scott River system.	79
NCIDC	Mid-Klamath River tributaries	Pond rearing program for mid-Klamath River chinook	101712 CDFG	FR- 6	Ongoing program. Production goal of 120,000 to 240,000 chinook (Indian, Grider, and Elk Creeks).	79
Art Frazier	Hammel Creek	Chinook hatching/rearing project	8074 CDFG	FR- 5	To rear 30,000 yearling Salmon River chinook	77
NCIDC	Lower Klamath River	Accelerated Stocking Program, Late Fall Run Chinook	133058 USFWS	FR- 9		77
<i>"Low" and "High" Budgets</i>			<i>E = 315,486</i>			
Orleans Rod and Gun Club	Orleans	Upgrade fish rearing facility	9550 USFWS	FR- 1	Increase rearing capacity and capability.	71
Paul and Joanne Luckey	Bogus Creek	Eagle Ranch Steelhead Rescue Rearing Facility	18473 CDFG	FR-10	Rear rescued steelhead from Bogus, Cold, and nearby creeks.	53
Commercial Maricultures	Iron Gate Hatchery	Hatchery Assessment	36000 USFWS	FR- 8		28
** Subtotal **			379509			

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
** CATEGORY: Habitat Protection						
Hoopa Valley Tribal Council	Pine Creek	Sediment monitoring	38662 USFWS	HP- 1	Phase 4 of the Pine Creek watershed 83 improvement program.	
			<i>"Low" Budget Σ = 38,662</i>			
Klamath N.F.	Negro/Indian Creek Drainages	Watershed Improvement Needs Inventory (WINI)	16300 USFWS	HP-17	South Fork of the Salmon River.	74
Klamath N.F.	Methodist Creek Drainage	Watershed improvement needs inventory (WINI).	17000 USFWS	HP-16	South Fork of Salmon River.	73
Klamath N.F.	Clear, Rainy, Elk and Dillon Cks.	Coarse woody material survey.	4000 USFWS	HP-13	To establish coarse woody debris restoration standard.	72
Pacific Watershed Associates	Lower Klamath River tributaries	Watershed and stream channel assessment of 5 tributary basins.	44635 USFWS	HP-12		71
			<i>"High" Budget Σ = 120,597</i>			
Klamath N.F.	Wooley Creek	Habitat Condition Study	31300 USFWS	HP-14		68
USFWS-KRFRO	Basinwide	Abandoned mine pollution survey.	24890 USFWS	HP- 2	Competitive bid: Identify pollution sites, evaluate degree of water quality degradation, and facilitate abatement of problem. (Policy 2.B.2.b,g)	62
Klamath N.F.	Oak Flat Creek	Sediment Study	26670 USFWS	HP-15		58
Shasta Valley RCD	Shasta Valley	Shasta River Riparian Inventory	10109 USFWS	HP-11		57
USFWS-KRFRO	Klamath R, Shasta & Scott subbasins	Design instream flow studies.	10785 USFWS	HP- 3	Competitive bid: IFIM study. (Policy 2.F.1.j)	55
Kier Associates	Basinwide	Database of water quality and habitat inventory.	0 USFWS	HP- 4	Incorporates data into national EPA waterbody system database. (Policy 3.2.c,d, Policy 3.13.b and Policy 7.7.b)	52
DWR	Scott River	Scott River IFIM study.	319000 USFWS	HP-10	Proposed for 3 years, total \$319,000.	49
DWR	Klamath River Estuary	Water quality and biological assessment.	66345 USFWS	HP- 6	Study proposed for 3 years, total cost \$132,680.	49
DWR	Klamath River	Instream Flow Needs Study, IFIM.	598000 USFWS	HP- 9	Proposed for 3 years, total \$598,000.	44

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
DWR	Lake Shastina	Limnological study.	35300	USFWS HP- 5	Water quality study of Lake Shastina.	43
DWR	Lower Klamath River	Water quality study.	176325	USFWS HP- 8	Proposed for three years, total cost \$176,325.	42
DWR	Shasta and Scott River basins	Assessment of Water Quality of Ag Return Flows.	39244	USFWS HP- 7		41
Research Triangle Institute	Basinwide	Data Management System	73981	USFWS HP-18	Data can be incorporated into the EPA waterbody system database.	38
Contaminant Research Center	Scott/Shasta Rivers	Agriculture effects study	376000	USFWS HP-19		37
Energy Resource Advocates	Upper Klamath River Basin	GIS Feasibility Analysis	35516	USFWS HP-21		30
DWR	Scott River	Sediment Pool Feasibility Study	29100	USFWS HP-20		30
** Subtotal **			1973162			

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
** CATEGORY: Habitat Restoration NCIDC	Tarup Creek	Migration barrier removal.	10192 USFWS	HR-24	Lower Klamath tributary. Remove sediment at mouth of creek.	90
Shasta RCD	Shasta River	Easton bank protection and riparian fencing.	7190 USFWS	HR-17	1400 lineal feet of riparian protection.	89
Shasta RCD	Shasta River	A.D. Banhart Cattle Exclusion Fencing	9698 CDFG	HR-18	Riparian fencing for 4500 lineal feet of 2 stranded electrical fencing.	88
Klamath N.F.	South Fork Salmon River	Overwinter Habitat Enhancement	3432 CDFG	HR-11	Juvenile winter habitat.	84
Siskiyou RCD	Scott River	Streambank protection.	11550 CDFG	HR-20	Work was identified in the FY91 riparian condition survey.	84
Siskiyou RCD	Scott River	Riparian Fencing and Re-vegetation Project.	17556 CDFG	HR-21	Work identified in the FY91 riparian condition survey.	84
Siskiyou RCD	Paradise Hollow, French Ck Drainage	Cattle exclusion fencing.	10340 CDFG	HR-19	Tributary to Scott River.	83
Klamath N.F.	South Fork Salmon River	Plant native riparian vegetation.	11640 CDFG	HR-14	Second stage of the riparian vegetation project.	82
Fruit Growers Supply Company	Cottonwood Creek	Cattle Exclusion Fencing	39456 CDFG	HR-25	Tributary below Iron Gate. 2 miles of 5 strand barb wire riparian fencing.	81
Shasta RCD	Shasta River	Riparian Fencing and Re-vegetation Project.	28886 CDFG	HR-22	2.5 miles of riverbank to be fenced, and planted if needed.	81
Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Shasta River CRMP Field Projects Coordinator	24785 USFWS	HR-23	Coordinate activities of the newly formed Shasta Coordinated Resource Management Program (CRMP).	81
Klamath N.F.	Indian Creek	Winter habitat restoration.	22725 CDFG	HR- 9	Mid-Klamath tributary. Complex large woody debris structures.	77
"Low" budget			Σ = 197,450			
Klamath N.F.	Indian Creek	Riparian restoration.	8840 CDFG	HR- 8	Mid-Klamath tributary. Summer and winter thermal protection.	74
Klamath N.F.	Salmon River basin	Log structure placement.	11327 CDFG	HR-13	20 structures placed in various	73
"High" budget			Σ = 217,617			

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
					tributaries to the Salmon River.	
USFWS-KRFRO	Basinwide	Adoption of sub-basins.	1000 USFWS	HR- 4	Competitive bid: Provide start up funding for local community groups for restoration at the "grassroots level". (Policy 3.1.d)	69
Six Rivers N.F.	Bluff Creek	Construction of log cover structures.	14615 USFWS	HR-16	12 complex structures placed in the mainstem creek.	68
Six Rivers N.F.	Red Cap Creek	Construction of log cover structures.	15290 USFWS	HR-15	14 structures in the main stem of creek.	67
Klamath N.F.	Salmon River mainstem	Provide boulder cover at Crapo Creek confluence.	6732 CDFG	HR-12	Provide protection for spring chinook.	64
USFWS-KRFRO	Scott River		200000 USFWS	HR- 6	Competitive bid: erosion control. No budget estimate.	61
Klamath N.F.	Grider Creek	Fish Habitat Improvement	20000 CDFG	HR- 7	Habitat improvement by providing juvenile rearing areas.	61
Klamath N.F.	Crawford Creek	Re-construct road adjacent to creek.	48255 CDFG	HR-10	Tributary to S. Fk. Salmon River. Sediment reduction.	60
CCC	Klamath River	Stream habitat restoration.	72088 CDFG	HR-27	Construct and install 50+ instream structures on mid-Klamath tributaries.	53
CCC	Lower Tributaries of Klamath River	Stream Habitat Restoration	81497 USFWS	HR-29		49
Trout Unlimited	Seiad Creek	Construction of habitat modification structures.	50000 USFWS	HR- 3	Mid-Klamath tributary. Project targeting juvenile rearing habitat improvement.	49
Trout Unlimited	Humbug Creek	Migration barrier removal.	78710 USFWS	HR- 1	Mid Klamath tributary.	46
USFWS-KRFRO	Salmon River	Erosion control.	200000 USFWS	HR- 5	Competitive bid: erosion control. No budget estimate.	45
Trout Unlimited	Horse Creek	Juvenile Rearing Structures	50000 USFWS	HR- 2	Mid-Klamath tributary. Instream habitat modification structures.	45
DWR	Scott River	Pilot Project: Modify 3500 feet of	30800 USFWS	HR-30		38

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
		stream channel				
Trout Unlimited	Horse Creek	Migration Barrier Improvement	80796	USFWS HR-28		36
Hegler	Empire and Lumgrey Creeks	Thermal Rehabilitation Ponds	150675	CDFG HR-32		24
Hegler	Walker Creek	Thermal Rehabilitation Ponds	49617	USFWS HR-31		22
** Subtotal **			1367692			

KLAMATH FISH RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR BIDDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
** CATEGORY: Program Administration						
USEWS-69	Basinwide	Sound system	7666 USEWS PA-	2	For use at Task Force and KFMC meetings. Cost is rough estimate.	80
USEWS-KRFRO	Yreka, CA.	Technical Library	4250 USEWS PA-	3		78
USEWS-KRFRO	Basinwide	Three year action plan	26600 USEWS PA-	1	Identification, prioritization, and organization of high priority steps for long range plan policy implementation.	71
** Subtotal **			38516			
*** Total ***			4496830			



KLAMATH FISHERY COOPERATION PROGRAM
RECOMMENDED WORK PLAN, FISCAL YEAR 1992

files: 92krp.dbf,ndx,frm

PROJECT COOPERATOR NUMBER	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	COMMENT
** CATEGORY: Education				
E- 1	Shasta Valley RCD	Shaata River Basin Operating expenses for Shaata Valley CRMP	2090	To cover administrative costs of newly formed CRMP.
E-13	Klamath Forest Alliance	Salmon River Poaching prevention workshop.	1600	Emphasis on protecting spring chinook and summer steelhead on Salmon River. participation by locals.
E-14	Calif. Salmon and Steelhead Rest.	Northern Calif. 10th Annual Conference	2500	Funding request for administrative expenses.
E- 6	USFWS-KRFRO	Basinwide Curriculum development for grades 9-12.	17500	Continue to expand existing curricula from grades 4-8 through grade 12. (In FY91, \$50,000 of funding will be available to continue these projects.) Also provides funding for equipment and materials for teachers with the Klamath River Educational Program.
** Subtotal **			23690	
** CATEGORY: Fish Protection				
FP- 5	USFWS-CCFRO	Basinwide Age composition/scale analysis of Klamath fall chinook.	5450	To provide the KRTAT with an age composition estimate.
FP-11	Hoopa Valley Tribal Council	Klamath River below Trinity River Estimate population size and range of green sturgeon.	14058	Tag and re-capture 100 migrating adult green sturgeon.
FP- 7	USFWS- Fish Health Center	Basinwide Disease Survey of Salmonid Smolts	10105	To determine status and smolt quality at Iron Gate hatchery prior to release and after 3 weeks in river, as well as wild smolts captured in the lower Klamath.
FP- 8	Coastal Resources Research Group	Salmon River Population Differentiation of Spring and Fall Chinook.	16109	Identification through DNA profiling used to distinguish between spring and fall chinook salmon stocks on the Salmon River.
FP- 4	USFWS-CCFRO	Klamath River at Big Bar Monitoring of Yearling Salmonid Emigration.	3000	Ongoing project.
FP-12	Hoopa Valley Tribal Council	Pine Creek Monitoring outmigrating salmonids.	25000	This proposal is for monitoring over a 3-year time period, with the understanding that the total cost will be \$49,000.
FP-15	California Dept. of Fish and Game	Kidder Creek Irrigation diversion screening	47476	Likely funded by CDFG (7/91). One screen on Kidder Creek 52 cfs diversion ditch.
FP- 2	USFWS-CCFRO	Blue Creek Status of Salmon and Steelhead Stocks of Blue Ck.	58729	Biological survey and habitat assessment. Ongoing project.

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
RECOMMENDED WORK PLAN, FISCAL YEAR 1992

files: 92krp.dbf,ndx,frm

PROJECT COOPERATOR NUMBER	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	COMMENT
FP-16 Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game	Scott and Shasta Valleys	Temporary help for the Yreka Screen shop.	27589	
** Subtotal **			207516	
** CATEGORY: Fish Restoration				
FR- 7 NCIDC	Fall Creek	Rearing Pond Project	33625	
FR- 3 NCIDC	Lower Klamath River Tributaries	Fish rescue and rearing project.	2750	To rescue stranded juvenile salmonids in the lower Klamath River and tributaries.
FR- 2 NCIDC	Lower Klamath River	Late run fall chinook gillnet capture.	24970	To capture 120,000 late run fall chinook eggs for lower Klamath River late fall chinook rearing program.
FR- 6 NCIDC	Mid-Klamath River tributaries	Pond rearing program for mid-Klamath River chinook	101712	Ongoing program. Production goal of 120,000 to 240,000 chinook (Indian, Bluff, Elk Creeks). Camp Creek broodstocks used in these ponds.
FR- 4 Orleans Rod and Gun Club	Orleans	Rescued steelhead rearing project	11297	Goal is to rear 18,000 to 20,000 steelhead rescued from Scott River system.
FR- 5 Art Frazier	Hammel Creek	Chinook hatching/rearing project	8074	To rear 30,000 yearling Salmon River chinook
FR- 9 NCIDC	Lower Klamath River	Accelerated Stocking Program, Late Fall Run Chinook	133058	
FR- 1 Orleans Rod and Gun Club	Orleans	Upgrade fish rearing facility	9550	Increase rearing capacity and capability.
** Subtotal **			325036	
** CATEGORY: Habitat Protection				
HP- 1 Hoopa Valley Tribal Council	Pine Creek	Sediment monitoring	38662	Phase 4 of the Pine Creek watershed improvement program.
HP- 4 Kier Associates	Basinwide	Database of water quality and habitat inventory.	0	Funded with \$102,000 from the State Water Resources Control Board. Incorporates data into national EPA waterbody system database. (Policy 3.2.c.d, Policy 3.13.b and Policy 7.7.b)
** Subtotal **			38662	
** CATEGORY: Habitat Restoration				
HR-24 NCIDC	Tarup Creek	Migration barrier removal.	10192	Lower Klamath tributary. Remove sediment at mouth of creek.

KLAMATH FISHERY COORDINATION PROGRAM
RECOMMENDED WORK PLAN, FISCAL YEAR 1992

files: 92krp.dbf,ndx,frm

PROJECT NUMBER	COOPERATOR	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	COMMENT
HR-17	Shasta RCD	Shasta River	Easton bank protection and riparian fencing.	7190	1400 lineal feet of riparian protection.
HR-18	Shasta RCD	Shasta River	A.D. Bannhart Cattle Exclusion Fencing	9698	Likely funded by CDFG (7/91). Riparian fencing for 4500 lineal feet of 2 stranded electrical fencing.
HR-11	Klamath N.F.	South Fork Salmon River	Overwinter Habitat Enhancement	3432	Likely funded by CDFG (7/91). Juvenile winter habitat.
HR-20	Siskiyou RCD	Scott River	Streambank protection.	11550	Likely funded by CDFG (7/91). Work was identified in the FY91 riparian condition survey.
HR-21	Siskiyou RCD	Scott River	Riparian Fencing and Re-vegetation Project.	17556	Likely funded by CDFG (7/91). Work identified in the FY91 riparian condition survey.
HR-19	Siskiyou RCD	Parndiae Hollow, French Ck Drainage	Cattle exclusion fencing.	10340	Tributary to Scott River.
HR-14	Klamath N.F.	South Fork Salmon River	Plant native riparian vegetation.	11640	Likely funded by CDFG (7/91). Second stage of the riparian vegetation project.
HR-25	Fruit Growers Supply Company	Cottonwood Creek	Cattle Exclusion Fencing	30456	Likely funded by CDFG (7/91). Tributary below Iron Gate. 2 miles of 5 strand barb wire riparian fencing.
HR-22	Shasta RCD	Shasta River	Riparian Fencing and Re-vegetation Project.	28886	Likely funded by CDFG (7/91). 2.5 miles of riverbank to be fenced, and planted if needed.
HR-23	Great Northern Corporation	Shasta River	Shasta River CRMP Field Projects Coordinator	24785	Coordinate activities of the newly formed Shasta Coordinated Resource Management Program (CRMP).
HR- 9	Klamath N.F.	Indian Creek	Winter habitat restoration.	22725	Likely funded by CDFG (7/91). Mid-Klamath tributary. Complex large woody debris structures.
** Subtotal **				197450	
** CATEGORY: Program Administration					
PA-4	USFWS-KRPRO	Basinwide	Program Coordination and Implementation	405000	Includes costs for 5 staff, travel for Task Force and Management Council, building rental, meeting room rental, printing, etc.
PA- 1	USFWS-KRPRO	Basinwide	Three year action plan	26600	Identification, prioritization, and organization of high priority steps for long range plan policy implementation.
** Subtotal **				431800	
*** Total ***				1223954	

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE NEWS

Western Regional Center
Seattle, WA 98115



NOAA-SEA-03-91

Contact: Hal Alabaster
(206) 526-6046
Roddy Moscoso
(301) 427-2370

SNAKE SPRING/SUMMER, FALL
CHINOOK ARE THREATENED;
NO LISTING WARRANTED FOR
COLUMBIA COHO

HOLD FOR RELEASE AT 1:00 PM PDT, JUNE 7, 1991

To: Regional Directorate, Region
From: Public Affairs, Region 1
Portland, Oregon

NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) today announced a decision to list Snake River spring and summer chinook salmon as one threatened species under the Endangered Species Act, and an additional Snake River fall run of chinook will also be proposed for threatened status. The Fisheries Service has determined that lower Columbia River coho salmon do not warrant listing under the law. The agency now has up to one year to determine if the proposed listings will become final.

Any final decision on whether to list the fall, as well as spring/summer chinook salmon, must be based solely on the best scientific data available on the status of these populations as required under the ESA. Under the Act, socioeconomic considerations cannot play a part in NOAA's decision whether or not to list.

Before any final decision to list these species, broad public input will be sought to ensure that the administrative and scientific record for any proposal is accurate and complete. Scientific data on the respective populations will be sought from a wide variety of groups and a broad number of scientists.

The law also calls for the preparation of a population recovery plan for each listed species. While socioeconomic considerations cannot figure in NOAA's decision to list, such factors may be considered within any recovery plan.

A year ago NMFS received four petitions from Oregon Trout, a sportfishing group, and other groups to list Snake River fall, spring and summer chinook salmon and lower Columbia River coho salmon. The petitions also requested the designation of critical habitat under the ESA.

The decisions come after an exhaustive, year-long biological review by fisheries experts, and the completion of separate status reviews for Snake River fall chinook salmon, Snake River spring/summer chinook salmon, and lower Columbia River coho salmon.

Snake River spring/summer chinook salmon once numbered in excess of 1.5 million annually during their annual returns but have declined to fewer than an estimated 10,000 fish distributed over the entire Snake River Basin in Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. Fewer than 400 fall chinook salmon returned to the Snake River during each of the last four years.

NMFS has evaluated the status of lower Columbia River coho salmon and decided that biological evidence suggests that listing these fish under the ESA is not warranted now. Lower Columbia River coho are presently comprised of a mixture of fish of various origins, and no evidence was found that there remains a distinct wild population segment of coho salmon in the lower Columbia River.

Public hearings on the listing proposals have been scheduled for July 30, 1991 in Portland, Oregon at the Federal Complex Auditorium, 911 NE 11th Avenue (1st floor rear entrance at corner of 9th Ave. and Holladay); July 31, 1991 in Seattle, Washington at the NOAA Western Administrative Support Center Auditorium in Building #9, 7600 Sand Point Way, NE; August 1, 1991 in Richland, Washington, Richland Federal Building Auditorium, 825 Jadwin Avenue; August 7, 1991 in Boise, Idaho, Boise Interagency Fire Center Auditorium, 3905 Vista Avenue. All hearings are scheduled for 7:30pm to 9:30pm.

Additional information on hearing schedules may be obtained by calling NMFS at (503) 230-5400. The proposed listings allow for a 60-day comment period ending August 7, 1991. Comments may be addressed to:

~~Endangered Species Coordinator~~
Environmental and Technical Services Division 911
N.E. 11th Avenue, Suite 620
Portland, OR 97232

June 7, 1991

actionpl.an
drafted 4/25/91

STATEMENT OF WORK

PREPARATION OF A THREE-YEAR ACTION PLAN

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM

I. PROGRAM INFORMATION

Restoration Program Objective 7: Provide adequate and effective administration to successfully implement the Restoration Plan and Program.

Restoration Program Policy 7.10: Ensure a practical and equitable project selection process.

Project Title: Prepare a three-year (FY1993-FY1995) action plan for the Klamath Fishery Restoration Program.

NOTE: THIS WORK IS NOT ENTIRELY FOR OUTSIDE COMPETITION; SOME WOULD BE DONE BY FWS STAFF AND TASK FORCE SUBGROUPS. THE REASON FOR PUTTING THIS SCOPE OF WORK INTO THE PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS IS TO IDENTIFY FY92 PROGRAM FUNDS TO BE SET ASIDE FOR ACTION PLANNING.

II. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

- A. Identify ways to implement each of the policies of the long range plan for the Klamath Fishery Restoration Program.
- B. Prioritize the implementation of policies.
- C. Organize the high-priority steps for policy implementation into a three-year action plan.

III. TASKS

Task A: Identify and characterize implementing actions.

A.1 -- Identify WHAT should be done to implement the policy, and HOW these actions should be taken; prepare a logical, time-sequenced stepdown plan for getting the policy implemented or, for ongoing policies, for keeping it implemented. Use flow charts, critical path analysis, value engineering, brainwriting, nominal group technique, interpretive structural modeling or other appropriate work planning tools to identify and organize the steps and substeps of implementation.

A.2 -- Identify WHO would be the most likely entities to implement and fund the policy. In some cases, there is a tribe or agency with obvious lead responsibility. In most cases, responsibility is diffuse. If Task Force, work group, or Yreka FWS staff could contribute, so identify. If some tasks, could be competitively funded, explain.

A.3 -- Identify WHERE actions should be concentrated. For some policies, the geographic locus is already defined. For others, some implementing actions should be concentrated in some priority locations, so these should be identified.

A.4 -- Identify WHEN actions should be taken. Some policies will take ongoing, unceasing effort to implement. For others, most actions may be needed in the near term, with a lower level of maintenance effort. Other policies can be assigned pretty specific start and complete -- or abandon -- dates.

A.5 -- Estimate funding and staff time requirements for each action.

A.6 -- Identify factors limiting implementation of the policy. Removal or mitigation of these problems should be a part of the action plan.

Task B: Prioritize each long range policy, or, where appropriate, to actions leading to each policy

B.1 -- Prepare criteria for assigning priority.

B.2 -- Using established criteria, make a preliminary assignment of priority to each policy and action.

B.3 -- Group the highest-priority policies/actions into a preliminary near-term action plan.

B.4 -- Review the preliminary plan for logic and consistency. Adjust as necessary to produce a final draft action plan. Maintain a written record supporting the process and logic of prioritization.

Task C: Organize the actions and priorities identified in Tasks A and B in a draft three-year action plan, with environmental assessment, for implementing the highest-priority actions.

C.1 -- Define the scope of the plan. If it includes all the highest-priority actions identified through Tasks A and B, say that. If some actions are left out of planning --- for example, if an agency asserts that the actions for which it is responsible are exempt from recommendations of the Task Force -- then identify those.

C.2 -- Schedule highest-priority actions in a logical three-year sequence, and display them in tables.

C.3 -- Develop a narrative describing the logic of the action plan.

C.4 -- Draft an environmental assessment, in compliance with Interior Department guidelines for NEPA compliance.

C.5 -- If so indicated by Federal regulations, prepare a draft environmental impact statement.

C.6 -- Develop a procedure for updating the action plan, and evaluating performance.

Task D: Communicate the draft action plan and EA to interested parties, and incorporate comments.

D.1 -- Coordinate with Klamath Task Force: provide review draft and oral presentation; incorporate comments and provide revised draft(s). Get agreement on a procedure for agency/public review.

D.2 -- Coordinate with the Secretary of the Interior

D.3 -- Distribute review drafts of plan and EA or EIS to agencies and public.

D.4 -- Arrange scoping sessions or public comment meetings, as needed.

D.5 -- Receive, compile, and incorporate comments. Coordinate Task Force participation in this.

Task E: Prepare a final action plan and EA or EIS.

E.1 -- Arrange final Task Force review. Make final edits.

E.2 -- Print and distribute final documents, with appropriate publicity.

IV. METHODS

It is proposed that the work be done primarily in-house, with some contract support. Tasks A, B, and C would be primarily assigned to the technical work group, with support from the Yreka field office. The work group role is realistic only if Task Force tribes, agencies and groups will contribute resources to make work group members available for an extended task. Expertise in some action areas not well-represented on the work group may be acquired through competitive procurement.

Tasks D and E would involve the field office, work group, and Task force.

Alternatively, the work could be primarily contracted.

V. SCHEDULE

Tasks A, B, and C: Initiate October 1991, complete December 1991

Task D.1: December 1991

Tasks D.2 and D.3: January 1992

Task D.3 and D.4: February 1992

Task D.5 and E.1: March 1992 (to precede FY93 RFP)

Task E.2: April 1992.

VI. BUDGET ESTIMATE

1. Personnel

Consultant specialists -- 80 hours @ \$30/hour.....\$ 2,400

2. Travel

Consultant travel/per diem..... 1,000

In-house travel: 4 work group meetings @ \$3,000..... 12,000

3. Supplies

Printing and distribution of draft and final plan... 10,000
and EA/EIS

4. Overhead

Consultant overhead -- 50% of direct labor..... 1,200

TOTAL 26,600

KLAMATH FISH RESTORATION PROGRAM
 PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
 files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
** CATEGORY: Education NCIDC	Lower Klamath	Video on Yurok harvest	15000 USFWS	E-17	Previously recommended by Task Force	99
Diane Higgins	Basinwide	Support for teachers of the Klamath River educational program.	1500 USFWS	E- 3	To provide funds for equipment.	83
Shasta Valley RCD	Shasta River Basin	Operating expenses for Shasta Valley CRMP	2090 USFWS	E- 1	To cover administrative costs of newly formed CRMP.	83
Klamath Forest Alliance	Salmon River	Poaching prevention workshop.	1600 USFWS	E-13	Emphasis on protecting spring chinook and summer steelhead on Salmon River, participation by locals.	78
Montague Elementary School Dist.	Little Shasta River	Stream restoration by Montague Elementary School.	4850 USFWS	E-12	Environmental education through hands on participation.	78
Calif. Salmon and Steelhead Rest.	Northern Calif.	10th Annual Conference	2500 USFWS	E-14	Funding request for administrative expenses.	76
"Low" and "High" Budgets						
UC Extension-Davis	Klamath River Basin	Conference on decomposed granitic soils: Problems and solutions.	6000 USFWS	E-11	Addresses erosion control policies.	66
Gary Warner	Kidder Creek	Kidder Creek outdoor school	4900 USFWS	E- 4		66
USFWS-KRFRO	Scott and Shasta River Valleys	Inventory and workshop on agricultural water conservation practices.	15900 USFWS	E- 8	Addresses plan policies 2.F.1.a,b,c.	65
Siskiyou RCD	Basinwide	Farmer/commercial fisherman exchange project.	3850 USFWS	E- 2	To foster communication between two primary user groups.	65
USFWS-KRFRO	Basinwide	Curriculum development for grades 9-12.	49000 USFWS	E- 6	To expand existing curricula from grades 4-8 through grade 12.	65
USFWS-KRFRO	Basinwide	Habitat restoration workshop	7800 USFWS	E- 9	To provide restoration technique training.	59
Trout Unlimited, Six Rivers Chapter	Shasta River Basin	Riparian restoration techniques conference.	1500 USFWS	E- 5	Funding for administrative expenses.	53
Lone Eagle & KEET TV	Basinwide	Video: "Klamath Salmon - A View From The Sea"	28500 USFWS	E-16		51

Σ = 27,540

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
USFWS-KRFRO	Basinwide	Workshops on current timber harvest practices	7800 USFWS	E-10	Addresses plan policies 2.A.1.a,c,e,f,g.	51
USFWS-KRFRO	Basinwide	Workshop on proposal preparation and bidding process.	2900 USFWS	E- 7		49
Yoon & Associates	Lower Klamth River	Radio Series	1600 USFWS	E-15		42
** Subtotal **			157290			
*** Total ***			157290			

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
** CATEGORY: Fish Protection USFWS-CCFRO	Basinwide	Age composition/scale analysis of Klamath fall chinook.	5450 USFWS	FP- 5	To provide the KRTAT with an age composition estimate.	89
Hoopla Valley Tribal Council	Klamath River below Trinity River	Estimate population size and range of green sturgeon.	14058 USFWS	FP-11	Tag and re-capture 100 migrating adult green sturgeon.	88
USFWS- Fish Health Center	Basinwide	Disease Survey of Salmonid Smolts	10105 USFWS	FP- 7	To determine status and smolt quality at Iron Gate hatchery prior to release and after 3 weeks in river, as well as wild smolts captured in the lower Klamath.	82
USFWS-CCFRO	Klamath River at Big Bar	Monitoring of Yearling Salmonid Emigration.	3000 USFWS	FP- 4	Ongoing project.	79
Coastal Resources Research Group	Salmon River	Population Differentiation of Spring and Fall Chinook.	16109 USFWS	FP- 8	Identification through DNA profiling used to distinguish between spring and fall chinook salmon stocks on the Salmon River.	79
USFWS-CCFRO	Klamath River	Biological Data Collection for Green Sturgeon.	38004 USFWS	FP- 3	Attempt to identify primary spawning areas, and collect early life history, age-growth, distribution, and abundance data.	79
Hoopla Valley Tribal Council	Pine Creek	Monitoring outmigrating salmonids.	49128 USFWS	FP-12	Monitoring over a 3-year time period.	79
California Dept. of Fish and Game	Kidder Creek	Irrigation diversion screening	47476 CDFG	FP-15	One screen on Kidder Creek 52 cfs diversion ditch.	78
		<i>"Low" Budget</i>	<i>Σ = 183,330</i>			
USFWS-CCFRO	Blue Creek	Status of Salmon and Steelhead Stocks, of Blue Ck.	58729 USFWS	FP- 2	Biological survey and habitat assessment. Ongoing project.	74
Clearwater Biostudies	Scott River	Catalog surface water diversions, Scott River Basin.	46429 CDFG	FP-14	Catalog will be used by CDFG Yreka Screen Shop.	73
Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game	Scott and Shasta Valleys	Temporary help for the Yreka Screen shop.	27589 USFWS	FP-16		73
		<i>"High" Budget</i>	<i>Σ = 316,077</i>			
USFWS-CCFRO	Lower Klamath and Estuary	Juvenile Salmonid Seining Program	35500 USFWS	FP- 6	Ongoing project.	70

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING IN FISCAL YR 1992
files: RFP92.dbf, RFP92.frm

PROPOSED BY	LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST SUB TO	ID NO.	COMMENT	RANK
USFWS-CCFRO	Lower Klamath River tributaries	Monitoring juvenile salmonid outmigration.	52555 USFWS	FP- 1	Terwer, Tectah, Roach, and Hunter Creeks.	67
Klamath N.F.	Salmon, Scott and mid-Klamath tribs	Spawning Ground Utilization Surveys	72280 USFWS	FP- 9	175 miles.	66
Clearwater Biostudies	Shasta River	Catalog of surface water diversions, Shasta River Basin.	38915 CDFG	FP-13	Catalog will be used by CDFG Yreka Screen Shop.	65
Klamath N.F.	Salmon River	Seasonal law-enforcement for fish protection (USFS).	16566 USFWS	FP-10	To alleviate the poaching problem on spring chinook, summer steelhead on the Salmon River.	57
Calif. Coop. Fishery Research Unit	Klamath River	Study of Life History of American Shad in Klamath River	20268 USFWS	FP-17		43
Biosonics	Klamath River	Hydroacoustic Monitoring	28500 USFWS	FP-18		32
** Subtotal **			580661			