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

9 June 1988

FROM: Ron Iverson

TO: Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force

SUBJECT: Draft minutes, Meeting of May 31 and June 1, 1988, Eureka, California

Attached for your review are minutes of the Eureka meeting, along with several documents. I have followed each motion passed, assignment made, or other decision point with a line of asterisks.

Ron Iverson
Recording Secretary

Attachments

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE

Proceedings of the Meeting Held 31 May - 1 June 1988, Eureka, CA

Call to Order Chairman Steucke convened the meeting at 1:00 p.m., with a quorum present (see attendance list, Attachment 1).

Correction and Approval of Minutes and Agenda Minutes of the meeting held 1 March 1988 were approved without changes. No additions or deletions to the 31 May agenda (Attachment 2) were identified.

****

Report of the Technical Work Group on Work Plan and Budget Ron Iverson summarized the work plan and budget proposed for Federal funding in Fiscal Year 1989 . The emphasis of the draft Federal work plan on monitoring and studies of natural anadromous stocks stimulated a debate among Task Force members about the value of investing in depleted stocks and damaged habitats as a means of restoring fish runs.

Mel Odemar then described the status of the State fishery restoration grant program, consisting of proposals for funding from various State sources, for work to be done in the State 1988-1989 Fiscal Year. By sorting the work proposals, Mel identified a group of proposals that appear to address the objectives of the Klamath Restoration Program. Budgets for these proposals sum to about $1.9 million. Mel requested that the Task Force review these proposals , identify those they can support, and consider that set to be the non-Federal portion of the Restoration Program work plan for the upcoming fiscal year. He asked that this be done in advance of project proposal reviews by California Department of Fish and Game, which will take place later this month.

Given the need for more information on proposals for State funding, and lack of consensus regarding some studies proposed for Federal funding, a motion was passed by consensus calling upon the technical work group to identify project proposals totalling about $1 million as the non-Federal contribution, and to reaffirm their support of the projects proposed for Federal funding.

****

Mel Odemar said that, in addition to funding projects, the State will be making available about $50,000 in staff time.

In a meeting held the evening of May 31, the work group recommended a set of project proposals for State funding (Attachment 3). On June 1, the Task Force endorsed a $1 million non-Federal matching contribution consisting of the projects identified by the work group, plus a small contingency fund.

****

Returning on June 1 to the discussion of the work group's proposal for the Federal part of the work plan, the Task Force made the following comments or changes:

o Responding to Don DeVol's concern about aggradation in the lower Klamath, directed that more attention be given to the mainstem Klamath in future work plans.

o Requested that the products of project (0.1), program administration, include an annual report on progress of the Restoration Program, and some kind of cost accounting.

o Approved funding project (2.21), fall chinook escapement monitoring, in Fiscal Year 1988 in the amount of $24,700.

o For project (3.1), substituted the second-year budget estimate of $109,650 for the first-year budget of $78,000, in order to get the project started at a full activity level. Other actions taken relative to the "educate" project were to accept the goals and objectives as proposed by the work group, but to appoint a new work group to refine the methods, products, and other proposal elements. Education work group members are Nat Bingham, Ronnie Pierce, Bob Rice, and Keith Wilkinson. The education work group will submit a refined statement of work to the Task Force prior to its next meeting.

o Increased funding for project (4.15), Scott subbasin sediment budget, from $36,000 to $50,000, in order to get all four elements of the project completed in FY1989. Bob Bartholomew of Soil Conservation Service indicated by telephone that the higher level of funding would be sufficient to complete the project at a survey level of confidence.

o Decided to provide $10,000 toward erosion control in Yreka Creek, and requested Bob Rice and George Thackeray to clarify the relationships of the project proposals submitted by Great Northern Corporation and the City of Yreka for improvement of Yreka Creek.

o Added projects (4.32) and (4.33), providing for diversion screen maintenance and construction, to the work plan. These projects were identified by the technical work group for State funding but were inadvertently not submitted as proposals.

o The Task Force endorsed the work plan proposed by the Technical Work Group for Federal Funding in FY 1989, with the indicated changes and additions. That work plan is summarized in Attachment 4.

****

Report on Proposed Legislation Bruce Taylor reported that both the amendments to the Klamath Act and the Russian River Bill are moving through the consideration process in the House of Representatives. The Klamath amendments are included in H.R. 4030, an omnibus fisheries bill expected to proceed from committee to the House floor during the week of 6 June. Bruce expected this non-controversial bill to be enacted by the October adjournment of Congress. The Russian River Bill, H.R. 2513, may be included in the omnibus fisheries bill after review by the House public works committee. The bill directs the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Corps of Engineers to conduct studies of watersheds, aquatic habitats, and fish populations. Bruce thought that passage and appropriations might take place in time for studies to get underway in FY1989.

Implementation Procedures for Federally-Funded Work. Bob Gable explained the types of funding arrangements likely to be used to implement the Klamath Restoration Program:

- o Cooperative agreements between the Service and states, Federally-recognized tribes, counties, and other levels of government.

- o Interagency agreements between the Service and other Federal agencies.

- o Contracts, including:

  - oo Sealed-bid procurements. These are not much used in acquiring professional services

  - oo Negotiated procurements, typically used to contract for professional services such as studies or planning. The time required between a request for contracting and the contract award is typically 4-6 months.

Bob explained that agreements take less time to implement than contracts, because the requirement for competition is waived.

Questions of Bob included:

Q: Could a continuing, multi-year agreement be entered into?
A: Yes, but funds are provided year-to year.

Q: What happens to unexpended funds left at the end of the fiscal year?
A: The Klamath Act authorizes carryover of funds between fiscal years.

Q: How will the Service comply with the requirement (paragraph 2(b)(3) of the Klamath Act) that certain classes of unemployed people be given preference in employment for construction activities related to fishery restoration?
A: It will be difficult to determine whether an individual qualifies for this special consideration, especially for the category: ..."other persons whose livelihood depends upon Area fishery resources."

Q: Several nonprofit entities have expressed an interest in the Restoration Program. Can they be given special consideration?
A: Yes, with justification. Generally, competition is preferred.

Q: Will the Service accept unsolicited proposals, in advance of bid solicitation, if they meet Task Force priorities?
A: Not for the FY1989 work plan.

Q: Is there a way to speed the process of implementing the FY1989 work plan?
A: The cooperative and interagency agreements (not contracts) can be entered into pending appropriation of funds.

Regarding the question on unemployed groups, Mel Odemar noted the State of California will be funding most of the Restoration Program construction work, and the State has ways of selectively hiring these people.

In response to a question as to how much the Service would deviate from the budget allocation approved by the Task Force, Wally Steucke said that deviations of more than about ten percent on any project would be brought to the Task Force.

Task Force Mission and Goals Following brief discussion of the draft mission statement provided by Ron Iverson, a work group was appointed to review the statement and develop it further. Members are: Nat Bingham, Rod McInnis (chair), Mel Odemar, Mike Orcutt, and Phil Schafer.

****

No time limit was placed on development of the mission statement. Ways to get public review were discussed, including incorporating mission identification in the education project, releasing a review draft for public and user group review, and including mission statement review with the public review process for the long-range program plan.

Interagency Memorandums of Agreement Ron Iverson reviewed the drafts that had been mailed earlier to the Task Force.

Other Old Business Wally Steucke reminded the group that Sue Masten's request to have the Bureau of Indian Affairs represented on the Task Force had been forwarded, with Task Force endorsement, to the Interior Secretary.

Reporting on controversy over the management of the Kelsey Creek spawning channel, Mel Odemar said that California Department of Fish and Game will continue to fund the operation of that facility. The spawning channel is out of operation for repair of leaks, but probably will resume operation in State fiscal year 1988-89. Disagreements during last year's operation had to do with appropriate times to release fish. Chinook salmon reared in the facility grew too slowly to be released in late spring, and State biologists felt water temperatures in Scott River were too high to permit release of fish until fall. The role of the Task Force in resolving such conflicts was discussed, but no consensus was reached.

Predicted Klamath Basin Flow Conditions Paul Hubbell provided a statement on predicted flow conditions (Attachment 5). Paul said California is still considered critically dry, but recent precipitation will permit the Bureau of Reclamation to provide prescribed minimum flows in Klamath River. Flows in Trinity River will follow the "dry year" schedule shown in Attachment 5. Overall, conditions for chinook salmon spawning this fall in Klamath Basin should be comparable to last year.

Public Comment Al Foss expressed concern that more effort should be invested in steelhead trout propagation. He described his involvement in a small steelhead hatchery, and said his group at Orleans may be interested in submitting a proposal for Restoration Program funding. Wally Steucke responded that a proposal may be submitted to the State of California, the Klamath Field Office, or Task Force members.

Jeff Self said he was glad the Task Force had seen fit to provide considerable support to education. He invited the Task Force to view the model fish hatchery at Washington elementary school in Eureka.

Discussion of Next Meeting Wally Steucke proposed the next meeting be held in mid-October, when the Federal budget for FY1989 may be known. Klamath Field Office will poll Task Force members for acceptable dates and suggestions for location.

Adjournment was at 4 p.m., June 1.

ATTACHMENT 1

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE

Attendance Roster, Meeting of May 31 - June 1, 1988.

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Name	Representing
Nat Bingham	California commercial salmon fishing industry
Don DeVol	Del Norte County
Rod McInnis	National Marine Fisheries Service
Mel Odemar	California Department of Fish and Game
Mike Orcutt	Hoopa Indian Tribe
Ronnie Pierce	Humboldt County
Bob Rice	Department of Agriculture
Phil Schafer	California in-river sport fishing community
Jim Smith	Trinity County
Wally Steucke	Department of Interior
George Thackeray	Siskiyou County
Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

OTHERS ATTENDING

Name	Representing
Jeff Self	Eureka City Schools
Mitch Farro	North Coast Troll Fisherman
Michael Bryan	Siskiyou County
Aldaron Laird	Trinity Fisheries Consulting
Paul M. Hubbell	California Department of Fish and Game
Dee Neker	PCFFA
Jim Cook	Great Northern Corp.
Diane Higgins	Educational interests
Robert W. Gable	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Jerry Barnes	U.S. Forest Service
Al Foss	Orleans Rod & Gun Club
Del Robinson	BIA
Sun Gnome Madrone	RCAA
Douglas Denton	Calif. DWR
Bruce Taylor	Congressman's Bosco office
Mike Parton	Karuk Tribe
	KINS

ATTACHMENT 2

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE
MEETING AGENDA

May 31, 1988

1:00 P.M. Call to order

1:10 Correction and approval of minutes and agenda

1:20 Report on proposed legislation (Taylor)

H.R. 3496, proposed amendments to the Klamath River Basin Fishery Resources Restoration Act

H.R. 2513, proposed studies of Russian River fishery resources

1:40 Report of the technical work group on the work plan and budget for Federal Fiscal Year 1989 and State Fiscal Year 1988-89

Work plan component proposed for Federal funding (Iverson)

Work plan component proposed for non-Federal funding (Odemar)

2:30 Break

2:45 Work plan presentation (continued)

3:30 Implementation procedures for Federally-funded work (Gable)

4:00 Adjourn

June 1, 1988

9:00 A.M. Convene. Discussion of Task Force mission and goals statement (Steucke)

9:30 Discussion of interagency memorandums of agreement (Iverson)

10:00 Other old business

10:15 Break

10:30 Briefing on instream flow conditions projected for summer 1988 in Klamath Basin (Hubbell)

10:45 Other new business

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE
MEETING AGENDA

June 1, 1988 continued

11:15 Public comment period

11:45 Discussion of next meeting

12:00 Adjourn

FEDERALLY-FUNDED WORK PLAN AND
BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1989
KLAMATH BASIN
FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM

TASK	SUBTASK	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	IMPLEM_BY	CONTINUE IN FY1990?
** (0)ADMINISTER PROGRAM					
(0)ADMINISTER PROGRAM		(0.1)OPERATE KLAMATH FIELD OFFICE	150000	USFWS	YES
** Subtotal **			150000		
** (1) PLAN PROGRAM					
(1) PLAN PROGRAM		(1.1) COORDINATOR FOR PLAN AND ENV. ASSESSMENT	105500	CONTRACT	YES
** Subtotal **			105500		
** (2) GET INFORMATION					
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.1) OCEAN HARVEST INFO	(2.11) PARTITION CHINOOK PRODUCTION ESTIMATES	50800	CDFG	NO
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.1) OCEAN HARVEST INFO	(2.12) TAGGING NEEDS FOR TIME/AREA MANAGEMENT	36400	CONTRACT	NO
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.2) CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT	(2.21) ESTIMATE FALL CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT	41700	CDFG	YES
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.2) CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT	(2.22) FALL CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT, LOWER KLAMATH	24000	USFWS	YES
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.2) CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT	(2.23) FALL CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT, BLUE CREEK	43800	USFWS	YES
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.2) CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT	(2.25) HYDROACOUSTIC WEIR, SALMON RIVER	22100	CDFG	YES
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.3) STEELHEAD ESCAPMNT	(2.31) STEELHEAD ESCAPEMENT, SELECTED TRIBS	63700	USFS	YES
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.4) PRODUCTIVECAPACITY	(2.41) HABITAT TYPE, STANDING CROP, 125 MI.STREAM	85100	USFS	YES
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.4) PRODUCTIVECAPACITY	(2.42) TYPE HABITAT, PLAN REHAB, PINE CREEK	20000	HVBC	NO
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.4) PRODUCTIVECAPACITY	(2.43) JUVENILE PRODUCTION, LOWER KLAMATH TRIBS	0	USFWS	YES
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.4) PRODUCTIVECAPACITY	(2.44) HABITAT AVAILABLE FOR FALL CHINOOK, BLUE CR	0	USFWS	YES

FEDERALLY-FUNDED WORK PLAN AND
BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1989
KLAMATH BASIN
FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM

TASK	SUBTASK	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST	IMPLEM_BY	CONTINUE IN FY1990?
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.5) DOWNSTRM MIGRANTS	(2.51) TRAP OUTMIGRANTS, LOWER KLAMATH RIVER	27200	USFWS	YES
(2) GET INFORMATION	(2.6) INSTREAM FLOWS	(2.61) ANALYZE RECORDS, FEASIBILITY OF AUGMENT.	36000	CONTRACT	NO
** Subtotal **			450800		
** (3) EDUCATE					
(3) EDUCATE		(3.1) (SCOPE OF WORK TO BE DEVELOPED)	109000	CONTRACT	YES
** Subtotal **			109000		
** (4) MANAGE HABITAT					
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.1) CONTROL SEDIMENT	(4.15) CONTROL BANK EROSION, YREKA CREEK	10000		
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.1) CONTROL SEDIMENT	(4.15) SEDIMENT BUDGET, SCOTT SUBBASIN	50000	SCS	NO
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.2) INSTREAM HABITAT	(4.25) EVALUATE EXISTING HABITAT IMPROVEMENTS	0	USFS	YES
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.3) SCREEN DIVERSIONS	(4.32) INCREASE MAINTENANCE CAPABILITY	20000	CDFG	YES
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.3) SCREEN DIVERSIONS	(4.33) BUILD NEW SCREENS	20000	CDFG	YES
** Subtotal **			100000		
** (5) ARTIF. PROPAGATION					
(5) ARTIF. PROPAGATION	(5.1) EVALUATE	(5.11) EVALUATE PRESMOLT CHINOOK RELEASE, IGSFH	57000	CDFG	YES
(5) ARTIF. PROPAGATION	(5.1) EVALUATE	(5.12) EVALUATE POND REARING OF FALL CHINOOK	27600	CDFG	YES
** Subtotal **			84600		
*** Total ***			999900		

ATTA[redacted]T 4

KLAMATH FISHERY RES[redacted]ATION PROGRAM
PROJECTS RECOMMENDED TO
BE FUNDED BY CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT
OF FISH AND GAME, FY 1988-1989.

TASK	SUBTASK	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST
** (0)ADMINISTER PROGRM			
(0)ADMINISTER PROGRM		STATE ADMINISTRATION	50000
** Subtotal **			50000
** (3) EDUCATE			
(3) EDUCATE		(99) YREKA CREEK NATURE TRAIL	11000
(3) EDUCATE		(111) CLASS ROOM INCUBATOR, EUREKA	2000
(3) EDUCATE		(146) TEACHER WORKSHOPS ON SALMON/STEELHEAD	7000
(3) EDUCATE		(45) AQUATIC ECOLOGY PROGRAM, EUREKA	3000
** Subtotal **			23000
** (4) MANAGE HABITAT			
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.1) CONTROL SEDIMENT	(156) ANALYZE AGGRADATION, LOWER KLAMATH TRIBS	10700
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.1) CONTROL SEDIMENT	(9) CONTROL BANK EROSION, SCOTT R.	113000
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.1) CONTROL SEDIMENT	( ) GRAVEL ENHANCEMENT	73000
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.1) CONTROL SEDIMENT	(10) REMOVE AND ROUTE SEDIMENT, SCOTT BASIN	16000
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.2) INSTREAM HABITAT	(194) SIDE CHANNELS FOR REARING, SALMON BASIN	35300
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.2) INSTREAM HABITAT	(15) HABITAT MODIF, BLUE CREEK	20000
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.2) INSTREAM HABITAT	(196) HELICOPTER PLACEMENT OF WOODY DEBRIS	7100
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.2) INSTREAM HABITAT	(195) BARRIER MODIFICATION, JACKASS CREEK	3500
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.3) SCREEN DIVERSIONS	(139) INVENTORY UNSCREENED DIVERSIONS	95800
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.1) CONTROL SEDIMENT	(101) SCOTT RIVER SAND TRAP	28300
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.1) CONTROL SEDIMENT	(8) SCOTT RIVER SEDIMENT REMOVAL/TRAPPING	28800
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.2) INSTREAM HABITAT	(146) BOULDER GROUPS, AKINS CREEK	7500
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.2) INSTREAM HABITAT	(209) BOULDER PLACEMENT, BLUFF CREEK	101000
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.2) INSTREAM HABITAT	(211) BOULDER PLACEMENT, RED CAP CREEK	25400
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.2) INSTREAM HABITAT	(210) LOG PLACEMENT, BOISE CREEK	29300

KLAMATH FISHERY RESTORATION PROGRAM
PROJECTS RECOMMENDED TO
BE FUNDED BY CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT
OF FISH AND GAME, FY 1988-1989.

TASK	SUBTASK	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.2) INSTREAM HABITAT	(165) SPAWNING RIFFLES, COTTONWOOD CREEK	31700
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.2) INSTREAM HABITAT	(197) INCREASE SIDE CHANNEL FLOW, ELK CREEK	16500
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.2) INSTREAM HABITAT	(198) ROCK CLUSTERS, ELK CREEK	5700
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.2) INSTREAM HABITAT	(199) ROCK CLUSTERS, INDIAN CREEK	14000
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.1) CONTROL SEDIMENT	(166) GRIDER CREEK BANK STABILIZATION	20200
(4) MANAGE HABITAT	(4.1) CONTROL SEDIMENT	(98) YREKA CREEK BANK STABILIZATION	8000
** Subtotal **			690800
** (5) ARTIF. PROPAGATION			
(5) ARTIF. PROPAGATION	(5.2) REAR FISH	(157) REAR LATE-RUN FALL CHINOOK, HUNTER CREEK	12000
(5) ARTIF. PROPAGATION	(5.2) REAR FISH	(58) OPERATE EXISTING FACILITIES, SALMON BASIN	40000
(5) ARTIF. PROPAGATION	(5.2) REAR FISH	(158) REAR LATE RUN FALLS, HIGH PRAIRIE CREEK	19200
(5) ARTIF. PROPAGATION	(5.2) REAR FISH	(159) REAR LATE RUN FALLS, OMAGAR CREEK	19600
(5) ARTIF. PROPAGATION	(5.2) REAR FISH	(16) REAR RESCUED STEELHEAD, EAGLE RANCH	29600
(5) ARTIF. PROPAGATION	(5.2) REAR FISH	(236) REAR CHINOOK, FALL CREEK FACILITY	25400
(5) ARTIF. PROPAGATION	(5.2) REAR FISH	(152) POND REARING OF YEARLING CHINOOK, KLAMATH R.	76700
** Subtotal **			222500
*** Total ***			986300

Projected Instream Flow Conditions in the Klamath River Basin -- Summer 1988 1/

The 1988 period for water supply accumulation in California is now very nearly over. At this point, it appears virtually certain that 1987 and 1988 will go into the record books as the third set of back-to-back critically dry years in this century.

Snowpack conditions continue to be far below normal. In an average year, about 70 percent of the seasonal snowpack remains on May 1. This year, the May 1 snowpack in California's North Coast Area, which includes that part of the Klamath River system lying within the State, amounted to only about 17 percent of the May 1 average. The snowpack in the Upper Klamath River Basin (Oregon) amounted to 35 percent of average on May 1. That in the Sacramento basin, by comparison, totaled 15 percent of the May 1 average.

Flows in most unregulated streams within the Klamath system are already relatively low. April runoff in the North Coast Area amounted to only 29 percent of average. For the period, October through April, total runoff for this area amounted to only 53 percent of average. Last year, runoff during this period totaled 60 percent of average for the area.

April-July runoff for the North Coast Area as a whole is forecast to be about 40 percent of average. Runoff during this period in the Trinity River basin at Lewiston is predicted to be about 44 percent of average, while that in the Scott River system, at Fort Jones, is projected to be only about 35 percent of average. The runoff into Upper Klamath Lake (Oregon) is forecast to be about 32 percent of average during this period.

At the beginning of May, storage levels in major Klamath basin reservoris remained fairly high, compared to historical averages. On May 17, Trinity Lake held approximately 1.969 million acre-feet (a/f) of water, just over 80 percent of its capacity, and 90 percent of average for that date. On about May 1, Upper Klamath Lake was at approximately 95 percent of its available active storage capacity of about 500,000 a/f. By comparison, Shasta Reservoir on May 17, contained approximately 3.096 million a/f of water. This is equal to

---

1/ Report to the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force, May 31, 1988. Prepared by Paul M. Hubbell, California Department of Fish and Game.

about 76 percent of average for that date, and amounts to about 68 percent of capacity.

While the May storms that have struck California and Oregon have increased precipitation totals somewhat, much of the water they yielded fell at lower elevations, generally increasing streamflows somewhat, but contributing only relatively minor amounts to reservoir storage.

Because Shasta Lake inflow for water year 1988 has been forecast at below 4.0 million a/f (the break-point between wet/normal and dry water years, as defined in the January 1981 Interior Secretary Decision Document), flow release totals to the Trintiy River at Lewiston will be reduced approximately 20 percent, from an originally scheduled 325,113 a/f to 260,600 a/f (see Table 1). At present, it appears the revised schedule will be maintained.

On April 11, 1988, the Bureau of Reclamatation's Klamath Project Manager advised the Department of Fish and Game of the Bureau's concerns about depleting the active storage capacity of Upper Klamath Lake this year with the possibility of yet another dry year occurring next year, and the need to take steps required to reserve a minimum carryover of 100,000 a/f of active storage in the lake. To retain this block of water, the Bureau felt flow releases to the Klamath River below Iron Gate would have to be reduced. Fish and Game and Bureau representatives met April 27 in Klamath Falls to discuss the Bureau's conservation proposals. Following the meeting, the Department, on May 9, provided the Bureau with a recommended schedule of releases for the reduced volume the Bureau proposed for the river (see Table 2). Subsequent to that date, the Bureau has advised the Department that because of recent storms, water conditions in Upper Klamath Lake have improved, to a point where all proposals to reduce flows to the Klamath River below Iron Gate Damn are now "on hold".

At the present time, water conditions in the main stems of the Klamath and Trinity rivers during the fall 1988 spawning season are expected to be comparable to those which occurred in 1987. Flows in unregulated tributary streams are expected to be lower than average, with conditions approximating those observed in the fall of 1987. As a result, unless significant early fall rains occur, most chinook salmon spawning is expected to occur in areas used in 1987.

Table 1

Comparison of Water Year 1988 Trinity River Flow Release Schedules for Lewiston Dam Under Normal and Dry Year Conditions

Month	Normal year (cfs)	Dry year (cfs)
October 1-31	300	300
November 1-30	300	300
December 1-31	300	300
January 1-31	300	300
February 1-29	300	300
March 1-31	450	450
April 1-17	600	500
April 18-May 13	800	600
May 14-21	500	500
May 22-June 30	700	500
June 1-3	700	500
June 4-17	700	400
June 18-30	700	300
July 1-31	600	300
August 1-14	500	300
August 15-31	400	300
September 1-30	300	300
TOTAL RELEASE (acre-feet)	325,113	260,600

Table 2

Comparison of 1988 Drought Contingency Flow Schedule Suggested by the California Department of Fish and Game in Response to Bureau of Reclamation Klamath Project (Oregon) Draft Water Conservation Plan for Upper Klamath Lake With Normal Minimum Iron Gate Dam Releases to Klamath River a/

Month	Normal minimum release (cfs)	Suggested drought contingency releases (cfs)
January	1,300	-
February	1,300	-
March	1,300	-
April	1,300	-
May	1,000	700
June	710	400
July	710	300
August	1,000	1,000
September	1,300	1,000
October	1,300	1,000 b/
November	1,300	-
December	1,300	-

a/ The Bureau of Reclamation has proposed modifying 1988 downstream flow releases in order that they may keep at least 100,000 acre-feet of active storage in Upper Klamath Lake to serve agricultural needs and ensure some downstream releases in 1989, should dry conditions persist.

b/ October releases may be reduced to 800 cfs, if drought conditions continue at that time.