



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Klamath River Fishery Resource Office
 P.O. Box 1006
 Yreka, CA 96097-1006
 (916) 842-5763
 fax (916) 842-4517

July 27, 1994

Memorandum

TO: Klamath Fisheries Task Force members

FROM: Project Leader, Klamath River FRO
 Yreka, California

SUBJECT: Minutes of the June 22-23 meeting in Yreka

Attached are the minutes of the June 22-23 meeting in Yreka. Please note that the attachment for agendum #13 should have noted John Crawford as Modoc County's representative on the Upper Basin Ad Hoc committee. Handouts you have not yet seen are attached.

The next meetings are scheduled for October 13-14 in Klamath Falls and February 15-16 in the Arcata/Eureka area.

If you have any questions, please contact me or Patricia Parker.

for *Patricia S. Parker*
 Ron Iverson

Attachments

Minutes
Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force
June 22-23, 1994
Miner's Inn, Yreka, CA

June 22

1. Convene meeting

At 1:00 pm the meeting was convened by Jerry Grover (acting in Shake's place) with a quorum of members and alternates present (Attachment 1). Grover announced that there will soon be a new Yurok Tribe representative. Until that person is named, Troy Fletcher will serve as the alternate. New member Elwood Miller is representing the Klamath Tribe and new member Dave Solem is representing Klamath County (Handout A). Members introduced themselves. Since there are no set provisions for protocol to follow in the absence of the chair and vice chair, Grover announced that he is willing to chair the meeting.

** Motion (Wilkinson): Grover to serve as chair.

Seconded.

**** Consensus.

2. Discussion, adoption of agenda. Discussion, approval of minutes from meetings of 19-20 April 1994, and 4 May 1994.

Jim Henrickson, from the National Biological Survey (NBS) office in Fort Collins, CO, asked to be put on the agenda to offer assistance to the Klamath Restoration Program. This agenda item could occur at 2 pm on Thursday.

** Motion (Wilkinson): Move to approve agenda with the proposed change.

**** Consensus.

Discussion of minutes:

April 19-20 meeting:

Wilkinson: I will offer a clarification of the minutes. When the ad hoc upper basin sub-committee met this morning, we discussed, then felt that we should clarify our understanding of the question from Todd Kepple (on page 25). Todd asked, "Will there be an opportunity for formal public comment on the revised upper basin amendment?" The ad hoc upper basin sub-committee understands (by consensus) that the chair responded affirmatively regarding having a public comment component at the October Task Force meeting in Klamath Falls. The ad hoc subcommittee decided not to start a formal public comment process over again, but instead let public comments be routed through the appropriate Task Force representative. A full formal public comment process may take up to 18 months, though we hoped to have the revised draft amendment

prepared by October. We want to make sure that Todd Kepple was aware of the delineation between these two different processes because he writes for the Klamath Falls paper and we don't want to accidentally have a misleading announcement regarding the public comment period.

Bulfinch: At the February Task Force meeting, I recall that we decided that re-writing the amendment would not include a formal comment process. Since the adoption of this amendment is scheduled to occur in October 1994 and a full program review is scheduled to occur in 1995, I don't think that it makes sense to have two full formal reviews that close in time.

Orcutt: If some member of the public has a grave concern with the revised draft amendment, then they will need to contact the appropriate Task Force representative.

Grover: What I hear you saying is, we will hear public comments via representation on the Task Force, but no additional formal comment period will be held.

Corrections to April 19-20 minutes

page 9: In McInnis' comment, correct the sentence, "The older method would have given us 72% 52%."

page 10: Agenda item #17, the third sentence should read, "lands have been purchased by the restoration program and managed by the Bureau of Land Management ~~Bureau of Land Management.~~"

page 11: Second paragraph, "Under that umbrella, we have a Trinity flows EIS (1996) ~~(1986)~~"

Fletcher: I have a concern about the assignment on page 18 of the notes. I called staff at KRFRO and asked about a subpanel being given an assignment. I was told there was no subpanel assignment.

Iverson: Staff were to look at the policies in the plan and work with tribal representatives to begin to identify possible ways to fund a flow study.

Spain: It looks like there was a mis-communication that could be cleared up by the Yurok Tribe stating what their concerns are. These concerns could be inserted into the minutes after Troy discusses the issue with Shake.

Orcutt: I recall that there was a lot of discussion around the motion I put forth on page 8 regarding flow. I felt that people did not want to move forward because of some representatives not being present (e.g. Siskiyou County).

** Motion (Farro): The minutes should be approved (with the clarification to be provided by Fletcher pending) (Handout B).

Seconded.

**** Consensus.

Minutes of May 4:

**** Consensus on accepting the minutes as presented.

Minutes of Feb 2 joint meeting:

The Yurok Tribe will provide comments to staff.

3. Report from the budget committee and the technical work group on development of the Fiscal Year 1995 work plan (Bob Rohde).

I am the chair of the Technical Work Group (TWG) which is the group of people assigned by the Task Force to review proposals and tackle other issues (as assigned by the Task Force). We met on May 17-19 to review and rank the proposals for FY95 funding. 70 proposals were received this year in response to the Request for Proposals. The Klamath River Fishery Resource Office (KRFRO) prepares a database table, labels, and distributes these proposals to all TWG representatives who review the proposals prior to the TWG meeting. This year we met at the mouth of the Klamath River at the Requa Inn. One afternoon, the Yurok Tribe took us on a jet boat ride up the Klamath River and some TWG participants visited the lower Klamath rearing pond projects.

Now, I'll report on the three main topics discussed at the meeting by referring to flip charts (reprinted here for your reference):

- I. Technical Workgroup Priorities
- II. Questions and Problems
- III. Technical Workgroup Recommendations for FY 95

I. TECHNICAL WORKGROUP PRIORITIES

- Prioritize research and monitoring needs for the Basin before next year's request for proposals process.
- Habitat typing protocol.
- In areas of mutual interest, collaboration between entities is needed before next year's proposal process.
Examples: HR-03, FP-13 and HR-08 Fall vs. Spring monitoring.

- We need top notch geomorphological assistance for addressing complex erosion problems in the Basin.
- Better coordination between the TWG and CRMP's prior to the request for proposals process.
- Prioritize our inventory, mapping and GIS needs.
- Re-do the sub-basin priority table.

II. QUESTIONS AND PROBLEMS

- Can we specify an administrative cost of no greater than 10% in our request for proposals?
- We need an inventory of all non-expendable equipment purchased with Restoration dollars and returned, if necessary for future re-use.
- How does the Task Force process fit into FEMAT?
- The Request for Proposals (RFP) needs to be clear about what level of detail is expected for progress reports so that unnecessary administrative costs are not included in proposals.
- Proposers need to be notified following the Task Force meeting in June whether or not they received a favorable rating and how the agreement process will proceed.
- Is there a way to assure that billings submitted by cooperators receive prompt payment?

III. TECHNICAL WORKGROUP RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FY 95

TWG members reviewed the proposals following the criteria printed in the RFP:

Technical workgroup ranking criteria

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Maximum Points</u>
Employment of targeted groups	10
Contribution to restoration goals and policies	20
Benefits to priority fish species and stocks	10
Ability of the proposer to successfully implement the proposed project	10
Scientific validity, technical quality, development of new concepts or information	20

Conforms to sub-basin objectives	10
Cost-effectiveness, including: pricing, resource benefits/cost, and leveraging of funds - willingness of the proposer to contribute funds or in-kind goods/services.	20

Additional information regarding the review/ranking process

Technical Work Group members are appointed by each Task Force representative. Each proposal is discussed openly in closed session before they are ranked. Ranking is conducted by secret ballot and averaged together by a Klamath River Fishery Resource Office, Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) employee. The ranking averages are not altered in any way. They are presented to the budget committee the day after the Technical Work Group and then passed on to the full Task Force for final approval.

TWG Recommendations

The TWG responded to two requests from the Task Force:

1) In past years, we have noticed that after the Task Force approves the workplan, other proposals may be funded by other entities. This is beneficial if the project was considered worthwhile by the TWG, but a problem can occur when extremely poor proposals are funded and expected to count as part of the non-federal match. The TWG was requested to make a recommendation on proposals that should not be funded by any funding entity regardless of the ranking they receive.

Proposal HP-07 (regarding a flow study) should be withdrawn. Instead, the TWG will develop a study plan for Klamath River instream flow assessment at our next scheduled meeting in August.

The background on this item is that a proposal for a flow study was presented to the Task Force for approval in February (by the Sacramento FWS Ecological Services Office), but the proposal wasn't approved. KRFRO re-submitted the proposal to the TWG for consideration for FY95 funding. Instead of funding the proposal as written, Sacramento staff specializing in instream flow studies will assist the TWG at the next TWG meeting.

Proposal PC-02 should not be funded by the Task Force or any other funding source: At this time, the proposed methodology is not appropriate. This proposal is for some type of Coordinated Resource Management Planning (CRMP) for the lower Klamath sub-basin. At the TWG meeting, members expressed the concern that new CRMP's should be initiated "from the bottom up" rather than going out for the money and then trying to put one together.

Proposal HR-24 was withdrawn by the proposer Therefore, it was not ranked by the TWG.

Proposal FP-02 is somewhat controversial, but it is technically needed. The screen shop needs to prepare an accomplishment report for the public to review. A screen shop employee is needed to maintain the screens that prevent outmigrating chinook from being diverted onto agricultural fields. The TWG feels that this position is important, but that the screen shop needs to calm the potential public controversy by preparing a report to the public explaining why funds from the Task Force are needed to maintain state mandated screen shop services.

2) The Task Force also requested that the TWG respond to the current water flow situation in the Klamath River. We responded to this request by setting up a subcommittee to draft a letter to flow managers (see agendum #17).

BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT (Rohde)

Two documents in the Task Force mailing of June 6 are pertinent to the discussion of this agenda item: 1) The memo dated May 18 to Nat Bingham from Ron Iverson (mailed to the Task Force June 6 -- Handout C) shows the draft budget for implementing and coordinating the restoration program in FY95; and 2) the TWG's ranking of the proposals (mailed June 6 -- Handout D). This second item was brought to the budget subcommittee meeting on May 20 (the day after the TWG meeting). Mike Orcutt was the only Budget subcommittee member present. Linda Schwinck (KRFRO) was present to provide staff support and answer questions. Mike Rode (CDFG) and John Hamilton (KRFRO) were also present.

Now it is up to the Task Force to make the final decision on the workplan as prepared by the TWG and reviewed by the Budget subcommittee.

4. Task Force Discussion of work plan recommendation.

Q: Farro: Regarding the rating criteria: Does the proposal need to show that they are definitely employing someone from those groups, or that they will try to hire someone?

A: Rohde: The proposals need to show that either they will be definitely hiring someone from a targeted group or that they will exhaust all opportunities to hire someone from a targeted group. The latter is a judgement call by each TWG member on the basis of the information provided in the proposal.

Q: Was the field office rated?

A: No. It is shown at the top of the cumulative funding list (Handout E) in order to more easily keep track of the cumulative funding to be used in FY95.

Q: Where would the budget cut-off?

A: Its hard to tell for sure (because CDFG will pick up some projects for funding). We will include HR-22 as a funded proposal for now.

Farro: Projects selected for Proposition 70 funding have not yet been finalized, so we don't know how much farther down the list the federal funding may stretch.

Benthin: The number of state funded projects will not be known until later this summer.

** Motion (Farro) accept this list of TWG ranked proposals (as presented) and fund the projects until we run out of money.

Seconded (West).

Discussion:

Q: Are the two proposals that the TWG recommended be removed from the list still under consideration for funding?

A: Yes.

** Farro: I'll amend my motion to delete those two projects from consideration for any funding (HP-07 and PC-02).

Q: Will the TWG develop a study plan for scoping the flow issue this year?

A: No, it will not be a proposal for this year (unless another organization funds the scoping, or unless the Task Force decides that surplus FY94 funds could be used to fund the scoping).

Q: What happened to the flow scoping proposal? Why did it receive such a low rating?

A: KRFRO re-submitted the scoping proposal that was originally put together by the Sacramento Ecological Services office. It is low on the list and is not qualified for any funding until the TWG has had an opportunity to review the process needed for an instream flow study process.

Rohde: The TWG has recommended that two projects not be funded at all (HP-07 flow study: to be done in-house instead and PC-02 lower Klamath CRMP: to be initiated internally at a later date). The screen shop position (FP-02) will occur (it is above the line and recommended for funding) after a report is sent out to the public describing the need for and successes of this project. HR-24 was withdrawn by the proposer.

** Motion clarified: (Farro): Fund projects based on the order, ranking and recommendations of the TWG.

Grover: Shake asked me to report that FWS supports funding for scoping the flow issue. Please also note that tomorrow's agenda calls for more discussion of the flow issue.

Orcutt: The appropriate time for addressing the flow issue is now. We are supportive of making rational decisions based on scientific evaluation. At

the Task Force meeting in February, we felt that there were some components missing in the original Sacramento Ecological Services proposal. When the TWG is done scoping the project, then the Task Force will buy off on it and join in to get the study funded.

Fletcher: I feel that Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) should pay for the flow study and the spawning survey on the mainstem.

Rohde: I support Farro's motion.

Grover: Will the maker of the motion withdraw it (with concurrence of the second) until after we get public comment?

Farro: Yes (seconder concurs).

Wilkinson: In the past, we have held the motion on the table until after public comment.

Grover: Is there further discussion on the Technical Work Group's report?

Q: (Benthin): What does the TWG mean when they request a "report of accomplishments" on the screen shop position?

Rohde: CDFG is asking for FWS dollars for something that seems like CDFG should fund. This controversial point could be resolved if we could see a written description of why federal dollars should be used to fund a state mandated program. We were not specific as to how this accomplishment report would be circulated.

Q: Why was that one proposal from CDFG singled out? Other agencies put proposals in for tasks that seem to be under their purview.

A: The proposal caught our attention because we wondered why federal funds were being requested to maintain screens on ditches -- that is the function of the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) screenshop.

Benthin: Many of our positions are being cut since our budget is under attack right now. It is very necessary for us to seek other funding. Our funds are very limited right now. Our intent is to restore funding for screenshop positions at some time in the future.

Grover: Is there any additional discussion of other items?

Miller: Are we still going to discuss the need for Klamath River instream flow? The flow issue does not seem to be getting resolved. If there is an initiative to get a flow study done, then who are the players going to be?

Grover: Let's discuss this topic more tomorrow.

5. Public comment on work plan recommendation.

Felice Pace, Klamath Forest Alliance (KFA): I have three comments to make on today's discussion: 1) I think it would be very difficult for the TWG to be objective when rating proposals because several representatives on the TWG are attempting to get their own projects funded. In this situation, it is not truly a technical review, it is political review too. We are hiding a political process behind a veneer of technical review. 2) Regarding the flow needs assessment: this issue needs to move forward, I'm concerned about the comment regarding waiting for BOR funding because I feel that the Task Force needs to find a way to make this flow study move forward. We need a time line and funding, to make this move. Otherwise, I anticipate that we will be back here next year having the same discussions. 3) Are we addressing the key limiting factors in each sub-basin? It is hard to know. It is clear from the law that the groups affected by low numbers of salmonids need to benefit from the restoration effort. These people (Native Americans, commercial fishermen, recreational anglers, loggers) need to be put to work in the drainage and the Task Force needs to look at how to correct this problem.

Rohde: In response to your comment on TWG credibility, the TWG is composed of professionals from a wide range of fields who do not take lightly the survivability of the anadromous fish of the Klamath watershed. We are looking for a better way to fund the instream flow scoping process and we will be looking for a way to fund the study as soon as possible after the issues are identified.

Pace: In the past, the TWG has stated that they don't have enough time to do the tasks that are assigned to them. I hope you can prove me wrong on this point, especially in regards to scoping the flow study. Scoping is a worthwhile issue that needs to be addressed. The problem of TWG credibility is a structural problem, not a specific problem with any individual member.

Dave Zeponi, Klamath Water Users Association: I have a question regarding the categories that the proposals are divided into. You seem to have both location and subject heading categories, how does this division work?

Rohde: The workplan used to be assembled in categories by the plan's subject headings. Two years ago we decided to rough out the priorities for each sub-basin so now we arrange them by sub-basin.

Zeponi: I keep hearing about the need to scope the flow issue, then have a flow study done. I think the Task Force needs to get off the dime and move on these activities. Perhaps this group should give official support to some kind of flow scoping study to be done by someone. Maybe funding could be obtained from another source (e.g. Foundation funds, matching funds) as opposed to using research money. I'm concerned because we are about to have another year move by without the Klamath getting any closer to having the flow scoping or study move forward. Another concern is that the instream flow proposal is 3rd from the bottom -- this could be misconstrued because it looks like it is a low priority idea. In reality, it is important to have the flow study scoped, the TWG just didn't agree with the techniques in the submitted proposal.

Rohde: It is well recognized that some kind of flow analysis needs to be done right away. That this proposal is low on the list is not indicative that it is low priority. Our recommendation to have the TWG address the need for scoping the flow study at our next TWG meeting.

Rod Kucera, Upper Basin Ad Hoc Subcommittee member: I agree with many of the comments made regarding supporting the flow study. The issue of flows needs to be looked at. I noticed that one of the criteria used to rate the proposals is "scientific validity and technical credibility" so I say, how can the Task Force be considered scientifically valid if it doesn't have a flow study?

Break

Terry Coltra, NCIDC: I am confused by the ranked table of proposals (Handout D). NCIDC has been doing the same kind of rearing process for the past 15 years, but all of a sudden our proposals were ranked at a very low level. I've never seen the criteria used to rate the proposals before now. If proposers don't see the criteria, then how can we address it? We in the lower Klamath are attempting to maximize the utilization of streamside rearing facilities. These projects service the historic major spawning tributaries of the Klamath River for people who subsist on these fish. Why did these proposals rank so far below what they ranked in past years? We need a specific explanation on what we were judged on.

Grover: Bob, are the criteria used to rate the projects internal?

Rohde: The rating criteria are shown on page 9 of the RFP.

Fletcher: We submitted a letter of concern regarding this project too (Handout F). It seemed to me that there was a greater level of scrutiny on this project (Handout G).

Q: How does the resolution that occurred at the May 4 teleconference affect the outcome of where to spend the \$38,000?

A: Iverson: The May 4 motion to "reject the proposed changes" resulted in KRFRO writing a FY94 agreement for the original NCIDC funding request minus \$38,000. The money available under the agreement allows NCIDC to be reimbursed for the money that they already spent. At this meeting, the Task Force may decide to fund all or part of the proposed new (FY95) tasks with the \$44,000 of surplus FY94 funds available. Each proposal that comes up for review each fiscal year is considered for funding by being rated and ranked by the TWG. Therefore, future years of broodstock capture or pond rearing are considered separately and are a result of the ranking process.

Coltra: I recall that the Task Force decided in May to put \$38,000 towards rearing activities and facilities after discussing it more at the meeting in June.

Q: What has happened in past years?

Coltra: In the past, KRFRO funded broodstock capture in advance of the fiscal year because of the lag time in between fiscal year funds being available.

West: Hatchery and rearing practices have been, and are still being scrutinized carefully by many people and many agencies. This scrutiny is not directed specifically at NCIDC's rearing proposals.

Break

6. Action: Task Force decision on final FY1995 work plan.

** Motion (Farro): The Task Force fund projects based on their ranking by the TWG with the exception of the two projects that were recommended not to be funded. Additionally, \$50,000 should be set aside in FY95 to be invested in a scientifically valid and acceptable flow needs assessment. The Chair will need to appoint a subcommittee to oversee that process.

Seconded.

Discussion:

Fletcher: I'd like to wait on committing \$50,000 until we hear the discussions tomorrow. BOR and others who manipulate the river should pay for the monitoring studies.

Spain: I understand your concerns, and I feel that \$50,000 is not adequate to do a full study, but we do need to get going on this issue. That's why I seconded the motion.

Miller: The instream flow issue needs to be addressed. It is hard to get money until we decide how we want to go forward.

Spain: The first step is to get a budget marker. It does not commit us to the study, it just sets aside the money.

Grover: As I understand the motion, it has 3 parts: 1) accept the ranking of the TWG, 2) set aside \$50,000, and 3) appoint a committee to oversee the process. My question is, if the \$50,000 is not spent on the flow study, will it go back to fund projects on the ranked list?

A: Yes (Farro). The motion calls for projects to be funded in the order as ranked by the TWG as money is available.

Orcutt: I assume the other motion was withdrawn.

Q: What is the status of the CCFRO proposals (spawning ground studies, juvenile outmigrant monitoring) for the current year? Have they been funded with other than Task Force money?

A: Halstead, CCFRO: Funding for outmigrant trapping will go on until we are out of funds -- probably early July (funded by BOR and FWS). The spawning

ground study was not due to be funded, but surplus funds became available so we were able to do it this year.

Orcutt: I have problems with the perceptions I've heard that the Task Force is dragging its feet on the flow issue. The Hoopa Tribe sees the urgent need to move on the flow issue. It is good to see all the people who are supporting this (including Dan Hamburg and the irrigators).

Grover: There is still a motion on the floor. Is there additional discussion?

Call for question:

** Motion fails (Fletcher voted no).

** Motion (Spain): Fund projects based on ranking of the TWG until available funds are expended. Include TWG recommendations (i.e. projects HP-07 and PC-02 are not to be funded).

Orcutt: I want specific direction on where the funding line should fall. I'm still concerned about the Task Force funding projects that the state should fund.

Benthin: As funding is committed during the next few weeks, we will let you know the status of state funding. Screen construction by CDFG is inexpensive compared to going outside for bids.

Call for question:

Orcutt: I have a problem with not knowing where the line is. Is it at HP-02?

Spain: The motion is independent of the funds available because we don't know where the funding line falls at this time.

Grover: Do we accept the motion as presented?

** Motion fails (Orcutt voted no, Fletcher abstained).

** Motion (Wilkinson): Regarding agenda item #3, I move that we accept the ranking of the TWG down to, and including, Project HP-02.

Seconded.

Discussion:

Farro: If, a project were supported through one of the other sources of funds, could the line move down?

A: Yes, the line could move down (Iverson).

Q: Would your motion continue funding beyond HP-02?

A: I didn't address anything beyond HP-02.

Call for question:

Grover: Do we accept the ranking including projects down to HP-02?

** Motion fails (Farro objects).

Grover: Does anyone wish to offer a compromise?

Rohde: Since the discussion on items #8 etc may change the outcome of this discussion, perhaps we could set aside this issue until later in the meeting.

7. Update on status of the FY94 work plan, and estimate of "surplus" funds available (Linda Schwinck)

Linda Schwinck, Cooperative Agreements Assistant at Klamath River FRO: The pink handout (Handout H) gives an update on the status of FY94 projects. At the bottom of page 4 you can see the surplus of \$44,684. This surplus comes from two sources: 1) \$21,500 is from the Tulana Farms project that was approved for funding in June 1993 (funded instead by the ERO) and 2) \$38,000 from the NCIDC agreement as a result of the revision of tasks. Out of the \$59,500 available, the curriculum development (Higgins) agreement was funded for \$36,059 leaving funds available amounting to \$44,684. The history on the Higgins agreement is that the Task Force decided in June 1993 to fund her proposal "as funds became available".

Tulana Farms	(+) \$21,500
NCIDC	(+) <u>38,000</u>
Subtotal	59,500
Higgins	(-) 36,059
Workplan adjustments*	(+) <u>21,243</u>
Total available	\$44,684

* These adjustments to the workplan are due to: 1) using some funds that remained from FY93 for Higgins in FY94 and 2) having several FY94 projects that cost less than originally estimated by the cooperator.

8. Task Force discussion of use of "surplus" funds, including use for funding projects from the FY95 work plan.

Fletcher: I believe that NCIDC has already made a request for that \$38,000.

Iverson: It is up to the Task Force today to decide what to do with the \$44,000 remaining from FY94. The options are to either add it to the funds available for projects requesting FY95 funds, use it to fund more projects off the ranked list for FY94, or fund some other top-priority project.

Coltra: The \$38,000 that was put on hold until this June meeting represents funds that could be used for the '95 capture and rearing activities for the lower Klamath ponds.

Q: Is the \$38,000 remaining from the NCIDC agreement part of the \$44,000 of surplus funds for FY94?

A: Yes (Schwinck).

Bulfinch: As I understand it, the proposed tasks to do repairs to the facilities should be seriously considered as a multi year project that is to be done in conjunction with broodstock collection. CDFG has committed to assisting NCIDC with preparing this five year plan and the Task Force is looking forward to seeing it when it is completed.

West: Page 4 of the May 4 notes show Coltra saying, "If you don't approve the 1994-1995 rearing, the money would come back to you. If you do, you would have the funds available for broodstock capture." So the decision on applying these funds for broodstock collection hinges on where this proposal falls on the FY 95 ranked list. This was also Kent's point during the teleconference.

Q: Terry, is what is recorded in the minutes, what you meant?

Coltra: There was always a disclaimer (in our agreement for rearing fish) that if the funding for collection of broodstock didn't exist, then the rest of the project (rearing) wouldn't be funded.

** Motion (Fletcher): I move that \$23,000 of "surplus" FY94 funds be allocated to NCIDC to continue broodstock capture for the rearing project.

Seconded.

Discussion:

Orcutt: I think people are against this project.

Q: How would this funding (for broodstock collection) tie in with the funding needed for the rest of the project (rearing)?

A: The Yurok Tribe is pursuing additional funding and we are in the process of more clearly defining the goals of these projects (Fletcher).

Spain: I am uncomfortable with this motion. If we follow the TWG's recommendation and fund projects according to rating, then the next proposal funded should be one that rates 63. This motion would lead us to allocating money to projects that rated at 48 or 42 and skipping over the twenty one proposals in-between. We are being asked to short circuit the TWG's rating and I am not comfortable with that. Why do we have the TWG if we do not heed their advice?

Q: In the May minutes, page 5, Bingham's amendment to the motion was intended to hold the funds until the June meeting to see how the TWG ratings worked out

for FY95. Why would we fund a project that had a low rating and what is the point in funding half the project (broodstock capture)?

A: The Tribe guarantees that if the fish are captured, their young will be reared. We will find a way to get funding for rearing (Fletcher).

Call for question:

Point of order -- we need to hear public comment before deciding on this issue.

Grover: The question will be held in abeyance until after public comment.

9. Public comment.

Felice Pace: My organization is in a dilemma over this issue. As many of you know, there is substantial question as to the technical validity of these artificial propagation projects -- yet, we are sympathetic to the tribe because it appears that other projects that may be of questionable scientific validity (e.g. USFS instream projects) rated high. The same body of scientific information that questions propagation also questions instream projects.

Terry Coltra: NCIDC has been in the rearing business since '79 and we have put in a considerable amount of money towards these rearing programs. We have involved quite a number of other funding sources in these programs too. Right now, we are in a transitional process of turning the fishery program over to the Yurok Tribe. If we are funded to capture the fish, we will guarantee that we will fund the rest of the program.

10. Task Force decision on use of "surplus" FY94 funds.

Grover: There is a motion on the table to allocate \$23,000 of the "surplus" FY94 to fund NCIDC's broodstock collection.

Call for question:

** Motion fails (objections: Spain, Farro, Bulfinch).

8. Task Force discussion of use of "surplus" funds, including use for funding projects from the FY95 work plan (continued).

Q: (Bulfinch) I am unclear on what the \$15,000 will be spent on. Are we looking at \$15,000 for repairs to the facilities as we discussed in the May 4 conference call? Why is the motion only for \$23,000?

A: Grover: As I recall, the conversation in the May 4 meeting referred to 2 sets of money. One was \$15,000 for repairing the facility to prepare for broodstock collection. The other was \$23,000 for broodstock collection.

A: Coltra: The \$15,000 is to be used for construction of roofs at Cappell Creek and to rebuild facilities at Spruce and High Prairie Creeks. The request is to use money for construction that had earlier been earmarked for fish rearing.

Fletcher: The motion that I've proposed requests \$23,000 because that is the bare minimum needed for broodstock collection. I thought \$38,000 was out of the question, so I let it go.

Miller: I sat on the TWG for a few years, and I saw how the process and ranking works. The results are individual and collective -- it is a pretty good process. Now, on this type of question, the Task Force has the ultimate decision. This project has been before us a number of times, so I think we should seriously consider it.

Spain: There are 21 projects ahead of this one on the ranked list. I would first need to be convinced that those other projects are not worthwhile before funding this one. Just because we have funded a project in the past, doesn't mean that we always need to fund it in the future.

Grover: In summary, the money (\$23,000) that we are referring to could be used for collecting broodstock this year, with no promise of funding for future years. We need to decide what to do with the surplus FY94 funds.

** Motion (Farro): I move that we use these FY94 funds to start funding projects at the top of the ranked list for FY95.

Seconded.

Q: What has happened in the past?

A: Iverson: What has happened in the past is pretty close to what Mitch has proposed. If surplus funds are available in this fiscal year, then the surplus money would be offered to the top ranking project from the FY95 list. The principle is to use the surplus for the highest ranking project of the next year.

Point of order: We cannot adopt the motion on the table until after we accept the FY95 workplan.

** Motion modified: "... after the FY95 ranked list is approved."

Discussion:

Q: What about FY94 projects that were just below the line? Why wouldn't we fund those with the excess money?

Q: Were FY94 projects resubmitted in FY95?

A: It is hard to tell. People typically resubmit the same proposals or revised proposals. It is a pretty small circle of people who request funding from us.

o It seems like we are just speculating on what should be done this year.

Thackeray: Isn't it just as much speculation to go forward as it is to go backward?

West: Something to consider is the question "is a project that ranked #31 for FY94 as high of a priority as a project that ranked #1 for FY95? In my book, it is not likely that funding low priority projects from last year is as worthwhile as funding high ranked projects for this year.

Call for question:

** Motion fails (objections: Orcutt, Miller, Farro)

Break

Grover: I'd like to remind the Task Force that consensus is 3 things: 1) voting in the affirmative, 2) negative, or 3) opting to step aside. Stepping aside is used when you do not fully agree with everything that is proposed, but for the good of the group, you abstain in order to let the group process move forward. Right now, we seem to be hung up on some funding questions: what to do with the surplus FY94 funds?

Wilkinson: Can we return to agenda item #6?

Grover: Yes.

6. Action: Task Force decision on final FY1995 work plan (continued).

** Motion (Wilkinson): Regarding agenda item #6: Incorporate work of TWG down to and including HP-02. In response to concerns heard earlier, any projects funded beyond that would remain in ranked order.

Seconded.

Discussion:

Q: Does that include surplus funds?

A: No.

Q: Does that include the TWG recommendation not to fund the 2 outstanding projects?

A: Yes.

Q: What is the difference between these two motions?

Farro: The earlier motion didn't specify that future money would be spent based on the rankings of the TWG.

Call for question:

**** Consensus (abstention: Fletcher). The motion is passed as written.

10. Task Force decision on use of "surplus" FY94 funds (continued).

Q: When will NBS be here?

A: Tomorrow at 2 pm.

Maybe we should defer discussion of this agenda item until after we hear from NBS.

Grover: Good idea. We will begin the meeting tomorrow at 8 am as printed in the agenda.

Announcements

Halstead: In preparation for tomorrow's discussions, I want to bring your attention to my handouts on flows (Handout N). I suggest you review these tonight.

Rohde: Franklin will be the alternate TWG chair tomorrow in my absence.

Recessed

June 23

At 8:12 am, the meeting was reconvened by Acting Chair Jerry Grover.

Grover: Yesterday, we discussed surplus funds and the FY95 workplan. We decided to adopt the ranked workplan as recommended by the TWG. Today we need to decide on the use of FY94 surplus funds.

10. Task Force decision on use of "surplus" FY94 funds.

** Motion (Solem): At a recent Task Force meeting, the Klamath Basin Water Users requested financial assistance for helping to rewrite the amendment. We have spent \$28,600 and we would like retribution for 25% of that (\$7,150). We

will pick up 75% of the costs. Since Alcorn has left, we have not had staff to help us on this project. The mission of the upper basin ad hoc committee has expanded and is now rewriting and revising the amendment.

Seconded.

Discussion:

Thackeray. We paid Kier to write the original plan and amendment, so I feel that we should pay the Water Users to write the revised amendment. It is appropriate that the Task Force supply 25% of the funding.

Grover: I'd like to keep this discussion item on the table, but withdraw the motion until the group discusses the route the package should take.

** Motion is withdrawn.

Grover: We will keep in mind that one use of the surplus funds could be to put \$7,150 towards rewriting the upper basin amendment.

Fletcher: Another option for using the surplus funds is the one we discussed yesterday. If the Yurok Tribe were to receive \$23,000 for broodstock collection, we would be willing to assume primary responsibility for rearing fish in the lower Klamath rearing ponds. This could be a contract with the Yurok Tribe, not through NCIDC. We would find some other funding source for rearing the fish.

Grover: Are there any other possible uses for the FY94 surplus funds?

Miller: A third option is that an indefinite quantity of money should go toward the flow study.

Bybee: Back to the option of funding the rearing ponds. I'd like to discuss the appropriateness of funding a facility that is not up to OSHA standards. Perhaps the facility should be brought up to OSHA standards with funding provided by us.

Fletcher: The whole project hinges on having the funding to capture the broodstock. This first step is critical.

Orcutt: Could we first discuss the: 1) NCIDC (now known as Yurok Tribe's) proposal, 2) flow study, then 3) discuss Klamath County's concern?

Farro: I'm concerned because the TWG didn't consider or rank a proposal from the Yurok Tribe for FY94 or FY95 funds.

Fletcher: If that is the concern, then the other option of funding the revised amendment falls out of consideration too (since the revision didn't go through the review and rating process either). If that is the feeling, then we should forego both those issues and go straight to the seed money for the flow study.

Solem: Efforts to revise the amendment are funded in KRFRO's budget (funds that had been targeted for Alcorn's position). Now we are trying to meet deadlines and get the amendment printed within the timeframe that had been proposed.

Fletcher: I am not against the project, just the principle.

- o We need to be fair and treat people equally.
- o Following that logic, then the flow scoping study should not be funded with surplus money either.
- o The TWG brings us the recommended list of projects for funding, but this Task Force has the final decision making power. Other projects have been funded out-of-order in the past (e.g. Higgins/Yoon educational field trip). It is up to the Task Force to be innovative.

Orcutt: I feel that all of this stuff should be handled at the field office level, it should never have been elevated to the Task Force. The field office in its previous handling of this project was flexible in allowing money from one fiscal year to be used for broodstock collection in future years. This would not be such an issue if the contract was let in a timely fashion.

Grover: Are there any other proposals for the use of these funds?

Thackeray: Could Ron respond to the points that Mike brought up?

Iverson: I would draw your attention to the notes of the telephone conference on May 4 -- all the details were gone over at that time.

Grover: The question remains: Do we accept the TWG ranking as it is? Or does the Task Force continue to review the specific management of these funds. Remember that the TWG is an extension of the Task Force, the members that you appointed are representing you. The discussion points are centered on four items: 1) providing \$7,150 to the Upper basin folks to assist with rewriting the amendment, 2) providing \$23,000 to the Yurok Tribe for broodstock collection, 3) using the funding as seed money for a flow study scoping process, or 4) improving the hatchery facilities at the rearing sites.

** Motion (Fletcher): I propose that the surplus FY94 funds (\$44,684) be utilized by the TWG as "seed" money to initiate a scoping specifically to address flow requirements for the Klamath River below Iron Gate Dam, and the Shasta and Scott Rivers. Included in this effort will be the identification of potential funding sources for eventual flow studies. The TWG will shape this effort as needed.

Seconded.

Discussion:

Q: Wasn't this idea for a flow scoping rated low as a potential project for FY95?

A: Fletcher: Well, this is different. The proposal submitted for review by the TWG only dealt with mainstem flows. I feel that flows in the Shasta and Scott can't be overlooked. There needs to be a unified approach to the whole issue and the proposal process needs to start now.

Q: Is your motion for a scoping process, not an actual study?

A: Fletcher: Yes. The scoping done by the TWG will give us the specifics (e.g. data, funding, methods).

Spain: Scoping the flow issue is definitely something we should do -- it is in the best interest of everyone.

Q: Would the burden of scoping the flow study go to the TWG or a special subcommittee set up by the chair?

A: After reviewing recommendations from the TWG, it appears that they are the appropriate people to attack the flow issue. The TWG would still need to bring in different interests to work with them on this project.

Wilkinson: I am concerned that some Task Force members are serving as TWG representatives. When the TWG was first appointed, Task Force members decided that they could not represent themselves on the group -- only Task Force appointees could serve on TWG.

Fletcher: The flow issue is different. I feel that Task Force members need to be involved in the flow scoping process (similar to the representatives present at the November flow scoping meeting). Everyone knows that if you don't bring all the interests into the process early on then the product will fall apart in the long run.

Stokely: In the future, I will have more time available to work on flow issues, yet I do not have a representative on the TWG. If we stay with the requirement that Task Force members not represent themselves on the TWG, then Trinity County will not have a representative on the flow issue.

Public comment:

Jim Henrickson, National Biological Survey (NBS), Fort Collins, CO: Recently the Secretary of Interior created NBS by putting research and development branches together in one agency. Under the new NBS arrangement, my office is within the "Midcontinent Ecological Science Center" in the River System Management section. We recently went through a planning process which evaluated 5 watersheds across the nation and selected the Klamath as one of the places to start work. We have eight staff members who will be starting a project 3-5 years in length on the Klamath River Basin. Our interdisciplinary team has 3 aquatic ecologists, 1 limnologist, a hydrologist, 2 social scientists and an economist. We will be able to provide 2-3 staff years of assistance per year. Our goal is fishery restoration and ecosystem management as decided by the Secretary of Interior. Our role is to form partnerships -- we are not bringing our own research agenda. We need to fit in with what you are doing. Our center really stresses development and applied science rather than research. We want to form partnerships in 3 areas: 1) identify and quantify aquatic habitat, 2) develop a water management routing model, and 3) describe social and economic benefits to restoration. Since we are new, we would greatly appreciate the opportunity to serve as members on various

working groups (e.g. the flow needs assessment group). We support the scoping phase of the instream flow study. Our participation in this scoping process would allow us an opportunity to get involved and get a better understanding of the information needs you may have. We are here to develop something that goes much beyond just an Instream Flow Incremental Methodology (IFIM) study -- we want to look at the whole system.

Discussion:

Thackeray: We have a lot of federal agencies involved already (e.g. USFS, BLM, USFWS - KRFRO and ERO). While I don't deny that you have the expertise, I'm upset by the government throwing money at problems. Do we really need another agency involved?

Henrickson: I'm an ecologist not a bureaucrat. Part of the selection process that brought us to this watershed is that we think we can develop tools here that will be able to be used in other areas.

Miller: We appreciate your offer for assistance. We need your help in the upper basin.

Hillman: The TWG is an extension of the Task Force. The process of scoping the flow study will need to encompass all the people who need to be involved. We appreciate you being here today.

Grover: Is there anyone else who wishes to speak? We still have a question on the table.

Thackeray: We cannot lose local control, we cannot turn our programs over to the federal government. Communities and tribes need to keep control. We can't have NBS come in here and suppress the local interests.

Henrickson: We view all of you as our clients. We have no vested interest here other than forming partnerships. Please also note that we include social scientists in our work.

Orcutt: I echo support for your intents.

Q: Is the National Ecology Research Center (NERC) process going to continue on the Trinity?

A: Yes.

Henrickson: Interior brought forth the Klamath as a focus for developing tools for restoring fisheries. Interior created NBS so that Interior would only have one voice from the scientific community. In the future, there is nothing to prevent us taking a recommendation from you to take our money somewhere else.

Franklin: As a member of the TWG, I feel that people are more than ready to see this motion pass.

Halstead: I am the FWS representative on the TWG. I echo Franklin's comment -- we need to move forward on this motion.

Call for question:

Thackeray: I object. I need to know more about what is involved in the flow study. How will it work, who will be affected, and what will be the ultimate goal? If these questions could be answered in a way that satisfies me, then I may change my vote.

Orcutt: I abstain.

** Motion held in abeyance until Thackeray's questions are answered.

Spain: The point of the motion is to create a budget line item for a scoping process so that all the questions/details you asked about can be clarified. The scoping process doesn't commit us to any one particular study, it is simply a way of working out all the details. It is the first step toward clarifying all the questions you raised. I'm supporting the motion because I want all those questions answered by experts.

Bulfinch: I understand that the motion is not to define flows, but to define a process to establish what flows are desirable. Until we determine where we are, and the routes available, we can't see where we want to go. I don't think that your support of this motion will compromise your control of what you want done.

Fletcher: Motion re-read. The bottom line is that we need to begin the process to answer the question of how much water do salmonids need. The scoping invites all parties to be involved in these discussions.

Thackeray: Having heard that explanation, and knowing that the stream flow delineation will certainly come back to the Task Force before any action, the motion sounds more acceptable.

Request for caucus.

Break: The call for question will be held in abeyance.

** Motion fails (Grover): In reviewing the process up to this point in time, it is obvious to the chair that the motion has failed to reach consensus. Additional discussion is needed.

** Motion (Fletcher): The "surplus" FY94 funds (\$44,684) will be utilized by the TWG as "seed" money to initiate a scoping specifically to address flow requirements throughout the Klamath River Basin (includes identifying potential funding sources, identifying the range of methods that could be used, inviting other people to be on group). The TWG will shape this effort as needed.

Clarification: Basically, this motion is meant to be the first step to scope the process, identify the issues and bring everyone into the process. The

difference is that this motion does not specify the lower basin or the tributaries (the first motion was below Iron Gate). It is for the entire watershed (mouth to headwaters). We need a flow study to determine flow requirements. The scoping that we intend to do will not attain any definitions. It will only help us to find the range of issues.

Q: Will this motion take all the other available surplus funds?

A: The motion on the floor speaks to the full amount of remaining funds.

Iverson: One comment that may help the discussion regarding the upper basin amendment is that the lack of staff support from our office will no longer be an issue -- we will have a new Senior Biologist (John Hamilton) at our office in 3 weeks. This may defray the need for funding by the water users.

Motion re-read.

Roll call vote: Oregon Dept of Fish & Wildlife, yes; Siskiyou County, yes; Klamath County, yes; Trinity County, yes; Hoopa Indian Tribe, abstains; Klamath Tribe, yes; National Marine Fisheries Service, yes; Department of Interior, yes; California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry, yes; Yurok Tribe, yes; Department of Agriculture, yes; Karuk Tribe, yes; Humboldt County, yes; California Dept of Fish & Game, yes; California In-River Sport Fishing Community, yes.

**** Consensus. Motion passes.

11. Report on the FY94 ecosystem restoration grant program, and plans for the FY95 program (Steve Lewis).

Steve Lewis couldn't be here today. Curt Mullis, the supervisor for restoration projects will give this report.

The ERO opened in '93 in response to drought conditions. Right now we are focussing on coordination, long range planning, outreach, and projects. Projects this year have emphasized: 1) benefits to threatened and endangered species, 2) benefits to sensitive species, 3) enhancement of water quality, and 4) employment of unemployed timber workers. The ERO assisted Klamath River FRO with reviewing projects for funding, and the FRO will reciprocate by helping the ERO screen project proposals. The FRO is also in the process of hiring a fishery biologist who will be assigned to work in Klamath Falls at the ERO. We have \$1.43 million from the following sources: \$130,000 from the Partners for Wildlife Program, \$400,000 from the Fish and Wildlife Foundation, and \$900,000 directly federal funded projects (BOR funds). We were successful in funding \$1.11 million to on-the ground projects this year. Any surplus will be used for next year. Approved projects are shown in Handout I. We have many communications with tribes and individuals regarding upcoming projects. We intended that half of the money available was to be used to hire coordinators, but instead we used the money on restoration projects. Currently, we are finalizing agreements for these projects. We anticipate hiring community conservation staff to assist in upper basin restoration.

Next fiscal year, we will be hiring another fishery biologist and an Information and Education Specialist. Our FY95 request for proposals was mailed to interested parties in early June (Handout J). We expect Reclamation to provide \$900,000 of funding. Other sources will also be sought. An obstacle to our progress is being addressed by developing a broad scale information system, but we also need basics such as office space and clerical help. The program's successes are that lots of good people have done lots of good work -- we have put \$1 million on the ground for restoration projects.

Discussion:

Q: Is the biologist position the same one as at the Klamath River FRO?

A: The person hired for this position will work at the ERO, be supervised in Yreka, and funded by the Regional Office (Iverson).

Hillman: One of the positions you mentioned was for an Information and Education Coordinator. Since this is an interagency position, couldn't that role be provided by a KRFRRO staff person?

Iverson: Our Regional Director has dictated this staffing structure. He wants a bigger outreach effort than our current staff can provide.

Mullis: Ron, is the scope of your current staff position basically mid-basin? We are looking for someone who could work in the entire basin.

Iverson: The scope of our program is throughout the range of anadromous fish.

Solem: Since KRFRRO and ERO staff are busy with tasks elsewhere, I support the task of hiring out for information and education assistance.

Break

12. Report on reauthorization of the Trinity Restoration Program (Tom Stokely).

In March '93 the Trinity Task Force approved a program extension report that did three things: 1) included a 5 year \$22 million program for construction, 2) removed the previous cap (of \$2.4 million) for operation and maintenance and 3) allows the state's 15% contribution to be in-kind services rather than direct payment to the federal treasury.

In September '93 the Task Force conceptually endorsed an amended program revision for approximately \$36 million dollars for restoration of the South Fork Trinity River and Grass Valley Creek. But in winter '93, objections were raised by sportfishing interests. These concerns included: inclusion of non-governmental organizations on the Task Force, increased coordination with the Klamath Program, limitation on administrative/overhead costs, change in lead agency status, comprehensive environmental review for mainstem channel modification, and changing the decision making process.

In January '94, the Trinity Task Force met and did not amend their original recommendation because of BOR opposition to the higher cost. In March '94, the Technical Coordinating Committee met and agreed to draft strawman legislation for discussion purposes, then held meetings to see if consensus could be reached.

I'm staff to the Chairman of the Technical Coordinating Committee (Trinity County's representative), so I drafted legislation (at the direction of the 4 Chairs), while Chip Bruss (BOR) scheduled meetings of "warring parties" at several locations around the basin (e.g. Brookings, Red Bluff). This was part of a fact finding mission for the Secretary. Trinity County's official position is endorsing the five-year \$36 million program. Before the bill can go to Congress, Interior needs to submit it to Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Right now it is unclear if the bill has moved out of Interior -- so we don't know the status.

Grover: My understanding is that the bill is still in Interior and it may be in the Program, Budget and Analysis Section. As far as I know there has been no request by the Secretary to request sponsorship of this program extension.

Stokely: The Trinity Program expires in a year from now. The concern is that it may take it a long time to get out of Interior and into OMB. The bill lacks the support of the commercial fishing industry because they do not see the benefit in having a restored fishery due to the 50/50 harvest sharing with tribes. The Salmon and Steelhead Advisory Committee meets July 15 in Trinidad. Hopefully we will come up with a bill to improve and enhance the program, and encourage action by OMB. This proposed bill may not be endorsed by federal legislators unless commercial fishing shows support.

[Update: The bill went to OMB during the second week of July.]

Farro: The opposition that I hear to reauthorization, living in a coastal community, is that the money is being spent but the fisheries are in worse shape.

Orcutt: I find this disturbing because the tribe bent over backwards to help the Trinity Task Force by attending the meetings that Bruss put together, but the troll industry didn't show up. I have problems with the commercial fishermen bringing up concerns now.

Farro: Other groups, including a group called Friends of the Trinity, are concerned about the violation of NEPA.

Stokely: The Friends of Trinity have recently learned a lot about mainstem restoration, so they are becoming more supportive of our activities. They have also learned that the channel modification projects need to be maintained by flows. An EIS will be the NEPA decision making document for a Secretarial decision in '96. The Notice of Intent is not yet published in the Federal Register, but the BOR has assisted and the Friends of the Trinity seem to be supportive. It is complicated and we have a lot of players, but we feel like

we can get a bill introduced to Congress. Later, we can work out the details. I need some clarification on the draft letter that is in your packets (Handout K).

Grover: The draft letter has been edited by Chairman Shake and two additional items have been added (item 6 and 7). If you have comments, please get them to Iverson.

Orcutt: I'm displeased that this letter has been changed after we agreed to it. I want to proceed with the letter that we had agreed to at the last meeting.

Hillman: I feel the same way. In Brookings, we spent a significant amount of time attempting to resolve the contentious issues that are part of this. The significant changes made to the letter (items 6 and 7) prevent me from supporting this letter.

Stokely: The strawman I developed did not get any support for legislating the four chairs. There was a lot of opposition from everybody.

Orcutt: I don't feel items 6 and 7 were supported by anyone.

** Motion (Hillman): Approve letter (Handout K) as drafted -- including non-substantial edits and excluding items 6 and 7.

Call for question:

*** Consensus: (Spain abstained).

13. Report of the upper basin ad hoc committee (George Thackeray).

The ad hoc committee was created in '93 to coordinate efforts for revising the draft amendment to the Long Range Plan. We have prepared a handout (Handout L) that summarizes our work so far. (Please note that the Modoc County representative on our committee, John Crawford, inadvertently did not get named on the handout. He is an active member on the committee). I would like to offer special thanks to the ERO who worked with water users and tribes to coordinate these revision steps.

Wilkinson: The ad hoc committee is concerned with the Task Force's concern regarding lack of progress by our group, so we wrote up the meeting chronology (see handout). We have had 5 meetings and recently laid out a timetable that specifies getting the revised amendment to the Task Force members prior to their October meeting. If the public has comments they will need to contact their Task Force representative.

Thackeray: Do other members of the ad hoc committee have comments?

Orcutt: We are glad to see the new people seated at the table for this meeting. I echo the comments regarding the clarification to the minutes that we discussed yesterday. Anyone who has comments on the amendment needs to

contact their Task Force representative to see how those concerns are addressed or not addressed in the document.

Miller: We are in agreement with this report. We hope that we are able to meet all these deadlines in order to get it done in time. I commend Zeponi on his work.

Thackeray: Thanks to Tricia for her work as the KRFRO staff biologist assigned to this task.

14. Task Force discussion of a process for review of the redrafted upper basin plan amendment.

Thackeray: We concluded at our meeting that having a public comment period at our next full Task Force meeting should suffice. Is this acceptable to other Task Force members?

Miller: If the Task Force is in agreement with the timeline that we propose in our handout, then items #14 and #16 would be postponed until the Task Force reviews the document. [Elwood, where are the items that you are referring to?]

Stokely: Your timeframe should show September 23 as the date to "Distribute to Task Force and public." In this way, the public will review it at the same time that the Task Force members are reviewing it.

Thackeray: As we spoke of earlier, folks who are interested in commenting on the revised document should contact their Task Force representative.

Hillman: I'm unclear on if we are having another public meeting.

Wilkinson: We discussed and clarified this yesterday when you weren't here. The public asked if there would be a formal meeting, but we decided that since it isn't new information we won't have to have a public meeting. A formal public hearing would hinder the process. The chair intended full public comment during a regular Task Force meeting, so we amended the minutes to reflect this.

Hillman: I feel that this document should also be distributed to the general public.

Wilkinson: Our subcommittee has no objection to having the September 23 final document distributed to the public.

Solem: Note that the schedule calls for an additional review on September 12 by a special task force composed of representatives from Klamath County.

Grover: We will keep with the spirit of public participation for this meeting. When the agenda goes out announcing the October meeting it will show a public comment period and announce the availability of the revised document.

Solem: Is there a source of funding to repay us for having the document printed?

Grover: The Service will find money to print the amendment.

15. Public comment.

Felice Pace: The Task Force needs to take action on the Upper Basin Amendment, but if the Task Force follows this schedule, it will lose credibility. Item 3 on handout L refers to contacting the appropriate representative. I have a problem with this because I don't see who represents the environmental community on the Task Force or the ad hoc committee. We may need to review the tape of the Brookings meeting to see if we are rewriting history by amending the minutes (regarding the intent of the chair for a public meeting). There is a specific government process for reviewing draft amendments. Your role as a federal advisory committee is not being fulfilled by presenting only a final document to the public.

Todd Kepple: I was the one who asked the question at the Brookings meeting about a public hearing. I am impressed with the Task Force commitment to accept public input and not moving forward when there is obvious discontent. Personally I am satisfied with the decisions that you have made regarding public comment opportunities. Although, I am concerned about readers who may not have a chance to see the final document. Perhaps if notice is put in papers, then people would have a chance to be notified. If they have concerns, they could comment at the October meeting.

Dave Zepponi: The intent of the proposed process is to try to bring public input in a timely manner. The Water Users have committed time and money to this revision process, but we didn't understand that we would also be responsible for getting documents out to the public and having a public review as part of our voluntary effort. It is not the direction of my executive committee to commit to a full legal process for public review.

Felice Pace: The \$7,000 request by the Water Users is out of order.

Rod Kucera, alternate for Klamath County on the subcommittee: My concern is that there seems to be a perception problem in the Klamath basin. It feels like farmers are not being given credit for being environmentally concerned. The agricultural community has contributed to 11 of the projects underway by the ERO. We are very involved in accelerating the process. When the county reviews the revised document, the local interagency task force will look at environmental concerns too.

16. Action: Task Force decision on amendment review process, including public review.

West: Yesterday, I feel that we modified the minutes of the April meeting without a full understanding of the issue. Now, I'm concerned that the intent

of the Chair's statement is not being carried out. The draft is not available in June, as intended, so the review period will only be 2-3 weeks long.

Solem: The Long Range Plan is a living document, it can be amended continually.

** Motion (Spain): Adopt timetable for adoption of amendment as proposed in the ad hoc committee's report of June 23, '94. Distribution of the final proposal to the public will be made when distributed to the full Task Force, but no later than with the distribution of the final agenda to the public for the October 13-14 meeting.

Seconded.

Discussion:

Iverson: I'm not a lawyer, but I would say that this proposed schedule could be trouble. It is not responsive to the intent of a public comment period. The schedule shows only a 27 day period from the time the ad hoc committee makes its decision, to when the Task Force makes its decision. The reality is that by the time we get the final document, then get requests for copies, then mail it out, the people who receive it will have very little time to comment. It sounds like the changes will be significant. The period of time shown here for public comment is really going to snarl us up. Years ago we had an extensive public comment period and we still had people not happy with it. If we do the best we can, we are still going to have people upset.

Q: What are the legal requirements?

A: Iverson: It is not so much the legal requirements, but the response to the spirit of adequate notice. The absolute minimum comment period for Federal decision documents is 30 days. I would argue for longer than that.

Q: Ron, isn't it true that we had a comment period for this document already? Since this is an extension, haven't we already met the legal requirements?

A: Iverson: I do not claim to be legal expert, but we are talking about a very revised document. Legal issues aside, this schedule troubles me. It feels like we are buying trouble.

Wilkinson: The ad hoc committee's compressed schedule for the upper basin amendment was developed as a result of a Task Force request. We will gladly extend the schedule if requested.

Miller: I support public comment at the October meeting more than I could support another public hearing. I am concerned about pushing back the dates any farther.

** Amendment: The public will be able to comment during the October 13-14 meeting. The final draft resulting from that meeting will go out for public review for at least 60 days, and noticed for adoption at the Task Force

meeting following immediately thereafter (this will allow publishing notice in the Federal Register).

Second concurred.

Caucus over lunch.

Lunch

** Motion Re-worded (Spain): Adopt a timetable for adoption of the upper basin amendment as proposed by the upper basin committee.

Second concurred.

Call for question:

**** Motion passes (USDA abstains).

17. Update on Klamath River water management (Bureau of Reclamation and fishery agency reps).

Bureau of Reclamation

Jim Bryant (speaking for Mike Ryan): Please refer to the salmon colored handout (Handout M) on "comparison of net inflow". The last three years, have been three of the five lowest Upper Klamath Lake inflow years on record. All three are considerably lower than the average of 1.3 million acre feet. This year we are estimating 650,000 acre feet of net inflow. On page two you can see that this year the Upper Klamath Lake is getting dryer and dryer. We know very little about the hydrologic conductivity of the Upper Klamath basin. By September 30, the lake level will be around 4137.5 which is lower than allowed by the biological opinion to protect the suckers (4139.0). Page three shows the model that we use to predict what the elevation of the lake is based on. Page four shows the figures we use to balance the system. The data is in acre feet. This model is complex, but it works pretty well. Estimating the net inflow is the hard part. Pulse flows were agreed to as being "better than nothing." The preliminary readings showed that the last pulse flushed a lot of hatchery fish downstream. In September we will have a 900 cfs flow, until that time we will be at minimum flow. We will not go below 250 cfs at Keno or below 500 cfs at Iron Gate Dam. The water users have set some goals for water conservation: 1) maximum amounts of water use on contracts that do not have a set acre feet per acre of water, and 2) smaller districts have an acre foot maximum. There will be a water coordination meeting in November for all organizations that have an interest in water. The meeting will be an opportunity for all to have input on decisions to be made this fall. The location will be arranged.

Q: Is it true that the biological opinion on suckers specifies that the water levels cannot go below the minimum more than 4 out of 10 years?

A: Yes. No more than two consecutive years, or no more than 4 out of ten. There is a bit of flexibility based on spawning activities. Last year the standards were exceeded.

Q: Is it possible to do a hydrologic model of the basin?

A: Klamath Tribe and USFS are working on some steps toward modelling for the basin, but it will be very expensive and long term. If we had the money, we could model most anything.

Fletcher: We understand what you mean about how hard it is to set figures for balancing the water system, because we have the same problems estimating fish numbers too.

Q: What is the percent of water deliveries to class A and B users? How does that compare to the reductions in FERC minimums?

A: A users get an adequate supply of water for crop irrigation (3 acre feet/acre and up). B users will get the contract amount (right now). Depending on precipitation, they may get less later this summer. C users (cemeteries, city parks, small users) may be lessened (50% of normal). I don't have the answer to your second question without doing some calculations.

Q: At the last Task Force meeting in Brookings, Mike Ryan noted that an additional 20,000 acre feet of water may become available. Did this water become available?

A: It is difficult to say at this time. We have no way of quantifying the water until we see how the water year shakes out. Up to 20,000 acre feet may be available this fall. It will be one of the things we discuss at the September meeting. [Jim Bryant, did you mean September? Last time you said November.]

Q: Do you have an idea of what will be available (percentages) for the FERC requirements? (Orcutt: I asked this same question at the Brookings meeting, but I didn't get an adequate answer.)

A: The percentage depends on the year. Of the available water, I would estimate that the water users would use somewhere in the neighborhood of 400,000 - 450,000 acre feet. That is highly dependent on the summer weather. This refers only to water users in the Klamath Project, not water users above Upper Klamath Lake.

Q: What is the available water?

A: Net inflow to Upper Klamath Lake is 650,000 acre feet, accretions below Keno are 200,000 acre feet so the net supply is 850,000 acre feet. So 50% is available.

Q: How much is used for irrigation?

A: It varies with the weather. If a lot of water is available, a lot will be used for irrigation. Last year, less water was used because summer temperatures were low.

Q: How many acres are in each of the three water classes?

A: I would say that A users account for 110,000 acres, B users account for 570,000 acres, and C users account for 5,000 acres (approximately).

Q: What percent of water will go to irrigation and what percent will be maintained to reach the FERC minimum?

A: About 50% of inflow will go to irrigation and about 50% will go downstream.

Q: What is the pricing schedule for water delivery?

A: The BOR came to the Upper Klamath area and began developing irrigation areas many years ago. Reclamation funded canal building, then water users joined together to repay costs (no interest). Right now there is no charge for water. Water users are developing a water conservation plan that will very likely include price incentives for conservation. Of the \$50 million that it cost to build this project (over the past 50 years), 96% has been repaid.

Q: Aren't there costs associated with project operation?

A: Yes, and the water users pay those every year.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Bruce Halstead, Project Leader, CCFRO:

As shown in handout N, we monitored the outmigration of juveniles using rotary traps to assess the success of pulse flows. The trap at Big Bar has been in place for the last five years. This is the first year for the other trap locations. The traps are monitored as a cooperative effort between USFWS and USFS. We are also looking at the time it takes for the fish to get from one location to another. The graphs in the handout show the river flow compared to the chinook catch. We have people on the traps 24 hr/day, 7 days/week to prevent temperature stress on fish. The catches decrease as you go downstream because the flows increase, so we are sampling less of the river. There is probably 5 times as much water at Big Bar than at Scott River. Wild fish are marked with dye on their tail at the Scott River sampling site. We hope to use this mark to assess natural fish outmigration rates. Meanwhile, we found that the fastest moving hatchery fish travel downstream at a rate of 23 miles/day. The last page of the handout shows the catch compared to fork length. For each day we measure at least 30 fish. We are finding that fish with a fork length of 80-85mm really move downstream. We haven't done any physiological studies on body composition, so we don't know if this is as much of a factor in their outmigration as size appears to be. June 17 was the first day that hatchery fish showed up at Big Bar (released 3 days earlier). The hatchery ad-clipped 4% of the fish they released. As of June 21, 4.2% of

the fish we caught at Big Bar were ad-clipped which coincides with the hatchery releases. An interesting point to note is that the highest amount of fish ever caught at Big Bar was 9,000 per year, but this year we caught 23,400 fish. So we estimate that we caught five times as many wild fish this year as we have caught since 1989. This is at a site where the conditions (e.g. flow) and methodology have been similar to past years. In summary, I'll state that the information I've shared today is all preliminary and that next time we should have traps measuring fish movement prior to the pulse flows being implemented. In this way, we can determine that the fish are in condition to move (e.g. size) so we can ask for a pulse flow to assist their outmigration.

Q: Is Scott Foott collecting any fish health data on these fish?

A: No, he is working on the Trinity right now.

Q: Are you making estimations about the number of fish that are stranded?

A: The range of water flows that we have experienced are not of the magnitude to strand fish. We also ratchet flows down over three days to minimize impact.

Q: Do you care to speculate why there are more natural fish this year?

A: The Secretaries of Commerce and Interior made a decision last year to allow 3,000 more fish upstream to spawn. But since only 20,000 actually spawned naturally, the higher numbers could have something to do with the excellent water year in '92-'93. Perhaps the Task Force members should each look at the overfishing report prepared by the Pacific Fishery Management Council.

California Department of Fish & Game

Paul Hubbell: We have people working in the Upper mainstem Trinity who have seen higher numbers of juvenile chinook than in the past. People working on the South Fork Trinity have also seen high numbers of juvenile spring chinook. My feeling is that there is better intragravel and post emergence survival than past years.

Yurok Tribe

Fletcher: I provided the Yurok Tribe's position paper on flows for all of you to see (Handout O).

Hoopa Tribe

Orcutt: At the last Task Force meeting in Brookings, I put forth a 3-part motion (later tabled) (see page 8 of minutes). Some members have since asked me for clarification. The federal trust responsibility that the U.S. has for the tribes is a critical element for stream flow issues in the Klamath basin. The U.S. President met with Tribal leaders on April 29 and signed proclamations that re-affirmed trust responsibility and a government to government basis of dealings. Regarding water management, our tribe has EPA

funding for water quality standard setting in the Trinity and Klamath. The Tribe is a player just like the state as far as water quality standards go. Within the deliberations between the Pacific Council and the Klamath Council, some of the political concerns are used in the wrong context. For example, where are those 3,000 extra "paper" fish that were supposed to spawn? The Long Range Plan refers to historic ways that tribal fishing rights were handled, but this is very different from the tribes value of the salmon harvest. The Tribe still wants to survive and have a meaningful opportunity to take fish as they always have (since time immemorial).

Spain: The three points in the motion are already required. I don't see any controversy in having the agencies and tribes, who work for anadromous fish restoration, follow the law.

Solem: I'd like to clarify a point: FERC minimums are for Pacific Power & Light, not BOR or irrigators. We are very interested in planning flows to do some good for the overall watershed, but BOR does not control water in the Upper Basin -- there are a number of manipulators (land users, water users, forest service) and there is a big difference between the Klamath Project and the BOR. It seems like the Task Force is trying to get BOR to do something that I don't feel they have the power to do.

Orcutt: The urgency of the water year is upon us. I would like to resubmit the motion as documented in April's minutes.

*** Motion reconsidered.

Seconded (Hillman).

Motion as excerpted from the April minutes:

** Motion (Orcutt): the Klamath Basin Task Force recognizes the urgent need to alter long-term instream flow management below Iron Gate Dam. To this end, we recommend the following:

1. Flow releases must be managed in accordance with Federal Trust Responsibilities to all basin tribes. Accordingly, Federal reserved fishing and water rights must be protected in times of shortage in order to ensure meaningful exercise of tribal fishing rights.
2. Flow releases must be managed in accordance with public trust responsibilities of the States of California and Oregon. Further, Klamath Basin fishery assets must be protected in times of shortage in order to ensure the health of Klamath Basin anadromous fish populations.
3. The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation must use the best available scientific information (including minimum flows established for Iron Gate Dam by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission), in developing operating criteria and procedures for the Klamath Project.

Discussion:

Q: Solem: If we are to use the best available information (FERC minimums), would it shut down the Klamath Project?

A: [The notetaker does not have the response to this question. Jim Bryant, would you like to provide a response?]

Fletcher: Perhaps we could amend the motion so that item #3 reads: "all federal agencies to use the best scientific information to develop operating procedures for the Klamath."

Bulfinch: The quality of the water from Iron Gate Dam is almost as important as the quantity. Department of Water Resources has found water quality to be deficient in terms of temperature and dissolved oxygen. I believe that this must be having a negative impact on the fish releases from the hatchery. There is a possibility of attaining cooler water for discharge by changing the hardware of the storage facilities. We need to have more flexibility built into the system. I don't want to be in an impasse like the one that is occurring with the spotted owl. I would like to see what could be done to improve the hardware on the water flow controlling devices.

Caucus

Wilkinson: I will not support the motion because of the legal implications to management of other species.

Benthin: I will not support this motion on a legal basis (there is a potential conflict between resources). This is such a complex motion that I would like to run it past legal staff prior to voting on it.

Fletcher: In the past, CDFG supported this motion.

Stokely: I don't have a problem with the motion. Although, perhaps "anadromous" could be removed to make it more acceptable. The public trust doctrine requires a balanced perspective and maybe this would help achieve it. Bulfinch's point regarding quality being as important as quantity is accurate -- this issue should be deferred, yet addressed at another meeting.

Hillman: The motion would serve to have existing federal policy and law be adhered to. This may signal a new beginning.

Q: Is there a problem with "best available scientific information?"

A: FERC is all we have right now, but we are not sure that it is the best information.

Hillman: There should be no problem with using the best available information once we find it. The purpose of this group is the Klamath Act. The purpose of the Act is to restore salmonids to the basin. What could be controversial about that?

Solem: The problem is that BOR is not using the best available information.

Orcutt: It seems that the only result of the caucus was to slightly change the motion from "BOR" to "all agencies." Why are we sitting here with the Act in place (with clear intent) and yet still hear the reluctance from some representatives to move forth with the public trust statement?

** Motion re-worded (Orcutt): Change item #3 to all "federal agencies."

Second agrees.

Public comment

Marcia Armstrong, Siskiyou County Farm Bureau: There are two adjudications on the Shasta and Scott that pre-date tribal rights. Both systems are fully appropriated. Not everyone is happy with the water delivery/rights system as it stands now, but it is reliable. The public trust doctrine applies to cases that are post 1914, but the Shasta ditch was built in 1852. Until 1872 water rights were not recorded. Re-opening this adjudication is going to be a very complex issue.

John Crawford, Modoc County's representative on the ad hoc committee and President of Klamath Water users: Let's identify where the water is going to come from -- stored behind dams? stored on wildlife refuges? endangered species water? water that has been diverted from lands above the Klamath project (agency, private, and tribal), FWS diversions from the Williamson on Klamath marsh? I agree that dewatering the redds in the mainstem was not good management. If the tribes would have been agreeable to a cutback in June when the water was available, it could have maintained flows during the time that water was needed for spawning.

Dave Zepponi, Executive Director of Water Users: I'm glad that we are coming together to work on these issues. There is potential to do things to benefit agricultural and fish.

Call for question (motion with minor amendment):

Roll call: California In-River Sport Fishing Community, no; California Dept of Fish & Game, no; Humboldt County, abstain; Karuk Tribe, yes; Dept of Agriculture, abstain; Yurok Tribe, yes; California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry, yes; Dept of Interior, yes; National Marine Fisheries Service, yes; Klamath Tribe, yes; Hoopa Indian Tribe, yes; Trinity County, yes; Klamath County, no; Siskiyou County, no; Oregon Dept of Fish & Wildlife, no.

** Motion fails.

Grover: Agenda item #19 was addressed earlier in the day: \$44,680 was approved to use as "seed" money for scoping the instream flow needs. Item #21 was also discussed earlier today. Is there a need for further discussion?

21. Task Force action on implementing flow-related policies, including instream flow needs assessment.

Q: Who would be included on the group that scopes the flow needs study?

A: Iverson: This group should be composed of the TWG and other representatives who are vital to the process.

Grover: So, Tom Stokely, Jim Henrickson and others who attended the November flow meeting would work with the TWG. This group may include Task Force members.

Hillman: I don't believe that membership in this group should be an issue. The intent of the motion is to allow the TWG to have flexibility to use their best judgement to bring together folks who need to be part of it. I don't see the necessity of appointing a specific group.

Grover: I agree. The TWG should use whatever resources (people) it needs to accomplish its objective. Now, let's look at the draft letter from the TWG to FERC and BOR (handout P).

Franklin: The TWG thought this letter was high priority.

Farro: My representative on the TWG called me to emphasize the need for this letter to go forward.

** Motion (Farro): Send letter.

Seconded.

Discussion:

- o BOR informed us "after the fact" that the decision to reduce flows had been made.
- o No, there was lag time of at least a week before flows were reduced.
- o Perhaps we could strike the last sentence to make the letter more acceptable.
- o Let's not sacrifice the intent of the letter.
- o The last sentence could read, "notification after decisions were made".
- o The ramification is that the eggs in the mainstem were killed, it doesn't really matter how.
- o The letter is correct as written.

Call for question:

**** Consensus: (Klamath County abstains).

22. Forest Plan update:

Jack West: At the meeting in Brookings, Barbara Holder and Julie Perrochet told you that Klamath National Forest (KNF) is spending \$820,000 on activities related to the Forest Plan. Projects are now moving forward, although there is concern over completing the road projects because of restrictions due to the Spotted Owl. Currently there are 10-12 lawsuits against the President's Plan. Preliminary hearings will be held in September. KNF and 4 Northern California forests are modifying their draft plans with responses to comments from the public and the President's Forest Plan. KNF should complete their revised plan by November '94. The Record of Decision from the Regional Forester is due in early '95. Pilot watersheds were selected by the Regional Interagency Executive Committee (RIEC). There are fifteen pilot watersheds in the Pacific Northwest. We are doing a watershed analysis on Elk Creek and the Upper South Fork Salmon River. The mainstem Salmon River is receiving a lot of money [Jack did you say \$18 million?] in FY95. This money will be used to implement restoration projects in emphasis areas. Monitoring plans will also be developed to track the effectiveness of the restoration activities.

Q: How many people in the 4 northern forests are committing to this effort?

A: I would estimate that of the 1,500 total employees on the 4 forests that 15-20% are directly involved in analysis.

Orcutt: I appreciate hearing your updates. It is critical to understand how this will be implemented.

Q: Could you tell us what you are doing with PacFish?

A: There is not much difference between the President's Plan and PacFish unless the forest is outside the range of the Spotted Owl. Six forests out of nineteen are affected by PacFish or the aquatic restoration strategy.

23. Identify date, location, and agenda for winter meeting.

February 15-16 in the Eureka/Arcata area.

An agenda item will be an update on TWG progress on scoping the flow study.

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING
June 22-23, 1994
Yreka, California

Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force members present:

Randy Benthin (for Rich Elliot)	California Department of Fish & Game
Kent Bulfinch	California In-River Sport Fishing Community
Jim Bybee (for Rod McInnis)	National Marine Fisheries Service
Mitch Farro	Humboldt County
Troy Fletcher	Non-Hoopa Indians Residing in the Klamath Conservation Area
Jerry Grover (for Bill Shake)	U. S. Department of Interior
Leaf Hillman	Karuk Tribe
Elwood Miller	Klamath Tribe
Mike Orcutt	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Bob Rohde (substituted for Leaf Hillman on 1st day)	Karuk Tribe
Mike Rode (for Rich Elliot)	California Department of Fish & Game
David Solem	Klamath County
Glen Spain (for Nat Bingham)	California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Tom Stokely	Trinity County
George Thackeray	Siskiyou County
Jack West (for Barbara Holder)	U.S. Department of Agriculture
Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife

Attendees:

Randy Brown	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Lewiston
Chip Bruss	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Sacramento
Mike Bryan	TF Technical Work Group - Siskiyou County
Jim Bryant	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Klamath Falls
Bob Byrne	
Bill Caldwell	Medford Irrigation District
Terry Coltra	Northern California Indian Development Council
John Crawford	Modoc County
Gary De Salvatore	California In-River Sports Fisheries
Earl Danosky	Tulelake Irrigation District
Clancy Dutra	Siskiyou County Supervisor
Gena Evans	Siskiyou Resource Conservation District
Rolando Flores	Siskiyou Daily News

Attendees Continued:

Jennifer Foster	USDA - Soil Conservation Service
Robert Franklin	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Bruce Halstead	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Arcata
Harold Hartman	Malin Irrigation District
Jim Henriksen	National Biological Survey
Paul Hubbell	California Dept of Fish & Game, Sacramento
Michelle Irwin	Talent Irrigation District
Ron Iverson	U.S. Fish & Wildlife, Yreka
Todd Kepple	Herald & News
Howard Klasser	Tulelake Irrigation District
Rod Kucera	Klamath County
Steve Lewis	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Klamath Falls
Roy Lincoln	Quartz Valley Reservation
Emily Loerke	(guest of Mary Taylor)
Bill Mendenhall	California Dept of Water Resources
Curt Mullis	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Klamath Falls
Felice Pace	Klamath Forest Alliance
Patricia Parker	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Yreka
Jay Power	Scott River Ranger District, U.S. Forest Service
Linda Schwinck	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Yreka
Monte Seus	
Joan Smith	KARE & California Women In Timber
Sari Sommarstrom	Scott River Coordinated Resource Management Planning
Marshall Staunton	Tulelake Growers Association
Mary Taylor	Women for Agriculture
Jeff Thomas	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Ecological Services, Sacramento
Paul Tschirky	Tulelake Grange
David Webb	Shasta River Coordinated Resource Management Planning
Dale Webster	Yurok Tribe
Scott Wiley	WESCO
David Zeponi	Klamath Basin Water Users Protective Association

FINAL AGENDA

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE

22-23 JUNE 1994

YREKA, CALIFORNIA

June 22

- 1:00 pm 1. Convene. Opening remarks, introductions of upper Klamath basin representatives.
- 1:15 2. Discussion, adoption of agenda; Discussion, approval of minutes from meetings of 19-20 April 1994, and 4 May, 1994.
- 1:30 3. Report from the budget committee and the technical work group on development of the Fiscal Year 1995 work plan. (Nat Bingham, Bob Rohde)
- 2:00 4. Task Force discussion of work plan recommendation.
- 3:00 5. Public comment on work plan recommendation.
- 3:30 Break
- 3:45 6. Reconvene. Action: Task Force decision on final FY1995 work plan.
- 4:45 7. Update on status of the FY94 work plan, and estimate of "surplus" funds available. (Linda Schwinck)
- 5:00 8. Task Force discussion of use of "surplus" funds, including use for funding projects from the FY95 work plan.
- 5:30 9. Public comment.
- 6:00 Recess

June 23

- 8:00 am 10. Reconvene. Task Force decision on use of "surplus" FY94 funds.
- 8:30 11. Report on the FY94 ecosystem restoration grant program, and plans for the FY95 program (Steve Lewis).
- 9:00 12. Report on reauthorization of the Trinity Restoration Program. (Tom Stokely)
- 9:15 13. Report of the upper basin ad hoc committee. (George Thackeray)
- 9:45 14. Task Force discussion of a process for review of the redrafted upper basin plan amendment.
- 10:30 Break
- 10:45 15. Reconvene. Public comment.
- 11:15 16. Action: Task Force decision on amendment review process, including public review.
- 12:00 17. Update on 1994 Klamath River water management (Bureau of Reclamation and fishery agency reps)
- 12:30 18. Review of policies pertinent to Klamath River flows (Mike Orcutt)
- 1:00 Lunch
- 2:00 19. Task Force discussion of how to implement flow-related policies, including instream flow needs assessment. (tabled from April 19)
- 2:45 20. Public comment.
- 3:15 Break
- 4:00 21. Reconvene. Task Force action on implementing flow-related policies, including instream flow needs assessment.
- 4:30 22. Forest Plan update. (Barbara Holder)
- 4:45 23. Identify date, location, and agenda for winter meeting.
- 5:00 Adjourn.

HANDOUTS

AGENDUM 1. HANDOUT A
Board of County Commissioners Klamath County, Oregon - Order
94-158 appointing Dave Solem as representative to the
Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force

HANDOUT B
Assignment in April minutes -- Yurok Tribe.

AGENDUM 3. HANDOUT C
Letter to Nat Bingham from Ron Iverson - May 18, 1994
regarding the FY 95 Budget for implementing the restoration
program

HANDOUT D
Ranking list of Klamath Fishery Restoration Program 95
Project Proposals [MAILED 6/6/94]

HANDOUT E
Klamath River Restoration Program Project Proposals for FY95
showing cumulative totals

HANDOUT F
Letter dated May 16, 1994, from the Yurok Tribe to Task Force
Chairman William Shake regarding the Yurok Accelerated
Rearing Programs administered by NCIDC. [MAILED 6/6/94]

HANDOUT G
Response to the Yurok Tribe dated June 2, 1994, from Task
Force Chairman William Shake.

AGENDUM 7. HANDOUT H
Updated Klamath Fishery Restoration Program Federal Work
Plan, FY94(pink)

HANDOUT I
FY94 Restoration Projects funded by ERO.

AGENDUM 11. HANDOUT J
Solicitation of Proposals for Fiscal Year 1995 from the
Klamath Basin Ecosystem Restoration Office.

AGENDUM 12. HANDOUT K
Draft Letter to Babbitt regarding reauthorization of Trinity
Act.

AGENDUM 13. HANDOUT L
Progress Report - Upper Basin Amendment Revision, June 23,
1994.

AGENDUM 17.

HANDOUT M

Comparison of net inflow, Jim Bryant's references during presentation.

HANDOUT N

CCFRO's graphics and data on pulse flow data, Halstead, June 94.

HANDOUT O

Yurok Tribe's position on water flows.

HANDOUT P

Draft Letter dated June 14, 1994 to Mark Robinson and Michael Ryan, from Chairman Bill Shake.

Informational Handouts

1. Environmental Assessment on PACFISH - Interim Standards for Managing Anadromous Fish Producing Watersheds, by Siskiyou County Farm Bureau - May 20, 1994
2. Memo re: Klamath Wild and Scenic River Eligibility Report and Environmental Assessment - to Regional Director, National Park Service; From Field supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service - April 15, 1994.
3. Memo re: Klamath Basin Final Stock I.D. Report
4. Letters inviting Klamath Co and Klamath Tribe to join Task Force.
5. Fax from Ron Iverson to Troy Fletcher and Mike Orcutt re: Background materials for June Klamath Task Force meeting, Agendum #18; dated 6/14/94.
6. Letter from Susie Long to Chairman Bill Shake: the appointment of a new Yurok representative to the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force.
7. Letter from Nat Bingham informing Chairman Bill Shake of his inability to attend the June 22-23 Task Force meeting.
8. Letter from Rod McInnis informing Chairman Bill Shake of his inability to attend the June 22-23 Task Force meeting.
9. Letter to Walter Lara from Susie Long of the Yurok Tribe re: the appointment of a Tribal Council member on the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force to represent the Yurok Tribe.

10. Memo dated April 21, 1994, from Fish and Wildlife Service to Bureau of Reclamation regarding the Klamath Project - Recommendations for alternative water releases and monitoring [MAILED 6/6/94]
11. Letter dated May 4, 1994 to Chair Susie Long of the Yurok Tribe from Roger Patterson of the Bureau of Reclamation re Need for Review of Instream Flow Releases from Iron Gate Reservoir [MAILED 6/6/94]
12. Letter dated May 27, 1994 to Dale Pierce, ES-FWS, from Michael Ryan, Bureau of Reclamation regarding Klamath Project-Recommendations for Alternative Water Releases and Monitoring. [MAILED 6/6/94]
13. Letter from Jeff Thomas to Klamath Task Force Technical Work Group re: Instream Flow Study Proposal
14. Letter to Chair Bill Shake from Congressman Dan Hamburg re instream flow.
15. Letter to Project Leader, Klamath River Fishery Restoration Office from Kent Bulfinch.
16. Salmon and Steelhead Populations of the Klamath-Trinity Basin; Final Draft by Roger Barnhart dated 4/25/94.