

DRAFT NOTES  
KLAMATH FISHERIES TASK FORCE  
TELEPHONE CONFERENCE, 4 MAY 1994

The conference call was initiated at 10 a.m. A quorum of Task Force members were present (see Attachment 1, attendance roster). Jerry Grover acted as chair, representing Bill Shake. To conform to FCC requirements, members confirmed they understood their comments would be recorded.

Background on the issue was provided in the conference call notice to Task Force members, dated 26 April 1994. Purpose of the telephone conference was for the Task Force to act on proposed changes in the scope of work for project 94-FR-2, propagation of fall chinook salmon on the Yurok Reservation. That is, proposed changes could be accepted, or not. If accepted, the changes would be incorporated in an agreement for FY94 work. If not, funds that would have been used for the new work items would be available to be obligated for something else. Grover pointed out that the Task Force would not have to identify specific alternate uses for the funds today -- that could be done later. Additional background provided during the conference call:

Terry Coltra, NCIDC: The only real change we propose in our revised FY94 scope of work is to reprogram some funds budgeted for fish rearing to rehabilitation of the rearing facilities. The other change from the original scope of work is inclusion of broodstock collection in fall 1994. While that task was not reviewed by the technical work group and Task Force, it is simply a continuation of the way funding of the rearing projects has been done for the past two years: any surplus funds may be carried over for collection of broodstock for the next rearing cycle. This enables NCIDC to get reimbursed for broodstock collection without waiting for the next contracting cycle. The front-loading of funds for broodstock collection was worked out by Doug Alcorn and Bill Risling, former NCIDC director.

Q: Has the Task Force approved 1994 broodstock collection?

Iverson: There is nothing wrong with providing funds in one fiscal year for broodstock collection in the following fiscal year. The only problem we have in proceeding with this agreement is that we have no record that the Task Force ever approved 1994 broodstock collection, and we don't, normally, fund work that the Task Force hasn't recommended.

Q: How many fish are being reared, and where is this project in its five-year plan?

Hillman: Cappell site was chosen for accessibility and water supply. This facility was intended to supply fish to Pecwan and other streams in the area, where no rearing sites are available. Broodstock were to be captured at the tributaries, fish reared at Cappell, then returned to home tributaries. The Task Force should think in terms of getting full benefit from the investments in these facilities.

Q: Total cost of repairs?

Coltra: \$4,100 at Cappell, \$3,900 at Hunter...\$15,480 total for materials and labor.

Q: In the memo we got, there was mention of \$38,000. Are we now down to \$15,480?

Coltra: That's for repairs. Iverson included the 1994 broodstock capture in coming up with the \$38,000. We consider that to simply be a routine part of this project, and not a new item.

Q: Surplus funds are available because of a broodstock shortage?

Coltra: Correct. We don't have enough juveniles to justify operating the Cappell complex.

Q: If you had gotten enough eggs to use up your funds for rearing, would you have brought the facilities repair to the Task Force for funding as a new, separate, project?

Coltra: Yes, or sought some other funding source. Need for repairs is critical to save the facilities and meet OSHA safety requirements. We see the repairs as meeting the same intent as the rearing work that the Task Force has already approved.

Q: Did the Task Force fund construction of these facilities?

Hillman: In past years, the Task Force has funded construction at small scale rearing facilities. Example: Orleans Rod & Gun Club steelhead facility. We have also funded maintenance.

Q: Would this project be jeopardized if we used the surplus funds for other purposes, and considered the rehab work in the next budget cycle?

Iverson: Typically, projected funds surpluses are estimated at the June Task Force meeting, and may be directed to some of the higher-ranking projects approved for the upcoming fiscal year. For FY94, the Task Force decided last June that any surplus funds would go to the education project proposed by Diane Higgins. We have identified about \$40,000 available for that project, which was budgeted for about \$51,000...so theoretically, the next dollar of surplus funds ought to go to that education project. On the other

Farro: I would like to see all this reviewed by the technical work group, to see if it stands on its own merits.

Grover: Is that a motion?

\*\*\*\* Farro: Move to reject the proposed changes.

\*\*\*\* Bingham: Second, and offer an amendment that we would hold these funds for a decision on what to do with them at the June meeting, after the 1995 rearing proposal has been through review.

\*\*\*\* Farro: Seems like that is what would happen anyway, but I accept the amendment.

#### DISCUSSION

Hillman: Does this mean a cooperative agreement would go forward to cover the remainder of the project?

Grover: If the motion passes, I will instruct the field office to write an agreement for the total amount less \$38,000, which would let NCIDC get reimbursed for funds they have already spent. If the Task Force decides, at the June meeting, to fund all or part of the proposed new tasks, then the amount of payment would be increased. We are speaking of the facilities maintenance, and the 1994 broodstock collection.

Coltra: The latter would not be an issue now, if we had had a signed contract.

Iverson: It doesn't matter what stage of contracting we are asked to sign off on, whether a draft agreement, or a modification to a signed agreement. If what is proposed is work that the Task Force has not approved, Bill Shake has not given us the authority to obligate money for that work.

Hillman: The advanced funding of broodstock collection has been done in the past two cycles, so I don't see why it is illegal now, and why it is being brought up for Task Force action.

Coltra: Just having come into this job, I assumed it is the normal process to fund next year's broodstock collection.

Bulfinch: Too bad we didn't start out viewing this as a multi-year project.

Elliott: Agree that a five-year plan would be useful, and I commit the Department to assist NCIDC in developing it.

Coltra: we intend to work on the plan in the next few months. Appreciate your help.

ATTENDANCE LIST

KLAMATH TASK FORCE TELECONFERENCE, 4 MAY 1994

Task Force members/alternates:

Nat Bingham

Kent Bulfinch

Rich Elliott

Mitch Farro

Jerry Grover for Bill Shake (chair)

Leaf Hillman

Walt Lara

Jack West for Barbara Holder

Keith Wilkinson

Others:

Terry Coltra

Jim Craig

Bruce Halstead

Ron Iverson

Linda Schwinck